



A-level RELIGIOUS STUDIES 7062/2E

Paper 2E Study of Religion and Dialogues: Judaism

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



2 2 6 A 7 0 6 2 / 2 E / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Methods of Marking

It is essential that, in fairness to students, all examiners use the same methods of marking. The advice given here may seem very obvious, but it is important that all examiners follow it as exactly as possible.

1. If you have any doubts about the mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking. It is extremely important that it is strictly adhered to.
3. Remember, you must **always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material that is irrelevant to the question or to the stated target, however impressive that material might be.
5. If a one-word answer is required and a list is given, take the first answer (unless this has been crossed out).
6. If you are wavering as to whether or not to award a mark, the criterion should be, 'Is the student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about using Levels of Response mark schemes.
8. Be prepared to award the full range of marks. Do not hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits full marks or to give no marks where there is nothing creditable in an answer.
9. No half marks or bonus marks are to be used under any circumstances.
10. Remember, the key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Do **not** change the standard of your marking once you have started.

Levels of Response Marking

In A-level Religious Studies, differentiation is largely achieved by outcome on the basis of students' responses. To facilitate this, levels of response marking has been devised for many questions.

Levels of response marking requires a quite different approach from the examiner than the traditional 'point for point' marking. It is essential that the **whole response is read** and then **allocated to the level** it best fits.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with genuine religious studies skills**. For example, a short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability must be credited at that level. (If there is a band of marks allocated to a level, discrimination should be made with reference to the development of the answer.)

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** objective of a question (see mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students' responses or **material** which they might use. These are intended as a **guide** only. It is anticipated that students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

It is a feature of levels of response mark schemes that examiners are prepared to reward fully, responses which are obviously valid and of high ability but do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. This should only be necessary occasionally and where this occurs examiners must indicate, by a brief written explanation, why their assessment does not conform to the levels of response laid down in the mark scheme. Such scripts should be referred to the Lead Examiner.

Assessment of Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all components and in relation to all assessment objectives. Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication. The quality of written communication skills of the student will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark awarded within the level of response. In reading an extended response, the examiner will therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, ie decide whether the answer:

- presents relevant information in a form that suits its purposes
- is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate, so that meaning is clear
- is suitably structured and that the style of writing is appropriate.

Levels of Response: 10 marks A-Level – AO1	
Level 5 9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate, relevant and fully developed in breadth and depth with very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, good knowledge and understanding of the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion is demonstrated • Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 4 7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate and mostly relevant with good development in breadth and depth shown through good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, alternative views and/or scholarly opinion are explained • Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 3 5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is generally accurate and relevant with development in breadth and/or depth shown through some use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, there is some familiarity with the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion • Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 2 3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is limited, with limited development in breadth and/or depth shown through limited use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion • Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary
Level 1 1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development • There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion • Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit

Levels of Response: 15 marks A-Level – AO2	
Level 5 13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised • Perceptive discussion of different views, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought with critical analysis • There is an appropriate evaluation fully supported by the reasoning • Precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 4 10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised • Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought, with some critical analysis • There is an appropriate evaluation supported by the reasoning • Good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 3 7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general response to the issue(s) raised • Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought • An evaluation is made that is consistent with some of the reasoning • Reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 2 4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited response to the issue(s) raised • Presentation of a point of view relevant to the issue with some supporting evidence and argument • Limited attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary
Level 1 1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic response to the issue(s) raised • A point of view is stated, with some evidence or reason(s) in support • Some attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit

0 1 . 1

Examine why there are different Jewish views about celibacy and marriage.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.3: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including causes and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note: 'celibacy and marriage' may be treated as a single idea.

One reason for differences is that while marriage is identified as the ideal state for Jews in both the Torah and the Talmud, there are significant differences in the detail. For example, there is less agreement about how a marriage comes about or what to do if the marriage is childless. This leads to different views about marriage and celibacy especially between Orthodox Jews for whom the Talmud is more important and Reform Jews who may view it as less significant. These differences include whether celibacy is ever acceptable.

