



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2
A STUDY OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
A120U20-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 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 or all 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.

A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 20 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> • <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> • <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> • <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied. - An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. - Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied. - A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. - Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied. • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.

2	<p style="text-align: center;">5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied. • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of some specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	<p align="center">Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i></p>
5	<p align="center">25-30 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p align="center">19-24 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p align="center">13-18 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.

2	7-12 marks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	1-6 marks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	1. No relevant analysis or evaluation.

A Level Component 2: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion

MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. (a) **Examine challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience.** [AO1 20]

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

- 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. Caroline Franks-Davis gave three challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience.
- Description challenges involve misremembering, exaggerating, misusing terms or telling lies. An example of a description challenge is a highly interpreted description ('I had an experience of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit'), which may also be a ground for doubt.
- Authenticity and objectivity should be granted to that which conforms to everyday experience. Religious experiences do not conform to everyday experiences. 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.'). As they in a fragile mental state, they have been mistaken and misguided. 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.
- There are other challenges to religious experience that come from the study of nature and human life. Religious experiences are not open to rational enquiry. This is something that has always been called upon in order for an experience to be considered objective, with the ability for it to be deemed as authentic. There are other explanations as to what is being experienced.
- 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, then they cannot be verified empirically.
- On the falsification side, Popper and Flew said that the only meaningful statements are those that are capable of being falsified. Flew said that religious believers refuse to have their statements falsified (in this case, claims of religious experience) making claims of religious experience evasive and not subject to any empirical test.
- Freud said that mystical experiences are the manifestations of the repression of sexual urges. The desire for a mystical experience is simply the desire of humans to return to the safety of the womb, a regression, which clearly is not the manifestation of a religious experience.
- Others say that the characteristics of a religious experience can be seen replicated in people who take drugs or use alcohol. Such experiences are simply hallucinations rather than an objective experience.

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

(b) **‘Religious experience has more value for an individual than for a religious community.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may choose to focus on particular religious experiences such as visions, prayer, conversion or mysticism. It would be just as valid to answer from a more generic standpoint, discussing religious experiences in general.
- A religious experience has tremendous value for the individual as it may inaugurate the individual’s faith making the experience life-changing with an empirically verifiable regeneration resulting from it.
- The experience can also strengthen an individual’s faith especially in times of persecution and/or opposition. This experience can then validate the religious tradition of the individual.
- This in turn will allow the individual to renew or reaffirm their commitment to the religious tradition.
- Their experience may form the basis of major teachings or writings by that individual which brings further value to their experience.
- The experience informs and consolidates their religious belief and practices.
- However, for the community a religious experience allows for cohesion within the religious community. It generates a sense of belonging and shared understanding.
- The experience can also strengthen a community’s faith especially in times of persecution and/or opposition. This experience can then validate the religious tradition of the community.
- The experience may form the basis of major teachings or writings which are used by the community thus making the experience valuable to that community
- A religious experience can act as an event which validates the religious tradition for the entire community.
- Credibility is given to a leader within a religion who has had such an experience which consolidates the credibility of that particular religious community.

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

2. (a) Examine the term 'miracle' with reference to three scholars. [AO1 20]

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

- Swinburne says that miracles are possible because God is omnipotent. If God wanted to intervene then he could suspend laws of nature. Scientific evidence does make accepting a break in the law of nature difficult but there is evidence to suggest that God can do this. To be classed as a miracle then the event must fulfil two criteria whereby it has to have religious significance and it had to occur in a timescale not normally experienced.
- Holland suggests that laws of nature need not be broken in order for an event to be termed 'a miracle.' Miracles are events that are coincidences that can be of benefit to humans and are miracles if interpreted in that way by an individual. They can, however, be interpreted differently which is equally as justifiable. He gave an example of a child on a train track whose mother prayed for his safety. The driver fainted onto the brake lever just in time for the child to be saved. His fainting could be explained in purely natural terms, but the mother declared the event as a miracle.
- Aquinas' God was a timeless God who could intervene in the natural order if he wanted to. He had 3 types of miracles. One was something that nature can't do but God can. The second was something that nature can do but we do not expect this to happen via nature, but God can do it. The third was something that nature can do as well as God being able to do it but God can do it without using the forces of nature. What unites all miracles is that the individual or group benefits from the miracle.
- Hume said that a miracle is 'a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of a deity ...' He was an empiricist who said that miracles are unlikely, but not impossible. They are unlikely as the weight of evidence suggests that the laws of nature do not break. We have little evidence for miracles occurring hence a 'wise man proportions belief to evidence.' Hume states that the testimony to miracles is extremely poor and unreliable. Reports of miracles are not to be believed as they come from 'ignorant and barbarous nations.' Those that claim miracles have something to gain from their occurrence. The miracles in religions all cancel each other out.

