



# Exemplars

**A Level Religious Studies: Paper 1 – Philosophy of Religion**

---

# **A Level Religious Studies Exemplars: Paper 1 – Philosophy of Religion**

---

## **Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Question 2</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Question 3a</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Question 3b</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Question 4</b>	<b>24</b>



## **Introduction**

---

- The purpose of this pack is to provide teachers and students with some examples of responses to A Level Religious Studies Paper 1: Philosophy of Religion.
- The sample assessment materials which these responses are based on can be found on the Pearson website
- In this pack, you will find a small sample of responses, an examiner commentary and the mark scheme for each question.
- The responses are all from students and we have retained their original responses where possible. In some cases, the student scripts have been typed to ensure that they are clear to read.
- In some cases, the students have used more space than was originally provided in the sample assessment booklets. In light of this feedback, the A Level specimen papers on the website and the Summer 2018 papers will have additional pages
- We will add to these exemplar packs throughout the year
- If you have any enquiries regarding these materials or have any other questions about the course, please contact our subject advisor team on [teachingreligiousstudies@pearson.com](mailto:teachingreligiousstudies@pearson.com)

## Question 1

### Question and Mark Scheme

- 1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

Question number	Indicative content
1	<p>8 marks AO1</p> <p><b>AO1 will be used by candidates to demonstrate knowledge, understanding and specialist language and terminology when responding to the question.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaning of the term 'analogy'.</li> <li>• There are analogies (similarities) between order in the world and man-made machines such as a watch.</li> <li>• There is evidence of analogies (parallels) between order in the human body such as the eye and order in the world.</li> <li>• The experience of order over time as in laws of nature and analogically between man-made machines.</li> <li>• Analogical reasoning leads to links between experience of man-made machines and the origin of order in nature, namely God.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Provides a superficial understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> </ul>
Level 2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> <li>• Develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li> </ul>
Level 3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> <li>• Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li> </ul>

**Candidate A:**

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

Some versions of the design argument are called analogical arguments, because they attempt to make proof based on analogy and comparisons. An analogy is a comparison between two or more objects to prove a point. William Paley thought of a the watchmaker analogy to describe the design argument for the existence of God. He said if we found a watch on a heath then we would assume it has some designer.

**Examiner comment:**

The candidate addresses a narrow range of the key religious ideas with a narrow range of knowledge and specialist language.

**Level 1 – 2 marks.**

Level 1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1).</li><li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li><li>• Provides a superficial understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li></ul>
---------	-----	---

**Candidate B:**

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

The best known analogy in the design argument is the analogy of the 'watch' by William Paley. He argued that if you came across a watch lying on the ground, picked it up and examined it, you would come to the conclusion that it was the work of a human designer. In the same way, he argues, various things in the world work together in a way that is even more complex than the watch, and it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the world must also be the work of a designer. This designer being God.

**Examiner comment:**

Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key ideas (such as things in the world working together). This is a complex idea but is under developed and not clearly explained.

**Level 2 – 3 marks**

Level 2	3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> <li>• Develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li> </ul>
---------	-----	---

**Candidate C:**

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

An analogy is a way of expression the design argument and there are many analogies used such as the archer and arrow and Paley's watch.

Paley's analogy is a watch, to compare to the creation of the universe. He uses a man-made object to show the complexity of the universe and how every part of the universe works together and how God made the universe the way a watchmaker made a watch.

The analogy of the archer and the arrow shows that the arrow cannot move without the archer. In the same way, the universe cannot have just happened, it must have had someone or something that designed it. This is good. God is the only possible being to have created the universe

(Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)

**Examiner comment:**

There are a range of points made but they are rather narrow in focus. The understanding is a little simplistic and lacking in detail. In order to move up the mark scheme, this response needed more complexity of understanding and more detail/purpose in the examples used, for example, in the analogy of the archer and the arrow.