Another reason for the differences is that different scholars have made a range of statements about marriage and celibacy. Rabbis have disagreed over whether celibacy is ever acceptable. For example, the prophet Jeremiah was celibate because he did not want to produce children to die in the impending catastrophe, and one of the Talmudic Rabbis was also celibate. Some Jews may follow these examples and accept celibacy. However, the majority of Jews follow the teachings of other scholars, like Maimonides, that procreation is a sacred duty and therefore marry.

Another reason for differences is that in the modern world, there is a range of social norms that influence views about celibacy and marriage. Orthodox Jews may ignore modern views and expect celibacy pre-marriage whereas other Jews may accept the reality of sex before marriage. Orthodox Jews may not accept same-sex marriage whereas Reform and other progressive Jews may accept the reality of same-sex marriages now that it is legally possible.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain different views.

0 1 . 2

‘Jews cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.’

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: The sanctity of life: the concept of the sanctity of life and its application to issues concerning...the use of weapons of mass destruction; different Jewish views.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments:

Jewish law states that it is unacceptable to use weapons which would result in an unnecessary loss of life, quantified by the Talmud as one sixth of the population. Therefore, the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) can never be justified. However, it is a commandment to defend oneself against attack and the only way to defend against WMD is to use WMD, thereby justifying their use.

Jewish law says that it is illegal to threaten to use a weapon which it is prohibited to use, as this is lying. Therefore, it is not possible to justify the possession of WMD as a threat in a Mutually Assured Destruction situation. However, it is permissible to lie to save life, and there is an injunction not to stand by while a neighbour's blood is shed. Therefore, possession of WMD, to use as a threat to prevent nuclear war, can be justified.

Jewish Law does not allow the killing of innocent civilians, women, children and prisoners of war. This means that the use of WMD can never be justified, as their use would result in such deaths. However, the use of battlefield nuclear weapons to annihilate the enemy, so protecting yourself, may be justified in the circumstances where a war is a last resort, and all other measures to prevent war have been tried.

0 2 . 1

Examine the significant ideas in the post holocaust theology of Ignatz Maybaum and Richard Rubenstein.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: A comparison of the significant ideas in the post holocaust theology of Ignatz Maybaum and Richard Rubenstein: Maybaum – churban, remnant and suffering servant; Rubenstein: the 'death' of God and of the Covenant.

Ignatz Maybaum

Maybaum argued Jewish history has always revealed God's existence and purpose for the Jewish people. The holocaust is therefore part of a pattern of persecution and not unique. Jewish destiny has been, and is, shaped by the relationship with non-Jews and is driven by non-Jews. The holocaust is therefore a churban (sacrifice) and created a new era in that relationship.

Maybaum argues that the destruction of eastern European Jewry was progress towards messianic post-medievalism and freedom from strict observance of halakhah. He believed that six million innocents died because of the sins of others, and God used the holocaust to cleanse, purify and punish a sinful world. He argued that Hitler was God's servant.

Richard Rubenstein

Rubenstein struggled to accept that the holocaust was the will of God so concluded that God was dead and there is no God. Human existence is therefore futile and meaningless. But as humanity exists, life needs to have meaning and this can be achieved through community and religious rituals, which therefore have a psychological purpose.

Rubenstein believes that Jews should not attempt to rise above nature, as was taught traditionally, but should submit to the idea that being human is natural and so can be enjoyed. Part of this return to nature is self-liberation from the past by a return to Zion, which is part of Jewish redemption. He also believed that Judaism must abandon the idea of the Jews as the chosen people.

0 2 . 2

‘The Talmud is a very important source of authority for Jews.’

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: The Babylonian Talmud: different Jewish beliefs about its nature, authority and importance.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments:

The Talmud is widely treated as a sacred text. For example, many Jews teach that it is part of Torah from heaven, and was given to Moses on Mount Sinai along with the Tenakh. This gives it the authority of revealed texts as God's word. However, only the Torah is direct revelation from God. The Talmud is considered indirect revelation, which means it is a lesser source of authority than the Torah and therefore cannot be said to be an important source of authority for all Jews today.

The Talmud gives practical details that are not in the Torah. It enables Jews to establish the true meaning of the 613 mitzvot and to be able to apply them in daily life and to contemporary situations. This means it is an important source of authority because without it many commandments are difficult to follow. However, the Talmud contains a range of opinions on some topics, which may be contradictory, so that it can be difficult to establish exactly what to do.

