

Cambridge Pre-U Specimen Papers  
and Mark Schemes

Cambridge International Level 3  
Pre-U Certificate in  
**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

For use from 2008 onwards

Cambridge  
**Pre-U**

[www.XtremePapers.com](http://www.XtremePapers.com)



UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE  
International Examinations



# **Specimen Materials**

# **Philosophy and Theology (9774)**

**Cambridge International Level 3  
Pre-U Certificate in Philosophy and Theology  
(Principal)**

**For use from 2008 onwards**

**QAN 500/5944/0**

### Support

CIE provides comprehensive support for all its qualifications, including the Cambridge Pre-U. There are resources for teachers and candidates written by experts. CIE also endorses a range of materials from other publishers to give a choice of approach. More information on what is available for this particular syllabus can be found at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk)

### Syllabus Updates

This booklet of specimen materials is for use from 2008. It is intended for use with the version of the syllabus that will be examined in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The purpose of these materials is to provide Centres with a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers in advance of the first operational examination.

If there are any changes to the syllabus CIE will write to centres to inform them. The syllabus and these specimen materials will also be published annually on the CIE website ([www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu](http://www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu)). The version of the syllabus on the website should always be considered as the definitive version.

Further copies of this, or any other Cambridge Pre-U specimen booklet, can be obtained by either downloading from our website [www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu](http://www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu)

or contacting:

Customer Services, University of Cambridge International Examinations,  
1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU  
Telephone: +44 (0)1223 553554  
Fax: +44 (0)1223 553558  
E-mail: [international@cie.org.uk](mailto:international@cie.org.uk)

CIE retains the copyright on all its publications. CIE registered Centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, CIE cannot give permission to Centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within a Centre.

Copyright © University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 2008



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/01**

Paper 1 Introduction to Philosophy and Theology

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

Candidates answer on the enclosed Answer Booklet.

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 on both sides of the paper.

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

Answer **three** questions. 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 **2** printed pages.



Answer **three** questions.

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

- 1 Compare and contrast the views of Plato and Aristotle on the relationship between body and soul [25]
- 2 'There is no doubt that scripture is inspired by God.' Critically assess this claim. [25]
- 3 'Moral duty is defined only by God's will.' Critically assess this claim. [25]
- 4 Consider the view that humans have no free will. [25]

---

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/01**

Paper 1 Introduction to Philosophy and Theology

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 75**

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



AO1	Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the issues arising from the relevant religious and philosophical themes and texts; and the ability to identify, select and apply ideas and concepts, through the use of examples and evidence from recognised sources of authority.	40%
AO2	Candidates will be required to provide a systematic critical analysis of the texts and theories they have studied, sustain a line of argument and justify a point of view. Different views, including those of different scholars and schools of thought, should be referred to and evaluated where appropriate. They should demonstrate a synoptic approach to the areas studied and make links between them and their responses where appropriate.	60%

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

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

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



### Question Specific Notes

**1 Compare and contrast the views of Plato and Aristotle on the relationship between body and soul. [25]**

Plato's assessment is based on a rationalist assessment of human nature, whereas Aristotle offers an empirical account based on his doctrine of causation. Candidates should root their comparisons in the presuppositions of rationalist as opposed to empiricist approaches to the issue in question: thus Aristotle observed the supposed links between material, formal, efficient and final causes, and concluded that the final causes of human action are morality and reason. The flesh and blood of a human is its material cause; the formal cause equates to the soul, and the formal cause is the same as the efficient cause, since it is what makes a potential human being into an actual/living being. For Aristotle, therefore, form and matter are inseparable. For Plato, his metaphysical assumptions about the world of Forms led him to assume that body and soul *are* separable: at death the body rots, but the soul goes to the world of Forms, contemplates them, then reincarnates, thus providing the brain with knowledge through *anamnesis* (recollection). Thus the embodied soul has three elements: reason, natural aggression, and base appetite, and these need to be in balance to ensure a stable personality. Candidates should be able to see that there is a metaphysical aspect to Aristotle's ideas also, in so far as his First efficient Cause has to be metaphysical – pure intellect; moreover if the FEC can exist without a body, the human intellect should also be able to exist as a separable soul. Analysis of these ideas can focus on any of these issues, and could, for example, include a comparison of Platonic and Aristotelian thought in contemporary debate.

**2 'There is no doubt that scripture is inspired by God.' Critically assess this claim. [25]**

Candidates would be expected to explain and assess the concept of inspiration in connection with one or more religious traditions. Most are likely to approach this from the standpoint of Christian scripture, since the traditions of scriptural analysis through text, literary and form criticism, for example, are well evidenced. The discussion could take several routes. Some might look at issues of text transmission, editing and redacting, formal analysis and so on, to suggest that a concept of scripture as 'God-breathed' and inerrant is difficult (or not difficult) to maintain. The discussion could include a consideration of the moral content of scripture, raising questions about the moral status of parts of scripture. Candidates are at liberty to take the discussion where they choose in consideration of the phrase, "no doubt". For example, they could consider the basis for the debate about fundamentalism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, where the insistence on the fundamentals of belief led to the Creationist stance in Europe and America, and in particular to the theory of intelligent design. Some might question inspiration "by God", assessing the counter-claim that inspiration is a psychological or a sociological phenomenon, for example. Questions about indubitability might also be assessed from a variety of perspectives.

**3 'Moral duty is defined only by God's will.' Critically assess this claim. [25]**

Candidates should recognise that the quotation refers to the claims of Divine Command Theory – i.e. the view that morality is defined by the moral will of the deity. Traditionally, this notion is defined by some kind of naturalist understanding, as in Aquinas' concept of Natural Law, in which morality is given by God in accordance with our supposed common human nature. Candidates should illustrate several problems with such a view. For example some may hold that one or other of the competing ethical theories is correct, either on the basis of meta-ethical theory, or else pragmatically. A central objection to DCT is Euthyphro's dilemma: i.e. the question of God's relation to the moral law, the dilemma being that God appears either arbitrary or impotent, and in either eventuality loses the status of God. Aquinas' answer was that God is not a moral agent – his goodness consists simply in being perfectly whatever it means for God to be good.

Assessment of DCT can take many paths, and candidates are free to take any route in assessing the key word, “only”.

**4 Consider the view that humans have no free will.**

**[25]**

The question invites candidates to consider the strength of determinism, so candidates might consider scientific, philosophical, theological, or other types of deterministic theory. Scientific and philosophical determinism are based in the success of induction, and the alleged fixity of the laws of nature: if these apply to the brain also, then determinism seems unavoidable, since the laws of causation would suggest that from the first fact of the universe, all other effects must follow inexorably. This might be challenged by an appeal, for example, to an exemption in the case of thought, which is sometimes held to work on non-deterministic quantum processes, although it is not clear whether quantum processes are simply non-computable yet still deterministic. Theological determinism might be rooted in philosophical determinism, but equally might be assumed entirely from religious considerations, such as the immutability of God’s will, or the certainty of God’s omniscience. The usual route out of this is to assume that God’s foreknowledge is acausal. Candidates will probably consider the defence of free will through compatibilism or libertarianism. Candidates might conclude that “no free will” would be an overstatement, since free will is a widespread assumption in folk psychology, and the structures of human society, including responsibility and accountability, presume it.

## Appendix A

## Generic Marking Scheme

<p>Level 6 21–25 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level</li> <li>• Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained</li> <li>• Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
<p>Level 5 16–20 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question</li> <li>• Response is accurate: answers the question specifically</li> <li>• Argument has structure and development and is sustained</li> <li>• Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
<p>Level 4 12–15 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked</li> <li>• Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained</li> <li>• Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument</li> <li>• May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately</li> </ul>
<p>Level 3 8–11 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon.</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success</li> <li>• Attempts to evaluate though with partial success</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided</li> <li>• Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly</li> </ul>
<p>Level 2 1–7 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic</li> <li>• Argument is limited or confused</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
<p>Level 1 0 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit</li> </ul>





---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/02**

Paper 2 Key Texts and Topics in Philosophy and Theology 1

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

Candidates answer on the enclosed Answer Booklet.

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 on both sides of the paper.

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 **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



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

*Hylas* I frankly own, Philonous, that it is in vain to stand out any longer. Colours, sounds, tastes, in a word, all those termed *secondary qualities*, have certainly no existence without the mind. But by this acknowledgement, I must not be supposed to derogate anything from the reality of matter or external objects, seeing it is no more than several philosophers maintain, who nevertheless are the farthest imaginable from denying matter. For the clearer understanding of this, you must know sensible qualities are by philosophers divided into *primary* and *secondary*. The former are extension, figure, solidity, gravity, motion, and rest. And these they hold exist really in bodies. The latter are those above enumerated; or briefly, all sensible qualities beside the primary, which they assert are only so many sensations or ideas existing nowhere but in the mind.....