**Level 2 – 4 marks**

Level 2	3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> <li>• Develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li> </ul>
---------	-----	---

**Candidate D:**

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

Analogies are used to strengthen the design argument, drawing a comparison in order to show a similarity. One of the most famous and used analogies is Paley's watch, giving a strong argument for the existence of God. He uses features of design such as intricacy, order, and purpose which implies a designer, comparing it to the universe and how it must have a designer - which must be God.

Aquinas' analogy is of the archer and the arrow saying that things in the world move toward goals, just as the arrow does not move toward its goal except by the archer's directing it. This beneficial order could not happen by chance therefore God exists as the explanation as they must be directed by something that does have intelligence. There must be an intelligent designer who directs all things to their goals, and this is God.

**(Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)**

**Examiner comment:**

The candidate uses good terminology and a range of knowledge. Some areas could be developed further to illustrate how the world also has order and intricacy as well as some further detail about why these features imply a designer.

**Level 3 – 6 marks**

Level 3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> <li>• Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li> </ul>
---------	-----	---

**Candidate E:**

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

An analogy is a comparison to explain a complex idea and simplify it so it can be easier understood. The teleological argument attempts to prove God's existence by putting him as the designer of a complex universe. It shows how everything we know works towards a 'telos' or end, since it fits its function it must have been designed that way.

Since an analogy is a way to simplify difficult ideas, William Paley uses a comparison between a watch and the universe. A watch is intricate and detailed, with many parts that work together to fit its purpose. We wouldn't think it possible for a watch to exist by chance, we assume there was a watch maker. The universe itself and the things in it also have complex detail and millions of parts that work together to make it function. An example in the world is the human eye. The muscles, iris ect. all work together so that we can see. If the universe also shows design, it must have a designer. This, logically, must be God. (Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)

**Examiner comment:**

There is a good range of ideas and some terminology which could be developed more here. The explanation about purpose rather than chance is valid but could be a little more precise. The candidate has used more than the allocated space for this response and more space will be provided in future for students.

**Level 3 – 7 marks.**

Level 3	6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li> <li>• Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li> </ul>
---------	-----	---

**Candidate F:**

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

Analogy is a comparison between two different things, in order to highlight a similarity. If things agree in some respects they probably agree in others.

Analogy is a key theme throughout the design argument used by philosophers to simplify complex arguments. Paley (1743-1805) uses a watch to show that objects with intricate features must be designed. The universe is even more complicated, therefore it too must have a designer who must be God. Through comparing the universe to a designed object it makes it much easier for us to understand.

Paley also argues from the point of *qua* purpose and *qua* regularity, where he uses analogy to show that everything is too complicated to have come about by chance.

Analogy is very important within explaining the design argument. Analogy is a way of comparing the universe to man made objects so that we can comprehend. Analogies can be easily adapted to suit ones argument too e.g. comparing the universe to a potato.

(Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)

**Examiner comment:**

There is good range of terminology used alongside a good range of ideas including order, complexity, regularity and purpose. The response loses a bit of focus in the very last line but the response as a whole comprehensively develops the key religious ideas and beliefs required for the question.

**Level 3 – 8 marks**

## A Level Religious Studies exemplars – Paper 1

Level 3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li><li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li><li>• Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li></ul>
---------	-----	---

### Candidate G:

*One analogy of the design argument which proves the existence of God is William Paley's analogy of the watch because the watch wasn't created by chance due to the intricate design. Therefore, William Paley said that it must have an intelligent designer. He compares this to the universe but the universe is so intricate that it must have a divine, intelligent designer that can create so much detail in a world that everything must be precise and aesthetic. This enables humans, animals and any other beings to live on it so that they can fulfil their purpose such as an eye which is so complex and fulfils its telos which is sight. This shows that an omnipotent and intelligent being must be the designer and that is God.*

*Another analogy is Aquinas Five ways. He uses the analogy of an archer and its target to show order and purpose. The archer (God), as an intelligent being, guide the arrow (unintelligent being) to the target (telos). This shows that everything in nature which is moving but has not intelligence must be directed to its telos by a powerful and intelligent being which is God.*

### Examiner comment:

There is a wide range of knowledge and use of terminology with development of a range of religious ideas to reveal a depth of understanding.

