



---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/01**

Paper 1 Introduction to Philosophy and Theology

**May/June 2019**

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**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**

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Critically examine Plato’s understanding of the relationship between body and soul.</b></p> <p>Plato thought that the soul is unchanging and simple – it has no parts, and so is indestructible. At death, the soul separates from the body, migrates to the world of Forms, and contemplates them until it is reincarnated, at which point it again views its existence as through prison bars. Being joined to the body clouds the soul’s ability to remember the Forms; nevertheless, the soul retains a dim memory of the world of Forms and desires to return to it. In the Meno, by eliciting geometrical truths from an ignorant slave boy, Plato attempts to demonstrate that knowledge is recollection.</p> <p>According to Plato, the soul has a tripartite/three-part structure, being composed of the logical, the spirited and the appetitive aspects. The logical aspect illustrates Plato’s view that reason should be dominant in human life. ‘Spirited’ refers literally to spiritedness, as in a spirited stallion; it can refer to a human’s natural pugnacity. The appetitive aspect includes the desire for food and sex.</p> <p>The background to Plato’s ideas about the relationship between the soul and the body is his concept of the Forms, which introduces a metaphysical element which for some has no place in an analysis of the world in general or of humanity in particular. The discussion could take many avenues, so all relevant approaches can be credited.</p>	25
2	<p><b>The view that all knowledge comes from sense experience claims too much. How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The view that all knowledge comes from sense experience might be grounded in the tradition stemming from Aristotle and/or the empiricist epistemology of Locke, Berkeley and Hume. An account of the rationalist/empiricist debate is the most likely approach to the question, although for the higher grades, candidates are expected to address the specific claim that ‘all knowledge comes from sense experience’. Some might consider sceptical arguments that there can be no adequate justification of knowledge. Some are likely to resolve the issues through the Kantian synthesis in the Critique of Pure Reason, in which Kant claimed that knowledge is impossible without accepting truths from both the rationalist and the empiricist schools of thought. Whatever material is used, solely the quality of the relevant discussion is judged.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>‘Morality is not commanded by God.’ Assess this claim.</b></p> <p>The question is directed at the coherence of Divine Command Theory – the extent to which moral duty is commanded by God’s will. The general logic of the theory is that God’s omnipotence and omniscience (together with his omnibenevolence and love) entail God’s absolute moral authority: hence for Calvin, for example, the will of God is the supreme rule of righteousness, so that everything that God wills must be held to be righteous merely because God wills it.</p> <p>Candidates might reject Divine Command Theory by reference to the atheistic position that no God exists to affect moral duty in any way, or by reference to the internal problems of the theory (primarily the Euthyphro Dilemma). Candidates might argue that irrespective of whether or not God exists, morality is an entirely human construct based on different moral norms in different societies. Alternatively, some might argue that actions are ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘right’, ‘wrong’, depending on whether they follow an objective principle, e.g. whether or not they bring about human flourishing, or the flourishing of the environment as a whole. Credit any relevant lines of argument, e.g. the epistemological issue of how one might know what God commands; the relevance of religious experience; religious texts; conscience and reason.</p>	25
4	<p><b>‘Conscience is nothing more than individual psychology at work.’ Critically examine this claim.</b></p> <p>The question is broad-based, so invites broad responses covering views about the nature and source of the conscience according to Augustine, Aquinas, Butler and Freud, although candidates are at liberty to refer to any other relevant approach such as Fletcher. Some might take a Freudian approach to suggest that the conscience is the result of societal and parental conditioning, and that this is inevitably individual, since these are the main forces by which any individual morality is developed. Some might develop a sociological view of conscience, that conscience is the self-understanding of society/a social group. Alternatively, conscience might be seen simply as the subjective moral opinions held by any individual, whatever their source.</p> <p>High-grade answers will consider the words ‘nothing more than’, which might be challenged, for example, with reference to the views of Augustine and Aquinas, that conscience is the voice of God in the mind or is the essence of God-given reason. Some might conclude that conscience cannot be defined with any degree of certainty, since the disagreement as to its nature and origin is extensive, so to say that it is ‘nothing more than individual psychology at work’ amounts to nothing more than saying, ‘This is the way minds work’. Credit any relevant lines of argument.</p>	25