*Philonous* You are still then of opinion that extension and figures are inherent in external unthinking substances?

*Hylas* I am

*Philonous* But what if the same arguments which are brought against secondary qualities, will hold good against these also?

[Extract from **George Berkeley**: *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*: 728]

- 1 (a) Explain why Hylas argues that there is a difference between primary and secondary qualities, and why Berkeley rejects this distinction. [10]
- (b) Assess critically Berkeley's claim that material objects exist only within the mind. [15]

#### Section B

- 2 Evaluate the claim that there is absolutely nothing that can be known for certain. [25]

OR

- 3 Critically assess foundationalism as a theory of knowledge. [25]

## Topic 2 Philosophical and Theological Language

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

### Section A

Many Christians will, no doubt, behave in a specifically Christian manner in that they will follow ritual practices which are Christian and neither Jewish nor Buddhist. But though following certain practices may well be the proper test for membership of a particular religious society, a church, not even the most ecclesiastically-minded Christian will regard participation in a ritual as the fundamental characteristic of a Christian way of life. There must be some more important difference between an agapeistically policed Christian and agapeistically policed Jew than that the former attends a church and the latter a synagogue.

The really import difference, I think, is to be found in the fact that the intentions to pursue the behaviour policies, which may be the same for different religions, are associated with thinking of different *stories* (or sets of stories). By a story I shall here mean a proposition or set of propositions which are straightforwardly empirical propositions capable of empirical test and which are thought of by the religious man in connection with his resolution to follow the way of life advocated by his religion.

[Extract from **R.B. Braithwaite**: *'An Empiricist's view of the Nature of Religious Belief'*, in **Basil Mitchell** (ed.), *The Philosophy of Religion*: 84]

- 4 (a) With reference to the passage above, explain Braithwaite's view that religious propositions are properly empirical. [10]
- (b) Critically examine Braithwaite's claim that it is the intention to behave that constitutes religious conviction. [15]

### Section B

- 5 Critically assess the claim that religious language is meaningful cognitively. [25]

OR

- 6 Evaluate the claim that moral values cannot be objective. [25]

### Topic 3 Philosophy of Religion

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

#### Section A

We may again follow David Hume as our guide to a world devoid of pain and suffering, and continue the discussion arising out of his second complaint concerning the universe. He makes here two suggestions, one more and one less radical. The more radical one is this: 'Might not the Deity exterminate all ill, wherever it were to be found; and produce all good, without any preparation or long progress of causes and effects?' In other words, might not God directly intervene in the workings of nature to prevent any occasion of suffering and to produce a maximum of pleasure and happiness?

The initial answer is of course that God, being omnipotent, could do this. But let us imagine Hume's suggested policy being carried out, noting in particular its consequences for man's status as a moral being. It would mean that no wrong action could ever have bad effects, and that no piece of carelessness or ill-judgement in dealing with the world could ever lead to harmful consequences. If a thief were to steal a million pounds from a bank, instead of anyone being made poorer thereby, another million pounds would appear from nowhere to replenish the robbed safe; and this, moreover, without causing any inflationary consequences..... We can at least begin to imagine a world custom-made for the avoidance of all suffering. But the daunting fact that emerges is that in such a world moral qualities would no longer have any point or value.

[Extract from **John Hick**: *Evil and the God of Love*: 324]

- 7 (a) With reference to the passage above, explain Hick's view that a world without suffering would no longer have any point or value. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Hick's claim that *this* world, with all its uncertainties, challenges and dangers, underlies the emergence of just about the whole range of the more valuable human characteristics. [15]

#### Section B

- 8 'Belief in a creator God is pointless, since the scientific evidence concerning the origins of the universe is necessarily independent of belief in God.' Evaluate this claim. [25]

OR

- 9 Examine critically the view that belief in miracles devalues belief in God. [25]



## Topic 4 New Testament: The Four Gospels

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

### Section A

#### Text (a)

Then they came to Jerusalem. And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who were selling and those who were buying in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money changers and those who sold doves: and he would not allow anyone to carry anything through the temple. He was teaching and saying, "Is it not written:

My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?

But you have made it a den of robbers."

And when the chief priests and the scribes heard it, they kept looking for a way to kill him, for they were afraid of him, because the whole crowd was spellbound by his teaching. And when evening came, Jesus and his disciples went out of the city. In the morning as they passed by, they saw the fig tree withered away to its roots. [Mark 11:15-20, NRSV]

#### Text (b)

The Passover of the Jews was near and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. In the temple he found people selling cattle, sheep and doves, and the money changers seated at their tables. Making a whip of cords, he drove all of them out of the temple, both the sheep and doves, and the money changers and overturned their tables. He told those who were selling the doves, "Take these things out of here! Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!" His disciples remembered that it was written, "Zeal for your house will consume me." The Jews then said to him, "What sign can you show us for doing this?" Jesus answered them, "Destroy this temple and I will raise it up." The Jews then said, "This temple has been under construction for forty-six years, and will you raise it up in three days?" But he was speaking of the temple of his body. [John 2:13-21, NRSV]

- 10 (a)** Discuss these accounts of Jesus' 'cleansing of the temple' and the solutions which have been proposed to the problems they raise. [10]
- (b)** Draw out what is taught or implied about the person and work of Christ in the prologue to John's gospel (1:1-14), and show briefly how these themes are developed later in the gospel. [15]

### Section B

- 11** In what sense, if any, did Jesus claim to be Messiah or accept that title? [25]

**OR**

- 12** 'Jesus' miracles presuppose faith; they do not create it.' How far do the gospel accounts of the miracles of Jesus support that claim. [25]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/02**

Paper 2 Key Texts and Topics in Philosophy and Theology 1

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 50**

---

This document consists of **14** printed pages.



AO1	Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the issues arising from the relevant religious and philosophical themes and texts; and the ability to identify, select and apply ideas and concepts, through the use of examples and evidence from recognised sources of authority.	40%
AO2	Candidates will be required to provide a systematic critical analysis of the texts and theories they have studied, sustain a line of argument and justify a point of view. Different views, including those of different scholars and schools of thought, should be referred to and evaluated where appropriate. They should demonstrate a synoptic approach to the areas studied and make links between them in their responses where appropriate.	60%

In the textual questions AO1 and AO2 are assessed separately.  
AO1 and AO2 are both to be considered in assessing each of the essay questions.

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

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

## Question Specific Notes

### Topic 1 Epistemology

[Extract from **George Berkeley**: *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*: 728]

- 1 (a) Explain why Hylas argues that there is a difference between primary and secondary qualities, and why Berkeley rejects this distinction.**

Berkeley's comments are part of his critique of Locke. According to Locke, for example, physical objects have both primary and secondary qualities. Primary qualities are measurable / quantitative, e.g. size, shape, weight. Secondary qualities are the 'qualitatives' – the sensible qualities such as colour and smell. For example, snow can be observed in terms of its shape, volume and movement, whereas its whiteness and coldness are what we perceive through our senses, and are said not to be intrinsic to the snow. According to Locke, only primary qualities are 'real'. The particular bulk, number, figure, and motion of the parts of fire or snow are really in them, whether any one's senses perceive them or no, 'but light, heat, whiteness, or coldness, are no more really in them than sickness or pain is in manna. Take away the sensation of them; let not the eyes see light or colours, nor the ears hear sounds; let the palate not taste, nor the nose smell, and all colours, tastes, odours, and sounds, as they are such particular ideas, vanish and cease, and are reduced to their causes, i.e. bulk, figure, and motion of parts.' According to Berkeley even primary qualities only exist in perceptions, because the concept of a wholly unperceived material object makes no sense. Heat, for example, is seen as a secondary quality. If the perceiver puts one hand into a bucket of cold water, and another into warm water, and then puts both hands into luke-warm water, one hand will convey the information that the water is hot, and the other that it is cold. Since there are two different objects perceiving the water (the hands) to be both hot and cold, then the heat is not a quality of the water. Primary qualities can be treated in the same way. Size, for example, depends on the distance between the observer and an object (or the size of the observer), and so cannot be a quality of the object either. **[10 marks]**

- (b) Assess critically Berkeley's claim that material objects exist only within the mind.**