### Level 3 – 8 marks

Level 3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li><li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li><li>• Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li></ul>
---------	-----	---

## Candidate H:

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

The design argument is based on the view that certain aspects of the universe are so perfectly adapted to fulfil their purpose that they display evidence of being designed deliberately by an intelligent designer which is God. An analogy is a comparison between one thing and another typically for the purpose of explanation. Paley's analogy of the watch is an argument based on comparing a watch back to the universe. The features of a watch show that a watch has been designed by a designer as the watch is too ordered complicated for it not to have been, each feature has to be put in the right place in order for the watch to work. The human eye is also too complicated for it to not have been designed by an intelligent ~~designer~~<sup>being</sup>, that intelligent being is God. Just as the

(Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)

existence of a watch implies a intelligent designer to put all its parts in place, so does the universe. The universe is too ordered and complicated to not have been designed by an intelligent designer. That intelligent designer is God.

**Examiner comment:**

Although this response is a little repetitious towards the end, a wide range of knowledge and religious ideas are explained well to reveal depth of understanding. As with other candidates, this student has written outside the allocated space. Additional space will be provided in future.

**Level 3 – 8 marks.**

## A Level Religious Studies exemplars – Paper 1

Level 3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li><li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).</li><li>• Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).</li></ul>
---------	-----	---

## Question 2

### Question and Mark Scheme

- 2 Assess the debate between Copleston and Russell on religious experience as an argument for the existence of God.

(12)

Question number	Indicative content
2	<p>4 marks AO1, 8 marks AO2</p> <p><b>AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis and evaluation. Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding when responding to the question, and in meeting AO2 descriptors described below.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO1.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaning of religious experience, including mysticism.</li> <li>• A feature of the argument is arguing from mental states to something outside of us.</li> <li>• Best explanation is that there is an objective cause of religious experience.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question. Such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO2.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems of the interpretation of experience and therefore may be unreliable.</li> <li>• Religious experiences may have a good effect on a person's life with a presumption of its truth and therefore a test of its veracity.</li> <li>• Evidence of fictional cases that influence people for the better, hence this does not provide evidence of an objective source.</li> <li>• Tensions between competing explanations, therefore with little common ground of testing the various options.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates who show achievement only against AO1 will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 1.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1).</li> <li>• Information/issues are identified (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements are supported by generalised arguments (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues which lead to a simplistic chain of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> </ul>

## Candidate A:

- 2 Assess the debate between Copleston and Russell on religious experience as an argument for the existence of God.

(12)

The issue at stake is whether religious experiences, specifically the mystical rather than visions, can be used as an argument for the existence of God. Copleston concedes they may not count as strict proof but contends that the best explanation of these experiences is in fact the existence of an object that transcends the self and is their cause, God. The nature of a mystical experience adds weight to his claim. They are ineffable and carry great love and <sup>(noetic)</sup> certainty, in that moment at least, of the existence of an external, transcendent, objective cause. They often lead to an overflow of creative/dynamic love and impact on the life of the experiencer - Copleston sees this as adding weight to the claim they can only be caused by an external being, God not simply a subjective explanation although he does allow for this possibility in some cases of visions where people may be deluded or hallucinating or alternative physiological explanations account for them. Copleston <sup>accepts</sup> the impact of these events in the life of the experiencer - and their long lasting nature adds evidence to the veracity and sanity of them rather than proof of the truth of the claim but this cumulative evidence adds weight to the argument for the existence of God from religious experience.

