



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
UNIT 3 - OPTION C
A STUDY OF JUDAISM
1120UC0-1**

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

UNIT 3 – OPTION C: A STUDY OF JUDAISM

SUMMER 2024 MARK SCHEME

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.
2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.
3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two-stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance, if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner. When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band (marks)	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Section A questions 30 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> - <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> - <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> - <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5 (25-30 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 (19-24 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 (13-18 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2 (7-12 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable) • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 (1-6 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable) • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. <p>N.B. A maximum of 3 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'.</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Section B questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5 (25-30 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 (19-24 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 (13-18 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2 (7-12 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought, appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 (1-6 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

WJEC GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES

UNIT 3: OPTION C – A STUDY OF JUDAISM

SUMMER 2024 MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

1.	Explain different Jewish understandings of the creation process, with reference to evolution.
----	---

[AO1 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses will be credited.

- Diversity of responses relating to the creation event with reference to bereshit (in the beginning); evolution and different Jewish understandings of the creation process; the debate about the age of the universe could be used as the basis for the examination of this issue.
- Many ultra-Orthodox Jews reject the scientific theories of evolution and the creation process entirely. This is because they accept the Bible as embodying eternal truths. As such, there is an unwillingness to re-interpret scripture in order to bring about a reconciliation with a scientific theory that, in their view, may be overhauled at some time in the future.
- Conversely, some Jews reject the biblical account of creation because it contradicts the theory of evolution. They see the Bible as an ancient human document that can no longer provide a meaningful understanding of the beginning of the universe for a person living in the twenty-first century. They therefore look to modern science to explain the origin of the world.
- Another approach within Orthodox Judaism is to seek to integrate the biblical account with the findings of modern science by arguing that the Bible and modern scientific theory describe the same process using different language: e.g. by using Einstein's theory of relativity to explain how God's six days of creation are equivalent to fifteen billion years of scientific evolution.
- Other Jewish thinkers reject literal understandings of the Bible in favour of metaphorical or allegorical readings arguing that the Bible offers a spiritual explanation of why the world came into being and what the role of humankind is in it, rather than a scientific description of how it originated.
- For the majority of Conservative and Reform Jews evolution is a scientific fact and science is the means by which to learn about the world. Conservative Judaism encourages its members to understand evolution in a way that does not contradict accepted scientific findings and accepts what is known as 'theistic evolution': that there is a God who set everything in motion, and who stands outside the universe as the cause and reason for life.
- Some Kabbalists claim that evolutionary theory corroborates their understanding of the origins of the world and its development: e.g. ancient fossils were the remains of animals that had perished in the previous 'worlds' as described in some Kabbalist texts.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

2.	Examine the diversity of views in Reform and Orthodox Judaism towards interfaith dialogue.
----	--

[AO1 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses will be credited.

- The Pittsburgh Platform of 1999 advocates a need and an openness to promote interfaith dialogue in order to 'bring peace, freedom and justice to our world.' Reform Jews today believe that such dialogue is important because many societies are now diverse and multicultural. Reference could be made to Leviticus 19:18: 'You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against your countrymen. Love your fellow as yourself.'
- For Reform Jews, the importance of working with those from other faith communities is also encouraged in order to achieve social justice. Reference could be made to the teaching from the Talmud which says: 'In a city where there are both Jews and Gentiles, the collectors of alms collect from both Jews and Gentiles; they feed the poor of both ... for the sake of peace.'
- Subsequently, the Reform Jewish community has joined with those of the Christian faith, for example, through the work of the International Council of Christians and Jews (ICCJ), and reference to the mission statement of the ICCJ can be used to exemplify the emphasis placed upon the importance of interfaith dialogue.
- The traditional view within the Orthodox tradition is that God entered into an exclusive covenant with the Jewish people at Mount Sinai (Exodus 19:5), and this suggests a covenant based upon particularism; a belief that Judaism is the one true faith.
- The views of Rabbi Soloveitchik and Rabbi Feinstein, both principal Orthodox Rabbinic leaders, can also be offered in relation to interfaith dialogue. When Pope Paul VI extended a hand of friendship to the Jews in an attempt to mend relations with them Soloveitchik acknowledged the historical relationship between the two faiths, however he argued against legitimising the relationship for fear that it would lead to the affirmation of the Church that Judaism's sole purpose was to pave the way for Christianity.
- Furthermore, it appears from Feinstein's deliberations that interfaith dialogue is Halakhically prohibited, based upon the concern that Jews might be enticed by the faith and values of other religions.
- However, not all Orthodox Jews dismiss interfaith dialogue as can be exemplified by a public statement entitled 'To Do The Will of Our Father in Heaven: Toward a Partnership between Jews and Christians' which was published on the website for the Centre for Jewish-Christian Understanding and Cooperation (CJCUC). It was signed by 30 Orthodox rabbis and recognised the need for a common mission between Jews and Christians to perfect the world under the sovereignty of God.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