Since, according to Berkeley, neither primary nor secondary qualities can be shown to exist outside perception of them, all the qualities or properties of objects, and indeed the objects themselves, are nothing but ideas – nothing but mental entities. The notion of material substance, on such a view, must therefore be abandoned. This was Berkeley's answer to the issue of scepticism about the external world, because all that exist are minds and their ideas. Berkeley's arguments have a common-sense feel about them: the concept of a smell that no-one smells seems nonsense. Equally, to refer to hearing assumes that there is a mind that hears; to refer to seeing assumes that there is a mind that sees, and so on. The corollary is that the *objects* of touch, taste, hearing, smell and sight exist only in the mind also: hence Berkeley called this philosophy 'Immaterialism' (later dubbed 'Idealism'). Berkeley's famous phrase which encapsulates this philosophy is: *esse est percipi* – 'to be is to be perceived'. There are a number of directions that candidates might take to reject Berkeley's claim. First, there is a difference between perception in general and one's own perception. If I feel pain, then the idea that the pain exists independently of my feeling it is nonsensical; but the same point does not apply to objects like the proverbial trees in a forest: I cannot personally conceive of a tree as existing without having such a perception in my mind, but I can conceive of a tree that exists unconceived. Presumably trees did that for countless millennia before the arrival of intelligent observers. Candidates could also discuss how Berkeley accounts for the difference between objects that are imagined in the mind (such as mythological beasts) and those that really exist; also, how he accounts for the consistency of sense perception in cases where objects undergo material changes when they are not being perceived, for example when an observer leaves a room in which a fire is burning and returns later to find that it has burned down. Candidates might argue that Berkeley seems to have no notion of an inference to the best explanation: he points out that it is *unnecessary* to postulate the existence of material substance, since our experiences could be exactly the same whether there were any non-mental cause of them or not, but he appears not to consider that the concept of material substance might still be the best inference. **[15 marks]**

**2 Evaluate the claim that there is absolutely nothing that can be known for certain. [25]**

Candidates could, for example, compare the truth of empirical and a priori propositions. Empirical propositions can of course be doubted, whereas a priori propositions can be held to be logically certain; the issue concerns the justification of knowledge. To some extent, candidates could fashion a reply through a discussion of local scepticism, for example by considering sceptical arguments about perception, such as arguments from illusion, which generally focus around disagreements about sense-data. Some might point out that Descartes used his argument from illusion, deception and dreaming to conclude that he could be certain that he was thinking: in other words, Descartes used a sceptical approach to justify knowledge, although most reject the certainty of 'I think'. The view that nothing can be known for certain will probably be identified by most as the viewpoint of global scepticism. Some might illustrate this by the 'brain in a vat' scenario, which can be used to illustrate the view of the global sceptic that our methods of *justification* of knowledge are inadequate – a view that some see as being fatal to any claim to certain knowledge, whereas others see it as perverse.

**3 Critically assess foundationalism as a theory of knowledge. [25]**

Foundationalism is that claim that all knowledge rests on a foundation that can be justified 'noninferentially'. Candidates should be able to illustrate this claim through the foundationalist rejection of the infinite regress argument: that there cannot be an infinite regress of justification of knowledge, so there must be some beliefs that are self-justified, or foundational. Foundationalism generally includes infallibilism – i.e. the view that foundational beliefs must be infallible – their justification must be infallible/indubitable, otherwise the knowledge that comes from them is not knowledge at all. The infallible foundation might be identified as comprising certain beliefs, such as Descartes' view that the belief 'I think' cannot be false; or else justification by immediate experience, i.e. how things 'seem' to me. Candidates should evaluate whether any such foundations can be an infallible basis for knowledge. They might also assess whether or not foundationalism leads to scepticism.

## Topic 2 Philosophical and Theological Language

[Extract from **R.B. Braithwaite**: *'An Empiricist's view of the Nature of Religious Belief'*, in **Basil Mitchell** (ed.), *The Philosophy of Religion*: 84]

**4 (a) With reference to the passage above, explain Braithwaite's view that religious propositions are properly empirical.**

Braithwaite tries to show that the meaning of religious language is to be found by ascertaining its use. He is therefore responding to the verificationist / falsificationist challenge to the meaningfulness of religious language by using the weak form of the verification principle. Thus according to Braithwaite, what is empirically verifiable in religious statements is their conative nature – they are to do with ethical intention / with the will: they express ethical intention. Braithwaite seeks to establish this by suggesting, as in this passage, that people do not identify what is *fundamental* about Buddhism, Christianity, or the other religions of the world, with adherence to particular religious practices. Following ritual practices is indeed behaviour that is typical of any particular religious tradition, but so, for example, is the use of certain styles of art, literature and music in different time-periods, and these are not fundamental either. The fact that a Christian might attend a church whereas a Jew might attend a synagogue gives us no indication about what constitutes the reason for a particular faith and for adhering to its faith claims. What is fundamental to all religious traditions is the intention to pursue particular behaviour policies, and that the different religions formulate these by statements contained within different sets of stories. Such stories contain empirical propositions that are empirically testable. The doctrines of Christianity, for example, are capable of different empirical interpretations, and Christians will differ on the interpretation they put upon the doctrines, such as Matthew Arnold's interpretation of the Anselmian doctrine of the Atonement. Braithwaite claims that such interpretations are weakly verifiable because the conduct of the believer can be tested in accordance with their interpretation of the stories. **[10 marks]**

**(b) Critically examine Braithwaite's claim that it is the intention to behave that constitutes religious conviction.**

Braithwaite claims that religious statements are used, then, as moral assertions. A moral proposition states one's intentions to act in a certain way. For example, a utilitarian claims that he is going to act in accordance with the principle that what he does will bring about the greatest happiness. This is testable, so is empirical. In the same way, then, religious statements are empirical, because the believer's intention to lead a religious life in accordance with the behaviour policies codified in religious stories can be tested. So a religious assertion is simply expressing the asserter's intention to follow a preferred policy of behaviour, and it is essentially this that constitutes the believer's religious conviction. The intention of a Christian to follow a Christian way of life is the criterion for the meaningfulness of his assertions, and not the dogmas of religion.

As a whole, Braithwaite seems right when he says that a system of religious assertions has a moral function. For example, a Christian's assertion that 'God is love' is taken to declare his intention to follow an agapeistic way of life. The assertion that Jesus healed a blind man means that the Christian wills himself to help blind people. Unless religious principles are moral principles, it makes no sense to speak of putting them into practice. When one is converted to a religion, it is a change in the state of the will whatever the experience. The result is a state of mind in which one intends to act in a certain moral fashion. This conviction does not have to be tied to any particular religion, since the believer inevitably will associate by culture and tradition with a particular religious group, by adopting the specific stories of that group. It is not necessary for a Christian, Hindu, or Jew to believe in all or even in a part of the story, only that it should be regarded as having meaning and value. Braithwaite's analysis is therefore a powerful tool for making sense of the plurality of religious traditions as opposed to the illogic of preferring one tradition to all the rest. Candidates are likely to challenge Braithwaite's conclusions by emphasising the cognitive assumptions of most believers, who tend to regard doctrinal assertions as factual rather than conative. Critical rationalism asserts meaning through inductive

arguments such as the cosmological and teleological arguments for the existence of God. Others might reject all claims to meaning in religious conviction and in religious assertion. [15 marks]

**5 Critically assess the claim that religious language is meaningful cognitively. [25]**

Cognitive claims about religious language are required for those who have a realist understanding of religious ideas and doctrines, although the cognitive status of what is believed can be asserted both by rationalist theological teaching as well as by fideism. Candidates are at liberty to approach this question from whatever angle they see fit, so long as it responds appropriately to the question. The general assumption behind religious belief is that it has cognitive status, hence the attack from Logical Positivism rejects its claim that statements other than analytic statements/tautologies that cannot be verified in sense experience are meaningless: hence religious language is cognitively meaningless. Candidates might use this in order to consider both cognitive and non-cognitive responses: e.g. Hick's claim that religious language is verifiable cognitively after death / Hare's view that religious statements are non-cognitive but meaningful 'blik's', and so on. It would be equally appropriate to approach the question through a consideration of falsification, or language-game theory, or a combination of such approaches. Candidates should discuss claims of *meaning* as opposed to claims of truth or falsity.

