UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

9774 PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

9774/03 Paper 3 (Topics and Key Texts in Philosophy and Theology 2), maximum raw mark 50

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY *of* CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

AO1	Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the issues arising from the relevant religious and philosophical themes and texts; and the ability to identify, select and apply ideas and concepts, through the use of examples and evidence from recognised sources of authority.	40%
AO2	Candidates will be required to provide a systematic critical analysis of the texts and theories they have studied, sustain a line of argument and justify a point of view. Different views, including those of different scholars and schools of thought, should be referred to and evaluated where appropriate. They should demonstrate a synoptic approach to the areas studied and make links between them and their responses where appropriate.	60%

In the textual questions AO1 and AO2 are assessed separately.
AO1 and AO2 are both to be considered in assessing each essay of the essay questions.

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.

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.

Table A: Generic Marking Scheme for 10-mark questions

Level 6 9–10 marks	• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues • Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts • Complete or near complete accuracy at this level • Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts • Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary
Level 5 7–8 marks	• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered • Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts • Response is accurate: answers the question specifically • Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts • Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary
Level 4 5–6 marks	• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered • Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts • Response is largely relevant to the question asked • Reasonable attempt to use supporting evidence • Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately
Level 3 3–4 marks	• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon • Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success • Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided • Some attempt to use supporting evidence • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly
Level 2 1–2 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question • Limited attempt to use evidence • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent
Level 1 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit

Table B: Generic Marking Scheme for 15-mark questions

Level 6 13–15 marks	• 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 • Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate • Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary
Level 5 10–12 marks	• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts • Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question • Response is accurate: answers the question specifically • Argument has structure and development and is sustained • Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence • Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate • Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary
Level 4 7–9 marks	• 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 3 4–6 marks	• 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 attempt at argument but without development and coherence • Some attempt to use supporting evidence • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly
Level 2 1–3 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic • Argument is limited or confused • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question • Limited attempt to use evidence • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent
Level 1 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Table C: Generic Marking Scheme for 25-mark questions

Level 6 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 5 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: answers the question 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 4 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 3 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 attempt at argument but without development and coherence • Some attempt to use supporting evidence • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly
Level 2 1–7 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic • Argument is limited or confused • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question • Limited attempt to use evidence • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent
Level 1 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit

Topic 1 Philosophy of Mind

Section A

[Extract from **Derek Parfit:** *Reasons and Persons:* 245]

1   Parfit refers here to the "Reductionist View" of mind.

    (a)   (i)   Explain briefly why Parfit's view of mind is reductionist.

        (ii) Using one of Parfit's thought experiments, show how Parfit uses the idea that the brain might contain "two separate spheres of consciousness" to support his reductionist view of persons.   [10]

Reductionism in philosophy is the claim that complex things reduce to the sums of simpler things. Minds/mental properties are claimed to reduce to the properties described by natural science. If all entities in the world are describable by physics, then the mind is reducible in the same way.

Parfit concentrates on two criteria for personal identity (PI) – the physical criterion, that PI over time just involves the physically continuous existence of enough of a brain to remain the brain of a living person; and the psychological criterion, where PI over time just involves the various kinds of psychological continuity. Both views are reductionist because they claim (1) that a person's identity over time just consists in the holding of certain more particular facts, and (2) that these facts can be described without presupposing the identity of this person, or claiming that the experiences in this person's life are had by this person, or even claiming explicitly that this person exists. These facts can be explained in an *impersonal* way. On the reductionist's view, each person's existence just involves the existence of a brain and a body, the doing of certain deeds, the thinking of certain thoughts, the occurrence of certain experiences, etc. So a person's existence reduces to the existence of a brain and a body, and the occurrence of a series of interrelated physical and mental events.

