



A-level RELIGIOUS STUDIES 7062/2E

Paper 2E Study of Religion and Dialogues: Judaism

Mark scheme

June 2025

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2025 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 | <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
- 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 the meaning and significance of God as creator of all things.

[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.

Note that meaning and significance may be treated discretely or together as one issue.

One aspect of the meaning of God as the creator of all things is that God created humans in God's image. This is significant because it means that all humanity is created equal and therefore all forms of discrimination are unacceptable in Judaism. For example, in chapter 1 of Genesis both man and woman are created in God's image, which means there should be no sexism.

Another meaning of God as the creator of all things is that life is sacred because it comes from God. The significance of this is that some Jews consider that only God has the right to give or take life, and therefore do not agree, for example, with abortion or euthanasia. The belief that God has a plan for each person leads some Jews to accept that their lives are controlled by God. Therefore, it is unacceptable to subvert that plan.

Another meaning of God as creator of all things is that the earth and all the animals are also created by God. The significance of this is that Jews are stewards of the earth. Jews are instructed in the Torah to care for and rule over the earth. The concept of stewardship is also connected to the idea of repairing the world, so that Jews are required to leave the world in the same state as it was when they entered it.

0	1	2
---	---	---

‘Jews can only rely on individual reasoning to guide moral conduct.’

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: Good moral conduct: the importance of good moral conduct in Judaism with reference to obedience to God and the mitzvot; and the extent of human freedom and moral responsibility; the place of individual reasoning and decision-making including the principle of pikuach nephesh.

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

Jews identify good moral conduct based on texts, including the Tenakh and the Talmud. While in general the texts of the Torah are taken to be the main source of authority, many of these texts may be seen as contradictory therefore it is only through individual reasoning that Jews can arrive at a moral guide. However, while there are many different sources, they are all based on the mitzvot, as found in the Torah, so many Jews rely on a combination of the mitzvot and individual reasoning.

For many Jews, it is not enough to follow mitzvot without the intention to behave morally. For example, in rabbinical texts there is debate about the need for intention. To have the intention to do good, Jews are using the capacity for individual reasoning. However, in other texts it states that performing mitzvot without intention is still behaving morally and does not require reliance on individual reasoning.

Although there are 613 mitzvot in the Torah, some cannot be followed in the modern world. Jews may have to decide which mitzvot to follow. They may use individual reasoning to decide if there is a case of pikuach nephesh and mitzvot can be ignored. However, there are defined situations in which pikuach nephesh applies. This is still following the mitzvot or following the advice of rabbis, rather than using individual reasoning to behave morally.

0	2	.	1
---	---	---	---

Examine the influence of pluralism on Jewish relations with other faiths.**[10 marks]**

Target: AO1.2: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies.

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.

Some Jews may reject pluralism, and their relations with other faiths are based on that rejection. They consider that the Jews are the chosen people who have a special relationship with God based on the covenants. All other faiths are outside that special relationship. While there may be social dialogue with other faiths in a pluralistic society, they may reject any form of theological dialogue with other faiths because this could be considered inappropriate for the chosen people.

Some Jews believe that in a pluralistic society it is necessary to find not only common ground between faiths but also to engage at a theological level. Relationships with other faiths are influenced by the fact that they do not feel threatened by other faiths, because they see themselves as the chosen people and have a unique relationship with God. These Jews engage with interfaith work, for example the Council of Christian, Muslims and Jews, which sees monotheistic faiths coming together.

Some Jews may reject relations with some other faiths, for example Hinduism, due to their use of images in worship to help them remember and focus on the Ultimate Reality. They may engage with these groups on a social level but not on a theological level. Some others may view the rules about idol worship as only applying to Jews, and therefore not applying to other faiths. This may allow positive relationships with other faiths in a pluralistic society.

0	2	.	2
---	---	---	---

‘Judaism is no longer a source of truth and moral values.’

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 challenge of secularisation including: the replacement of religion as the source of truth and moral values; relegation of religion to the personal sphere; the rise of militant atheism: the view that religion is irrational and a threat to social stability.