**6 Evaluate the claim that moral values cannot be objective. [25]**

The objectivity of moral values might be described through an appeal to systems such as Natural Law or Kantian ethics, where the appeal to objectivity is through what is defined as natural or through a supposed moral faculty supported by reason. Counter-claims are many and varied, and might be established by looking at subjective systems in general or in particular. Evaluation of the claim that moral values *cannot* be objective might be seen as a trivial truth that requires no detailed justification beyond pointing to common ethical practices. Others might see it as subversive: for example a rejection of the objectivity of moral law might be taken as a rejection of morality as a whole, and as a threat to cultural stability, since it includes a rejection of the whole moral framework of duty, responsibility and obligation. Its truth or falsity might be evaluated in terms of meta-ethics, i.e. through some form of naturalist approach. For example, neo-naturalists might argue that moral values are objective because they are lodged in an objective criterion, i.e. that good is any action that improves the human condition, and bad is any action that does the opposite.



### Topic 3 Philosophy of Religion

[Extract from **John Hick: *Evil and the God of Love*: 324]**

**7 (a) With reference to the passage above, explain Hick's view that a world without suffering would no longer have any point or value.**

Hick's position stems from a rejection of the traditional free will defence as being contrary to the modern scientific mind, which takes that view that evil and suffering really do occur. The FWD is locked into the Augustinian mindset, where evil stems from the human misuse of free will. Hick believes that any credible theodicy must be grounded on the 'evil really occurs' premise. Non-moral evil, for example, is explained as "the matrix within which God is gradually creating children for himself out of human animals." The development of human personality and of the concepts of religious and ethical responsibility take place against a necessary background of a world of exertion, choice, struggle and danger, without which "there would have been virtually no development of the human intellect and imagination, and hence of either the sciences or the arts, and hence of human civilization or culture."

Hick's point is that no human actions could have any measurable consequences. The examples chosen by Hick suggest that such a world would be senseless, since it would be in a real sense incoherent. Cause and effect would cease to exist as we know them, since the world would have to adapt magically to whatever actions humans saw fit to carry out. Hick is advocating the view that freedom is a high-order good, since it allows for a real choice between good and evil actions, and allows humans to change the world for good or ill; and that this is a real good, and not an apparent good. **[10 marks]**

**(b) Evaluate Hick's claim that *this* world, with all its uncertainties, challenges and dangers, underlies the emergence of just about the whole range of the more valuable human characteristics.**

Hick suggests that high-order goods, such as compassion, sympathy, empathy, understanding, fortitude, generosity, and the like, are the product of high-order evils, such as hatred, envy, malice, greed, and so on. Experience of evil is formative, in so far as it teaches us the value of good, and teaches us that the good is to be preferred in all respects. Candidates could support this as a reasoned version of the free will defence considered without reference to Augustinian presuppositions about the misuse of freedom: freedom is not something that has been granted and then misused, but is a functional necessity in any universe in which moral and emotional values are paramount (i.e. the universe of a 'God of love'). As a critique, candidates might question Hick's examples given in the passage. He assumes that in order to eliminate all suffering, God would have to deal with the consequences of human actions that might be random, capricious, or evil; but would it not be more coherent to assume that God would 'construct' humans to instantiate free choices that were uniformly sensible and good? Some, for example, might take Dostoyevsky's point, that the sheer amount of suffering in the world must bring into question God's goodness and common sense in creating such a universe in the first place. Hick argues that human beings cannot be treated as means toward the fulfilment of some later developing being – for this would devalue those persons who suffer, but that statement seems to ignore the simple fact that, as David Griffin says, there is no obvious reason why God should have wasted over four billion years setting the stage for the only thing thought to be intrinsically valuable, namely the moral and spiritual development of human beings. The high probability that hundreds of millions of years of that preparation involved unnecessary and utterly useless pain counts against Hick's defence of the omnipotent God's total goodness. **[15 marks]**

**8 'Belief in a creator God is pointless, since the scientific evidence concerning the origins of the universe is necessarily independent of belief in God.' Evaluate this claim. [25]**

Candidates are being examined on the theology rather than the science, although they should be sufficiently well informed of the scientific issues as a basis for theological reflection. The question

refers to belief in a creator God, as opposed simply to belief in God *per se*, to there needs to be a discussion of God's creative role in relation to God's supposed creative acts. The bulk of current scientific theory about the origins of the universe revolves around some version of the Big Bang hypothesis, supported by various 'Inflationary' models. The theory assumes that the laws of physics are universal. No theoretical model within mainstream science is currently expounded in which God is invoked as a causal agent. On the other hand, there are several physicists who use probability arguments in connection with Big Bang models, on the assumption that 'God' is the best explanation of what initiated the explosion, why there are mathematical laws, and so on. Some invoke the Anthropic Principle to explain the 'universal constants', arguing that the possibility that all the constants were correct at the Singularity, purely by chance, is inconceivable. Opposing views suppose that there could be any number of previous universes, or any number of universes existing parallel with our own, with only this one being ordered and life-bearing, purely by chance. Some might look at the different versions of Process Theology, where the definition of God's creative role is often in line with quantum mechanical notions about freedom and probability within the universe. Belief in God is not solely dependent upon any particular aspect of God's nature, so some might argue that belief in a creator God depends on the total theological/scientific picture, and not just one part of it.

**9 Examine critically the view that belief in miracles devalues belief in God. [25]**

Some will use Wyles' view, that a God who intervenes to change water into wine at a society wedding yet ignores the plight of the Holocaust victims would not be worthy of worship, so belief in an interventionist deity inevitably devalues belief in God. Moreover there seems no justifiable reason why God would make a law-abiding and isotropic universe (uniform in all directions) and then arbitrarily break that arrangement. Others might argue that God intervenes without breaking the laws of nature, which seems a peculiar idea, since there could be no evidence for a miracle, and thus no reason to suppose that one had occurred, in which case some could argue that different definitions of miracle would lead to different conclusions about value. Some will use Hume's definition of a miracle, as the most unlikely of all events, thus using an *a priori* argument that miracles do not happen; moreover belief in God or any metaphysical entity is without justification, so the question falls by default: there is no God for whom acceptance of miracles would devalue belief. Candidates are free to set their own parameters for this question.

#### Topic 4 New Testament: The Four Gospels

Then they came to Jerusalem. And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who were selling and those who were buying in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who sold doves; and he would not allow anyone to carry anything through the temple. He was teaching and saying, "Is it not written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations'? But you have made it a den of robbers."

And when the chief priests and the scribes heard it, they kept looking for a way to kill him; for they were afraid of him, because the whole crowd was spellbound by his teaching. And when evening came, Jesus and his disciples went out of the city. (Mark 11:15-18)

The Passover of the Jews was near, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. In the temple he found people selling cattle, sheep, and doves, and the money-changers seated at their tables. Making a whip of cords, he drove all of them out of the temple, both the sheep and the cattle. He also poured out the coins of the money-changers and overturned their tables. He told those who were selling the doves, "Take these things out of here! Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!" His disciples remembered that it was written, "Zeal for your house will consume me." The Jews then said to him, "What sign can you show us for doing this?" Jesus answered them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." The Jews then said, "This temple has been under construction for forty-six years, and will you raise it up in three days?" But he was speaking of the temple of his body. (John 2:13-21)

#### 10 (a) Discuss these accounts of Jesus' 'cleansing of the temple' and the solutions which have been proposed to the problems they raise.

Mark, like Matthew and Luke, places this event at the beginning of the last week of Jesus' life just after his triumphal entry into Jerusalem. John, on the other hand, places this event in chapter 2 of his gospel, but like the synoptic evangelists at a time when the Passover was about to be celebrated. He also follows a slightly different tradition concerning this event, and lays greater emphasis than Mark on Jesus' anger, .i.e. Jesus makes a 'whip of cords', which he uses in the process of driving the offenders out of the temple.

Scholars have proposed several solutions to this problem: (i) The event happened twice. (ii) John places it in its right context, and the synoptics are wrong. (iii) The synoptics place it in its right context and John is wrong. (iv) John knew that this event occurred in the last week of Jesus' life, but has transposed it to this point in his gospel for homiletic reasons. While the first three solutions have had their advocates, it is increasingly recognised that (iv) provides the solution to the problem.

In Mark this event is seen as symbolic of the fulfilment of Malachi 3:1 and the coming judgment of God on Jerusalem and the temple. It is set in a context of judgement, with the cursing of the fig tree being fulfilled the following morning.

In John it is the raising of Lazarus, rather than Jesus' cleansing of the temple, which is the last straw for the chief priests and the Pharisees. (John 11:42-53). John links the cleansing of the temple to the image of the new temple, his body, i.e. the temple of the Holy Spirit, and uses this to introduce a section of teaching on the work of the Holy Spirit, 3:1 – 4:42. Just as Jesus cleansed the temple, so the human mind and heart has to be cleansed by the Holy Spirit, if one is to enter the kingdom of God, and he uses two extremes of humanity, Nicodemus the young rabbi and the Samaritan woman, to show that this need is universal.