Candidates could refer to one of a number of Parfit's thought experiments, e.g. teleportation, including the 'branch-line' case / the transfer of half a person's brain into his brother's skull / the transplantation of the two halves of 'my' brain into the bodies of 'my' two fatally brain-damaged brothers. Parfit argues that belief in Cartesian egos cannot explain what goes on in these cases. The most logical explanation is that where 'I' divide, although my relation to each of the resulting people cannot be called identity, it contains what fundamentally matters, i.e. psychological continuity. For example, in a case of brain fission where 'my' brain is transplanted into two different bodies, each of the resulting people will have half my brain, and will be fully psychologically continuous with 'me', and Parfit asserts that we seem forced to conclude that this is a full description of the case.

There is no required balance between answers to **(a) (i)** and **(a) (ii)**, although to obtain the higher Levels, candidates must address both parts of the question.

(b) Critically assess Parfit's view that with persons, what really matters is not personal identity, but psychological connectedness. [15]

Parfit is led to his reductionist view through an exhaustive analysis of thought-experiments which, he admits, might always remain entirely impossible: for example there is no evidence that the lower brain can ever be divided in the way in which his thought experiments envisage during brain fission. According to Parfit, this does not matter, since in principle it is a given fact that under certain conditions (e.g. that described in the text above) a brain can contain two centres of consciousness that are unaware of each other. Whereas opponents of the reductionist view argue that each stream of consciousness retains unity, Parfit concludes that in neither stream of consciousness is there a 'thinker of the thought': we might ascribe the experiences in each stream to a subject of experiences which is *not* 'me', and, therefore, not a person. Or, if we doubt the existence of such entities (as Parfit does), we can accept the reductionist explanation – persons reduce to collections of experiences and thoughts. In cases of fission, 'my' survival in two new bodies is therefore a survival of whatever psychological connectedness that exists with 'me' before I divided.

Candidates might defend Parfit's reductionist approach, for example by reference to mind-brain identity theory, which proposes an ontological reduction of the mental to the physical – mental states are identical with brain states. Parfit's conclusion that questions about identity reduce to statements about psychological connectedness might be held to be indicated by the fact that all physical states of the body and brain are subject to change; moreover people's memory and psychology change continually, so the best sense to be made of this is to assume that 'identity' really boils down to a sufficient degree of physical and psychological connectedness to maintain continuity with different states of 'me'. The fact that there can be extreme discontinuity (e.g. where through brain disease a person ends up with no connected memories or psychological states) supports Parfit's conclusion that personal *identity,* as such, does not exist.

Candidates might question Parfit's approach on several fronts, for example the notorious difficulty in reducing the mind's intentionality: it is hard to see how mere brain states can have a representational content. Some might refer (for example) to Swinburne's arguments in favour of Cartesian-type souls; others to the body of philosophical opinion that mental phenomena are simply irreducible (e.g. by appeal to quantum mechanical arguments that reality cannot be explained through mechanistic/materialist models). Parfit appears to claim that where strong connectedness exists between different states of a person, then psychological continuity is maintained, but this seems to be making use of the very concept that Parfit is analyzing – i.e. the concept of 'same person'. A reductive analysis cannot make use of the concept it is supposed to be analysing. Parfit admits that he finds it difficult to relinquish his 'intuitive belief in the Non-Reductionist View', which echoes the opinion from 'folk psychology' that persons do exist and have identity. Perhaps the reason that the intuitive view is so prevalent is that it is a common sense view.

Section B

2 **'The explanatory weakness of substance dualism means that it fails as a theory of mind.'**
Discuss. **[25]**

According to substance dualism (SD), mind and body are distinct: the body and brain are material objects, have extension in space, and are subject to change and decay; mind is a non-material substance, has no spatial extension, and cannot decay, so is immortal. Mind and body interact in the brain. Candidates might discuss the Cartesian arguments, e.g. that physical objects cannot use language or use reason, and Descartes' argument from doubt by which he reasoned that 'I am not my body'. Language is governed by the rules of syntax and semantics; and machines can use mathematics meaningfully, so there is no obvious reason why language and reason could not be mechanical; further, the argument from doubt seems to rest on an inappropriate use of Leibniz's principle of the indiscernibility of identicals, which does not work when applied to psychological states like believing and doubting. Descartes' argument from consciousness is more powerful, and candidates might argue that mind explains the 'hard problem' of consciousness better than any materialistic theory. More recent versions of SD see the brain as the *receiver of* consciousness, and often appeal to quantum mechanical principles to argue that purely physical descriptions of mind and brain themselves lack explanatory power.

