

# Religious studies

## Answers and commentaries A-level (7062)

### **Component 2E: Study of religion and dialogues: Judaism**

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

# Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

<a href="#">10 mark question (AO1) mark scheme</a>	3
<a href="#">15 mark question (AO2) mark scheme</a>	4
<a href="#">10 mark questions (AO1)</a>	5
<a href="#">15 mark questions (AO2)</a>	15
<a href="#">25 mark questions (AO1 and AO2)</a>	25

## Answers and commentaries

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level Religious Studies Paper 2E Study of Religion and Dialogues: Judaism June 2022 Question paper.

### 10 mark question (AO1) mark scheme

Levels of response: 10 marks A-level – AO1	
<b>Level 5</b> <b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 reference where appropriate.</li> <li>Where appropriate, good knowledge and understanding of the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion is demonstrated.</li> <li>Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4</b> <b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Where appropriate, alternative views and/or scholarly opinion are explained.</li> <li>Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3</b> <b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Where appropriate, there is some familiarity with the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion.</li> <li>Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2</b> <b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion.</li> <li>Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>Level 1</b> <b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development. There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion.</li> <li>• Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No accurate or relevant material to credit.</li> </ul>

## 15 mark question (AO2) mark scheme

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

## 10 mark questions (AO1)

### Question 1.1

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

**[10 marks]**

### Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 3 for levels of response](#).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain different views.

## Student responses

## Response A

Judaism emphasises the importance of marriage. According to orthodox Judaism, before a couple get married, ~~then~~ both the husband and wife must show their parents Ketubah, a marriage document, to prove they're Jewish. Additionally, a marriage takes place under a chuppah, which is like a canopy, where blessings are recited. Then the husband stamps on ~~glass~~ glass which symbolises that husband and wife are now officially married. According to Jewish law, man and woman are not allowed to live together until marriage, they also aren't allowed to touch each other until marriage in any sort of way, this concept is known as Shomer Negia. For an orthodox Jewish wedding to take place, both ~~man and~~ husband and wife must be Jewish according to Halacha, Jewish law, therefore, both of their mothers must be Jewish.

However, conservative Judaism doesn't accept Divine authority of the Torah, as they believe the Torah was written by man. Conservative Judaism accept Jews of patrilineal descent, therefore, they would allow a Jewish wedding for two people who wouldn't be considered Jewish according to Jewish law. ~~But they~~ Conservative Judaism also promote egalitarianism, they believe that because the role of women has changed in society, Judaism must follow. Therefore, conservative Judaism would allow a female rabbi to conduct a wedding ceremony.

Similarly, progressive Judaism also doesn't accept Divine authority of the Torah, and believes that the Torah evolved out of other cultures and religions. Progressive Judaism advocates for social justice, for example, in the case of marriage, progressive Judaism would allow for same-sex marriages in a progressive synagogue.

However, same-sex ~~sex~~ marriage would be prohibited by orthodox Judaism on the grounds that ~~that~~ the act of homosexual relations is forbidden according to Jewish law.

### This is a Level 3 response

Knowledge and critical understanding is generally accurate and relevant with some development in this response. The answer includes reasons why there are different views with each paragraph beginning with a reason for the views of one group of Jews, although it does also include some unnecessary descriptive material that is not addressing the question set. The response includes accurate use of terminology, but it lacks the development in breadth and depth required to move up to Level 4.

**6 marks**

## Response B

Celibacy is one uses protection when having sexual relations with their partner. This is to stop the growth of a fetus from occurring. In Orthodox Judaism this would not be allowed as in Bereishit it says "to go forth and multiply." One of our purposes on this earth is to produce another generation of children of G-d. There are some exceptions in Judaism where if it causes harm to the woman to have a child then it is ok to refrain from having one. The other sectors of Judaism for example progressive have different views and think that celibacy is allowed because it is their own body and can choose what they want to do with it. Progressive Judaism is a very feminist section believing men and women are equal so a woman can refrain from ~~the~~ having a baby just as a man can stop doing something he doesn't want to. Which would contrast with Orthodox as there are some things that women are made by G-d to fulfil his purpose and "multiply". Reform Judaism is also agreeing with progressive as women can do whatever they want depending on the circumstances.

When it comes to marriage, G-d put people on this earth to fulfil his purpose where that would be ~~to~~ to have children and the only way to do that in Judaism is to get married. However if someone doesn't want to have children but still get married it will be a problem because it is still fulfilling a big mitzvah of G-d but it is not complete. There are many examples in the Torah where many great people were married for many, many years without children. When one gets married it is said that "your name becomes one"



and you become connected in many ways where the man and woman have to take care of each other and support one another through everything, no matter what. Under the chuppah is where you sign a ketubah meaning an agreement into everything that will happen once you are married in the name of g-d where you both sign it and with the help of rabbanim.