The reasons for Russell's objections are concerned with the lack of empirical evidence. He asserts he is agnostic about

God there is no evidence. His initial objection is that moving from mental states to external objects is 'a tricky affair' - it is usually managed by consensus of people (many can see the clock in the room but RE is often private); and despite corporate experiences, Copleston is focusing on mystical here which means Russell has a point. He also argues if evidence of reports of encounter with God are to be taken as true surely so should reports of experiences of negative realities / forces e.g. devils and yet Copleston would not argue for this. That because there are accounts of experiences we cannot know they are true and if we are to believe some shouldn't we believe all? Copleston points to the different, positive, nature of mystical experiences and their lasting positive impact on the lives of those who have them to support their value but Russell suggests one can have these (Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 20 MARKS

extra page  
 → responses to fictional characters, or even if you don't know they are fictional and think they are real which leads to this positive impact in your view, it does not mean that they are real or can be the cause of the impact. In the absence of further evidence and because it is 'tricky' to move from mental states to objective beings and because positive effects do not <sup>prove</sup> conviction of the existence of objective beings Russell is not at all persuaded by Copleston's view that the best explanation for mystical experiences is God.

**Examiner comment:**

This answer covers a wide range of material revealing good knowledge and uses terminology well throughout. It critically deconstructs information and presents reasoned judgments about key issues and reasons for the positions adopted by the key thinkers. It is very well informed and it constructs a coherent discussion across the full range of elements in the question. As with other candidates, this student has written outside the allocated space. Additional space will be provided in future.

**Level 3 – 12 marks.**

## A Level Religious Studies exemplars – Paper 1

Level 3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li><li>• Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li><li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li></ul>
---------	------	---

## Question 3a

### Question and Mark Scheme

A fine brash hypothesis may be killed by inches, the death by a thousand qualifications...

It seems to people who are not religious as if there was no conceivable event the occurrence of which would be admitted by religious people to be a reason for conceding 'There wasn't a God after all.' Someone tells us that God loves us as a father loves his children. But then we see a child dying of inoperable cancer of the throat. His earthly father is driven frantic in his efforts to help, but his heavenly Father reveals no signs of concern. Some qualification is made – God's love is 'not merely human love'. But then we ask: Just what would have to happen to entitle us to say 'God does not exist'?

A believer's statement has been so eroded that it is no longer an assertion at all.

(Source: Quote from 'The Philosophy of Religion', Flew, A, Editor: Mitchell B,  
By permission of Oxford University Press)

- 3 (a) Clarify the ideas illustrated in this passage about falsification in religious language.

*You must refer to the passage in your response.*

(10)

Question number	Indicative content
3(a)	<p>10 marks AO1</p> <p><b>AO1 will be used by candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding and specialist language and terminology when responding to the question.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The believer in the passage qualifies his views because of the absence of evidence.</li> <li>• The sceptic tries to build up a cumulative case.</li> <li>• The sceptic sets up various tests and these do not produce evidence to support a belief in God.</li> <li>• The process of qualification by the believer dissipates the original assertion about the existence God.</li> <li>• The end result is that the original hypothesis becomes so qualified that it dies as a meaningful claim, 'the death of a thousand qualifications'.</li> <li>• The argument of Flew is that the religious believer will not allow anything to falsify the religious claim.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is superficial (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs with some inaccuracies that are not directly linked to the extract (AO1).</li> </ul>
Level 2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is detailed, however it is not fully developed (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs and are linked in most cases to reference from the extract (AO1).</li> </ul>
Level 3	7–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is detailed and fully developed (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs and are fully linked to references from the extract (AO1).</li> </ul>

Candidate A:

Read the following passage before answering the questions.

A fine brass hypothesis may be killed by inches, the death by a thousand qualifications...

It seems to people who are not religious as if there was no conceivable event the occurrence of which would be admitted by religious people to be a reason for conceding 'There wasn't a God after all.' Someone tells us that God loves us as a father loves his children. But then we see a child dying of inoperable cancer of the throat. His earthly father is driven frantic in his efforts to help, but his heavenly Father reveals no signs of concern. Some qualification is made – God's love is 'not merely human love'. But then we ask: Just what would have to happen to entitle us to say 'God does not exist'?

A believer's statement has been so eroded that it is no longer an assertion at all.