In terms of explanatory power, SD has no clear answer to a number of problems, e.g. that some mental states are caused by states of the world, in which case causation in thought seems back to front. Also, it says nothing about how one mental state causes another – how does one non-physical state bring about another non-physical state? Further, SD asserts that mental substance is conscious, but offers no theory of consciousness. One of the most difficult issues for SD is that some mental states correlate systematically with some brain states: for example brain damage causes damaged reasoning; yet if reasoning is a process within the mind, how can it be affected by a brain state? These are formidable objections to SD, but there are other issues: e.g. Hume's problem of counting souls – SD cannot provide evidence that there is a ratio of one soul to one brain/body. Physiology provides a major objection to SD as a theory of mind – namely that many human actions can be explained purely in physiological terms, without recourse to the idea of a non-physical substance. Consciousness might provide a major objection to the physiological explanation, but again, SD merely asserts that mental substance is conscious, without having a theory of consciousness. For many, the main objection to SD as a theory of mind is that of how mental and physical substances can interact: it is not at all impossible that they do, but SD can give no account of how they do.

OR

3 Critically assess functionalism as a theory of mind. [25]

Functionalism is the view that the mind is a programme run on the brain's hardware. Sensory inputs are converted into behavioural outputs: the mind is not a logical substance, rather it is a function. Functions are described in terms of converting an input into an output, and there is a difference between a thing's function and the set of arrangements that enable that function. Thus the function of a car is to provide mechanical motion for its occupants, and it does so by (for example) converting petrochemical fuel into combustible material that provides explosive power to move the mechanical parts that drive the wheels and provide the movement. Functions are multiply realisable: if I want to drive a car, there are many different sets of fuel and mechanics that can provide the same function. If I want to tell the time, I can do so by a wrist watch, a pocket watch, a digital watch, a sundial, or Big Ben, for example. If functions are multiply realisable, then a function can be specified independently of the arrangements that embody it. In theory, then, mental functions could be discharged by a non-physical mind/soul as well as by the physical brain and central nervous system. Most functionalists, however, maintain that that which occupies the causal role in the body is the brain.

There are different functionalist theories, and candidates are at liberty to refer to any of these, such as Computational/Turing Machine Functionalism, Metaphysical Functionalism, and Psycho-Functionalism. As a theory of mind, functionalism avoids the more obvious problems associated with substance dualism, such as the existence of non-physical souls. The idea that sense-experience provides a system of causes which the brain translates into behavioural output seems to be a common-sense view. Functionalism also solves the issues of mind/body causation: pain, for example, is analysable by the *complete* functional state of related inputs and outputs.

Candidates might identify a number of problems with functionalist accounts of mind. For example, Searle's 'Chinese Room' argument shows that functionalism has great difficulty in accommodating intentionality: human brains have intentionality and conscious awareness, whereas computers (for example) do not: human brains do not, therefore function as machines. Candidates could refer also to a number of thought experiments put forward by Ned Block that are damaging to functionalism, such as: 'China brain' or 'Chinese nation', 'Blockhead', and 'Inverted Spectrum'. A powerful objection to functionalism is that it cannot deal with subjectivity – with the 'privileged access' that people have to their mental states/qualia (candidates might illustrate this through Frank Jackson's 'Mary').

Topic 2 Ethics

Section A

[Extract from **John-Paul Sartre:** *Existentialism and Humanism: 62-63*]

4 **(a)** **Examine how Sartre defends his theory of choice in this passage.** **[10]**

Candidates should identify the following key points: basic assumption is that existence precedes essence. Distinctions between authentic choices vs inauthentic choices. Definition of cowards and scum. Universal quality of freedom means all are free to choose, whilst the content of morality is variable. Example of the student who has to choose between going to war or staying home to look after his mother – a case study in which the impossibility of making moral rules is defended. The student cannot make a 'right' decision or a 'wrong' decision, but he can and must make a decision. Moral rules are an invention; there is no authority to instruct in moral choice. There are no moral rules and when a real decision needs to be made principles are too abstract to be any use. Whilst their content cannot be judged the freedom and authenticity with which they were made can.

