

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2008

GCE

## GCE Religious Studies (6584) Paper 1A

## 6584 - Unit 4A: Philosophy of Religion Mark Scheme

Question 1a		
Level	Mark	AO1
4	19-24	<i>Comprehensive understanding of the argument/interpretation of the passage, with clear and critical analysis and proficient use of religious language, discussed within a wider context.</i>
		It is likely candidates may stress the thrust of argument in this passage that language about God is nonsense. Candidates may present an exposition that moves from an account of religious language as a mystery, transcending human understanding and hence unintelligible. If God cannot be an object of reason but an object of faith this signifies it cannot be proved. Both in terms of reason and faith God cannot be described and is devoid of meaning. Candidates may provide a philosophical context in terms of logical positivism with an analysis of its key ideas such as relation of ideas and verification using scholarly contributions. There may be evidence of conceptual analysis such as ideas of 'meaning' and criteria for meaningfulness.
3	13-18	<i>Clear understanding of the main point(s) and key idea(s) of the argument/interpretation of the passage, set in an appropriate context, with some analysis of key concepts; use of relevant religious terms.</i>
		Candidates may clarify the main line of reasoning regarding the problems of religious language and the test of the verification principle. Candidates may examine terms such as mystery, mysticism, unintelligible and nonsense. Candidates may refer to the likes of Ayer and his contributions to this debate.
2	7-12	<i>Presentation of a selection of relevant material which reflects a basic understanding of the argument/interpretation of the passage; some use of specialised religious language in appropriate contexts.</i>
		Candidates may provide a basic understanding of the passage about religious language not making sense with some attention to terms such as faith and the view that religious language talks about that which cannot be described.
1	1-6	<i>Uncritical presentation of the argument/interpretation of the passage; limited ability to identify and select the most relevant/important information and, therefore, reflecting little understanding; over reliance on repetition of the chosen passage.</i>
		Candidates may provide a simple summary of the passage with limited attention to terms such as trust.

Level	Mark	AO2
4	13-16	<p><i>Coherent and comprehensive analysis of a range of implications of the expressed viewpoint and a careful analysis of their relationship to human experience and religion; a sustained and critical line or argument, including a balanced discussion of alternatives; substantiated conclusions drawn with full justification of viewpoint; expressed accurately, fluently, using a range of technical terms.</i></p> <p>It is likely candidates may debate the line of reasoning in this passage weighing up strengths and weaknesses. Candidates may argue using exemplar material from relevant scholars such as Flew and also counter views such as the later Wittgenstein. Candidates may indicate a clear line of reasoning and it is likely this will be supported by scholarship such as the interpretation of Braithwaite and the test of moral intention as the means of establishing the sense of religious language claims. Candidates may evaluate the implications for religion in the sense that if logical positivism is justifiable, the more significant claims are nonsense or candidates may argue for alternative interpretations of religious language such as a non-realist stance. From the perspective of human experience candidates may debate the views for and against the status of religious experience.</p>
3	9-12	<p><i>Evidence of understanding of a range of implications of the expressed viewpoint in their broader context and in relation to aspects of human experience and religion; a clear line of argument and comparison of relative strengths/weaknesses of a point of view; a structured argument, clearly expressed and accurately using some technical terms, giving a clear justification of a point of view.</i></p> <p>Candidates may debate the implications of this passage about the confidence people may or may not have about religious language claims. They may compare some views for and against the argument in the passage and come to their own line of reasoning. In terms of implications for religion candidates may argue that the phenomenon of religion is more than a linguistic activity and in terms of human experience candidates may argue for the weaknesses of religious experience.</p>
2	5-8	<p><i>An attempt to consider the implications of the expressed viewpoint for its broader context and in relation to aspects of human experience and religion; a basic attempt to discuss and evaluate a point of view and justify opinions at a simple level; sufficient clarity of meaning.</i></p> <p>Candidates may argue in support of this passage at a simple level. They may consider that the passage leads to a rejection of religious belief and that religious experiences are subjective.</p>
1	1-4	<p><i>Limited awareness of the implications of the expressed viewpoint for its broader context and relation to aspects of human experience and religion; a limited attempt to discuss and evaluate a point of view, imprecisely expressed.</i></p> <p>Candidates may present a superficial account of a view against this passage that religious language may be informative and a descriptive view of mysticism.</p>