



A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/2E

Paper 2E Study of Religion and Dialogues: Judaism

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



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 © 2023 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 below 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.

LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Levels of Response: 10 marks A-level – AO1

- Level 5**
9–10
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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**
- No accurate or relevant material to credit.

Levels of Response: 15 marks A-level – AO2

- Level 5**
13–15
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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**
- No accurate or relevant material to credit.

0 1 . 1

Examine why there are different Jewish views about the concept of stewardship.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.3: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including cause 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.

One reason that there are different views arises from different understandings of the scriptures. Some Jews interpret the biblical creation narratives to mean that God gave everything in creation for humans to use because humans are the pinnacle of creation, so humans have God's permission to use all resources as they wish. Other Jews interpret the narratives to mean that humans are equal recipients of God's creative power, but are appointed by God to care for creation, and therefore treat both animals and natural resources with respect.

Another reason for different views arises from the perceived relationship between humans and animals. While most Jews agree that humans have a responsibility for stewardship of animals, for example, a farmer must feed his animals before his family, there is disagreement about whether it is acceptable to use animals in certain situations. Some Jews may allow experimentation on animals because they see it as leading to the preservation of human life. Others may not allow it because the link between saving human life and experimentation is not proven.

A third reason for difference arises from how Jews view the effects of human activities on the environment. Some Jews may consider that part of their purpose is to repair the world, to try to reverse the damage to the planet and other forms of life by good stewardship. Other Jews may focus on activities which involve stewardship for the Jewish world, and prioritise preserving the earth for the use of future generations.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only explain different views.

0 1 . 2

‘Martin Buber’s ideas about the relationship between God and humankind do not make sense.’

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: Martin Buber: key ideas about God in Martin Buber’s theology: God as the ‘Eternal Thou’; God known in and through personal human relationships.

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

Buber claimed that a true relationship with God, as experienced from the human side, must be an I-Thou relationship, in which God is truly met and addressed. For some Jews, this makes no sense because God is transcendent and cannot be met. However, because Buber sees God as the Eternal Thou, it could be argued that his views are just a different way of understanding God.

Buber states that any kind of I-It relationship, which treats the other as an object, should be avoided when considering the relationship with God. This includes making God an object of dogma. This makes no sense because religions, including Judaism, often use dogma to attempt to explain an incomprehensible God. However, if, as Buber says, that dogma replaces a true relationship with God, then this would make sense for Judaism because Jews have always held the relationship with God to be an I-Thou relationship.

Buber also rejected any fixed rules of behaviour in the relationship between humans and God. He believed that the Bible originated in the ever-renewed encounter between God and his people but he also believed that the Talmud came from what Buber called ‘the spurious tradition removed from the Thou relationship with God’. For some Jews, this makes no sense, because they believe that God revealed the Talmud to humans so that it could clarify the relationship between humans and God. However, for those Jews who see the Talmud as the work of humans, Buber’s interpretation may make sense.

0 2 . 1

Examine how Judaism responds to materialistic secular values.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including religious, philosophical and/or 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.

One way that Judaism responds to materialistic secular values can be seen in the way that some Jews reject materialism in society and instead choose to live a simple life rooted in an exclusive Jewish community. Some may choose to live in a ghetto, where everybody has similar values and rejects the materialistic secular world. Some may also choose to live within the secular world but reject its values by, for example, sharing wealth through supporting the local Jewish community.

A second way that Jews respond is by embracing the materialistic values of capitalist western societies. Some separate religious beliefs from secular achievement, and see wealth as a sign of success, which gives them an opportunity to do good and give generously to charity. There are some Jews who see wealth and possessions not only as signs of secular success, but also as rewards from God for their faith. Some Jews see the poor as providing an opportunity for others to do good.