**[10 marks]**

**(b) Draw out what is taught or implied about the person and work of Christ in the prologue to John's gospel (1:1-14), and show briefly how these themes are developed later in the gospel.**

'In the beginning' – John begins his gospel with an echo of Genesis 1:1, implying that this is a new 'creation story', c.f. the numerous echoes of the early chapter of Genesis in the section from 1:1 to 2:11. Jesus as the Logos – the intended double meaning, i.e. God has spoken through him, c.f. Hebrews 1:1-2; he is also the creator and the rational principle behind the universe, c.f. the role of Wisdom in the Wisdom Literature, and *logos* in Greek philosophy. Creator verse 3; life, light/darkness, verses 4-5. N.B. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it, v.5, a hint of the coming battle between Christ and the powers of darkness and evil; perhaps John intends 'It is finished', the final word of the human Jesus(19:30), to be interpreted as echoing this. Jesus as the true light, which enlightens everyone, v.9. He was rejected by own – the shadow of the cross appears even here, with a possible echo of Isaiah 53:3, verses 10-11; his work in the hearts of those who 'receive' him, verses 12-13. Incarnation, glory (*shekinah*), grace and truth – living presence on earth of God in human form.

The themes of the prologue are developed in numerous ways throughout the gospel, e.g. in the 'I am sayings' such as 'I am the light of the world', 'I am the way, the truth and the life', and also in other sayings such as 'If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples; and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free, (8:31-32), and 'I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly', (10-10b). As 'the light of the world' Jesus heals a man who was born blind, and a significant discourse follows on the theme of human blindness, (9:1ff.). 'But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God.' Nicodemus had to be born again, to receive Christ, to enter the kingdom of God; the Samaritan woman did receive him through the gift of 'living water', and became a child of God, etc.

The themes of the prologue are developed at numerous other points in the gospel. The question asks candidates to 'show briefly how these themes are developed later in the gospel', so don't expect all the above to be covered in detail. **[15 marks]**

**11 'In what sense, if any, did Jesus claim to be the Messiah or accept that title?' **[25]****

Give full credit for any well argued answer, whether radical or conservative in approach, which covers the basic issues, and shows a sound knowledge of the text. Weaker candidates may just summarise the traditional Christian beliefs about Jesus as the Messiah. Little credit can be given for this. Candidates should also distinguish between any claims of Jesus himself, from the ways in which the evangelists may present Jesus as the Messiah, e.g. Matthew's presentation of him as the Son of David, c.f. Burridge, *Four Gospels, One Jesus?*, p.68ff.

(i) Synoptic Gospels: remarkable reluctance of Jesus to claim or accept the title of Messiah; prefers Son of Man, rejects Son of God, Son of David, King of Israel, etc. Most likely explanation of his reluctance to accept this title is his wish to dissociate himself from current hope for a political/military Messiah who would deliver the Jews from Roman domination. Mk. 9:41, Mt. 23:10 two occasions on which he appears to have used this title of himself, but thought by some to be editorial additions. Also according to Mk.14:61,62 Jesus openly admits to being the Christ, but n.b. Mt. & Lk. - 'you say so'. So also Mk. 15:2 before Pilate. His constant stress on fulfilment of O.T. in his ministry, (or is that comment by the evangelists?), an implicit claim to be Messiah, e.g. Lk.4:18ff and Mt. 11:2-5 = Lk. 7:19ff, and evidence(?) of how he understood his role as Messiah. So also his entry into Jerusalem Mk.11:1-10 and deliberate identification with Zechariah's prophecy, 9:9ff, of a humble king who would bring peace. Mk. 1:11 may also be evidence of his acceptance of the title at his baptism. Also accepts title from Peter, Mk. 8:29-30, but significantly goes on to speak about his role as Son of Man, c.f. the voice from heaven at his baptism and transfiguration.

(ii) John: much more Christocentric, didactic and interpretative, e.g. 'I am' sayings some of which have clear Messianic overtones; but are these the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus? John Baptist points to Jesus as the Messiah, so also does Andrew, and Jesus acknowledges he is the Messiah in conversation with the Samaritan woman, 4:26.

Credit may be given for discussion of the Messianic Secret in Mark (Wrede, etc.), and also for discussion of different Messianic hopes current in Judaism, provided such discussion is handled in a manner relevant to the question, and not at the expense of material of more immediate relevance.

**12 'Jesus' miracles presuppose faith; they do not create it.' How far do the gospel accounts of the miracles of Jesus support this claim? [25]**

Synoptic Gospels: In Mt.4 and Lk.4 Jesus refuses the temptation to perform miracles to coerce people into belief/create faith and 'pressurise' them to enter the Kingdom of God, cf. also Lk. 4:23. In the Synoptic Gospels faith is often required or implied as a condition of the miracle being performed, e.g. Mt. 9:18-31, though such faith does not always have to be expressed publicly, cf. Mk. 5:25. The faith honoured or rewarded is sometimes vicarious faith as with the Centurion, Jairus, and the Syro-Phoenician Woman, and corporate faith as in the case of the man who was lowered through the roof by his friends into the presence of Jesus. There are, however, examples in the Synoptic Gospels of miracles happening through the compassion of Jesus, without any overt or implied expression of faith, though obedience is sometimes required, cf. exorcisms (Mk. 2:21 and Mt.9:32), Lk.5:1ff and Feeding of 5,000. There are also examples in the Synoptic Gospels of miracles which enhance/produce faith such as The Calming of the Storm, (Mk. 4:35).

Fourth Gospel: In John miracles = 'signs', though in Synoptic Gospels Jesus refuses to perform signs, and his miracles are often referred to as 'acts/works of power' instead of 'signs'. Several examples of 'gratuitous' miracles, e.g. the miracle at Cana and the feeding of the 5,000; also as in the Synoptic Gospels, (c.f the raising of the son of the widow at Nain) also miracles which create/enhance faith such as the miracle at Cana; n.b. especially Jn. 2:23, 6:14 and also 20:30-31.

## Appendix A

Table A: Generic Marking Scheme for 10 mark questions

Level 6 9-10 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 5 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Response is accurate: answers the question specifically</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 4 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately</li> </ul>
Level 3 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon.</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly</li> </ul>
Level 2 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short.</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
Level 1 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit</li> </ul>

## Appendix A

## Table B Generic Marking Scheme for 15 mark questions

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

## Appendix A

Table C: Generic Marking Scheme for 25 mark questions

Level 6 21–25 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level</li> <li>• Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained</li> <li>• Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 5 16–20 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question</li> <li>• Response is accurate: answers the question specifically</li> <li>• Argument has structure and development and is sustained</li> <li>• Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 4 12–15 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked</li> <li>• Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained</li> <li>• Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument</li> <li>• May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately</li> </ul>
Level 3 8–11 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success</li> <li>• Attempts to evaluate though with partial success</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided</li> <li>• Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly</li> </ul>
Level 2 1–7 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic</li> <li>• Argument is limited or confused</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
Level 1 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit</li> </ul>





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/03**

Paper 3 Key Texts and Topics in Philosophy and Theology 2

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

Candidates must answer on the enclosed Answer Booklet.

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 on both sides of the paper.

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

Choose **one** of Topics 1 to 3. 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 **4** printed pages.



Choose **one** of Topics 1 to 3.

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 Philosophy of Mind

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

#### Section A

I assume that I am one of three identical triplets. Consider.

*My Division.* My body is fatally injured, as are the brains of my two brothers. My brain is divided and each half is successfully transplanted into the body of one of my brothers. Each of the resulting people believes that he is me, seems to remember living my life, has my character, and is in every other way psychologically continuous with me. And he has a body that is very like mine.

This case is likely to remain impossible. Though it is claimed that, in certain people, the two hemispheres may have the same full range of capabilities, this claim might be false. I am here assuming that this claim is true when applied to me. I am also assuming that it would be possible to connect a transplanted half-brain with the nerves into its new body. And I am assuming that we could divide, not just the upper hemispheres, but also the lower brain. My first two assumptions may be able to be made true if there is enough progress in neurophysiology. But it seems likely that it would never be possible to divide the lower brain, in a way that did not impair its functioning.

Does it matter if, for this reason, this imagined case of complete division will always remain impossible? .... The one feature of the case that might be held to be *deeply* impossible – the division of a person's consciousness into two separate streams – is the feature that has actually happened. It would have been important if this had been impossible, since this might have supported some claim about what we really are.