The Talmud comments on the discussions of previous rabbis and verses in the Torah, thus bring Judaism up to date. This makes it an important source of authority. However, the Talmud cannot provide answers for issues which are new to the modern world, as it has been seen to be complete for many centuries.

0 3 . 1

‘Philosophical arguments are irrelevant to Jewish beliefs about life after death.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Judaism and philosophy.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1.4: Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

AO1

Judaism

There is a range of beliefs about life after death in Judaism including resurrection of the flesh, reincarnation and immortality. There is also teaching about Sheol and the nature of the soul.

Philosophy

There are different views about the nature of the soul and the body/soul relationship, including Descartes' argument for the existence of the soul. The possibility of continuing personal existence after death is broadly discussed.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Judaism and philosophy.

AO2

Philosophical arguments may be considered irrelevant if they fail to prove their case. For example, the argument that there is no soul to be passed on after death, because nothing can be detected using the five senses, fails if the soul is not regarded as something that can be sensed in this way. However, there are philosophical arguments in favour of life after death, or which at least show it to be a coherent possibility. There may be reference to Hick's idea of eschatological verification and to his replica theory here. Religion may consider philosophy relevant when it works in its favour.

Religious belief can be seen as a perspective, not itself based on evidence or reason, from which all evidence is viewed and all experiences interpreted. This likens belief to a 'Blik'. If belief is not based on reason it may be considered immune to rational argument. However, not all believers accept this understanding of faith and regard their position as reasonable and as supported by evidence. This means that philosophical challenges to the way the evidence has been interpreted are entirely relevant.

Philosophical arguments may be considered irrelevant to religious beliefs if religious claims are understood non-cognitively and / or as part of a religious language game in which those within the game can converse between themselves but have no significance for those outside the game. However, many see religion as making truth claims, such as 'there is a heavenly realm', which can be challenged by philosophy, and the analysis of religious language as non-cognitive may be seen as a philosophical argument.

0	4	.	1
---	---	---	---

‘The beliefs of all religions are equally valid.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Judaism and philosophy.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1.4: Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

AO1

Judaism

There is a range of views about the beliefs of other faiths in Judaism. The concept of pluralistic Judaism has implications for relationships between the different traditions of Judaism, and between Judaism and other faiths. The concept of 'the chosen people' also impacts on this.

Philosophy

This can be approached in a variety of ways. For example, philosophy may challenge the validity of all faiths. It may also point out that arguments used by one faith to support, or attack, belief in miracles or religious experiences must be applied to the claims of all faiths in relation to these topics. Mystical experiences may be seen as the common core of all faiths. Similarly, arguments for God's existence relate to God in general, rather than God as specifically understood by Christians, Muslims or Jews, or to Brahman or the Trikaya.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Judaism and philosophy.

AO2

All arguments from philosophy in favour of, or against, a religious belief are common to all faiths where the belief is present, for example, beliefs about miracles, religious experiences and life after death. An argument supporting the possibility of personal existence beyond death, for example, supports all those religions that include that belief and arguments against the existence of a metaphysical dimension to life challenge all faiths that believe that such a dimension exists. This suggests that philosophy finds all faiths equally valid / invalid. However, many of the beliefs are contradictory, which seems to show that they cannot all be valid, and certainly some followers of individual religions claim that they alone know the truth.

The view may be supported by those who see all religions / minority Jewish groups as historically and culturally relative expressions of the same underlying awareness or path. The individual faiths, on this view, are merely different ways of talking about ultimate reality which enables individuals to deepen their understanding of it, but the one reality lies beyond these. However some Jews regard their own faith as the only true way, and it is very difficult to see some other faiths as expressions of the same underlying reality because of the great differences between them.

Tolerance of other faiths is a characteristic of much Jewish teaching, and within a secular context, freedom of religious expression is extended to all faiths. However, there are values and practices in other faiths or Jewish sects which some Jews find intolerable. These vary, but may include, for example, polygamy and idol worship. Divisions on ethical issues such as abortion are also evident. Beliefs that operate in the personal realm but are not expressed in practice may be accepted as 'valid' while acting on them is not.