In progressive Judaism, there may be a different take on this that one's purpose in life isn't to marry and settle down to have children which orthodox do comply with but to live your life in a way g-d will still be proud of you and still fulfilling your purpose even if it isn't exactly marriage and children. They believe you have to stop working and be a stay at home wife and mother just because it's the typical 'norm' in Judaism but they don't want this to stop them from doing what they want in life. Reform also takes a similar view on the equality of men and women and don't think it's necessary just for the sake of it even if it is fulfilling g-d's purpose for us, there is more than one.

### This is a Level 2 response

The answer includes limited development through examples about marriage. Since it does not address the reasons why there are different views the limit of Level 2 is applied. The paragraph on celibacy is incorrect and is ignored; the response would require further development in depth or breadth to move into Level 3.

**3 marks**

## Question 2.1

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

[10 marks]

### Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 3 for levels of response](#).

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

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

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

### Ignatz Maybaum

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

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

### Richard Rubenstein

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

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

## Student responses

## Response A

Post Holocaust theology is the ongoing discussion about the Holocaust and God's role in it and the universe as a whole. This is because as a ~~result~~ <sup>result</sup> of the Holocaust occurring, many religious <sup>and</sup> philosophical people have started to examine God's ~~the~~ participation in this world.

Ignatz Maybaum stated that through vicarious atonement, the death of the European Jews was to atone for the rest of the world's sins. The Jews are God's chosen people and so through His people, God is communicating with the world. Maybaum constructed the idea of 'the suffering servant', by this he meant that the Jews purpose in this world is to relay messages from God to the rest of the world. Jews suffer the sins of everyone else including the wicked. It is through this suffering that everyone else examines their role in this world and all other cultures and religions start to re-evaluate ~~the~~ everything. Therefore, Ignatz Maybaum views the Holocaust as the Jews fulfilling their role in this world by suffering for the sins of everyone else.

Richard Rubenstein stated that the only intellectual response to the Holocaust is to conclude that there is no concept of our God, nor his divine plan and anything else related to him. Rubenstein states that ever since the Holocaust occurred, the Jews connection and relationship with the God who made the covenant with Abraham, is over. He states that we are now alone in this world and life is meaningless, and so us as humans must make for ourselves our own meaning and value of work. He states this because he cannot fathom the idea that an omniscient, omnipotent and omnibenevolent God would allow such a disgraceful human based event to occur to His own people. Instead, Rubenstein stated that as humans must only rely on ourselves. He ~~also~~ stated that there is no longer any point in giving Tzedakah, praying for someone to get better, etc. Therefore, Richard Rubenstein's view is that the Holocaust was a terrible, inhuman, human originated event in history that never should have occurred.

**This is a Level 5 response**

This is a clear, detailed response demonstrating knowledge and critical understanding that is accurate, relevant, and fully developed in both depth and breadth, meeting the requirements of Level 5. The content is presented in a way that is clear and coherent, although this could be improved at times, so the answer is awarded 9 rather than 10 marks within the Level 5 band.

**9 marks**

## Response B

~~02-1~~ Rubenstein created the death of God theology. He believed after the death camps it was impossible to believe in a supernatural being. Instead he believed God caused the Holocaust as punishment for not accepting Christ and so sinning against God for that long. Rubenstein therefore believed we live in a kind of the death of Christ where the thread between man and God has been broken by sin pushing God away. Instead now God is part of nature, He is the ocean and we are the waves, we can grow and become almost our own entity but never fully and only momentarily. Thus the God we know is dead and instead God is in nature, worship therefore has lost its meaning ~~but~~ meaning can still be found in rituals such as sacrifice according to Rubenstein. He wanted to reintroduce sacrifice as a way of releasing destructive energy <sup>and</sup> remember Jews as the sacrifice of the Nazis. ~~and~~

Rubenstein was a conservative Jew but his theory leads into mystical realms of God in nature <sup>leading to many</sup> and ~~a~~ <sup>worshipping</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> nature which never happened. It takes away from many aspects of God and proves him not worthy of worship. It never really fully justifies the need to reinstate sacrifice, all significant ideas on why Jews reject Rubenstein's theory on post Holocaust theology.

Maybaum believed the Jews had experienced three main catastrophes in their time, each of which had a silver lining, a positive outcome to be found. The destruction of the 1<sup>st</sup> temple which led to diaspora and the spreading of the word, the destruction of the second temple which led to the formation of the rabbinic tradition and synagogue worship and the Holocaust which Maybaum describes as a sacrificial to cleanse the world. Maybaum believes God use Hitler to ~~kill~~ kill the Jews as innocent sacrificial victims ~~to~~ as Jesus' did to cleanse the world of its sin. He compares the gas chambers to Golgotha and speaks of a new start.