[Extract from **Derek Parfit**: *Reasons and Persons*: 254-255].

- 1 (a) Explain why Parfit considers here whether or not the kind of brain transplant that he describes might be possible or impossible. [10]
- (b) Assess Parfit's view that our identity is not what matters. [15]

#### Section B

- 2 Consider the idea that mental states are non-reducible properties of brain states. [25]

OR

- 3 Evaluate the view that functionalism turns humans into robots. [25]

## Topic 2 Ethics

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

### Section A

There are... the Christians, amongst whom I shall name Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel, both professed Catholics; and on the other the existential atheists, amongst whom we must place Heidegger as well as the French existentialists and myself. What they have in common is simply the fact that they believe that existence comes before essence – or, if you will, that we must begin from the subjective. What exactly do we mean by that?

If one considers an article of manufacture – as, for example, a book or a paper-knife – one sees that it has been made by an artisan who has a conception of it; and he has paid attention, equally, to the conception of a paper-knife and to the pre-existent technique of production which is a part of that conception and is, at bottom, a formula. Thus the paper-knife is at the same time an article producible in a certain manner and one which, on the other hand, serves a definite purpose, for one cannot suppose that a man would produce a paper-knife without knowing what it was for. Let us say, then, of the paper-knife that its essence – that is to say the sum of the formulae and the qualities which made its production – precedes its existence. The presence of such-and-such a paper-knife or book is thus determined before my eyes. Here, then, we are viewing the world from a technical standpoint, and we can say that production precedes essence.

When we think of God as the creator, we are thinking of him, most of the time, as a supernal artisan. Whatever doctrine we may be considering, whether it be a doctrine like that of Descartes, or of Leibnitz himself, we always imply that the will follows, more or less, from the understanding or at least accompanies it, so that when God creates, he knows precisely what he is creating. Thus, the conception of man in the mind of God is comparable to that of the paper-knife in the mind of the artisan: God makes man according to a procedure and a conception, exactly as the artisan manufactures a paper-knife, following a definition and a formula.

[Extract from **Jean-Paul Sartre**: *Existentialism and Humanism*: 26-27]

- 4 (a) Explain the implications of Sartre's suggestion here that when we think of God as the creator, we think of him as making man "according to a procedure and a conception". [10]
- (b) Examine critically Sartre's ideas about human essence. [15]

### Section B

- 5 Consider the view that Aquinas' formulation of Natural Law Ethics is neither natural nor ethical. [25]

OR

- 6 'Kant's theory of duty fails.' Discuss [25]

### Topic 3 Old Testament: Prophecy

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

#### Section A

- 1 Hear this word that the Lord has spoken against you, O people of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt:
- 2 “You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all you iniquities.
- 3 “Do two walk together, unless they have made an appointment?
- 4 Does a lion roar in the forest, when he has no prey?  
Does a young lion cry out from his den, if he has taken nothing?
- 5 Does a bird fall in a snare on the earth, when there is no trap for it?  
Does a snare spring up from the ground, when it has taken nothing?
- 6 Is a trumpet blown in a city, and the people are not afraid?  
Does evil befall a city, unless the Lord has done it?
- 7 Surely the Lord God does nothing, without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets.
- 8 The lion has roared; who will not fear?  
The Lord God has spoken: who can but prophesy?”
- 9 Proclaim to the strongholds in Assyria,  
and to the strongholds in the land of Egypt,  
and say, “Assemble yourselves upon the mountains of Samaria,  
and see the great tumults within her, and the oppressions in her midst.”
- 10 “They do not know how to do right,” says the Lord,  
“those who store up violence and robbery in their strongholds.”
- 11 Therefore thus says the Lord God:  
“An adversary shall surround the land, and bring down your defences from you,  
and your strongholds shall be plundered.” [Amos 3:1-11]
- 7 (a) Comment on the meaning and significance of this passage in Amos 3 within the context of the prophet’s message. [10]
- (b) Consider the view that Amos’ oracles against Israel’s neighbours (chapters 1-2) were motivated only by Amos’ desire for justice. [15]

#### Section B

- 8 Discuss the view that the origins of Old Testament prophecy must lie outside Israel. [25]
- OR**
- 9 Assess the function and importance of symbolic acts in the message of pre-exilic prophets. [25]

---

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/03**

Paper 3 Key Texts and Topics in Philosophy and Theology 2

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 50**

---

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.



AO1	Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the issues arising from the relevant religious and philosophical themes and texts; and the ability to identify, select and apply ideas and concepts, through the use of examples and evidence from recognised sources of authority.	40%
AO2	Candidates will be required to provide a systematic critical analysis of the texts and theories they have studied, sustain a line of argument and justify a point of view. Different views, including those of different scholars and schools of thought, should be referred to and evaluated where appropriate. They should demonstrate a synoptic approach to the areas studied and make links between them in their responses where appropriate.	60%

In the textual questions AO1 and AO2 are assessed separately.  
AO1 and AO2 are both to be considered in assessing each of the essay questions.

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

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

## Question Specific Notes

### Topic 1 Philosophy of Mind

[Extract from **Derek Parfit**: *Reasons and Persons*: 254-255]

- 1 (a) Explain why Parfit considers here whether or not the kind of brain transplant that he describes might be possible or impossible.**

The thought experiment described by Parfit is part of his discussion of what, if anything, constitutes personal *identity*. Some of the thought experiments he considers have actually happened in the sense that injuries of various kinds can lead to conditions of the brain that resemble the product of those experiments. Where one hemisphere is destroyed, it has been observed that the remaining hemisphere can eventually compensate for lost brain functions, and can retain self-awareness. Parfit extrapolates from such cases to (as yet) hypothetical cases that become distinctly conceivable, of brain bifurcation or of the assimilation of two alien hemispheres in one skull; or of the disassembly of a person at one point in space and their reassembly in another, or in a duplicated series of other spaces. If such experiments are impossible, it might give some support, for example, to the notion that we are indivisible Cartesian egos. If the separation of the brain into two hemispheres remains impossible, then this might support the dualist view of 'one soul per brain', and remove the traditional dualist problem of 'counting souls'. The confirmation from observation of split-brain patients that the mind seems capable of sustaining two streams of consciousness simultaneously gives some basis for rejecting the concept of an indivisible soul. Parfit thus goes on to assert that our identity is not what matters. **[10 marks]**

- (b) Assess Parfit's view that our identity is not what matters.**

Parfit accepts that the question of identity does matter to individuals, for example in thought-experiment cases where one resultant individual is faced with death/extinction. The results of thinking about the experiment in the passage above reveal a number of possibilities: (1) I do not survive; (2) I survive as one of the two people; (3) I survive as the other; (4) I survive as both. Through an analysis of the different possibilities, Parfit concludes that these seem to present irreconcilable outcomes. For example, there is some observational evidence to suggest that brain-damaged patients can retain self-awareness and memory through retaining either brain hemisphere. If the brain is bifurcated experimentally, there seems to be no sensible conclusion, therefore, as to the location (if any) of the original consciousness. Parfit concludes that personal identity and personal survival are not based on numerical identity of body or brain or soul, but on psychological continuity. Candidates might suggest that this conclusion, developing John Locke's view that personal identity is based on memory, is the best option, given that psychological continuity is the best way of making sense of the physical and mental differences displayed by humans between cradle and grave. Others might argue that it is counter-intuitive, and that psychological continuity presupposes personal identity. Candidates are at liberty to defend any view of the matter they like. **[15 marks]**

- 2 Consider the idea that mental states are non-reducible properties of brain states. **[25]****

This is the thesis of property dualism, which differs from Cartesian dualism in asserting the existence of a single, physical substance that has two potential properties: physical and mental states that are not reducible. This is not simply a claim that we can talk about mental and physical states in different ways: the difference is in ontology as well as language. Mental states are an extra property of matter in the brain. Searle, for example, claims that consciousness is realised inside the structure of the brain, a concept that is clarified, for example, by the idea that mental features 'supervene' on top of physical properties. Candidates might suggest that this goes some way towards solving the mind-body problem, since consciousness remains real without having to believe in the existence of Cartesian souls. To reject the claims of property dualism, candidates might point out that mental causation becomes impotent – causation becomes bottom-up from

the physical to the mental, which seems to go against common sense. Candidates might also question how matter can produce qualia, for example.

