GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2023

**AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF
RELIGION
B120U20-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2023 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- "Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited."
- "This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives."

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.

2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.

3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two-stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 25 marks
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including: − *religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching* − *influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies* − *cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice* − *approaches to the study of religion and belief.*
5	**21-25 marks** • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	**16-20 marks** • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	**11-15 marks** • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	**6-10 marks** • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	**1-5 marks** • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. **N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'**
0	• No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions *25 marks* *Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief,* *including their significance, influence and study.*
5	**21-25 marks** • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	**16-20 marks** • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	**11-15 marks** • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	**6-10 marks** • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	**1-5 marks** • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	• No relevant analysis or evaluation.

4

COMPONENT 2: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

SUMMER 2023 MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

Either,

0 1 **(a)** **Outline the different teleological arguments for the existence of God presented by:**

(i) **Paley's analogy of complex design**
and
(ii) **Tennant's aesthetic argument.** **[AO1 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Teleological arguments present an 'a posteriori' argument. That is, they are inductive and based on empirical experience. It has a basis on probability rather than proof. Candidates may show how the nature of inductive arguments 'work' relating this to teleological arguments in particular.
- Paley's view is that God is the best explanation for the existence of the universe. Paley's argument contains two parts relating to design qua purpose and design qua regularity or order. He argues that objects inside the universe display both a purpose in that they seem to have a shared end goal and also that these objects have a distinct regularity. He also says that such beneficial order cannot happen by chance. Paley's view sees the universe like a complex machine made by an intelligent designer and uses the analogy of the watchmaker.
- Paley's watch analogy highlights the notion of movement between complex parts which work together in order to achieve a purpose and the workings of the universe are analogous to this. Similarly, the watch has regularity, and the universe is analogous to this also. Paley contrasts the universe with simple objects, such as a stone. Such objects, lacking in complexity, have no designer. Hence, as the universe is analogous to complex, regular, orderly and purposeful things, which have a designer, so too does the universe have a designer, God.
- Even if one had never seen a watch before and did not know what its specific function or purpose was, or if the watch was broken, this would still not affect the implications of the analogy presented by Paley.
- Paley also used examples such as the workings of the eye, an insect's antennae, the number of teats that different species have or the intricacy of a bird's wing. These he said are additional proof that the universe is intelligently designed.
- Tennant's aesthetic argument uses the beauty inherent in the universe as evidence for a loving designer God. 'Aesthetics' is the appreciation of beauty. However, this argument goes further than just that to include the life-enhancing features that humans experience as a result of certain pursuits. Tennant argues that the universe is not just beautiful in some places; it is full of beauty at the microscopic level. Humans indulge in so many activities that other species do not. Evidence could be being awe-struck by a sunset, the colour of a rose, the love of philosophy.
- If survival of the fittest were true then humans do not need a love of music in order to survive. Such beauty can only be there by the deliberate act of a loving designer who wanted humans to have such aesthetics in their lives. Therefore, there is an omnibenevolent designer who made this choice, God.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) **'Teleological arguments are more persuasive than scientific explanations for the existence of the universe.'**
Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The teleological argument claims to be based on empirical observation of apparent design, order and purpose. This is a scientific method. Therefore, the argument rests on the same assumptions as scientific theories. Both, it could be argued rely on faith, hypothesis and the use of reason. Indeed, many of the arguments contained within teleological arguments appeal to human logic and indeed evidence. For example, it could be argued that the analogy between the watch and the world is a good one and we can see certain similarities between them. Equally, it is plain to see that nature does seem to have so much beauty in it that is superfluous to human existence that a choice to endow the universe with such beauty is appealing. It is 'a posteriori' and therefore based on empirical evidence

- In support of scientific explanations, it could be claimed that design is only apparent, with no proof of intention or a designer God. Candidates may refer to such things as the 'Epicurean hypothesis' which says that eventually order was bound to occur, as a result of what some may call 'trial and error.' Darwin could be referred to, mentioning that random changes can indeed lead to things becoming self-arranging.