However, this Hoang leaves <sup>God's</sup> ~~the~~ chosen people with a new meaning that doesn't seem in line with his benevolent character. It also compares Jesus, I mean ~~Jesus~~ who is God incarnate who voluntarily died to redeem the ~~the~~ original sin and sin of people to bring men women and children who forcibly were gas to death. This can be also seen as devaluing Jewish people; a significant ~~new~~ point for Jews to take into ~~their~~ account.

### This is a Level 3 response

Knowledge and critical understanding here is generally accurate and relevant. There is familiarity with scholars but the ideas are not fully explained, therefore it cannot reach Level 4. The use of appropriate vocabulary is reasonable with organisation of ideas within the answer.

**5 marks**

## 15 mark questions (AO2)

### Question 1.2

'Jews cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.'

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

### Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 4 for levels of response](#).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Student responses

## Response A

Jewish texts advocate for peace. They see that any mass destruction cannot be used. Any form must be avoided to the last possible moment. If a threat of war takes place, Jewish people are obliged to make peace before any form of war. This is because there is a belief that killing a person is like killing the world. It's clear that Jews cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.

~~How~~ But, in some cases it can be justified. In the Tenach, texts have indicated some permissible wars. Michalment Mitzvah is a war commanded by God. For example, Jews are commanded to kill any descendants of Amalek. So, if a threat of Amalek was present, Jews are obliged to use weapons of mass destruction to kill all. To add, other wars are permissible, such as using a war as self defense. For example, the Maccabees fought the Hellenists as self defense. They were obliged to do so, as it was an act of self defense. Another binding law is those that are commanded by the Sanhedrin. Therefore, it's clear that Jews can justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.

On the other hand, Judaism advocates for the sanctity of life. All human life is precious - we are all made in the image of God. Jewish belief promotes morality to the highest level, where all laws are put to the side in order to



Save a life, pikuach nefesh. If this is so prominent, then even the thought of war is out of the question, so Jews cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.

In summary, it's ~~total~~ <sup>clear</sup> that Jews cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction due to such importance of peace and sanctity of life. The theme of peace is found throughout prayers where Jews pray for peace all around the world ~~in~~ we in Oseh Shalom. To add, sanctity of life is found a lot too, even to the extent of animals and plants; animals deserve kindness, and the belief that fruit trees should never be cut down. Jews have the obligation to take care of God's creation, and advocating for the opposite is illogical. Jews have to take care of the world through the law of Tikkun Olam, so ~~is~~ Jews cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction, due to the importance of Stewardship, and peaceful relations.

#### This is a Level 4 response

This is a well-focused response and different views are discussed in relation to the statement from the question. In the conclusion there is evaluation of the strength of those views, although it is not fully supported by the reasoning. There is some critical analysis but this could be developed throughout the answer to make it a fuller evaluation and more perceptive discussion.

11 marks

## Response B

Judaism has many laws about what can and can't be done in war. There are three types of war in Jewish thought, *Milchemet Mitzvah* is a war commanded by G-d, for example, a war against Amalek or to conquer Israel. ~~*Milchemet Reshut* is a war of self-defence, for ex~~ *Milchemet Reshut* is an optional war, these wars had to be approved by the Sanhedrin, for example, wars fought by King David ~~were~~ were permitted by the Sanhedrin. The third type of war in Jewish thought is *Reief* ~~and~~ and this is a war of self-defence. Judaism has specific rules on weapons of mass destruction and says that they can never be justified.

Judaism differentiates combatants and non-combatants. There must be an attempt to make peace because if a battle commences without peace, this is most probably unlawful. Furthermore, non-combatants must be given a chance to leave the area before the battle starts. However, some authorities say, if civilians choose to stay in a place where a battle is ~~starting~~ knowingly about to start, they lose their protection. The reason for these rules is because Judaism believes the death of innocent civilians and non-combatants is abhorrent. The Talmud goes even further and says that it prohibits the waging of war in a situation where the casualty rate exceeds a sixth of the population. Therefore, the use of weapons of mass destruction can never be justified because human life is sacred, we were all created in the image of G-d, so life is G-d given and only G-d can take it away.

Furthermore, the Torah also instructs that fruit trees are not allowed to be cut down and natural habitat can't be destroyed. Fruit trees are very symbolic in Judaism, for example, Adam ate from the fruit tree when he was told

not to' by G-d. Weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear weapons would never be allowed according to Jewish law because they cause mass destruction to civilian life as well as the planet. However, it is justifiable to own nuclear weapons and threaten the use of them to ~~not~~ adopt a ~~policy~~ military strategy and deter a war from happening.

Judaism promotes the idea of Tikkun Olam, the idea that we have a responsibility to repair the world. However, the use of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction totally contradicts what Judaism is all about. ~~It~~ G-d created the world for people to live in it, but by using weapons of mass destruction that's getting rid of masses of people and contrary to Divine will. A prominent idea in Judaism is ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ "love your neighbour as you love yourself". This means we should love and respect each other.