(Source: Quote from 'The Philosophy of Religion', Flew, A. Editor: Mitchell B. By permission of Oxford University Press)

- 3 (a) Clarify the ideas illustrated in this passage about falsification in religious language.

You must refer to the passage in your response.

(10)

In this passage Flew argues that religious believers will not admit to anything being able to change their view/belief. They say God is love and do not allow anything to be able to prove that wrong and make them change their position – even the suffering of children which surely is incongruous with the idea of an all loving God. He says they constantly 'qualify' their assertion, or hedging it around with sayings like 'God is mystery' or 'God's love is not like human love' as a way to try to protect their belief in God.

even in the face of evidence that to many others seems to directly contradict and challenge it. As there's nothing (it seems) that is agreed by believers that would make their statement about God false, it cannot be falsified, then it cannot be a meaningful statement according to Flew. Hick first observed that 'in order to say something is possible we must say something which may possibly be false', but if believers are not doing this, as it cannot possibly be false, then their statements 'die the death of a thousand qualifications' and are meaningless. If nothing can count against it the falsification principle would agree the statement is saying nothing of any meaning - as anything is consistent with the claim eg 'God is love' even great atrocities as illustrated in the problem of evil, the statement becomes vacuous. If it is meaningless to talk of God's love then it's also meaningless to say 'God exists' if nothing (even great suffering) can be allowed to falsify that view. It's like the parable of the gardener - one person qualifies his belief so much - 'he is invisible, intangible' etc. that in reality it is little different from no gardener at all - at what point, suggests Flew, will the believer concede this? If he will not give a point/condition for this it is all meaningless.

**Examiner comment:**

This response outlines the ideas in the text and explains their context using a wide range of knowledge of religious ideas. This is fully developed; ideas are linked to references from the extract and specialist language is used well throughout. The candidate displays a rigorous understanding of the key concepts and implications in this passage.

**Level 3 -10 marks**

Level 3	7-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is detailed and fully developed (AO1).</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs and are fully linked to references from the extract (AO1).</li> </ul>
---------	------	--

## Question 3b

### Question and Mark Scheme

(b) Analyse the implications for religious language from this passage.

(20)

Question number	Indicative content
3(b)	<p>5 marks AO1, 15 marks AO2</p> <p><b>AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis and evaluation. Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding using specialist language and terminology when responding to the question, and in meeting AO2 descriptors described below.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO1.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Religious language has many uses with an assumption that it communicates sense.</li> <li>• However, religious language is so different from normal speech, such as speech used in discussion about God who is believed to be beyond space and time.</li> <li>• Religious language has been criticised in many ways, including logical positivism and its allied view of language – falsification.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question. Such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO2.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logical positivism argues there are tests to determine whether or not claims are meaningful, including support from experience. When this is applied to religious language there seems to be no empirical evidence and therefore the claim is said to be meaningless.</li> <li>• A further test as to whether religious language is meaningful or meaningless is that it is not analytic and true by definition and therefore is meaningless.</li> <li>• Hare argues that religious language is like a 'blik' because people believe in them and act on them even though they are not readily supported by evidence and therefore this type of claim, including religious language can be argued to be meaningful.</li> <li>• Mitchell builds up a case for the use of evidence when claims may appear to be ambiguous and may therefore be meaningful.</li> <li>• There can be criticisms of the falsification stance on the grounds of its reliance on empirical evidence, this weakens the falsification technique because these are based on the limitations of the verification principle.</li> <li>• There are alternative models for assessing religious language claims, such as Wittgenstein's language games, and therefore these may limit the strength of falsification.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates who show achievement only against AO1 will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 1.</p>

## A Level Religious Studies exemplars – Paper 1

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1).</li> <li>• Information/issues are selected (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes basic connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements are supported by generic arguments (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, some of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made with little or no attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues, which lead to a simple chain of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between many but not all of the elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made, which are supported by an attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected, most of which are used appropriately and accurately throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between a wide range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of many but not all of elements in the question, which are supported by the appraisal of some evidence (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question, which are fully supported by the comprehensive appraisal of evidence (AO2).</li> </ul>

## Candidate A:

(b) Analyse the implications for religious language from this passage.