A third way that Judaism responds to materialistic secular values is by the continuing engagement with liberationist ideas to support the poor and defend the oppressed, through organisations such as the Jewish Social Action Forum. The Board of Deputies of British Jews started this group which supports, for example, Mitzvah Day which is the largest faith-led day of action in the UK. Some Jews have also embraced Political Zionism in order to live in a country which is based on both materialistic secular values and the principles of Judaism.

0 2 . 2

‘Judaism responds successfully to issues raised by genetic engineering.’

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: Different Jewish responses to ethical issues raised by science: genetic engineering.

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

One issue that is raised by genetic engineering is the view that since God created all things, altering the genetic material is interfering with God’s will for that organism. A successful Jewish response is that God gave scientists the ability to do this. However, humans are able to do many things which are not good, and just because people have the ability to alter genetic material does not mean that they should do so. There is a danger that people may subvert God’s will through genetic engineering.

Genetic engineering may have unforeseen consequences, for example, it might cause lasting harmful changes to the human genome. Jews may respond that the risk of harm is always present in any creative process, and that provided that all possible steps are taken to minimise future harm, it would be wrong not to use the abilities which God has given. However, it could be argued that causing even the smallest amount of harm is unacceptable, and since only God can know the future, humans can never be sure that they will not cause harm through genetic engineering.

Jews may argue with some success that genetic engineering can be used to prevent or reduce human suffering by eliminating some genetic diseases, for example Tay-Sachs, or by increasing food production in order to reduce world hunger. However, suffering may be part of God’s will for the world, since through suffering people develop qualities of compassion, charity and perseverance. Reducing suffering may prevent people from developing these qualities and so delay or prevent them from fulfilling God’s purpose for them.

0 3 . 1

‘Philosophical arguments for the existence of God show that Jewish beliefs about God are not coherent.’

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

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, 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 may be consideration of God as one, omnipotent, omniscient, creator and controller of all things, God as personal or Maimonides’ Thirteen Principles about the nature of God.

Philosophy

There may be consideration of any arguments for the existence of God and criticisms of those arguments.

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

AO2

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

The Cosmological Argument, which suggests that God is a necessary first cause, offers an image of God as an uncreated impersonal force. Although this argument is implied by Maimonides in the Thirteen Principles of the Faith, Jewish belief that God is an active creator ex nihilo does not cohere with this. However, Jews may argue that the Cosmological Argument operates as a justification for belief in a creator God, not as a description of God's personal qualities.

Anselm's Ontological Argument proposes a necessary being 'than which nothing greater can be conceived'. It is a deductive argument which depends on a concept of God that does not cohere strongly with Jewish beliefs about God as personal and immanent. However, Anselm was a monotheist whose purpose was 'faith seeking understanding'. His argument was trying to demonstrate that faith in God was the product of reason, not an attempt to describe all God's qualities. Judaism assumes that faith in God is reasonable.

Paley's Design Argument, that the complexity, order, and apparent purposefulness of the world show evidence of a divine designer, does not cohere with Jewish beliefs about God as omnipotent and omnibenevolent, since the world contains evil and suffering. However, many Jews believe that God created evil and suffering along with the rest of the world. Arguments from design can explain the nature of God without any need for theodicies, and are therefore coherent with Jewish views.

0 4 . 1

‘Philosophy does not support belief in the authority of the Tenakh.’

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

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, 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 may be consideration of the Tenakh as divine revelation and the ultimate authority as complete and unchangeable or as inspired by God and of the relative authority of different sections of the Tenakh.

Philosophy

There may be consideration of any relevant philosophical discussion, including religious experience, sources of authority and religious language.

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

AO2

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

For most Jews, the authority of the Tenakh depends on its status as originating from God. Many Jews believe the Torah is the absolute word of God revealed to Moses, and that the rest of the Tenakh is inspired by God through the religious experience of the writers. Philosophers disagree about the nature of religious experiences and have questioned whether religious experiences have any divine origin, thus undermining the authority of the Tenakh. However, Jews may respond that religious experiences are widespread and well-attested, and Swinburne's principles of credulity and testimony support the view of the authority of the Tenakh as divine revelation.

