Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge Pre-U

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY **9774/01**

Paper 1 Introduction to Philosophy and Theology **May/June 2023**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 75

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

[Turn over

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Assessment objectives (AOs)

AO1	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding; identify, select and apply ideas and concepts through the use of examples and evidence.	40%
AO2	Provide a systematic critical analysis of the texts and theories, sustain a line of argument and justify a point of view. Different views should be referred to and evaluated where appropriate. Demonstrate a synoptic approach to the areas studied.	60%

AO1 and AO2 are both to be considered in assessing each essay.
The **Generic Marking Scheme** should be used to decide the mark. The essay should first be placed within a level which best describes its qualities, and then at a specific point within that level to determine a mark out of 25.

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

Generic Marking Scheme

Level 5 21–25 marks	• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues. • Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question. • Complete or near complete accuracy at this level. • Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained. • Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence. • Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts. • Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 4 16–20 marks	• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered. • Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question. • Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically. • Argument has structure and development and is sustained. • Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence. • Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts. • Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.

Level 3 12–15 marks	• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered. • Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question. • Response is largely relevant to the question asked. • Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained. • Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument. • May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.
Level 2 8–11 marks	• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon. • Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success. • Attempts to evaluate though with partial success. • Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided. • Some attempts at argument but without development and coherence. • Some attempt to use supporting evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.
Level 1 1–7 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short. • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic. • Argument is limited and confused. • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question. • Limited attempt to use evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.
Level 0 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	**Critically examine Aristotle's doctrine of the Four Causes.** Aristotle's doctrine of the Four Causes is part of the ongoing investigation (e.g. in Physics and Metaphysics) as to why things are the way they are and why they behave in the ways that they do. Summaries of the Four Causes are likely, but not mandatory. The theory integrates cause with the categories of substance, form and matter and act and potential. Substances/things are made from permanent form and changing matter. Form is what a thing is, e.g. a tree, a bird, a human, a bronze statue. Matter is the potential of a thing to change and to become something else: for example, wood changes into charcoal when burned by 'actual' fire. An actual thing is needed to make a potential thing become an actual thing: for example, fathers are needed in order to actualise their children. Making potential things actual is the process of cause. In Aristotle's account of things, then, there are four causes that explain why the world works in the way it does and why everything is the way it is: • the material cause – matter itself, out of which something is made • the efficient cause – the actual thing that causes potential things to become actual • the formal cause – for example, the form of a human is what causes a human to be a human and not an octopus • the final cause – the purpose for which something comes into existence / the end for the sake of which a thing is done: for example, the purpose of a bronze statue is aesthetic appreciation; the end of diet and exercise is improved health. The efficient cause corresponds with the modern understanding of causation. For example, the efficient cause of a bronze statue is the sculptor who works the alloy; however, it becomes clear that Aristotle's understanding of why things are as they are is largely teleological. With regard to house building, for example, the final cause / the end is the production of living accommodation / comfort / protection and the like. The material cause of the finished house includes (for example) water-proof materials, structures such as bricks that have regular form to allow construction / beams of a shape, size and density to allow resistance to weather. The builder (as the efficient cause of the structure) cannot avoid using and shaping these components in order to build a house. Some might argue that this kind of reasoning led Aristotle to postulate the existence of a first efficient cause, an unmoved mover, a non-material mind. Critical examination of Aristotle's ideas might include: • Aristotle's belief that the Four Causes can give an answer to the 'why?' questions about the world. • The concept of a first efficient cause / unmoved mover / Aristotle's unmoved mover is aware only of itself, so how is the human *telos* / purpose decided? • Whether or not evolution is teleological in nature / whether the universe as a whole has a *telos* / purpose. • The view (e.g. Nietzsche) that meaning and purpose derive from the individual, and not from any external source. • Issues concerning causation, e.g. Hume's critique of causation.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