**3 Evaluate the view that functionalism turns humans into robots. [25]**

Functionalism is the approach that what makes something a thought, a desire, or any other type of mental state, does not depend on its internal constitution, but solely on its function, or the role it plays in the cognitive system of which it forms a part. Functionalist theories take the identity of a mental state to be determined by its causal relations to sensory stimulations, other mental states, and behaviour. The question does not require an outline of functionalism, but candidates would be entitled to provide one as a basis for discussion. Candidates are likely to refer to at least two main objections to functionalist theories, namely intentionality and subjectivity, both of which would presumably be absent from robotic entities. The most likely means of illustrating the former is through John Searle's Chinese Room argument, which argues that thought has intentionality, i.e. it has a semantic content and awareness that is absent from machine function, although some candidates might be aware of attempts to counter this. The most likely means of illustrating the problem of subjectivity is through Frank Jackson's 'Mary', the scientist who is an expert on the brain-physics of vision, who lives in a black and white environment. On being released from her monochromatic environment, it seems persuasive that she learns something new, namely the qualia of colour. Some might advance the zombie argument as an alternative to robotic scenarios. Chalmers's version of the argument (1996) is that it is *conceivable*, in a special, robust, "positive" sense, that there are molecule-for-molecule duplicates of oneself with no qualia; second that scenarios that are "positively" conceivable in this way represent real, metaphysical, possibilities. So zombies are possible, and functionalism — or, more broadly, physicalism — is false.

**Topic 2 Ethics**

[Extract from **Jean-Paul Sartre**: *Existentialism and Humanism*: 26–27]

**4 (a) Explain the implications of Sartre's suggestion here that when we think of God as the creator, we think of him as making man "according to a procedure and a conception".**

The assumption that God exists, and that man is made in God's image, assumes the same kind of relationship between a human and God as between an artisan and what the artisan creates. If the artisan must have a concept of a paper-knife before producing it, then God must have a specific view of human nature before he creates it: man is made according to a procedure and a conception. If that is the case, then (as Aquinas claimed), man must have a common human nature, and this in turn means that all humans must have the same approach to moral matters. Sartre wants to reject this claim, and to assert that man is nothing: man is a being thrown into the world by accident. The essence of human beings does not precede their existence. When humans consider their existence, therefore, they simply find themselves in existence, without any pre-defined nature that helps us to make sense of our lives. There is no divine plan, and there is no common human nature. Man is free to be what he wants. Not only that, but having freedom invites a commensurate responsibility to determine whatever it is that we should do with our lives. The non-existence of God is not an academic issue. In particular, it is not an issue that is irrelevant to how we view good and evil. Ivan Karamazov (in Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*) says that 'if there is no virtue, there is no immortality', which implies conversely that if there is no God, then any evil is permitted. Sartre's existentialism deals with the consequences of that assumption. **[10 marks]**



**(b) Examine critically Sartre's ideas about human essence.**

Sartre's foundational claim is that 'existence precedes essence'. Since God does not exist, man is nothing, and is thrown into the world by accident, so the idea of human essence must be rejected. Instead, man is what he wills, and he is totally free. Sartre calls this 'subjectivity'. Hence Sartre illustrates this idea with the example of a paper-knife. For all objects that *are* designed, production precedes essence. The maker knows its purpose in advance, and so designs it accordingly, after which all paper-knives are more or less identical in their nature. But humans cannot be compared with manufactured objects, and are therefore free to create their own purpose, a process which commences with consciousness. Any other approach to the question is propaganda by those who want to limit freedom. Man is defined by his actions – his 'projects'. Candidates could suggest that Sartre assumes what he denies – that human nature is universal. He even uses the term, 'a human universality of condition' (46). If humans share the same basic freedom, isn't that a common human essence? Moreover Sartre's definition of 'essence' is dubious, since it implies that it derives from an external source (God). Yet when he talks about objects in nature that exist with a ready-made essence, one wonders why humans should be any different. How far does genetics predetermine essence? Sartre's philosophy emphasises the centrality of anguish, abandonment and despair, but it could be argued that such an approach does nothing to encourage a proactive approach to dealing with the human condition; hence communist critiques of Sartre reject in particular the implication that humans have no obvious reason for cooperation or motivation in removing inefficient political systems. Equally, Christian objections are generally based on his denial of God's existence, which removes the Christian emphasis on the sanctity of life. Some object that even if there is no God, there is no reason to suppose that humans have no essence, since that essence can be defined in biological / genetic / social / familial terms. Sartre would reject this through his notion of facticity. There is no human essence, but there is a universal human condition of being in the world and having to live and die there, and there are no limitations on how we deal with that: we do not have to behave in specific ways but are free to choose. [15 marks]

**5 Consider the view that Aquinas' formulation of Natural Law Ethics is neither natural nor ethical. [25]**

Some explanation of NLE is expectable (but not required beyond the levels required for discussion). The central features include: Aquinas' reliance on reason and our common human nature; the background in Aristotle's analysis of efficient and final causes; Aquinas' five main principles; delineation of primary and secondary precepts. The concept of natural law begins from the perspective that what is natural follows from nature itself, and so is universally authoritative and omnipotent. According to Aquinas, natural law is the perfection of human reason, but needs to be supplemented by revelation, which seems an odd combination if reason is paramount. A critique of the idea of natural law might take the line that reason is unable to derive ethical rules from natural laws, since the latter are objective and the former subjective. Evaluation of whether or not NLE is ethical might focus on some of the following, for example: K. Neilson's challenge to Aquinas' belief that there is one common human nature; the possibility that Aquinas could be wrong about the primary precepts (and thus wrong also about the secondary precepts that derive from them); rejection of its legalistic stance; counter-arguments to these points: the strength of legalistic systems in producing societies with good common rules; justification for punishment, and so on. Some might refer to Proportionalism as an attempt to meet some of the criticisms whilst preserving the strengths of NLE.

**6 'Kant's theory of duty fails.' Discuss. [25]**

This might be exemplified, for example, through the common objection that duty is based on the concept of absolute rules that simply cannot be articulated without contradiction. This is generally illustrated by the scenario of the axe-murderer who asks for the direction of her victim. To give

the direction leads to the unacceptable consequence of murder; to withhold it breaks the rule against telling lies. The fact that most would lie leads to the supposition that Kant must be wrong about the existence of absolute moral values, so categorical imperativism fails. Some might argue that telling the truth is still required in such a situation, otherwise the rule is devalued and loses its force, but in practical terms that seems a weak response. Candidates might refer to attempts to rescue Kant from failure, e.g. R.M. Hare's Principle of Overridingness or W.D. Ross's concept of *prima facie* duties, although these are open to the counter-argument that the selection of what is 'overriding', or which '*prima facie* duties' are most important, is arbitrary. Candidates might argue that Kant's theory fails on other counts, for example in its emphasis on reason, or its attitude to consequences, or the possibility of universalizing contradictory categorical imperatives, and so on. They might also consider whether or not Kant's theory does, in fact, fail.

### Topic 3 Old Testament: Prophecy

Hear this word that the Lord has spoken against you, O people of Israel, against the whole family that I brought up out of the land of Egypt:  
 You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Do two walk together unless they have made an appointment? Does a lion roar in the forest, when it has no prey? Does a young lion cry out from its den, if it has caught nothing? Does a bird fall into a snare on the earth, when there is no trap for it? Does a snare spring up from the ground, when it has taken nothing? Is a trumpet blown in a city, and the people are not afraid? Does disaster befall a city, unless the Lord has done it? Surely the Lord God does nothing, without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets. The lion has roared; who will not fear? The Lord God has spoken; who can but prophesy? Proclaim to the strongholds in Ashdod, and to the strongholds in the land of Egypt, and say, "Assemble yourselves on Mount Samaria, and see what great tumults are within it, and what oppressions are in its midst." They do not know how to do right, says the Lord, those who store up violence and robbery in their strongholds. Therefore thus says the Lord God: An adversary shall surround the land, and strip you of your defence; and your strongholds shall be plundered. (Amos 3:1-11)

#### 7 (a) Comment on the meaning and significance of this passage in Amos 3 within the context of the prophet's message.

Amos' comments here show his emphasis on election responsibility (v.2) – the fact of election brings greater responsibility, and therefore greater punishment for abrogation of the covenant agreement. Verses 3-8 illustrate the compulsion of the prophetic *dabar* ('word') in which it is God who speaks, and not the prophet. The figures of speech include a statement of the theme of God's control of / intervention in history. 3:3-8 use a different kind of oracle to those employed in the bulk of Amos' writing, namely a sapiential (wisdom) disputation form where the rhetorical questions provide an early justification for Amos' own prophetic office and for the fact of punishment, where "evil" / *calamity* is sent as corrective discipline – a theme explored, for example, in Job 2:10; Isa.45:7. The fact that Yahweh reveals his "secret" through the prophets illustrates the central OT assumption about the nature of revelation, that God discloses his will through the prophets (e.g. Amos 2:11; Gen. 18:17-19; Exod. 4:15-16; Jer. 7:25; Dan. 9:10).