In conclusion, there are no circumstances where Jews would be able to justify the use of weapons of mass destruction as they are contrary to Divine will and deny G-d ~~as~~ as creator of all that exists.

### This is a Level 3 response

This is a general response with one strong view which agrees with the statement. There is some material on an alternative view at the beginning of the answer which just moves it into Level 3 based on the criteria set out in the levels of response. The answer lacks the critical analysis required by the higher levels, and contains more discursive than evaluative content.

7 marks

## Question 2.2

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

Evaluate this claim.

**[15 marks]**

## Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 4 for levels of response](#).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Student responses

## Response A

The Talmud is the *minhag* and *Gemara* which involves the wisdom of *Yehuda ha-Nasi* and his students. The Talmud was believed to have come from Mount Sinai where God told Moses how *Torah* was used. It was known as the oral law. It was orally passed down to each generation from father to son. It is written in prayers like the *Shema* to 'teach your children, when you are sitting at home and when you go to bed and get up'. It is clear that passing on beliefs to the next generation is vital in Judaism. So it's clear that the Talmud is a very important source of authority for Jews.

But, in the Babylonian period, the oral law was written down as the Talmud. Due to this, progressive Jews do not see importance of the Talmud and dismiss it as authority. Progressive Judaism would see the Talmud as a product of that generation's views and is disregarded of any authority. Progressive Jews would only see their Rabbis as a very important source of authority as their wisdom is the only regarded authority that is kept. So for progressive Jews, the Talmud is not a very important source of authority for them as it's disregarded as only relevant to the people in the generation it was written in.

~~In~~ However, in other demonstrations of Judaism, this is not the case. In Orthodox Judaism, all of the Talmud is binding and eternally relevant. Some may argue it's the most important source of authority as it's used as a foundational basis of any debate of Jewish law. Orthodox Jews use the Talmud as a guide for understanding Judaism. For example, the idea of *tehilim* is found in the Tenach which is an object used in some prayers - without the guidance of the Talmud, Jews would likely not understand a lot of observed traditions. Another example is found in Sukkot which is one of the tree foot festivals. The Tenach states that people should live in a *sukkah* during the festivals. The Tenach does not give explicit details on what a *sukkah* is. Some may interpret as a caravan, or a tent, or a gazebo. With the guidance of the Talmud, Jews are able to understand this command properly where specific details are given, like the dimensions and how you should be able to see the stars at night through the roof. So, for Orthodox Jews, the Talmud is a very important source of authority.

In conclusion, the Talmud is a very important source of authority for Orthodox Jews, but not progressives. Its highlighted importance is subjective dependant on which community they're in. For Orthodox, the Talmud is eternally binding, but for Progressive, the Talmud is a product of views

from a specific generation, so really, it's unclear as the statement is not universal for all Jews due to its conflicting ideas of its authoritative status.

**This is a Level 4 response**

This is a well-focused response, with two clear views on the statement in the question and some critical analysis. The evaluation of the argument is found in the conclusion; and a small amount in the paragraph about progressive Jews. It does not reach a Level 5 because the evaluation is not fully supported by the reasoning, which could have been achieved by evaluating further throughout the answer.

**12 marks**

## Response B

The Talmud is a big and useful source of authority used by millions of Jews to gain knowledge and understanding of their past and how they should maintain of Jewish background doing the correct things throughout the day and the rest of their lives.

However the Talmud does come from the Tanach which ~~is~~ ~~the~~ contains three things, one being the Torah that the Jewish people received on Har Sinai within it is the five books of Moses, telling us all the stories and events that came on from the beginning of creation to the beginning of the exile from the destruction of the first Temple. (Second). Then is the Nevi'im which is all the books about the prophets and the Ketuvim which is translated as writings e.g. the Megillot we read on different festivals. Only now does the Talmud come in with the Gemara and Mishna books which make up the Talmud, which come from the Babylonian Talmud. The Talmud is a good authority source used by Jews because its giving us information about many years ago about the Babylonian era and is a good way for people to learn and grow on their knowledge and understanding of a more in-depth way of looking at Judaism in a new light other than the Torah, the 10 commandments and the 613 mitzvot. ~~needed~~ to be complete to be a Jew.



However the Talmud has been proven to be outdated as it is written and had gotten all its information from a very long time ago. The Gemara and the Mishnah has both been proven as one of the hardest books in Judaism to look through and learn, even today many don't learn Gemara because it's just not necessary or it's just too hard for one to comprehend. The Tanach, including Torah, Nevi'im and Ketuvim are a much more preferred source of authority because it is easier to understand and used more on a daily basis where even you can learn the stories of their own ancestors which is way easier than understanding the Talmud.

In conclusion the Talmud is still a very important source of authority and every should still follow and try to learn from it, however there is an easier route to just follow and learn the Tanach and Torah which is a more updated version of the Talmud.