1	• The simplicity of a causal explanation which inevitably has no knowledge of quantum theory and current discussions about causality. For example, some theories suggest that causal laws are not necessarily absolute / although others suggest that the unification of quantum mechanics and general relativity will explain everything. • Some might query the notion of *ergon* / essence and whether an object's essence precedes existence or vice versa. Credit all relevant and accurate lines of discussion.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**'Knowledge comes mainly from sense experience.' Evaluate this claim.** This question is broad-based and could be answered in a number of ways. The question might be answered, for example, by a study of the historical debate or else by a narrower focus on issues that divide or unite empiricists and rationalists. For empiricists, the mind starts as a *tabula rasa* – an empty slate / white 'sheet' of paper (Locke) which accumulates knowledge after observation – knowledge begins with the senses. Propositions can be known and justified *a posteriori*, only after experience. For rationalists, knowledge is known *a priori* – independently of experience, from rational deduction / intuition that warrants belief, for example, that the number of prime numbers is infinite, a concept which can be proved mathematically and can also be grasped as a rational intuition of the mind. Some candidates might discuss the view that all, or at least some, of our knowledge and ideas are innate and the extent to which this is plausible. Some will focus on the contribution of scholars whose work exemplifies the different approaches, for example: Plato, Descartes, Leibniz, and Spinoza among the rationalists; Aristotle, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Russell, and Ayer among the empiricists. Empiricist critiques of rationalism might focus on Plato's theory of Forms, or on Descartes' arguments for the existence of God, or on the apparent success of the empirical sciences in understanding the universe. Rationalist critiques of empiricism might focus on Ayer's principle of verification through sense experience: the verification principle fails its own test. Empiricism is open to a number of attacks, for example, that empirical science is underpinned by mathematical logic; that mathematical truths exist in the intellect and not in the senses (the concept of pi is not grounded in empirical observation); that how we perceive the empirical world is not necessarily all that exists. In particular, as Hume himself noticed, there is a particular problem with the principle of induction, that the future will resemble the past: there can be no guarantee of the truth of this expectation, yet science itself proceeds by it. The key word in the question is 'mainly', to which there are a number of possible / likely responses. One likely approach is the Kantian synthesis that there must exist innate faculties in the mind that filter / interpret sensory inputs: i.e., sensory input is filtered by the intuitions and concepts of space, time, substance, cause and effect, self, etc. On such a view, both the senses and mind cooperate: concepts without percepts are empty; percepts without concepts, blind. Credit all relevant and accurate lines of discussion.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**'Euthyphro's dilemma shows that moral duty cannot be defined by God's commands.' How far do you agree?** The issue in the question concerns the extent to which moral duty can be defined by God's commands, raised in the dialogue between Socrates and Euthyphro in the context of Euthyphro's argument that he is justified in prosecuting his own father for breaking the divine command against murder. Euthyphro holds that his duty to his father is subordinate to his duty to uphold justice. The discussion concerns the nature of what is holy / morally right / pious / virtuous, which Euthyphro defines as 'what the Gods prescribe'. For Socrates, the central question is: 'What is the nature of piety itself, and what makes virtuous acts virtuous?' Euthyphro's eventual definition is that 'Piety is what is dear to the gods. Impiety is what is not dear to the gods.' This then leads to a dilemma: 'Is the pious (good) loved by the Gods because it is pious, or is it pious because it is loved by the Gods?' The dilemma becomes clearer in modern formulations, where 'the Gods' are replaced by the 'God' of the monotheistic religions. The two possibilities here form the two 'horns' of the Euthyphro Dilemma: (1) An action is good because God commands it. This statement encapsulates the absolutist meta-ethical approach taken by Divine Command Theory. This entails that God is the source of all moral goodness, so if God decided to command that murder and lying are good, then it would be a moral duty for humans to murder and lie. This is problematic: God could command all manner of 'unjust' or trivial actions that go against our most basic moral instincts concerning moral duty. On this view, then, God's commands are therefore arbitrary, and a morally arbitrary God loses the attribute of omnibenevolence: a God who is not omnibenevolent is