- Indeed, the analogy between the universe and the watch may break down in which case the teleological argument is flawed. There is actually so much disorder in the universe that it may point away from a designer or at least question the characteristics of that designer. This may be exemplified by reference to Hume's views.

- Some would point out that God fills the gaps that Science cannot answer. However, the retort may be that the so-called 'God of gaps' argument is unnecessary in a scientific age which can answer so much that the gaps are ever decreasing.

- However, teleological arguments have longevity and they have not been entirely discredited. Science changes and develops and, therefore, scientific evidence is not necessarily a definitive challenge.

- There is a plethora of information which suggests that the two disciplines are not mutually exclusive. One can accept scientific explanations alongside teleological ones. Candidates could refer to scholars who suggest compatibility of teleological arguments and scientific explanations. For example, the anthropic principle.

- However, many would argue that Darwin and evolution provide better explanation than the 'Genesis' account of creation. In particular, natural selection explains the problem of evil better than intelligent designer theories. Against that one may say that Darwin is useful in helping us to understand how life on earth developed. But it does not tell us why it developed. Teleological arguments provide this answer.

- Against the aesthetic argument it could be argued that survival of the fittest is ultimately a more powerful influence upon humans than appreciation of beauty. If one was being chased by a tiger the most likely outcome would be that you would run for safety rather than standing still to admire its stripes.

- But Intelligent Design including Irreducible Complexity can show how scientific means can be used to consolidate God's design. Behe argues that the universe is mechanistic, driven by biological impulses. The development suggested by evolution just would not work. There are some things that simply could not have existed in a less developed way.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

6

Or,

0 2 **(a)** **Outline the different cosmological arguments presented by:**

(i) **Aquinas' First Three Ways**
and
(ii) **the Kalam argument.** **[AO1 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Aquinas' First Way is based on the concept of motion or change. A thing which is in motion is moving from a state of potentiality towards a state of actuality. However, that thing in motion has to be brought from a state of potentiality to a state of actuality by something already in a state of actuality. Aquinas used the example of wood and fire to illustrate his point. This actual cause of movement must itself have been moved by something else from potential into actual. There is no infinite regress since if there were no first mover there would be no secondary causes. 'Therefore, it is necessary to stop at some first mover which is moved by nothing else. And this is what we all understand God to be.' (Aquinas)
- His Second Way refers to the concept of 'Efficient Cause'. Cause and effect are universally observable within the universe. Aquinas reasons that to remove the cause also removes the effect; however, to remove the first efficient cause is to remove all others. Alternatively, an infinite regress of efficient causes would mean no first efficient cause and therefore no ultimate effect or intermediate efficient causes (i.e. there would be nothing here now). Aquinas concludes, 'it is necessary to suppose the existence of some First Efficient Cause, and this men call God'.
- The Third Way is based upon the concepts of contingency and necessity. In nature there are things which are possible to be and not to be (contingent). If this was the case for everything (i.e. contingent) then there would be nothing today since – as contingency suggests - at some point there would have been nothing in existence because an infinite regress of contingent beings is logically impossible. As there is something now, then this needs an explanation because something cannot arise from nothing. There must be something which is not contingent that relies upon nothing for its existence and so has necessary existence. This necessarily existent 'being' which caused all contingency to be, is God.
- The Kalam argument is based on the classical Islamic argument. It is an 'a posteriori', inductive argument (with, some say, deductive reasoning), based upon the view that everything that begins to exist is caused by something else within time and space.
- The Kalam argument works as follows. Everything that has a beginning has a cause. The universe began to exist therefore it must have a cause. This is God. God has to be a self-causing and necessary being that exists within time and space. The universe was caused at a point in time. That cause was God; therefore God exists in time – there is no infinite regress.
- The conclusion that the universe came into being as a result of a deliberate choice by a personal creator is an important part of William Lane Craig's argument. As the laws of science did not exist before the universe did then they cannot be responsible for the creation of the universe. God is therefore responsible for the existence of the universe.
- Craig's arguments concerning potential and actual infinites may be presented.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) **'Cosmological arguments are effective in proving God's existence.'**
Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Cosmological arguments suffer various objections. One is that cause and effect may not be linked. This makes an inductive jump which is not warranted. There is an effect (universe), but we cannot say definitively what the cause is, even whether there is a cause at all. Also, the cosmological argument is inductive and so the conclusion may be possible, even probable but it is not definitive proof.
- There may indeed be a plurality of causes thus the cosmological argument does not prove the God of classical theism. In this sense any conclusion based upon a cosmological argument would be ineffective as it may only prove a beginning to the universe as opposed to the God of Classical Theism as being the cause.
- Logically the argument makes no sense. If everything needs a cause, then what is the cause of God? Aquinas would argue that God is a 'special case' and the argument regarding causes does not apply to God. The cosmological argument only applies to contingent things within the universe.
- The universe could just be a brute fact, something that exists without the need of an explanation. Cosmological arguments rely on the asking of the question 'why?' there is a universe and 'how?' did it come about. If there is no question to ask, then the cosmological arguments are not needed as an answer. Though it could be argued that simply avoiding the question is not a sound form of argument.
- Some, including those using the laws of science would argue that there is no need for a first mover as things are capable of moving themselves. Indeed, we of our own volition can choose to move ourselves. However, it could still be argued that initial movement would not have started without a Prime Mover.
- The Big Bang can account for the existence of the universe without the need for reference to God as the first cause. However, many would suggest that there must be a reason why the Big Bang occurred suggesting there is still a role for God.
- The concept of infinity is indeed illogical as we cannot add to infinity. The present moment would not have arrived if infinity were true. There must therefore have been a starting point.
- Things can only achieve a different state via the intervention of a third party, the efficient cause. Only that which is in a state of actuality can effect a change from potentiality to actuality. For example, a person can only teach Spanish to someone else if that first person can in fact speak Spanish themselves. Without the intervention of God then the universe would never have come into being.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