(20)

The Falsification Principle argues that 'God talk' about the nature or existence of God is meaningless, nothing but a set of vacuous formulae or ~~statements~~ <sup>statements</sup> that nothing is permitted to count against rendering them devoid of any empirical meaning. If this is a correct assessment of how (religious) language works then any discipline or discussion using religious language is pointless, if it allows nothing to count against it, it cannot be a real assertion at all according to Flew. Theology, worship and scripture are all rendered meaningless and this has a significant implication for believers, educators and those engaged in the study of theology. There are also implications for undermining the cultural heritage of many nations in literature, language and so forth.

However, there have been many attempts to rescue religious language from this challenge. RL can be understood differently and yet retain meaning, many would argue [e.g. it can be meaningful analogically perhaps]. R. M. Hare coined the term 'blik' and explained this refers to a way of regarding the world, a blik is in principle non-verifiable or falsifiable but can be 'veridical' or 'illusory'. They express beliefs and concepts that are important to people and affect the behaviour of individuals and groups - which is empirically observable so these statements can be acknowledged as having

meaning because they affect how one lives or behaves. This means they are meaningful even if they refer to entities that cannot directly be verified empirically. Even the Verification Principle (which is of course flawed itself though) in its weak form allowed for things, in principle, to be verifiable e.g. after death and for many believers this is enough. Here argued beliefs are meaningful as they affect how people live.

Mitchell suggested that believers do acknowledge there is evidence to count against their belief or assertion but persist in their faith regardless. It is not burying their head in the sand or putting their fingers in their ears but steadfastly holding to the commitment made to that belief despite empirical evidence to challenge it. These are then 'significant articles of faith' that are rooted in relationship (like for the Partisan and the Stranger) of humans and God that provide the strength of commitment even in most challenging realisations (e.g. suffering) and cannot be easily abandoned.

It is clear these beliefs are important then but can they be empirically true/false or cognitive as the V.P and F.P would want? If their meaning comes from assent to them and their use and the outcome is often (empirically observable) behaviour or commitment to a certain way of life then it

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Meaning because  
 could be said to be meaningful but in its own sphere  
 of assertions. If it is not empirically verifiable  
 (or falsifiable) as a statement then we have  
 a Language Game, where meaning is clear  
 for those in it but harder to engage with  
 from outside of that language game. This is  
 possibly the issue, and an important implication  
 for today, for those outside the game. Are they  
 willing to learn and accept the new rules  
 of non-cognitive meaning and engage in  
 dialogue across the spheres of meaning or  
 remain steadfastly committed to the  
 notion of meaningfulness only be derived  
 from cognitive statements that are  
 empirically verifiable or falsifiable.

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

**Examiner comment:**

This answer is clearly structured and covers a wide range of knowledge and uses specialist well throughout. It makes connections between a range of ideas and deconstructs issues; it also manages to present coherent and reasoned judgements with a full appraisal of evidence.

**Level 5 – 20 marks**

Level 5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question, which are fully supported by the comprehensive appraisal of evidence (AO2).</li> </ul>
---------	-------	--

## Question 4

### Question and Mark Scheme

- 4 Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the belief in immortality of the soul and reincarnation.

In your response to this question, you must include how developments in Philosophy of Religion have been influenced by one of the following:

- Religion and Ethics
- New Testament Studies
- the study of a religion.