Philosophers, for example Ayer and Flew, have questioned the meaningfulness of religious language. This undermines the authority of the Tenakh because if its contents are neither verifiable nor falsifiable, then they are meaningless. However, other approaches to religious language may support the view that the Tenakh is meaningful, and has authority. Examples include Aquinas' view that religious language is analogical, or Tillich's view that it is symbolic.

For many Jews, the Tenakh still has authority because the Talmud and other documents are evidence of God's continuing work in the world. The idea that God can, and does, intervene in the processes of the world has been challenged by philosophers such as Hume and Wiles. However, some philosophers suggest that by working at a quantum level, God can, and does, continue to influence the world, and this supports the view that the authority of the Tenakh may be the result of God's continuing influence on Judaism.

0 5 . 1

‘Natural Moral Law gives Judaism clear guidance on issues surrounding wealth.’

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 religion and belief, including approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, 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 may be consideration of Jewish responses to materialist secular values and to wealth and possessions, following the mitzvot, for example to give charity and liberationist approaches as supporting the poor and defending the oppressed.

Ethics

There may be consideration of Natural Moral Law and its strengths and weaknesses.

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

AO2

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

Natural Moral Law (NML) is mainly a deontological, absolutist system of ethics which offers guidance based on five primary precepts from which secondary precepts are derived. Acts are either right or wrong. Thus NML gives clear moral guidance on all matters, including wealth and the absence of wealth. However, the weaknesses of NML, including its oversimplification of issues and its disregard for outcomes, make it unhelpful for dealing with issues of relative wealth and the effects of wealth on human lives.

One issue for Jews is the question of what they should do with the wealth they possess. NML seems quite clear that wealth should be used to pursue the primary precept of living in an ordered society, so, for example, Jews should use their money to support the Jewish community world-wide. However, this does nothing to relieve the poverty and suffering of non-Jewish communities. Such an outcome seems intuitively wrong, which suggests that the guidance is not clear.

Another issue which arises is the extent to which Jews may use resources and animals to create wealth. NML, as expressed by Aquinas, is quite clear that humans may cause damage to the environment and use animals in order to gain wealth. However, Jews today may feel that their duty of stewardship rejects NML, and instead requires them to use their wealth for the purpose of repairing the world. This would lead Jews to care for the environment and the oppressed, and to preserve animals as well as human beings, showing that the guidance is not clear.

0 6 . 1

‘Bentham’s consequential ethics have no value for Jews.’

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

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, 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 may be consideration of the place of mitzvot and individual decision making and the extent to which Jewish moral principles can be seen as consequentialist.

Ethics

There may be consideration of utilitarianism including the key ideas of Bentham about moral decision making, and teleological and consequentialist moral principles.

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

AO2

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

Bentham's Act Utilitarianism is a naturalistic theory which defines good as the maximisation of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Many Jews see pain and suffering as part of God's purpose, so Bentham's basic premise is wrong, and his theory has no value for them. However, it could be argued that Jews are commanded by God to relieve suffering, for example in prayers that show what is needed to secure a place in the world to come. Therefore, Bentham's approach, though secular in formulation, is consistent with Jewish teaching and has some value.

Bentham's commitment to social equality led him to the view that the principle of utility should act for the maximum number of people without regard to status. This seems to reduce human beings to impersonal units. Jews may see no value in this because, for them, each individual is a child of God. However, Bentham's view that social status and wealth do not define people's worth is consistent with Jewish teaching. Therefore, the inherent fairness of Bentham's system has value for many Jews today.

Bentham's ethics may contain nothing of value for Jews who consider the Tenakh and the Talmud to be the authoritative source of beliefs and teachings. Bentham does not depend on external sources of authority to define good or evil, or to identify moral values. However, some Jews today do not depend on sacred texts as their only source of moral guidance. They may value human beings as God's creatures, and see in Utilitarianism a way of acting out God's justice and love in the world.