(b) **'No rule of general morality can show you what you ought to do.' (Jean-Paul Sartre:** *Existentialism and Humanism:* **43)**
Evaluate this claim with respect to the general rule of morality against killing the innocent. **[15]**

Candidates may draw upon any number of ethical theories in response to this question and it is anticipated that scripts will also draw upon a wide range of practical ethics topics. Candidates are free to identify who, or what might be 'innocent' and it is anticipated that some will include animals and embryos in their definition. Any reasonable parameters are acceptable with marks being awarded in line with the level of critical response achieved. Higher level answers will create a debate in which example and argument are used to represent each side of the question.

Section B

5   **Consider the view that virtue ethics is the most useful ethical theory when considering business ethics.** [25]

Candidates might provide a brief outline of virtue theory before attempting any application. Expect reference to eudaemonia; formation of good character by habit; movement away from individual ethical dilemmas to consideration of general character formation. Some narrative on the practical application of virtue theory to business ethics with examples is anticipated. This may include commentary on the need for character virtues such as integrity and honesty in business. Comments might include reflection on how this would affect decision making in the business environment: 'What would a good person do here?' Others may reflect upon business operations and the work environment as an essential part of the good life with employees needing to live well, get along with others and have a sense of self respect as well as to feeling part of something worthwhile. John Paul II, 1991: *35* 'In fact the purpose of a business firm is not simply to make profit but it is to be found in its very existence as a community of persons who in various ways seek to satisfy their basic needs and who form a particular group at the service of the whole society.' A contrast may be drawn with the idea of employees as 'human resources'. It might be argued that the only context in which citizens can achieve eudaemonia is in a just orderly society and that business ethics need to make a positive contribution to this. Consideration of the wider global community, fair trade and environmental concerns may be included. Any arguments which show that virtue ethics in business might be seen as part of the contribution a business might make to the growth of a more just society which facilitates eudaemonia to be credited. It might be argued that rules, even if they could be universally implemented, can never substitute for character.

Candidates need to evaluate 'most useful' and may consider whether virtue theory is useful at all. They might argue that it is too idealistic, not practical, that economic interests dominate, and that there are different rules in operation in the world of business which require people with single minded ambition. Others may argue that rules rather than virtuous characters are most helpful, that personal integrity is not enough in the world of business. It might be argued that an agreed set of Kantian universal rules such as 'obey the law', 'keep your promises',' honour your word', with penalties for breach of trust would be more reliable in securing successful business relationships than trusting to good character. It may be argued that consideration of consequences and the Utilitarian rule of working towards the greatest good for the greatest number would be the most helpful approach and/or some form of Christian Ethics might be advocated as the most helpful.

Evaluative responses will consider at least one other ethical theory in relation to business ethics, but where the range of enquiry is limited the full range of marks will only be available if depth of analysis is evident.