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

Traditionally, Judaism was observed and practised within communities. Often, this is no longer the case. For some Jews, Judaism is now largely considered to be a private matter. Some Jews find their own source of truth and moral values, which need not have a religious basis. However, Jewish communities which offer a source of truth and moral values still play an important role in society. Many Jewish children attend Jewish schools, which teach Judaism, and all major religions are recognised in national occasions, for example the coronation of King Charles. This shows that Judaism has not been wholly relegated to the personal sphere.

In recent years militant atheists have gained attention by claiming that science and philosophy show religion to be a bad influence on society. They claim that religions are based on untruths and are the source of social unrest and conflict. They call for people to set religion aside in order to base moral values on secular ethical systems. However, many Jews still find inspiration in their religious texts and teachings, and see social unrest and conflict as human failures to live up to the ideals in the Tenakh. For these Jews, militant atheism is mistaken, and Judaism remains a source of truth and moral values.

Some people claim that Judaism is not based on reason, and is therefore irrational, so cannot act as a source of truth and moral values. People today should instead look to science and secular philosophy to make sense of the world, and to determine how to live well. However, Judaism has a long history of using reason in the development of teachings about the world and moral values, for example in philosophical and ethical debates in the Talmud. Some strands of Judaism today continue to evolve using reason, and therefore Judaism continues to be a rational source of truth and moral values.

0 3 . 1

‘Philosophy cannot support belief in religious sources of authority.’

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 is a range of Jewish views about religious sources of authority. For Jews these may focus on the authority of the Torah, the Talmud and/or rabbis. They may consider God’s authority as controller of all things, or as Father and King.

Philosophy

This can be approached in a variety of ways. For example, philosophy may challenge belief in the existence of God as a source of authority with reference to the weaknesses of arguments for the existence of God, and to the problem of evil. It may also question the role of religious experiences, miracles and the use of religious language in and by sources of authority.

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:

Philosophers may argue that religious sources of authority depend on belief in God who is creator of all things and therefore the source of all authority. Arguments for the existence of God cannot prove the existence of God. The logical and evidential problems of evil further suggest that the God of traditional theism does not exist. However, Jews may argue that although arguments for the existence of God do not constitute proof, they allow that belief in God, and therefore God's authority, is rational. Theodicies and the free will defence also defend belief in God. Therefore, philosophy can support Jewish belief in God as a source of authority.

Philosophy may argue that the Jewish belief in the authority of the Torah has no foundation, because the text contains many examples of miracles, for example the splitting of the Red Sea, which cannot be verified. Science has demonstrated that miracles may have physical or psychological explanations. However, Jews may argue that Swinburne's principles of credulity and testimony suggest that miracles can be accepted as a basis for faith, and thus faith is confirmed for believers. Therefore, philosophy can support belief in the Torah as a source of authority.

Philosophy may argue that the Jewish belief in the authority of religious texts, for example the Tenakh, is unsustainable because the religious language of these texts is largely meaningless. Since much of the Tenakh is neither verifiable nor falsifiable, it cannot convey meaning about the world, and therefore cannot have authority. However, philosophers such as Hare and Wittgenstein have shown that non-cognitive language may be meaningful, or it may be seen as symbolic, as discussed by Tillich, or analogical, as shown by Aquinas. Therefore, philosophy can support belief in religious texts as a source of authority.

0 4 . 1

‘Judaism should reject the truth claims of other religions.’

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

Jewish attitudes to other faiths generally might be informed by the concept of Pluralistic Judaism, Jewish understandings of their role as the chosen people and / or the post holocaust theology of Ignatz Maybaum and Richard Rubenstein.

Philosophy

Philosophy may challenge any religious truth claims by considering the challenges of the verification and falsification principles to the meaningfulness of religious language. Religious truth claims based on religious experiences may be challenged by science or because they cannot be verified. Students may also consider the value of miracles and claims about life after death.

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:

Jews may take a position based on the teachings of Judaism that the Jews are the chosen people with a special relationship with God. Any truth claims which contradict this view must therefore be rejected. However, some others may agree with Wittgenstein that most religious truth claims are better understood as context-specific language games which are meaningful within each religious faith community, and cannot be rejected or accepted outside the context.