### This is a Level 2 response

This is a limited response to the issue raised; it contains one argument in favour of the statement in the conclusion, which means it just meets the criteria for Level 2. While there is a lot of information about the Talmud and the Torah in this answer, it is only occasionally focused on the question that the Talmud is a very important source of authority. The answer is more AO1 than AO2. The answer includes comparison of the authority of the Talmud with that of the Torah, which does not answer the question; it would need more focus on the set question to move into Level 3.

**4 marks**

## 25 mark questions (AO1 and AO2)

### Question 3.1

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

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

**[25 marks]**

### Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 3 for levels of response for AO1](#) and [page 4 for levels of response for AO2](#).

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

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

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

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

## AO1

### Judaism

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

### Philosophy

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

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

## AO2

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

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

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

Student responses

Response A

Plato realm of forms → reincarnation - mystic → soul perfection  
 Aristotle Physicalist → functionalist → dead Hicke replica theory. <sup>orthodox - no cremation</sup> resurrection judgement day  
 Descartes sub dualist → dream like state - sheet → Return <sup>of</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>body</sup> <sup>to</sup> <sup>life</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>after</sup> <sup>life</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>the</sup>  <sup>Garden of Eden.</sup>  
 ↳ NDE's (proof). <sup>low of forgetfulness</sup> <sup>Primo-Judaic</sup> <sup>maximiser</sup> <sup>bring up soul.</sup>

Hicke - soul making - evil - bad on this world made up by God

Kierkegaard - faith goes further than reason - leap of faith.

Rel. lang. meaningless non cog verification  
 But Eschatological verification says.

Conc:

03.1 The Tenakh says very little about Jewish life after death leaving it open to great discussion and interpretation and thus plethora of views. Some Jews will relate to philosophical arguments, others will say they don't need arguments as faith is more powerful than reason making the arguments irrelevant.

For example mystic Jews such as Kabbalistic Jews, may believe in resurrection for soul perfection to be with God just like Plato's realm of the forms, the soul moves from person to person after death to achieve perfection to go back to realm of the forms and be with God. This is a very similar argument ~~pro~~ proving a relevance ~~of~~ ~~of~~ philosophical to Jewish beliefs about life after death.

Many Jews also believe ~~that~~ that when you die you lie in the ground until judgement day when God will <sup>physically</sup> raise you ~~the~~ for eternal life ~~of~~ with God in the Garden of Eden or for damnation in Gehennom. This more like Aristotle, they believe in physicalism and this sort of life after death analogy

be achieved by Hick's replica theory; God's omnipotence is able to build an exact replica of you for the messianic age when the messiah has come and brought peace to all nations and bring's about judgement day. This is why orthodox won't do organ donation or be cremated so their body is intact <sup>physical body</sup> for a resurrection. Again philosophical argument is relevant.

Other Jews, such as reform, may take a more substance dualist approach like Descartes where the body and soul are two separate entities where the soul can exist without a body. Near death experiences are often proof of this and show a continuation of the self in a dream like state of sleep, the law of forgetfulness. This is referred to in the Talmud when Pinchas Pincus calls a medium ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> ~~en~~ to call up the dead souls to see if he will be favourable in a battle. Saul says 'why have you waken me to bring me up?' suggesting a place on nothingness for a continued existence after death in the bones of the earth. Descartes a philosopher, making a point which can be relevantly applied to Jewish beliefs.

Hick's soul making theory claims the evil in this world, a big philosophical problem with relation to God, is actually character building and soul making - not Augustine's view of soul deciding. Thus, Hick doesn't try to solve the evidential problem of evil but says a just God will reward all in the end; logical leading to a life after death due to the evidential and logical problem of evil in this world. This philosophical view supports the Jewish belief that death isn't the end and comforts them in that whatever suffering they endure in this world, everything will be made right in the end.

Philosophy may argue that Jewish beliefs about life after death are irrelevant to them as they are meaningless. Moltz schlick ~~and~~ and Al Ayer argue that if something cannot be verified in principle or in practice then it is none cognitive and so meaningless. All views about life after death are pure speculation on something we cannot prove or even imagine a rational one (sub).

However, it can be argued that it can be verified eschatologically, in end times, after death. This means when we die it can be verified in practice and in principle we can verify it making talking about life after death cognitive and meaningful and so relevant.

In conclusion, philosophical arguments can provide reason and logic to religious beliefs and so make a belief that a proposition is true more reasonable but Jews believe in a life after death and so that requires faith. Reason can only go so far but a 'leap of faith' (Kierkegaard) is required for ~~more~~ faith which takes you further. Thus philosophical beliefs about a Jewish life after death can be relevant but not important to the Jews and not affect their decision.