OR

6 Critically examine Kant's attempt to put forward a theory of morality based on reason. [25]

Kant's distinction between theoretical (pure) reason and practical reason is helpful. Theoretical knowledge requires both concepts and sense-experiences. Experience without concepts give no knowledge but concepts without experiences are 'empty', mere forms of thoughts without content. For Kant a theory of morality cannot therefore be based upon theoretical reason; his moral theory is a product of practical reason. For Kant the fully rational person has to postulate as a matter of reason certain things. A rational assumption is that the world, both as it appears to us (the phenomenal world) and as it exists apart from our perceptions (the noumenal world), is rational and intelligible. This cannot be known from pure reason but is a rational postulate of practical reason. Kant also postulates as a matter of practical reason that we are free. This cannot be proven theoretically, but reason compels us to assume that we are free, otherwise there would be no rational thought and no action could reasonably be judged right or wrong. Kant considered that the practical considerations forced a commitment to the concept of human freewill even though it can never be proved. God, rationality, immortality and freedom, (none of which can be theoretically proven but are nonetheless postulates of practical reason) are the rational assumptions behind Kant's moral theory, which Kant did not think could be disproved. 'Two things fill the mind with wonder and awe: the starry heavens above and the moral law within.' Kant did not think that ethics could be done independent of these ideas. Are there objective moral laws/ values? Kant accepts that there is a certain theoretical agnosticism involved – there can be no pure knowledge on this matter, no rationally decisive consideration either against or for objective moral values, but there nonetheless has to be a practical commitment. Hence morality is a postulate of practical reason. Kant considered the practical impact of accepting a priori moral values to be far stronger than any theoretical objection against it. The Categorical Imperative is a principle upon which a rational person who accepts Kant's postulates of practical reason will act.

Expect commentary upon the different statements of the Categorical Imperative.
- Universalisability,
- Treat others as an end in themselves, never only as a means
- Act as though you are a member of a law making kingdom of ends

Expect comment upon the necessity of a goodwill. Expect outline of Kant's moral theory as deontological.

Evaluate: Kant's moral theory is based on rational principles but there are other equally rational principles a person could act upon. It is not possible to prove the postulates of practical reason and whilst they remain unproven it is not irrational to reject them. It is not therefore irrational to reject the postulate of God, immortality, freedom and reason. If these are rejected the Categorical Imperative can be rejected as well. This would be perfectly rational. Kant states 'I have found it necessary to deny knowledge, in order to make room for faith.' Morality represents a commitment to a world view which claims that the world is rational and that the universe is fair. Why else be moral? But all these postulates can rationally be rejected and morality as well. Claims about the existence of a noumenal world may also, rationally, be rejected which further undermines Kant's moral theory. Kant's moral theory is rational but will not convince all reasonable people, since the ultimate grounds of it do not lie in pure theoretical reason. Students may use examples to demonstrate that Kant's moral theory is unworkable, and indicate that any theory which is impractical has not provided a rational basis for ethics.

Topic 3 Old Testament: Prophecy Section A

[Extract from Hosea 1: 2-9]

7 (a) Consider the meaning of this passage in relation to the rest of the book of Hosea. [10]

Candidates might discuss this extract in a general context or in the more particular context of the identity of the woman in chapter 3 and of the symbolic names of the children ("Go again..."), or both.

Candidates may find it helpful to introduce their answers with a brief note about the historical context which relates to this passage. This proclamation includes judgment against the dynasty of Jehu, and is probably dated in the reign of Jeroboam II. On Jehu's death his son Zechariah took the throne but was assassinated shortly after in 752 B.C.E. It was a time of political and military strength for the Northern Kingdom, with attendant prosperity. Hosea saw that this had led directly to a feeling of self-reliance and rejection of the covenant. In this passage God's covenant relation to Israel is symbolized in Hosea's marriage to Gomer who will prove to be as unfaithful to her husband as Israel has been to Yahweh. In the first three chapters of the book Gomer is rebuked and chastised but is ultimately reconciled with her husband.

As the first of his commands (v. 2), God tells Hosea to find and 'take to yourself a wife of whoredom.' It is possible that Gomer was an active prostitute and may have been serving in that capacity in a pagan temple. Such temples were mainly devoted to the Canaanite god Baal. The full context of the book of Hosea reveals that Hosea's experience was designed to be symbolic of Yahweh's relation with Israel. Their marriage provides a clear parallel with God's own relation to his covenant people as demonstrated throughout Hosea's prophecies. The passage records that the marriage results in "children of harlotry." It is disputed whether all of Gomer's children are the product of prostitution, although it is clearly stated that Hosea fathered their firstborn son. The main stress of the context, which colours the whole book, is on the symbolic role that Gomer bears as a metaphor of Israel's spiritual nature. Harlotry/prostitution is a popular analogy for covenant disloyalty (cf. Exod. 34:15. 16; Lev. 17:9; 20:6; Deut. 31:16; 2 Chron. 21:11, 13; Ezek. 16; 23). Hosea records the specific charges concerning the Northern Kingdom's spiritual infidelity. The firstborn son is named Jezreel ("God will sow/scatter'). Jehu had been commissioned to bring the Omride dynasty to an end together with the rule of Ahab and Jezebel, (2 Kings 9:7-10). Jehu carried out his commission but exceeded it by putting to death all rivals as well as many innocent people. Having killed the prophets of Baal (2 Kings 10:18-30), he proceeded to adopt their apostate religious practices. Where Jehu massacred the royal house of Judah (2 Kings 9:27; 10:12-14) his dynasty will end, in the Valley of Jezreel. The theme of punishment for apostasy runs throughout the text.