8

Either,

| 0 | 3 |

(a) Outline the nature of religious experience with reference to prayer <u>and</u> conversion. **[AO1 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- As St. Teresa is specifically mentioned in the specification candidates may refer only to her which is perfectly legitimate. They may refer more widely to the concept of prayer as a communication between an individual and the divine and credit should be given for reference to other scholars and/or pertinent points.

- She deemed God's grace to be essential in order to assist a person to perform meaningful prayer. Her metaphors used aspects that people could relate to, making them easier to understand. She tracks the spiritual progress of a person from their first attempts at prayer, as a novice, through to those who through effort and God's grace have become more competent.

- St. Teresa referred to four stages of prayer using metaphors from gardening. One metaphor shows God as the one who roots out 'weeds' or obstacles from the soil and plants good plants instead.

- Another metaphor shows prayer in four stages by referring to how a garden is watered. One method is to get water from a well. This does show the active nature of prayer at this stage. The second method is to use a water wheel. This stage of prayer brings greater clarity. The third stage is when the water comes from a stream or a brook. This is Christ's input. The last stage is when the garden is watered by heavy rain. This requires no work form humans as God does it.

- In 'The Interior Castle' St. Teresa describes the soul as a diamond in the shape of a castle. This castle had seven mansions. She shows the progress of the soul through these seven dwelling places with the intensity increasing as this happens.

- The fourth mansion is The Prayer of Quiet. This begins the mystical stages. In this stage faculties are dormant. The fifth mansion is The Prayer of Union. God has touched the soul and this is assured and certain. The sixth mansion is spiritual marriage. This represents the longing for the divine as a person may long to spend all of their time with their spouse. The seventh mansion is mystical marriage. At this point, an individual has experienced ultimate unity with the divine. The mystic knows the divine.

- Conversion is the change in direction of a life. Conversion can be individual, for example St. Paul or communal, for example at Pentecost, the conversion of the disciples in the Book of Acts. It can involve a change in direction from theism to atheism, atheism to theism (St. Augustine) or a conversion from one religious tradition to another.