Section B

- | | |
|----|---|
| 3. | 'The Gemara is more important than the Mishnah for study in Judaism.' |
|----|---|

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- It could be argued that once the Mishnah was written down, it was no longer able to meet the demands of changing times and circumstances. Neither did it give definitive rulings on specific problems. Rabbis continued to meet to discuss new issues, arguing and debating upon concerns arising from the Mishnah, the Torah and other sources. These dialogues were ultimately recorded and became the Gemara. As new questions arose, interpretations were offered, so that old summaries were supplemented or recast. It was the Gemara that provided a record for these further additions to the corpus of Jewish religious law. It is, therefore, a key element in bringing about a clearer understanding of how to live according to the mitzvot, and as such might be said to surpass the Mishnah in its importance as a key to understanding the Talmud.
- The following examples could be used as evidence to show how it is the Gemara rather than the Mishnah that has brought about a more coherent understanding of the Talmud: it explains unclear words or phrasing; it provides precedents or examples in application of law; it offers alternative opinions from sages of Mishnah. It can therefore be seen to be bringing clarity to the material in the Mishnah and aids understanding of the issues under discussion.
- The Gemara has a wider range of content and deals with practicalities of life – e.g. medical knowledge, superstition, and criminal law. And significantly, it makes connections between the biblical text and the practices and legal opinions of its time for nearly every law discussed, whereas the Mishnah rarely does so.
- Furthermore, great emphasis is placed upon learning the Gemara amongst Jewish students at yeshiva. The reason for its inclusion in the syllabus is that it trains the brain in deep and sharp thinking, thus bringing about a basic understanding of the reasoning of the Talmud in order to come to a proper understanding of Jewish law. It has been said that studying Gemara will help each student to absorb the spirit of the Torah.
- Another line of argument could be that we must not forget the relationship between the two texts. By its very nature, the Gemara acts as a commentary on the Mishnah, and therefore relies upon the Mishnah for its existence. It cannot therefore be viewed in isolation. However, it could be argued that its content brings about a greater understanding and is therefore essential as a commentary upon the Mishnah. Furthermore, the Gemara is never printed independently, and will never be viewed with the same authority as its predecessor.
- Another issue that could be noted is that study of the Gemara is highly academic, and not something that non-scholastic Jews would undertake. Nevertheless, it has had an important impact on the way in which decisions regarding contemporary issues have been made.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

4.	'Rashi is more important than Maimonides for understanding Hebrew scriptures.'
----	--

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- Both are renowned scholars within Judaism, and it is their legacies that need to be considered when evaluating their relative importance for understanding Hebrew scriptures.
- In Rashi's favour, it is his commentaries on the Hebrew Bible and Talmud upon which his fame rests. Scholars note that Rashi has been acclaimed for his ability to present the basic meaning of a text in a manner that is clear and concise, thus making his work accessible to both rabbis and students alike. For example, his commentaries rely upon 'peshat': the 'plain' or 'literal' sense of a passage. Furthermore, he writes in clear, concise, and readable Hebrew prose, drawing upon a wide range of knowledge. His importance in the understanding of Hebrew scriptures could be underlined further by reference to the claim that no Jew who studies Torah or Talmud does so without his influence.
- Nevertheless, Rashi is not without his critics who cite his lack of scientific method as preventing him from achieving the highest rank in the domain of exegesis.
- As far as Maimonides is concerned, he too holds a position of great authority especially within Orthodox Judaism due to the quantity, quality, scope and originality of his writing. For example, the purpose of his Mishneh Torah was to bring about an understanding of the Talmud that would be clear and concise for Jews of the time, and it continues to be regarded by Orthodox Jews as the pinnacle of halakhic writing.
- However, Maimonides was not without his critics either, as a number of Jewish scholars were troubled by some of his views which they believed were out of line with traditional scholarship. For example, reference could be made to his beliefs about the physical resurrection; and that knowledge of God should be based upon Aristotelian principles.
- A further line of argument could be to question whether it is in fact possible to compare the approaches of Rashi and Maimonides in an objective way. For instance, it is difficult to compare them when they existed almost a century apart. It could also be maintained that they appeal to different audiences: Rashi's ideas may be accessible to most Jews, and remain the substance, for example, of sermons at the synagogue; whilst Maimonides appeals more to intellectuals. It may be that they are both important in their own way, and, despite their different approaches, they both continue to hold sway when matters of law are under discussion.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

