OCR H573 | INDEPENDENT REVISION

A* Model Essay

Death & the Afterlife

Christian Thought

How far does bodily resurrection provide a convincing Christian account of life after death?

1,571 response words | Complete annotated PDF | Individual topic edition

What is included

A complete original response, an argument plan, paragraph-level AO1/AO2 annotations and source works for further reading.

A* describes the intended style of this teaching model. This is independently written, not an OCR-marked script or a guaranteed grade.

Use this model to study argument and evaluation, then write your own answer. Do not submit it as your own assessed work.

Individual-use digital edition | 10 November 2026

Argument plan

How far does bodily resurrection provide a convincing Christian account of life after death?

Thesis: Bodily resurrection best expresses the Christian hope that God redeems the whole person and creation, but its coherence requires more than the production of a psychologically identical copy. It is a credible theological hope conditional on divine faithfulness, rather than a conclusion demonstrated by scientific evidence or an uninterrupted material identity.

1. Paul's resurrection teaching preserves embodied personhood and divine transformation.

Counter-argument: A transformed body appears difficult to reconcile with continuity of the original person.

Interim judgement: Resurrection need not preserve every atom, but it must preserve more than resemblance.

2. Hick's replica proposal shows how an embodied afterlife might be conceivable.

Counter-argument: A perfect replica may be a successor rather than the numerically same person.

Interim judgement: The thought experiment clarifies the problem without independently solving it.

3. Resurrection unites justice, purification and a redeemed creation.

Counter-argument: Eternal punishment and weak empirical evidence threaten the account's moral and evidential credibility.

Interim judgement: The strongest version retains transformation and judgement while admitting contested details and the limits of proof.