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

- (b) **‘All definitions of miracles are inadequate.’**
Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates could look generally at some definitions of miracles and say that some definitions are too restrictive or too broad. This will inevitably lead them into discussion of specific scholars and their definitions.
- A coincidence for many is not a miracle. They are two separate things and to suggest that a coincidence can be taken religiously as a sign and called a miracle is nonsense. A coincidence is a purely non-religious concept, a fortuitous event.
- But it may be argued that an omnipotent God can act without breaking the laws of nature in such a way to allow for the interpretation of events as a miracle.
- An issue raised is whether a definition must/not involve God/gods. Many of the scholarly definitions do involve a God/gods or supernatural being. For many, for something to be termed a miracle, then some agency which is out of the ordinary is needed.
- However, where does this leave Buddhism? Where does it leave atheism? Are we to deny millions of people their claim to a miracle? This would also rule out definitions such as a miracle as ‘a change for the better.’
- Another line of argument would be whether laws of nature can/not be broken. Some would argue that laws of nature could not be broken. They are generalisations based upon the evidence we have up until today. They are permeable and not set in stone. Thus, an event which appears to break a ‘law’ that has been established up until today, it has not. The new event would simply be incorporated into our new ‘law’ of nature. Hence, definitions of miracle that include reference to a break in the law of nature will have problems.
- Others would argue that that in order for something to be truly miraculous it must break the law of nature. Hence, arguments that contain reference to this are adequate.
- It could be argued that there are so many different definitions of miracle that there cannot be one adequate definition. Indeed, it may be more suitable to say that the definition of miracle that one holds as an individual is adequate for that person only. To suggest that ‘one size should fit all’ is an inadequate suggestion.

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

Section B

3. (a) Examine the main criticisms of religion made by New Atheism. [AO1 20]

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

- The problem of evil, both moral and natural has always been a problem that non-religious people have used as evidence against God's existence. This is still the case and continues to find its adherents amongst New Atheists today.
- New Atheism may suggest that religion contradicts and/or impedes scientific progress. As more and more advances are made in science then religion may suffer more and more as a result. Things can be explained without reference to religion and indeed, many New Atheists will say that religion should not figure in the scientific age.
- Related to this, New Atheism may say that their views are thinking and intellectual which are appropriate to today's world. Contrary to this religion is non-thinking and non-intellectual which makes the ground fertile for the rise of New Atheism.
- The soil of a secular society is fertile for the rise of New Atheism. A decline in traditional religious family values leads many to rebel against such things and claim that a religious lifestyle is not relevant today.
- There has been a decline in traditional values associated with religion as well as a decline in belief in deities, myths and all matters supernatural gives further credibility to anti-religious propaganda, branding religion as a product of a bygone age as opposed to lending itself to the scientific era.
- Terrorist activity which has been linked to a religious group may lead to responses in the form of New Atheism. This may be perpetuated by sensationalised media coverage of terrorist attacks and of fundamentalist groups.
- New Atheism may promulgate the view of religion as mythical and infantile, which was suited to a previous age but not any longer. This may include a rebuttal of much from sacred writings as well as classical arguments for God's existence.
- There may be pertinent case studies, which refer to the specific work of New Atheist apologists such as Harris, Dennett, Dawkins, and Hitchens.

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

- (b) **'Religious responses have overcome the challenges from New Atheism.'**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

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

- Because of the threat from New Atheism, fundamentalist activity has increased in certain religious group. Therefore, the challenge from New Atheism has actually been met with a far greater and indeed, more challenging response, from religious groups. Due to the fact that the religious response has been more 'threatening' the New Atheist challenge has been viewed as a weak one.
- Alister McGrath, author of 'The Dawkins Delusion' has for many effectively responded to the New Atheists. Many Christians, for example, have supported McGrath's presentation of religion as a perfectly rational stance to adopt.
- Although non-religious, Owen Jones has publicly spoken out of behalf of atheists that want to distance themselves from the views of Richard Dawkins and the New Atheists – an indirect consequence of the responses of leading religious academics.
- The threat from New Atheism has led some religious communities to become even stronger in terms of 'strength in numbers.' Faith has been reaffirmed as a secondary result of this. Cohesion is always greater when there is a threat from the outside. This has led, for example, to the upsurge in more faith schools. This increases religious cohesion and reaffirms more strongly the faith. Hence, religious responses to New Atheism have been stronger than the challenge.
- Stronger cohesion amongst religious communities can lead to the accusation that they are isolationist and supremacist. This would be consolidated by many atheists and this would have a public forum in the work of notable New Atheist speakers and authors. This challenge to religion leads to opposition to them becoming solidified also. The atheist opposition will find popular appeal when it attacks fundamentalism, as Dawkins does in his series 'the root of all evil' with regard to Islamic and Jewish fundamentalism.
- However, many responses to atheism have led to results which diminish the challenge of New Atheism. Showing that, for example, mindfulness is very popular and has tremendous benefits to the individual undermines the atheistic claim that all religious practices are out of date and pointless. This increase in popularity of spirituality has led to the upsurge in New Religious Movements.
- New Atheism has challenged the role of religion in areas of public debate, such as politics and the media.
- Others suggest that New Atheism is hypocritical. It accuses religion of being rigid in its views and unwilling to change. This is exactly what New Atheists display.