(30)

Question number	Indicative content
4	<p>5 marks AO1, 25 marks AO2</p> <p><b>AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis and evaluation. Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding using specialist language and terminology when responding to the question, and in meeting AO2 descriptors described below.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO1.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A belief in life after death may be the view that humans will survive death.</li> <li>• Some religious traditions give an account of immortality of the soul, linked to dualism.</li> <li>• In Hindu traditions, some religious believers link reincarnation to transmigration.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question. Such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO2.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The belief in the immortality of the soul is a stronger stance than materialism because of the strengths of dualism.</li> <li>• Consciousness is no more than brain activity and when the brain dies so does any notion of consciousness and therefore the notion of the immortality of the soul becomes redundant.</li> <li>• The strength of reincarnation is related to a range of empirical evidence that accumulates to support this belief and therefore leads to a sound basis for belief in reincarnation.</li> <li>• A weakness of reincarnation includes problems about identity, especially if there are multiple types of future existences, and therefore this leads to a rejection of belief in reincarnation. Resurrection is an alternative to these beliefs about life after death and is a stronger system because of evidence to support it.</li> <li>• A belief in life after death may influence ethical principles, such as the sanctity of life, and this type of principle may therefore be associated with debates about abortion and euthanasia (this shows links with Religion and Ethics).</li> <li>• These belief systems can be compared to New Testament teachings about resurrection and therefore may be used to assess the distinctive nature of these respective beliefs (this shows links with New Testament Studies).</li> <li>• Many religious traditions believe in life after death, although there may be some similarities and some substantial differences between their beliefs. For example, Islam presents beliefs about resurrection related directly to the 'Day of Judgement' and the authority of Allah. Therefore this is significantly different from the belief in immortality of the soul (this shows links to Study of Religion).</li> </ul> <p>Candidates who show achievement only against AO1 will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 1.</p> <p>Candidates who do not show links with another area of their course of study will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 4.</p>

## A Level Religious Studies exemplars – Paper 1

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1).</li> <li>• Information/issues are identified (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes basic connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements are supported by generic arguments (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements made with no attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).</li> <li>• Conclusions are provided but are simplistic and/or generic (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, some of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements made with little or no attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).</li> <li>• Conclusions are provided, which loosely draw together ideas but with little or no attempt to justify (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues, which lead to a simplistic chain of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between many but not all of the elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made (AO2).</li> <li>• Judgements are supported by an attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).</li> <li>• Conclusions are provided, which logically draw together ideas and are partially justified (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected, most of which are used appropriately and accurately throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between a wide range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of many but not all of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Reasoned judgements are supported by the appraisal of some evidence (AO2).</li> <li>• Convincing conclusions are provided which fully and logically draw together ideas and are partially justified (AO2).</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Reasoned judgements are fully supported by the comprehensive appraisal of evidence (AO2).</li> <li>• Convincing conclusions are provided which fully and logically draw together ideas and are fully justified (AO2).</li> </ul>

## Candidate A:

- 4 Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the belief in immortality of the soul and reincarnation.

In your response to this question, you must include how developments in Philosophy of Religion have been influenced by one of the following:

- Religion and Ethics
- New Testament Studies
- the study of a religion.

(30)

Immortality of the soul has had many advocates notably Plato and Descartes, from a dualist perspective. This is the idea that the body and soul are distinct entities. Descartes argued that the body is spatial and not conscious whereas the soul/mind is non-spatial and conscious; its essence is to think - and thinking/reasoning is the only place certainty can be found. The mind and body are believed to interact through the brain but when the physical body and brain die the soul, which is of a different nature and independent of the body (it is non-composed) lives on. Some believe the rationale for this is it is non-composite so indivisible and therefore indestructible and immortal. This is an attractive theory, and therefore strong, as it advocates the survival of a 'self' after physical death and is coherent with the sense that we are more than the sum of our physical parts. It is easier than the Christian belief in bodily resurrection as it overcomes problems of a (physical) place to exist in new bodies and is not subject to the

challenges if how the physical can survive death in its many guises – disease, explosion – how do the parts re-assemble? how 'old' are we in heaven, will the body age and expire again etc, and how are we the same person if our bodies are re-created or replicated? ToS argues it is the soul that constitutes the self and this continues unscathed through physical death. However, it has related weaknesses. What evidence do we have for a soul? Near Death and Out of Body experiences provide some account of apparent existence separate to the body but remain largely unconvincing with alternative explanations eg lack of oxygen to the brain being possible. Also, how might we be identified as our self in post-physical existence? All previous experience of identity and action has been in physical form yet some (H. H. Price) say it is conceivable that memory can persist in some form & these disembodied souls might interact with each other & any surroundings via some form of telepathy. This involves a good deal of supposition and many feel that notions of the soul are in fact a mis-use of language, a category mistake, and the soul does not exist we are simply material beings. Russell said 'when I die, I shall rot and nothing of me shall remain!'