Hosea goes on to record the birth of his daughter (v. 6) whom he dutifully named Lo-ruhamah ("no pity/mercy"). The name reflects the certainty of judgment on the Northern Kingdom. God is pictured as a God of judgment (cf. Exod. 34:6; Deut. 4:31). Political and military strength would not spare Israel from God's judgment. Nor would Judah thus be spared. Judah's salvation depended solely upon its covenant faithfulness to "the LORD their God" (v. 7).

Two major divisions in the book are recognized by nearly all expositors (Chapters 1-3, 4-14). The first division centres upon Hosea's marriage to Gomer, itself symbolic of God's relation to Israel. The second contains a collection of prophetic oracles dealing with the infidelity of God's people and their need of repentance as well as the Lord's faithfulness and love despite the need for his judgment against his people. Indeed, the marriage theme is a prominent one not only in chapters 1-3 but in various places in Hosea's prophecy. For example, God is portrayed as a jealous husband (2:2-13) due to the infidelity of his wife Israel (as symbolized

by Gomer). Israel has played the harlot by flirting with pagan idolatry (e.g. 4:10-18; 5:3-4; 6:10; 7:4; 8:4-6, 9; 9:1, 10, 15; 10:5; 11:2, 7; 12:11) as well as in its unwise political alliances and unrighteous social immorality. Yet God is also portrayed as a faithful and loving husband who longs for and is willing to forgive Israel (2:14-3:5; 9:1; 14:4).

The marriage theme is also closely allied to that of the covenant. Even though God had redeemed his people out of Egypt and brought them into covenant relationship with him (11:4; 12:9; 13:4), they have violated that covenant repeatedly (e.g. 6:7; 8:11-14). Israel's sole hope lay in the fact that God's covenant loyalty and redemptive love for them remained (2:18-23; 3:1-5; 8:1-14; 13:16).

Due to Israel's violation of her fidelity to God and his covenant with them, there was need of repentance. Repentance, therefore, becomes a prominent theme in Hosea (e.g. 2:14; 3:5; 5:6; 6:6-7; 7:8-10; 14:4) as well as the need for Israel to practice righteousness (10:12; 12:6; 14:9).

(b) Critically assess the view that in Hosea's prophecy love is stronger than judgement. [15]

Students may appropriately make reference to the passage quoted. Hosea's theological perspective begins with these opening verses. Israel's spiritual harlotry will bring God's certain judgement of exile to the nation (1:1-9). However the overriding theological message is that of God's love. The Lord's great unfathomable love will one day result in Israel's forgiveness and restoration in a new exodus event that will bring the people back to the covenant relationship (1:10-11). These themes resound throughout the book.

On judgement candidates may use any of the following to illustrate their argument: Israel's sin is termed harlotry/whoredom and Israel is depicted as a harlot/whore (cf. 1:2 with 2:1-13; 3:1; 4:10-18; 5:4; 6:10; 7:6; 9:1). Her sinfulness is that of infidelity against Yahweh her Redeemer expressed in the worship of idols (4:1, 17-18; 5:7; 8:5-6; 9:10) and the pursuit of sinful practices associated with them (4:14; 9:15; 10:5-6; 12:11; 13:2; 14:8). Because Israel has broken its covenant with God (6:7; 8:1, 11-14; 10:1-3; 12:14; 13:16), God's judgement must come, for Yahweh is a God of justice (4:19; 5:5, 8-12, 14; 6:4-5; 7:12-16; 8:12-14; 9:3-9, 17; 10:7-10, 14-15; 11:5-6; 13:5-9, 15-16). Moreover, Israel has repeatedly violated the terms of the law.