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

4. (a) **Explain religious language as analogy, with reference to Aquinas and Ramsey.** [AO1 20]

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

- The concept of analogy as non-cognitive, that is not intending to function as that which is either true or false. It has a different function which is to talk about God by way of a comparison between God and that which we understand.
- Reference to why Aquinas said that talking about God univocally (same word, same meaning) is insufficient as that would mean that we anthropomorphise God by saying that God and humans are exactly the same.
- Reference to why Aquinas said that talking about God equivocally (same word, different meaning) is insufficient as that would mean that we are not really saying anything if we are simply saying that God and humans are completely different.
- Suggesting that language about God can be used analogically is due to the 'causal link.' God caused humans to be, showing that cause and effect are inextricably linked. There is a relationship between God and humans as God caused humans to be.
- Analogy of proportion which means that entities have a characteristic in proportion to what they are. So we have goodness in proportion to being human. God has goodness infinitely as that is what is required in proportion to God being God.
- Analogy of attribution can be viewed in two related ways. An attribute is a quality, so God has attributes which he attributes (second use of attribute) to humans as God caused us. This again shows the link between cause and effect. Aquinas used the example of a healthy bull (cause) has the effect of producing healthy urine.
- Ian Ramsey's analogical approach is via 'models and qualifiers.' A model is what we begin with as a model is that which we know. This means the model generally begins with the human realm. For example, we know what 'wisdom' is with regard to humans. When we say the 'God is wise' we must qualify this wisdom by using the word 'infinitely' when related to God.
- He uses many words and phrases that help to clarify his ideas. These could be used, explained and exemplified. They include new dimension, ice breaks, empirical anchorage, and discernment of depth.
- Examples used in his book 'Religious language' could include the high court judge, equal pay for equal rights, the dinner jacket splitting, to name a few.

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

- (b) **‘Non-cognitive interpretations of religious language are meaningful.’**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

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

- Discussion as to whether the term non-cognitive is, in fact, a solution to religious language being claimed as being meaningless. Candidates may consider whether or not this term is appropriate.
- Arguments considered would include a debate as to whether non-cognitive interpretations of religious language (analogy, symbol, myth, language games) are valid responses to the challenges to the meaning of religious language.
- This may include discussion as to whether, in analogy, there are grounds to consider the analogy appropriate or, is there a suitable point of connection between God and humans in order to allow for such an analogical concept. Aquinas would call this the ‘causal link’.
- Symbolic interpretations of religious language suggest that symbols have functions and that they point to and participate in, a deeper level of reality that would otherwise have been unknown. The debate may include whether a symbol actually conveys any information. Consideration of the validity of Randall and Tillich’s works.
- Discussion as to whether myths may communicate important messages regarding such questions as ‘why are we here?’ or whether it is satisfactory to claim them to be a valid explanation given by primitive humans. Evidence may be that they help to explain religious, ethical and social values. However, the number of different creation myths, for example, may mean that they cancel each other out in terms of any meaning. Or, as products of their time, they contain no meaning today.
- Scientific evidence may be considered as a way to show that myths do not promote meaning but rather, present a misunderstanding of the correct world-view and are thus unhelpful in transmitting meaning. Or, once a myth has been demythologised perhaps the true kerygma is shown.
- Religion may be considered as having meaning in its ‘form of life’. This fits with the coherence theory of truth which may be appealing in today’s world. However, it may be argued that religious believers would want their claims to be cognitive and indeed would claim that they have evidence that it is cognitive. This would fit with the correspondence theory of truth.
- There could be no meaning for religious language if different religious groups cannot communicate across ‘forms of life’. This could make religious language struggle in today’s world. Alternatively, it could mean that each form of religious language retains identity, as it is self-contained and cannot be refuted.

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

5. (a) **Examine Irenaean type theodicies.**

[AO1 20]

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

- Irenaean type theodicies are rooted in the text of Genesis 1:26 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. John Hick saw 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.

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

- (b) **‘No theodicy successfully defends the God of Classical Theism.’**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

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

- Candidates could reflect on the relative successes or failures of one theodicy against another and could therefore defend one, more than one or none whatsoever.
- With regard to Augustine, 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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?
- With regard to Irenaeus, it could be said that this type of theodicy reflects our understanding of evolution and is therefore successful for that reason.
- However, the authenticity of his Biblical references may be called into question and may therefore suggest that his theodicy is unsuccessful. If humans were not made in the image of God, then the development to likeness suggested is also called into question.
- For some, God’s omnibenevolence squares with the idea of universal salvation. However, for others this is the weakness of the theodicy. It is an unjust concept and does not square with a fair God.
- It may well be true that some suffering does allow humans to develop morally; it does generate characteristics of fortitude and courage. However, others do not develop as a result of suffering. It breaks them rather than developing them.
- The suggestion that the theodicy relies on there being an after-life can be used both as a success and as a weakness. If there is an after-life, it may succeed but if there isn’t then it seems that the theodicy may fail to defend the God of Classical Theism.

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