#### This is a Level 4 response for both AO1 and AO2

The AO1 in this answer covers both Philosophy and Judaism with connections drawn between. There is development in both depth and breadth and some use of textual references. It is well-focused and there are clearly two views on the statement expressed. The conclusion evaluates the strength of the arguments so is supported by the reasoning.

**18 marks (AO1: 7 marks and AO2: 11 marks)**

## Response B

Plato believed that the soul and mind / body are separate so when one ~~dies~~ <sup>dies</sup> the body goes with it but the soul lives on. ~~Thus agreeing with~~ Thus agreeing with the Jewish belief on life after death.

There are three things that make up a soul + according to Plato. Firstly is the desire for food and drink to keep healthy. Secondly is the sexual desire to be able to live and reproduce and lastly would be our own thoughts we gained through experiences. The first one is the silly one that dies with the ~~soul~~ <sup>body</sup>. The next live on with the soul as the id can still function on those two things.

This also leads on to what is false and what is real. There were two men in a cave and fire had shown a shadow onto the wall, the two men believed it was ~~the~~ real because they hadn't seen anything else or different when one of men got out of the cave, he realised it wasn't real but only real in his mind and now he knows from experience that it was false.

Life after death where the soul goes after it dies is where G-d will judge us according to what we did throughout our life with our body and soul connected. There is something called the kingdom of ends which is where you're the king and you would treat your

people the way you would want to be treated. This is why philosophical arguments are relevant to Jewish beliefs because we believe everyone should be treated equally but fairly even in the afterlife and with the kingdom of ends where the king would do everything it can to keep the peace in the land just like G-d would try to succeed in the afterlife.

In conclusion this is a positive dialogue because it does correspond to both philosophical and Jewish beliefs. But there are some doubts where one wouldn't know the difference between imagination and reality.

\* A person can not know something like what is real and reality when it comes down to doubt because they don't know if they thought they had was real, they know they had a thought and that appeared in their mind but we're looking for more. There is also the argument of invisibility and divisibility.

### This is a Level 2 response for both AO1 and AO2

This answer includes both philosophical content and relevant Judaism content, with limited knowledge and understanding shown. The arguments presented for AO2 are not all related to the question, so it lacks focus. There is only one view expressed in relation to the statement and so Level 3 criteria cannot be met.

**10 marks (AO1: 4 marks and AO2: 6 marks)**



## Question 4.1

'The beliefs of all religions are equally valid.'

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

[25 marks]

## Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 3 for levels of response for AO1](#) and [page 4 for levels of response for AO2](#).

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

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

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

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

## AO1

### Judaism

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

### Philosophy

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

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

## AO2

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

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

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

## Student response

Throughout history, there has been a worldwide view that only one individual religion is correct, and the others are all wrong. For example, in Spain the Roman period, people were forcefully converted or sent to death. Truth claims have been pushed onto others due to superiority of their beliefs.

In Judaism, there are many approaches towards truth claims of other religions, where some are optimistic and some are pessimistic. Maimonides saw that all Abrahamic religions are valuable, as they promote the values of Judaism such as monotheism of worshipping one god, ~~or~~ upholding a spiritual life through keeping ritual monotheism. Maimonides saw that all are a part of the divine plan, but we all have our own role. For non-Jewish people, they keep the 7 Noahide laws like not committing adultery. For Jews, they keep the 613 commandments of God for in Torah.

In the book 'Dignity of Difference', Rabbi Lord Sacks wrote that 'no religion has a monopoly on truth claims'. The edition of this quote comment was frowned upon in Jewish circles where people were asked to burn the book. Lord Sacks was asked to 'reflect' on his 'absurd' comment. In a later edition of 'Dignity of Difference' his view on truth claims was revised as 'only Judaism has a monopoly on truth claims'. This view is similar to a biblical approach in Judaism. A passage is written where Yehuda H'Levi goes around telling kings that only Judaism is correct. It's clear that Judaism does not see all truth claims as equally valid.

But, the belief on Lord Sacks is a different approach taken on by his university of Cambridge teacher, Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein saw that non-cognitive does have meaning through the analogy of language games. All truth claims of religion are different and unique to each other like Christians view of the holy trinity. Each belief has its own sets of rules which only apply to that truth claim. So according to Wittgenstein, the beliefs of all religions are equally valid as they all possess their own meaning due to the social context of it.

To add, the idea that truth claims are equally valid is supported by Hare. Hare saw we all hold beliefs called 'blik's which have meaning. They can only be understood to those who have blik's. For Christians, they hold a 'blik' that Jesus was the son of God, born through the virgin Mary. For the Jewish people, they hold a 'blik' that God created the world in 6 days and used the last day as rest, which is observed as Shabbat. No matter what, blik's are unchangeable beliefs. Hare used the parable of a Lunatic to support this. A Lunatic believes that all his university professors are plotting to kill him, no matter what evidence is put forward, the Lunatic does not change their mind. This too is applied to truth claims where Hare would argue that beliefs of all religions are equally valid.