On 'love' candidates may use any of the following to illustrate: Hosea has much to say about genuine repentance and forgiveness (e.g. 2:18-20; 6:1-3; 10:12; 12:6; 14:1-4). Such forgiveness is based upon the love of God for Israel and the love of Hosea for his wife. God will one day return a repentant and forgiven people to the land (11:1-4; 12:9; 13:4-6, 14) and initiate a new covenant with them (2:18-23; 3:5). Yahweh is a God of love and undying faithfulness (11:12). This love will ultimately triumph (11:6-11; 14:4-7). Israel must realize that there is only one God and they belong to God as Gomer must realise that she only has one husband and that this too is an exclusive relationship (2:23; 12:9).

In terms of the fate of the Northern Kingdom, judgement seems an unavoidable feature of Hosea's message. Students may argue that since the majority of Hosea's messages is condemnation that those prophecies that contain a note of hope (e.g. 1:10-2:1; 2:14-23; 3:5; 11:8-11; 14:4-8) are the work of a later redactor. It seems clear that the Book of the Twelve underwent such a redaction, and certainly the change of tone between 13 and 14 is very marked. Others may argue that a blending of negative and positive prophecies is a common feature in many of the prophets and that the core experience of Hosea suggests that both judgement and love are necessary. A high level response will show the tension between these two and present arguments both for and against the question.

Section B

8 **Critically examine the roles of the ro'eh, hozeh and nabi' in the development of Old Testament Prophecy.** **[25]**

Candidates need only make reference to the set texts to gain access to the full range of marks although credit will be given to more wide ranging responses. A brief overview of the language associated with the role of prophet may be offered by some candidates.

The common word for prophet in Hebrew is *nabi'* and the LXX usually renders it by the Greek word *prophetes* which is also used for prophets in the NT. Both are commonly rendered "prophet" in English translations. Two other Hebrew words are associated with prophetic figures: *hozeh* and *ro'eh* both mean "someone who sees" and can be literally rendered "seer". The words *nabi'* and *hozeh* are close synonyms, in Amos 7:12 Amaziah calls Amos *"hozeh",* but suggests that he "prophesy" in Judah (verb *naba'* from same root as *nabi'*). There may be an interesting difference in usage between *hozeh* and *nabi'* between Northern and Southern kingdoms. In texts associated with the Deuteronomy movement (Dt; Jos-2 Kgs; Hosea; Jeremiah) *nabi' is* the preferred term. Texts associated with more purely Judean traditions (Amos, Micah, Isaiah) use "*nabi' "* less, and often in negative ways (e.g. of "false prophets"). The books most closely associated with the Jerusalem establishment show the lowest usage of *nabi',* while Jeremiah and Hosea show the highest figures. The title *hozeh,* appears to be preferred by texts associated with the Judean traditions.

The role of the nabi/prophet may be discussed using a wide range of examples to show that the prophet was one **called to speak** *(nabi'* means "to call to speak," "to proclaim,"). The LXX translation, prophetes, includes the additional inference that the prophet is called to speak 'on behalf of' and Aaron is appointed *nabi'* to Moses and the context makes it clear that Aaron is to be the spokesman (Exod. 7:1). The prophet could **foretell future events** (Ahab complains that Micaiah, never prophesied well for him), but this is not a central part of the prophetic office. The prophet was called **to correct moral and religious abuse** and to speak about religious truths connected with the character of God (candidates may draw richly from any of the set texts). Prophets were not necessarily involved in formal or institutional religion, although they could be (Samuel and Isaiah vs Elijah). Some prophets had a priestly function, (Samuel performed as a priest and term *ro'eh* is used of Zadok the priest, II Sam. 15:27).Prophets were necessarily involved in politics since religion and politics were not distinct areas of activity. Prophecy could include hints of ecstatic behaviour.