Reincarnation shares some key ideas with ToS in that it holds that the true self is not the physical but the immortal soul or atman in Hinduism, that inhabits successive bodies in its quest to achieve moksha, or liberation from the cycle of samsara (life death & rebirth) and reunion with

Brahman. This is achieved by earning good karma – performing good moral actions that ensure progression. This theory too has its attractive/strengths – our physical form is less important than our moral character, we are required to be moral and do good to aid our progress (which is pertinent for ethical decision making linked to religion). Evidence for reincarnation has been assessed to include déjà vu, child prodigies and reabs remembered lives, notably in Stevenson's studies. However, these results are disputed – after alternative possible sources of this knowledge are identifiable and this undermines the strength of this evidence in support of the theory. There is also a philosophical challenge in the idea that we are supposed to learn and progress via karma, towards moksha and yet the majority have no access to accumulated moral knowledge, being unaware of previous existences. This seems unfair. It is also unjust if karma is visited on my karmic heir (e.g. Tom) who shares none of my physical identity – being a new body – nor my non-physical awareness/memory.

It could be argued that both of these theories are strong in that they emphasise that we as humans are not simply our bodies and can continue to exist without them, but they are both significantly challenged in explaining how this can be and yet still be a certain individual. Although they do not

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

suffer from the challenges to continuity that the Christian view of resurrection does these theories still lack sufficient evidence and philosophical coherence to be totally convincing. Developments in debates about these theories have been influenced by both religion – in comparison to Christian ideas of resurrection of the body in recent scholarship and historical debate but also by decision-making and debate in Religion and Ethics. The view of the importance of the soul as constituting the essence of a 'person' has been hugely influential in relation to Ethics regarding the beginning and end of life as well as being influenced by these debates too. If there exists a soul which is pre-existent and determined to continue to exist after the physical death of the body then the value, care and consideration given to a person when considering start (e.g. genetic engineering, or abortion) or end of life issues (e.g. euthanasia) take on greater significance. If it is believed the soul enters a body at a certain point there are implications for abortion, if humans are more than our physical components perhaps issues over 3 percent embryos are less significant. It could be argued that greater investment and emphasis on palliative care is required to ease the passing of the soul – or indeed the reverse – euthanasia should be permitted to release the soul from the decaying physical form. (Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

The influences are seen to operate both ways and <sup>the issues</sup> of great significance for debate in philosophy and ethics.

TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 30 MARKS

TOTAL FOR PAPER = 80 MARKS

**Examiner comment:**

This answer gives a full account of the issues in the question using terminology competently and in a sustained manner. The candidate answers the full elements of the question in a balanced manner. There is effective use of scholarship coupled with a proficient use of key terms. The systematic analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of various points of view shows a very good level of understanding and a comprehensive appraisal of evidence. It moves towards conclusions that are convincingly advanced based on reasoned judgements and a careful marshalling of evidence concerning issues raised. It deconstructs ideas and considers challenges regarding identity and continuity well. There are good links made between this and other area of study as required by the question and there is a consideration of the impact from and upon other areas of studies with a good use of evidence.

**Level 5 – 30 marks.**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes connections between the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question (AO2).</li> <li>• Reasoned judgements are fully supported by the comprehensive appraisal of evidence (AO2).</li> <li>• Convincing conclusions are provided which fully and logically draw together ideas and are fully justified (AO2).</li> </ul>