- There are a variety of component parts to the description of conversion that candidates could refer to as well as individual and communal. Conversion can be sudden, an unexpected event that happens 'out of the blue'. However, conversion can also be gradual, where a person undergoes almost a 'drip-feed' set of experiences that culminates in conversion.

- The conversion generally brings about a feeling of renewal where the person may describe a feeling of being 'born again' or of becoming a new person. This conversion may be as a result of their own choice to freely surrender themselves to the experience. Others describe being 'taken' by the experience where they are completely passive, with the experience happening to them.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

9

(b) **'Challenges to religious experiences prove that they do not really happen.'**

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Challenges to religious experience may include reference to the lack of authenticity and the subjectivity of religious experience. Due to the nature of certain types of religious experience, it may be said that the criteria for truth is almost impossible to establish. This is because some experiences are deemed to be subjective and therefore not without dispute with regard to their credibility.
- The work of the Vienna Circle and Logical Positivism said that for a statement to be meaningful (capable of passing on information) it must either be analytic or synthetic. Many religious experiences are claimed in language that falls into neither of these categories, so they are meaningless.
- However, rejection of the truth of an individual's religious experience just because it cannot be verified or falsified is potentially offensive, as it assumes that the individual's testimony cannot be trusted. Swinburne's Principles of Testimony and/or credulity could be employed here. Indeed, the notion of some religious experiences contains the concept of them being one-off experiences. Hence although they cannot be repeated the truth of the experience cannot be denied.
- Caroline Franks-Davis outlined three challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience. Description-related. There is no proof that the claim that 'God' or 'the Divine' has been experienced. The description is therefore to be refuted. Subject-related. The subject is the person who receives the claimed experience. S/he is considered unreliable. They may suffer from episodes of hallucinations or from mental illness (described further under 'naturalistic explanations.') Object-related. This relates to the object that the person claims to have experienced. The likelihood that the object described has indeed been experienced, is as unlikely as the most unlikely object we can imagine has been experienced. If someone claimed to have experienced something preposterous, we would be unlikely to believe her or him. This should also be the case with a religious experience.
- Richard Swinburne's principles of credulity and testimony may be used to refute general challenges to the above three challenges to religious experience.
- However, religious experiences provide comfort and support to individuals and groups. Challenges to these experiences do not always take account of the positive psychological effects that recipients claim. As James would say, this shows that the experience has produced 'fruits' thus suggesting that the experience did happen and because of this has resulted in a change in a person's behaviour.
- Many of the challenges only consider an empirical and rational view of the universe and therefore may be too reductionist to account for an experience which may come from beyond these spheres of experience.
- Religious experiences can increase individual and, sometimes, corporate spiritual understanding and should therefore not be dismissed out of hand because of the challenges to them. Alternatively, candidates may consider that the weight of empirical evidence against religious experiences is so overwhelming that it ensures that challenges to the truth of religious experience are stronger than claims in their favour.
- The widely reported effects of substance misuse as having very similar effects to those of individuals claiming religious experiences suggest that the experiences are not what the individual believes them to be. This could show that the challenge to the truth of the experience is valid. Scientific processes, such as those induced by Persinger's Helmet, demonstrate that religious experiences are clearly created by reactions in the brain and so support the challenges to the truth of religious experience as valid.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