As well, this is supported by Braithwaite. He saw that all truth claims are correct, where religions have just interpreted a denominator differently. With God, Jewish people see God as Hashem, Christians see God as Paul and Islam sees God as Mohamed. They all differ in inferences.

but have the same common denominator" of a monotheistic god. So, all religions are valid as they are truly promoting the same idea.

But, some philosophers may take a ~~similar~~ <sup>differing</sup> approach. ~~to Yehuda H'Levi~~ Logical positivists may dismiss all truth claims as religion does not come under scientific language. Truth claims are non-cognitive, so it would be argued to have no value at all. Ayer saw only empirically proven language is valid, where language is analytic by definition, or synthetic through empirical evidence. Using the idea of Ayer, no religious beliefs are valid as they do not hold an empirical value due to claims being metaphysical.

In some cases, Judaism and philosophy to coincide with truth claims especially with the studies of more modern thinkers such as Lord Sacks and Wittgenstein. As many arguments over power counter arguments such as beliefs of Yehuda H'Levi, it's clear that accepting other truth claims is a clearer argument. So, the beliefs of all religions are equally valid.

#### This is a AO1 Level 4 response and AO2 Level 5 response

The AO1 reaches Level 4 because it is mostly accurate and relevant, although some points are not fully related to the question. It uses both philosophical and Jewish scholars, explaining their response to the question, although not always fully developing them. The extent of examples means this is a Level 4 and not a Level 3, but it does not reach Level 5 because each point is not fully developed in breadth and depth, so scores a Level 4, 8 marks. The AO2 reaches Level 5. There is not only evaluation at the end in the conclusion, but evaluation throughout the answer, assessing the strength of each of the arguments. This lifts the answer to Level 5. However, while there is perceptive discussion of different views, the answer is not always tightly focused on the question so reaches the bottom of Level 5, 13 marks. The two incorrect examples of Paul and Muhammad are ignored, but the point that they are exemplifying are valid and therefore contribute to the AO2 mark.

**21 marks (AO1: 8 marks and AO2: 13 marks)**

## Question 5.1

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

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

[25 marks]

## Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 3 for levels of response for AO1](#) and [page 4 for levels of response for AO2](#).

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

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

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

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

## AO1

### Judaism

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

### Ethics

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

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

## AO2

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

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

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

## Student responses

Bentham's way of making moral decisions is compatible with Jewish ethics. Bentham's act utilitarianism states that one must "increase the <sup>happiness</sup> ~~goodness~~ for the greatest number" of people. This means that ~~a~~ ~~decision~~ decision to act is considered moral if it will result in the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people. Act utilitarianism states that it doesn't matter what the action is or what the motivation is, so long as it increases happiness for as many people as possible. Bentham is ~~is~~ pointing out that happiness should be the deciding factor of a moral action ~~as~~ as it is the most basic, primal thing that everyone seeks.

Jewish ethics works very similarly to Bentham's act utilitarianism when regarding the Messiah. The Maharal states that there will be a catalytic war where the evil will perish and those worthy will survive, at which point the Messiah will allot ~~portions~~ ~~everyone~~ portions of the land of Israel according to the denominations of the 12 tribes. The Jews will return to their land of Israel and live in harmony with God and Messiah. ~~The~~ The idea of the Messiah's arrival is very well thought out, ~~is~~ studied and something that Jews are praying for every day. The Maharal goes on to say "they shall do for themselves" what the Messiah will do for us. By this, Maharal is stating that the Jews should voluntarily ingather themselves to the land of Israel in order to prepare for Messiah and prevent the Catalytic wars. As a result, Jews have taken this decision seriously ~~and~~ and have moved to Israel already. Regardless of who is currently residing in Israel, the Jews have taken Maharal's words to be a serious moral decision and have moved to Israel. This is compatible with Bentham's act utilitarianism as it doesn't matter about anything else other than increasing the Jews happiness by moving to Israel to look forward to Messiah's arrival.



However, it can be argued that Jewish ethics is not compatible with Bentham's way of making moral decisions and vice versa because Bentham's act utilitarianism specifically states it does not matter what the motivation and action is, the only thing that is important is increasing happiness for the greatest number of people. However, in Judaism it seems to be that the motivation and action of moral decision making are very important as well. For example, within Judaism, you must "love your neighbour as you love yourself". This means that one must act with respect and dignity towards other people with the aim of maintaining peace and prosperity. Within Judaism it is considered that everyone is made "in the image of God" and everyone has as well as everyone having a soul and so everyone must be treated kindly and as special and unique. No one person is more special than another and so it would not be permissible to kill one person to give their organs to 5 people. According to act utilitarianism, this would be permitted, however Judaism would disagree.