Some Jews may argue that those of other faiths may still be united with God through Jewish teachings, for example by being included in the seven laws given to Noah. Any truth claims which contradict this are mistaken and may be rejected. However, this view fails to respect the beliefs of other faiths. Other Jews may recognise the diversity of faiths in society and religious pluralism as a feature of modern secular states, and thus live alongside other faiths without needing to reject or accept their truth claims.

Jews may argue that the teachings found in the Tenakh and the Talmud, including the 613 mitzvot, define God's truth. Therefore, truth claims of other religions which do not agree with these are wrong and must be rejected. However, other Jews may take a pluralist view, that all faiths, including Judaism, have only a partial understanding of the truth. Therefore, no truth claims should be rejected.

0 5 . 1

‘The conscience is the best guide for Jews to make decisions about embryo research.’

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

Jewish responses to issues raised by science with reference to genetic engineering may be considered. There may be reference to Jewish teaching about the sanctity of life and its application to issues concerning the embryo and unborn child.

Ethics

Answers may focus on the value of the conscience as a moral guide, and may refer to differing ideas about the nature of conscience. There may be some consideration of Divine Command Theory. They may also consider normative ethical theories and how they may be applied to embryo research.

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:

Some Jews may take the view that the conscience is the God-given faculty of reason, and therefore is the best guide to any decision making on any subject, including embryo research. In doing so, they may also consider some aspects of Natural Moral Law. However, other Jews may prefer to base decisions on the mitzvot as found in the Torah and the Talmud, seeing them as divine commands from God to be obeyed, and therefore as the best guide for such decisions.

Although it is a Christian ethical theory, some Jews may apply some aspects of Situation Ethics, and view the conscience as the choice to do what agape-love demands in a particular situation. This would make it the best guide because it produces the most loving outcome for decisions about embryo research. However, other Jews may consider that Jewish teaching about the sanctity of life means that any outcome which involves the death of an embryo is unethical, so the conscience may be a poor guide for decisions about embryo research.

Some Jews may see the conscience as the voice of God, so it must be the best guide to decision making about embryo research because it cannot lead a person to do something morally wrong. However, other Jews may argue that scientific research which interferes with something God has created, for example altering the DNA of an embryo, is putting human choices above God's will for that person. If the conscience appears to allow that, it is mistaken, and cannot be a good guide for decisions about embryo research.

0 6 . 1

‘Neither Judaism nor ethical theories deals effectively with issues of animal life and death.’

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 beliefs about stewardship and repairing the world. Jewish responses to issues of animal life and death may be discussed, and there may be reference to teachings about animals from the Torah and Talmud.

Ethics

There may be consideration of the application of Natural Moral Law, Situation Ethics and Virtue Ethics to issues of non-human life and death.

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:

Utilitarianism fails to deal effectively with issues of xenotransplantation because it only considers the happiness of the humans involved and not the animals. Judaism may also not deal effectively with xenotransplantation, especially if the parts come from non-kosher animals and therefore are deemed unable to be used. However, by considering the happiness of humans as more significant than that of animals, Utilitarianism may deal effectively with this issue. When looking at the preservation of life, Judaism may also allow such transplants even if, for example, the parts, such as heart valves, may have come from a pig. This means they deal effectively with issues concerned with xenotransplantation.

Situation Ethics is an ethical system which fails to deal effectively with the use of animals in scientific procedures. Situation Ethics sees scientific procedures on animals as a way to maximise agape-love by saving human lives. This suggests that God's love does not extend to the animals that God created. However, if the concept of agape love or the concept of pikuach nephesh is applied to animals, both Situation Ethics and Jews may consider the most loving outcome of scientific procedures for both animals and humans, so they may deal effectively with this issue.

Neither Judaism nor Virtue Ethics deals effectively with intensive farming. Both would seem to allow intensive farming, however cruel, yet both value the virtue of kindness. Jewish teachings about animals allow the use of animals as food, and Aristotle's Virtue Ethics applies only to humans, because animals are lower on the hierarchy of souls. However, many Jews today see kindness to animals as important and treat food-use animals well. More modern approaches to Virtue Ethics consider humane treatment of animals to be virtuous. Therefore both Judaism and Virtue Ethics do deal effectively with intensive farming.