not God. (2) Every action that God commands humans to do is good because it is in accordance with the demands of some other moral authority. Many Divine Command theorists who find the concept of a morally arbitrary God repugnant opt for an alternative answer to Socrates' question, that God commands what is morally right because God knows that it is morally right, so God knows that murder is wrong, and God could never command humans to obey morally arbitrary rules. However, if we then ask how it is that God knows that murder is wrong, the only answer seems to be that there is some other moral authority to which God submits. On this view, God is no longer the commander and author of morality: instead, God recognises an external moral law to which God himself is subject. Moreover, since God is subject to an external law, he loses the attribute of omnipotence: a god who is not omnipotent is not God.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Candidates are likely to consider arguments to the effect that either or both horns of the dilemma can be resolved, for example: • Some accept that even if it is a logical possibility that God could command murder or moral trivia to be true, 'the good' is not external to God, but is a reflection of God's omnibenevolent nature, which entails that he would never do so. Many point to the story where God instructs Abraham to offer his beloved and only son Isaac as a burnt-offering sacrifice on an altar of fire (Genesis 22:2). Kierkegaard argued (in *Fear and Trembling*) that God may legitimately require people to commit such acts that require a 'teleological suspension of the ethical': obedience to God takes precedence over normal ethical beliefs. To others, there is no sense in which such an action could show such a God to be morally good or that following such commands defines human moral duty. • Swinburne proposes a distinction between necessary and contingent moral truths. Contingent moral truths are true by divine command, e.g. 'honour parents' / 'care for the sick'. By contrast, necessary moral truths (like mathematical propositions) are true irrespective of any divine command, so genocide and torturing children are wrong independently of any divine command. It is therefore no limitation on God's power to say that he cannot make genocide morally good. • Some (e.g. Russell) use the Euthyphro Dilemma as a disproof of God's existence: P1: If there is an absolute moral law, either it comes from God or it does not. P2: If it does, then the moral law is arbitrary, since whatever God commands becomes our definition of goodness. P3: If it does not, then God recognises its authority and has to obey it. P4: If P2, then God is arbitrary and not good. If P3, then God is subject to an external standard, and cannot be omnipotent. P5: Neither an arbitrary nor a non-omnipotent God is worthy of worship. C: Therefore, God does not exist. There are, of course, other approaches – to what, for example, is the Bible itself consistent? – which should be credited.	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Critically assess the view that hard determinism is true.** Hard determinism holds that all states and events in the observable universe are caused by events and states preceding them. The sciences of physics, chemistry and biology can be used to predict future events from present observations – a principle on which science operates with reasonable success and which is often illustrated with reference to Newton's classical laws of motion and the observable behaviour of billiard balls on a billiard table. Since humans are part of this physical world, they must obey the same laws. Some candidates might examine logical or theological counterparts here which would be fine. One obvious objection to the alleged truth of hard determinism is that it is one thing to make deterministic pronouncements about billiard balls and quite another to demonstrate that the infinite number of physical causes operating within the universe at any one moment is causally determined; moreover, only a minute fraction of the totality of causes can be observed. An omniscient mind (such as Laplace's Demon) would presumably be able to contemplate and verify all such causes, but the existence of such a mind cannot be demonstrated. Further, despite the computational power of modern physics, the number of events that can be predicted with complete accuracy is again minute by comparison with the totality of physical events. However, non-computability does not entail lack of determinism. The fact that science can show that some events are predictable may still allow us to think that there truly is some underlying causal mechanism explaining and linking all events. Some are likely to refer to Hume's sceptical views on induction and causation. Events that we can predict are known inductively, but inductive arguments cannot guarantee the truth of their conclusions. Another area of doubt concerning the truth of hard determinism comes from quantum theory, where Newtonian mechanics no longer applies, and the science of the behaviour of sub-atomic particles is inseparable from probability theory and the phenomenon of consciousness. Candidates might refer to the issue of truth, falsity, etc., in one or more of the following: • The implications of determinism for ethical truths, e.g. Hume's Compatibilism. • Comparison with libertarian positions, e.g. Locke's account of belief, etc. • Another challenge to hard determinism is our distinct perception of being free agents, able to make some free autonomous choices for which we are answerable. If hard determinism is true, then this is an illusion, and we cannot be held responsible for our choices. Credit all relevant and accurate lines of discussion.	**25**