The term *nabi' is* used in an interesting way in Amos 7:14, in the narrative concerning Amaziah, thought to be a reference to Amos' call. Because of the difficulties of understanding the tense of the verbs involved, it is not clear whether Amos us claiming not to be a *nabi'* (suggesting that he sees that role in a derogatory, professional light in connection with Amaziah) or whether he is saying that he was not a *nabi'*, but was a herdsman, etc., and has *now* become a *nabi'*.

Studies of the words *hozeh* and *ro'eh* have failed to demonstrate any marked difference in meaning, and most English translations render both by "seer." It would seem that the Hebrew writers did not employ the terms in such a manner that clear distinctions can be drawn between, seers and prophets. Candidates may wish to draw a distinction between prophets of Yahweh and false prophets or cultic prophets.

1 Samuel 9:9 contains an editorial note that the *nabi'* used to be called a seer *(ro'eh),* and some argue that Samuel shows a transitional stage between the seer and the *nabi'.*

OR

9 **Critically examine the content, structure and meaning of prophetic call narratives or the nature and meaning of symbolic acts in pre-exilic prophecy.** **[25]**

Prophetic call narratives.

Candidates may usefully draw upon Amos 7-9, Elisha (1 Kings 19:19,) Jeremiah 1, Micaiah (1 Kings 22:19-22 but knowledge of other call narratives whilst not essential will be credited if used. Prophetic call narratives **content:** A call received directly through God's personal address. The prophets felt compelled by a stronger will than their own (Jeremiah 20:7, Amos 3:8). Often the call was accompanied by an abnormal psychic state such as a vision and an audition, sudden inspiration and/or miraculous knowledge. The vision may be of God or of something understood to be symbolic. The 'seen' element is always followed by a 'heard' element. The prophet is acquainted with the will and purpose of God through the encounter.

Structure. The prophetic call gave rise to a new literary category, the account of a call. They are typically given in the first person singular as an expression of the exclusive encounter. They are not in all probability transcripts of the events but serve definite ends and may to an extent be stylised. The prophet records that Yahweh made a deep personal contact with them in which the spirit or the word came upon the prophet. They often report that the force of God imposed itself upon them sometimes against their wish or inclination. They report persuasive content and consistent demand as part of the call experience which broke through their human response. The stylistic form of the call narrative may be a later interpretation of the material intended to provide a degree of authenticity to the prophet in question.

Meaning. Usually they meant that the person had been called to abandon the fixed orders of religion which the majority of the people still supported. The act of writing down an account was aimed as justifying the prophet before those sections of the public who doubted him. The prophet was called for a life of service in which they typically gave up their profession, social life and economic securities.

Variations within the accounts which may be noted include the call of Elisha, who was called by a fellow human being (1 Kings 19:19ff) and received Elijah's calling and charisma 2 Kings 2:9). Prophets from Amos onwards do not think of themselves as bearers of the spirit but as preachers of the word.

The prophet, unlike the mystic, considered themselves to be in an unusual and abnormal relationship with God as a result of their call. They did not think that their relationship with God was normal and encourage others to seek the same encounter

Symbolic actions

The prophets frequently performed symbolic actions which constituted a form of proclamation to supplement prophetical discourse. Students may refer to any symbolic actions but anticipate reference to Hosea 1 (his marriage), Jeremiah 13:1-11 (hiding of a waistcloth), 16:1-4 (Jeremiah's renunciation of marriage and children), 19 (the breaking of a flask). They were performed in public for a specific purpose and were done knowingly and deliberately. These actions accompanied the spoken prophecy and as a result are acted prophecies. The acted prophecy guaranteed that the event spoken of would come to pass. The actions gave assurance that the event would take place. Prophetic acts are done because God directs them to be done, just as the prophetic words are spoken because God instructs them to be spoken. The actions declare God's intentions and the actions help bring about the event announced.

Where candidates refer to symbolic *visions,* or other material with symbolic import, as opposed to specific acts, such material can be credited.

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011