0 5 . 1

‘Bentham’s way of making moral decisions is compatible with Jewish ethics.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Judaism and ethical studies.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1.4: Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

AO1

Judaism

Jewish ethics may be unpacked with reference to the mitzvot and the importance of individual reasoning and decision-making, There may also be reference to the principle of the sanctity of life and its application, including pikuach nephesh.

Ethics

Bentham's key ideas may be identified as: how consequences of pain or pleasure determine whether an action is right or wrong; the goal of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, the hedonic calculus and the equality of pleasures. Bentham's approach may be identified as act utilitarianism, meaning that each situation is judged on its own merits rather than any moral rules or laws applied.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Judaism and Bentham's way of making moral decisions.

AO2

There are likely to be many issues on which both Bentham and Judaism would reach the same conclusions, because the virtue of compassion for all is easily translated into a desire for the happiness of all, or 'the greatest good for the greatest number'. However, Bentham's system potentially justifies any action as long as it contributes to that goal while the moral teachings of Judaism do appear to prohibit certain actions, such as murder and adultery, regardless of their consequences.

Bentham's way of moral decision making identifies the right action as that which produces the greatest happiness of the greatest number in the concrete situation in which a decision is required, that is consistent with a compassion based decision making process which some Jews use to over-rule specific laws in extreme circumstances. However, not all Jews would accept this way of making moral decisions because they see Jewish ethics as rule based.

Bentham's system treats all sentient beings equally so that the happiness of each individual is taken into account in the decision making process: this appears to be consistent with the ethical teaching of Judaism. However, Bentham's system allows the interests of the minority to be sacrificed to benefit the majority and values all pleasures equally. Judaism values spiritual happiness above all other forms and can have serious objections to the 'tyranny of the majority'.

0	6	.	1
---	---	---	---

‘Kant’s way of moral decision making supports Jewish beliefs about lying.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Judaism and ethical studies.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1.4: Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

AO1

Judaism

There is a range of views about lying in Judaism. In general, it is forbidden by the mitzvot, however, there are exceptional circumstances in which lying may be permitted. The Talmud appears to permit, and even require, lying 'in the interest of peace', which includes to save a life and to avoid hurting feelings. Permission to lie is also given in order to protect property and for reasons of modesty. The intentions behind the action determine if it is right or wrong.

Ethics

Kant may be understood to see truth telling as a duty that has to be universalised, and one treats all people as ends in themselves rather than means to a secondary end. For example, the individual cannot be treated as a means to increase overall happiness of those around them. There may be reference to the 'mad axe murderer' dilemma or similar, and Kant's response that even in this situation, lying cannot be justified. Some may argue that Kant's maxims can be contextualised – meaning that the moral duty depends on the circumstances.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Judaism and Kant's way of making moral decisions.

AO2

At first sight, both Judaism and Kant's system forbid lying, as evidenced by the mitzvot and the debate, for example, about telling the murderer where his victim may be found. Kant defended the imperative 'do not lie' even when the consequences would be the death of an innocent person because that rule had to be universalised. However, Jewish teachings allow exceptions to the rule, for example to save a life, out of modesty, where the truth appears boastful, and to protect feelings and property.

Any situation in which lying would save the life of an innocent person would seem to involve a conflict of duties for those using Kant's way of making moral decisions, for example, between 'do not be responsible for the death of an innocent person' and 'do not lie'. This is a dilemma comparable to one faced by Jews between the duty to show compassion and the 'law'. However lying to the murderer would be treating him as a means to an end, protecting lives, rather than an end in himself, so many of those using Kant's system would reject this outright, while in Judaism the right intention could justify the act, and some Jews argue that they have a duty to lie if it will save the life of an innocent person.

If Kant's system allows for the maxim to be formulated in response to a specific situation, then the universalised rule about lying could allow exceptions, such as 'tell the truth' unless lives depend on it. This would bring it more into line with that Jewish thinking which prioritises compassion over blind obedience to a law. Also the imperative 'do not lie' is not the same as 'tell the truth'. It is possible to give a response which does not lead to the death of innocents but does not involve lying, for example, I will not tell you, and such a response might satisfy both Kantians and Jews. However, Kant explicitly rejected the consideration of the consequences of lying as an argument in its favour, while Judaism does not.