5.	'No theological response to the Holocaust is legitimate.'
----	---

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- It could be argued that since the traditional understanding of suffering within Judaism is that it is a form of retribution, some might disagree with the statement in believing the tribulation of the Holocaust to be an expected outcome following disobedience to God.
- However, consideration could be given to the fact that the enormity and uniqueness of the Holocaust brings with it a completely different set of challenges: the classical biblical explanation of failing to keep the terms of the Mosaic covenant, and that God sent this punishment because of the sins of the people is impossible to accept in light of the death of six million innocent Jews.
- Responses from specific Holocaust theologians may be discussed in order to oppose the statement. Berkovitz, for instance, argued that Jews have a right to reason, and even wrestle with God rather than accept the horror of the Holocaust without question. Evidence from the Torah could be offered as a means of providing justification for this approach, for example when Abraham wrestled with God over the fate of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; and when Job struggled with God over the misfortunes that had befallen him.
- Furthermore, Berkovitz aims to address the problem of God's perceived absence from the Jews during the Holocaust by reference to biblical tradition when he talks of 'the hiding of the face' (Isaiah 45:15). Rabbinic tradition maintains that God hiding his face is not due to callousness, rather it is due to the need for God to give space in order for people to be able to develop as moral beings.
- Another theologian whose theodicy could be used in order to argue for the legitimacy of responding to the Holocaust is Wiesel. Furthermore, his response carries with it the strength that he experienced the Holocaust first-hand which gave him greater insight. It could be argued that his response is therefore more developed than those of other Holocaust theologians who did not. Wiesel's response takes the form of protest: great anger is expressed about God; God is put on trial and declared to be guilty, thus suggesting that protest is a legitimate response to the Holocaust.
- Nevertheless, the responses of such theologians are not without criticism; furthermore, their lack of agreement regarding the reason for the Holocaust could be used to argue in favour of the statement.
- However, some might argue that a response to such a dreadful occurrence is imperative no matter how weak.
- Also, if Holocaust theology provides hope for the future then its legitimacy is enhanced.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

6.	'Women and men are equal in Judaism.'
----	---------------------------------------

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- Restrictions imposed within certain Jewish groups suggest that equality is not possible for women as long as practices such as the following still exist e.g. divorced women not being able to re-marry; the status of agunah; women not being able to count towards the minyan; not allowed to lead public worship. These suggest a subordinate role to men.
- However, practices from the Reform movement may be presented as evidence that equality between women and men certainly does exist. Women perform many rituals that have traditionally been reserved for men: reading the Torah in public; counting towards the minyan; serving as cantor; serving as rabbi. This is based upon the belief that the various differences between men and women in traditional Jewish law are not relevant to modern-day society and therefore are not applicable today.
- In addition, the development of the Jewish feminist movement suggests that women are taking action to bring about equality. For example, the development of small worship groups, led by lay people rather than rabbis allow women to take an active role in worship. This is an evolutionary process that exists even within the Orthodox tradition.
- Evidence also shows an increase in women attending yeshivot; this is in contrast to the traditional view that prohibits women from Talmud and Torah study.
- Another line of argument may suggest that in Orthodox Judaism women are not regarded as unequal, but that they hold a different, but equally important role within the Jewish family. Jews follow matrilineal descent, and therefore Jewish mothers have a high status. Some would argue that modest dress and time for women during their menstrual cycle are examples of women being respected and honoured within the religion.
- Treating men and women differently is natural and not an example of lack of respect or honour. Orthodox Jews believe that the woman is being honoured by being treated in this way.
- It could also be argued that it depends upon whether or not the customs of some Jewish groups are regarded as being out of line with the expectations of the roles of men and women in secular society – should we be comparing them?

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.