10

Or,

(a) **Explain how Irenaean type theodicies offer a solution to the problem of evil.** **[AO1 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may set the scene by outlining the problem of evil. However, the focus of the question concerns Irenaean type responses to it and that is what should be credited.
- There may be an explanation of what a theodicy is, the justification of God in the face of evil. They may refer to this type of theodicy as one of a 'Free-Will Defence' type theodicy and emphasise the important point that God is not to blame for evil and suffering but moral agents are.
- Irenaean type theodicies are rooted in the text of Genesis 1:26 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'. Such theodicies (e.g. John Hick) see this verse as representing two separate stages in the creative process. The first is the initial stage with imperfections, the latter the stage that will be attained.
- It has as its focus the idea of moral and spiritual development of humans which makes free will a vital part of the theodicy. This free choice will enable humans to move from God's image into God's likeness (perfection).
- Suffering is needed as certain qualities such as compassion and courage only thrive in the context of suffering. Without suffering these qualities could not be developed so the world could not work to God's perfection if it were any other than as it is.
- God made the world imperfectly deliberately so that humans have the capacity to develop. Otherwise, the world would be a toy world where choices are not real and the love of God would be forced. This is not true love.
- The theodicy covers both moral and natural evil. Humans were made imperfectly and so will do that which is wrong. Natural evil is the necessary consequence of an imperfect world. However, the qualities generated as a result of these evils helps with the soul-making process. The world was not designed to be a perfect habitat.
- An analogy that Irenaeus used was one of a craftsman. This craftsman works with people, in willing cooperation in order to achieve future justification for all of the evil suffered. Both positive and negative experiences allow God to envisage the perfectly moulded human being.
- This theodicy does rely on there being an after-life where all people will eventually be in the likeness of God. This is because the process will take longer for some than others and many do not get enough opportunities on earth for their soul to be ready. It also suggests that this perfected stage will be afforded to all people in the end.
- John Hick's presentation of an Irenaean type theodicy may be presented separately or be integrated into the above solutions and his ideas of epistemic distance and eschatological justification may be explored.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) **'Augustinian type theodicies successfully defend the God of Classical Theism.'**
Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Many would claim that Augustinian type theodicies retain the characteristics of the God of Classical Theism. God is still omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent.
- However, it could be argued that saying that evil is a privation denies the reality of evil. Evil is not just the absence of good, but it is a living presence in the lives of many. It also makes no sense to say that the perfect world became imperfect. If there is no evil in existence, then how can bad choices be made?
- On scientific grounds Augustine's theodicy can be rejected. Humans are not descendants of Adam thus demolishing a major premise of the theodicy. It may also call into doubt the historicity of The Fall.
- As the majority of humans are destined for hell this suggests that hell was part of the world that God created. This not only goes against his suggestion that there was no evil at the origin of the universe, but it also suggests that God has committed a major design flaw. This then questions a number of characteristics of the God of Classical Theism. For example, if God is omniscient then why could God not have foreseen what humans would do in the future and prevent such actions from taking place?
- However, the notion that humans must suffer as a punishment for sinning is an accepted idea in Jewish and Islamic circles and so is in accordance with major world faiths. Indeed, our expectation that cause and effect as a system works in our world consolidates the success of the theodicy. This would be in accordance with the notion of a just God, one who unwillingly must accept that there are consequences to wrongful deeds.
- It can free God from blame. Augustine exemplified this by saying that all humans commit concupiscence (a desire to turn from human to God). Augustine had thought that sin was a learned attitude which developed as one got older. He then altered his view to one that believed all humans were born with inherited sin. The responsibility for sinning becomes humanity's due to the sin of Adam in which all are 'seminally present'. This then actually removes the problem of evil as it is in no way attributed to the God of Classical Theism, hence freeing God from any blame.
- Some will say that this theodicy justifies 'innocent' suffering as through his inheritance of guilt doctrine, no one is innocent. However, Rowe and Paul would argue that innocent and animal sufferings are not justified. Animals do not inherit Adam's sin so why do they suffer?