The oracles in ch.3-9 have been loosely linked under rubrics such as, 'hear this word' (3:1, 4:1, 5:1), and the invective operates by alternate accusation and judgement. These comments are announced to Israel ruled by Jeroboam II, and to the states neighbouring the Northern Kingdom, and that polemic against the North is continued throughout the book. The judgement pronounced in 3:9-11 culminates in the Assyrian destruction of Samaria in 721, the deportation or execution of a large proportion of its population, and the political removal of the Northern Kingdom as an independent state. Amos characterises the fate of Samaria through images of its 'end' (v.15) through ruin, flight and death. The winter and summer houses that were the pride of their owners will be destroyed by a major cataclysm (3:13f.). Verse 12 is sometimes considered to be a doctrine of as remnant, but appears more likely to be a metaphor of the completeness of destruction. The passage reflects Amos' demands for justice in

the rest of the book, and his depiction of the social *injustice* that makes catastrophe inevitable. This message is overshadowed by later Judaeon reworking within the Book of the Twelve, particularly the concluding sections that offer comfort to those who survived the next major disaster of the Babylonian invasion of 587. [10 marks]

**(b) Consider the view that Amos' oracles against Israel's neighbours (chapters 1-2) were motivated only by Amos' desire for justice.**

This section of Amos is the longest within the book, and includes a series of oracles against Israel's immediate neighbours: Damascus (1:3-5), Philistia (1:6-8), Tyre (1:9-10), Edom (1:11-12), Ammon (1:13-15), Moab (2:1-3), Judah (2:4-5); and finally against Israel itself (2:6-16). As a shepherd from Tekoa, Amos seems to have been personally concerned about the social injustices of the time, which were brought about by a period of prosperity that led to overwhelming greed on the part of the rich and powerful at the expense of the less affluent members of society. Thus the reason for the indictments appears to be Amos' concern for justice, driven by his call to prophesy, recorded in 7:10-17). Tyre is condemned for lack of brotherhood and pity; the four Philistine cities because of their slave traffic with Edom; Ammon for ripping open the bellies of pregnant women in pursuance of its expansionist policy; Moab for the desecration of cremating the body of the Edomite king after death; Judah for rejection covenant law, and Israel for a whole catalogue of sins – *selling the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes; trampling the head of the poor into the dust, profanation of Yahweh's name by father and son going into the same maiden* – injustices that are expanded upon in the later sections of the book. The unifying hand of Amos can be seen by the way each oracle is stylised with four common elements: (1) the introductory messenger formula (*'Thus says the Lord...'*); (2) a general declaration of culpability: *'For three transgressions of ... and for four, I will not revoke...'* – a phrase found in the wisdom literature, where the numbers indicate a number of faults (Prov.6:16ff.); (3) an announcement of God's verdict, prefaced by the 'I' of Yahweh in 1:4,5,6,8 etc.; (4) a concluding oracular formula (e.g. in 1:5,8,15, etc.) – so Amos can reasonably be seen as constructing a careful demand for justice as the justification of what he says in the rest of the book.

Balanced against this interpretation, collections of oracles against the foreign nations are a well-known stylistic feature of other prophetic books: for example First Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and it may be that the oracles have been placed here in imitation of that formal characteristic. In other words, the writing is formulaic and not moral. One interesting feature of Amos' presentation is that whereas in other collections of oracles against foreign nations, judgement of Israel follows those directed against Israel, Amos reverses that pattern: the doom of Israel is climactic. Amos' motivation may therefore have been much wider than a simple desire for social justice, and may include traditional prophetic themes such as God's control of history, and the unrivalled power of Yahweh in a world dominated politically by a number of competing powers, particularly by the expansionist major powers of Assyria and (later on) Babylonia. Amos' intent may therefore be theological, since the power of a nation was generally seen as being in proportion to the power of its gods, and Amos (like Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, *et al.*) is concerned to assert the unrivalled power of Yahweh. Also, Israel's geographical position in the corridor between the power of Egypt in the south and whatever power dominated in the East, meant that geo-politically she was involved in any power struggle. In terms of the resolution of that struggle, according to Amos, Israel's guilt is in the social realm: it was symptomatic of a way of life in the era of uncharacteristic prosperity under Jeroboam II, and Amos may well have foreseen that this temporary and unusual state of affairs politically was bound to end soon, and was therefore likely to end catastrophically. Given Israel's military insignificance, the solution could hardly be military, so had to be religious. [15 marks]

**8 Discuss the view that the origins of Old Testament prophecy must lie outside Israel. [25]**

There are a number of similarities between prophets/prophetic phenomena in the OT and those from the nations surrounding Israel. The issue of the origins of OT prophecy is complicated by the lack of information from archaeological records prior to Omri/Iron Age II. If the historical record is inaccurate before Omri, then there is a *prima facie* case that OT prophecy derives from

Canaanite models. If the validity of the general picture of the earlier period is accepted, then candidates might refer, for example, to: prophetic ecstasy in the story of Wen-Amon, sent by the Egyptian king to Byblos; prophetic functionaries of both sexes from Mari, in Mesopotamia, whose function was to give oracles from the gods; the ecstatic *muḫḫum* prophets referred to in some of the Accadian texts, and so on. The prevalence of these functionaries throughout the ancient world makes it a moot point as to which area and tradition was primary. Lindblom concluded that the phenomena arose independently as a result of prophetic consciousness of the divine. In the OT, the seers and ecstasies are sometimes seen as separate from the *nabi*-prophets. Some claim that prophecy in ancient Israel was borrowed from the Canaanite milieu; others that it was unique to Hebrew consciousness. It would be appropriate, for example, to conclude that the origins of OT prophecy are not likely to be known. Equally, the imprecise historical date render any absolute judgement on “must” a doubtful one.

**9 Assess the function and importance of symbolic acts in the message of pre-exilic prophets. [25]**

This question might be answered in terms of symbolic acts in general, or with reference to instances of acts associated with specific prophets, or both. Thus candidates could include symbolic acts in the sense of deeds, or conditions, etc. The function of symbolic acts is generally seen in terms of active efficacy of the prophetic *dabar*, as well as having genuine situational impact; although many consider the general tone of symbolic acts to be a literary device rather than a literal record. General comments about their importance in the message of the prophets might include: the efficacy of the symbol as in some way activating the prophetic *word* that accompanied it; the dramatic effect of gestures such as Jeremiah’s burying of the loin cloth, or walking about bearing a yoke, or smashing the potter’s vessel, and so on. It would also be legitimate to refer to material such as the symbolism of Hosea’s marriage and the naming of his children. Some of the prophetic acts were clearly intended to shock those who witnessed them, such as Isaiah walking naked and barefoot. In a society where literacy was confined to a small fraction of the population, such signs would be a visible backup to the power of the spoken word. The primary level of their importance might be seen in their being signs of Yahweh’s will.

## Appendix A

Table A: Generic Marking Scheme for 10 mark questions

Level 6 9-10 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 5 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Response is accurate: answers the question specifically</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 4 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately</li> </ul>
Level 3 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon.</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly</li> </ul>
Level 2 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short.</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
Level 1 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit</li> </ul>

## Appendix A

## Table B Generic Marking Scheme for 15 mark questions

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

## Appendix A

Table C: Generic Marking Scheme for 25 mark questions

Level 6 21–25 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level</li> <li>• Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained</li> <li>• Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 5 16–20 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question</li> <li>• Response is accurate: answers the question specifically</li> <li>• Argument has structure and development and is sustained</li> <li>• Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts</li> <li>• Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary</li> </ul>
Level 4 12–15 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked</li> <li>• Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained</li> <li>• Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument</li> <li>• May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately</li> </ul>
Level 3 8–11 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success</li> <li>• Attempts to evaluate though with partial success</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided</li> <li>• Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly</li> </ul>
Level 2 1–7 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic</li> <li>• Argument is limited or confused</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
Level 1 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit</li> </ul>

**BLANK PAGE**









University of Cambridge International Examinations  
1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1223 553554 Fax: +44 1223 553558  
Email: [international@cie.org.uk](mailto:international@cie.org.uk) Website: [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2009