Another way in which Jewish ethics is not compatible with Bentham's way of making moral decisions is compatible with Jewish ethics is due to the fact that Jewish ethics is partly deontological, character-based and teleological but not according to Bentham's utilitarianism. Jewish ethics may be considered deontological since within Judaism, Jews must 'blindly' obey God's rules, the 613 mitzvot, the 10 commandments, the Tabernacle and so on. There is great emphasis within Judaism that if someone breaks any rules they will be punished, for example by stoning to death. This shows how it is not about the Jew's character, nor is it about what they are striving for, rather they must simply follow the rules. However some could also say that Judaism is character based as we do things in order to develop our character and become virtuous people. This means that our soul will build a closer and stronger spiritual connection to God and so we will become greater, more holy people. This represents Jewish ethics as being based off our soul and how to become closer connected to

God by ~~the~~ partaking in his commandments. ~~the~~ Lastly, ~~the~~ Jewish ethics can be seen as teleological however not in the context of Bentham's utilitarianism. This is because rather than doing things in order to create happiness for most people possible, Jews do things in order to reach the desired eternal location; Gan Eden / Heaven. The physical world is considered like a lobby to the next world, where we must do things and don't do things in order to reach Olam Haba. Therefore, ~~Jewish ethics is not utilitarian~~ Bentham's way of making moral decisions is <sup>only</sup> not compatible with Jewish ethics as Jewish ethics seems to be partly deontological, teleological and character-based as well.

Bentham's way of making moral decisions is compatible with Jewish ethics as there is a very important idea within Judaism. It is the idea that one must "love your neighbour as you love yourself". This is the idea that one must always act kindly and help others achieve their own happiness as well as your own. This is based on the idea that every Jew is special as we all ~~are~~ came from Adam, as well as all of our souls being present when we were given the Torah at Mount Sinai. As a result of this, one must act with dignity, respect and love towards each other as we ~~are~~ are all God's children and are all special. This links with Bentham's idea that we should try to increase the love for as many people as possible, as everyone has equal right to be treated well.

In conclusion, Bentham's way of making moral decisions is compatible with Jewish ethics. However Jewish ethics is not only limited to Bentham's teleological utilitarianism. Jewish ethics is also composed of character-based theories as well as deontological and other teleological theories.

**This is an AO1 Level 5 response and AO2 Level 4 response**

The AO1 of this answer reaches Level 5 as it is detailed and thorough, covering Bentham's ethics in detail and several different ways that Jewish ethics can be defined. Judaism and Bentham are compared and contrasted throughout the answer and there are specific examples supporting each element of the answer. The AO2 reaches Level 4. There are several different views on the statement, each of which is fully developed. There is evaluation at points throughout the answer, including comparisons between Bentham and Judaism, that takes the answer to the top of Level 4. It does not reach a Level 5 as although there is some critical analysis of the arguments, it is not consistent. The AO2 receives 12 marks.

**21 marks (AO1: 9 marks and AO2: 12 marks)**

## Question 6.1

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

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

[25 marks]

## Mark scheme

Please refer to mark scheme on [page 3 for levels of response for AO1](#) and [page 4 for levels of response for AO2](#).

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

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

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

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

## AO1

### Judaism

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

### Ethics

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

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

## AO2

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

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

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

## Student response

Kant's decision making argument is a deontological argument based on moral laws and rules or ultimately based on duty to themselves and others. He comes with an imperative to go with his way of decision making morally. It is the conformity of what is morally right. He also comes up with a hypothetical imperative to understand the way we will make these decisions.

He believes that person is not a means to an end nor humans be treated that way but an end of their own selves which will help them to develop into a stronger person with the ability to make thoughtful choices.

~~There is some reasons why someone~~  
~~Any adult person it comes to making~~  
~~choices. When it comes to doubt, a person~~  
~~can know that they're thinking~~  
 when it comes to lying and Judaism one may only do it if it saving another's life and if it is an absolute necessity.

This a positive dialogue because it does correlate lying to ethics and Judaism when lying they're thought process behind it which should be thought about before doing the wrong doing. There is also an aspect that it is a negative dialogue because in spite of laws in Judaism lying would be not allowed when in ethics you just have to think before you make that decision. Thinking is it a morally right decision following along with Judaism as well.

**This is an AO1 Level 2 response and AO2 Level 2 response**

The AO1 for the answer just reaches a Level 2. There is some accurate information about Kant and a correct statement about Jewish ethics and lying which makes it 'limited' rather than 'isolated', so is awarded a Level 2, 3 marks. The AO2 also just reaches Level 2 as it presents a point of view on the statement in the question with some evidence, and therefore is awarded 4 marks.

**7 marks (AO1: 2 marks and AO2: 4 marks)**

# Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at [aqa.org.uk/7062](https://aqa.org.uk/7062)

You can talk directly to the Religious Studies subject team

E: [religiousstudies@aqa.org.uk](mailto:religiousstudies@aqa.org.uk)

T: **0161 957 3881**

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