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Or,

(a) **Outline the ontological arguments for the existence of God presented by Anselm <u>and</u> Malcolm.** **[AO1 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The ontological argument is a deductive argument, that is, the process of reasoning from one or more statements to a logical conclusion. It is 'a priori' based on logical deduction rather than from observation or experience.
- The ontological argument can be found in Anselm's Proslogion and it is important to look at his definition of God from Chapter 2. This definition of God is of 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived'. Anselm believed in God already and was trying to show how self-evident God's existence was to him. Indeed for him, to accept the definition of God and then to deny God's existence would be absurd and self-contradictory.
- Anselm referred to 'the fool' in Psalm 14 who denies the existence of God. The idea is that the very definition of God means something that must exist in reality and not only in mind. Even the fool accepts that God exists in the mind, it is only to reject God. If God is the greatest imaginable being then God must exist separately from people's imaginations. God must exist in reality. If God exists only as a concept, then a greater being could be imagined i.e. one that exists in both mind and reality. This builds on his earlier premise that existence in the mind and in reality, is greater than existence in the mind alone. This cannot be the case (Proslogion 2)
- Anselm's second form of the argument is found in Proslogion 3. This states that God has necessary existence in the sense that God *cannot be thought of as not existing*. The opposite mode of existence would be *a God that could be thought of as to not-exist*. Anselm reasons that if God is the greatest being that can be conceived of, then he must necessarily exist and cannot be thought of to not exist since it is greater to have existence that has to be (necessary), than one that can be thought of a coming into and going out of existence (contingent existence). So again, in order for God to 'match up to' the definition of having necessary existence then God's existence is a logical necessity and *cannot be thought of as not existing*.
- Malcolm makes no reference to the Bible but like Anselm does use a definition of God as an unlimited being as the basis of his argument. However, Malcolm rejects this part of Anselm's argument accepting that existence adds nothing to the concept.
- In Anselm's second form in Proslogion 3 he compares two logical scenarios for God's existence. One is *a God that could be thought of as to not-exist* the other is God *cannot be thought of as not existing*. Clearly the latter is greater than the former. So, in order for God to be 'a being...' then existence is a logical necessity. Again, proof by contradiction. Malcolm develops this part of Anselm's argument as he sees logically necessary existence as a predicate.
- Malcolm develops his argument by claiming that God's existence is either impossible or necessary. If God did not exist then God could not come into existence or cease to exist otherwise, he would be limited, and so not be God. However, by definition he is not limited. God is an unlimited being and therefore necessarily exists. Like Anselm, Malcolm uses the method of proof by contradiction.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) **'Challenges to the ontological argument result in its failure.'**
Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may refer to any ontological argument as well as to deductive arguments. They could consider the relative successes of ontological arguments when compared to others.
- Gaunilo's 'perfect island' example suggests that existence is not a predicate. A predicate adds to our description of something. To say that something exists does not. So we cannot give a long list of predicates, add 'exists' to the end of it and thereby define it into existence. This challenge is a strong one because it is quite clear that 'existence' does not perform the same function as a true predicate. It adds nothing to the description of the subject.
- However, existence can be used as a predicate which goes against the main challenge to the effectiveness of the argument. The real (money) does have a property which money in the mind doesn't have which is the property of purchasing power. Therefore, 'existence' really can be a predicate.
- Anyway, it can be pointed out that Gaunilo's island example only works when referring to contingent things. The argument does not work when talking about God.
- Aquinas said that God's existence is synthetic (has to be shown to be true) rather than analytic. If God's existence were analytically true, then everyone would see how self-evident God's existence is. They do not; hence the logic of the ontological argument is not effective.
- However, Anselm would say that the ontological argument applies to God only and not to such things as islands. Islands have no intrinsic maximum; they can always be added to so challenging the ontological argument in this way is not effective.
- Kant would say that all arguments for God's existence are doomed to failure as such proofs belong to the noumenal world which we cannot access. He also rejected the basic premise that existence is not a predicate. Moreover, Kant said that Anselm's claim that it is greater to exist in reality than in mind alone is not effective. He commented that 100 real thalers contained no more thalers than 100 thalers in the mind. Specifically addressing Descartes' ontological argument Kant also noted that if a triangle exists, it must have the property of 3 sides and 3 angles. However, there is no contradiction in rejecting the triangle altogether. Similarly, if God exists God must have necessary existence but there is no contradiction in rejecting God in the first place.
- If the premises of a deductive argument are incorrect then so will the conclusion be. This can show that a premise such as 'existence is a perfection' if it is not true, makes the conclusion false.
- However, if the premises are true in a deductive argument, then the conclusion follows of necessity. Supporters of the argument would claim that 'God exists' serves the same function as 'a bachelor is an unmarried man.'
- Many would argue that it is a successfully made point to say that it is more perfect to exist in reality than in mind alone. We would rather have a real holiday than one which just exists in our minds.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.