

Cambridge International AS & A Level

BIBLICAL STUDIES**9484/42**

Paper 4 Christian Understandings of God, Life and the Universe

October/November 2024

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **10** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range (where middle marks are available).
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

Annotation:

- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Assessment objectives**AO1 Knowledge and understanding**

Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of specified texts and Christian teachings, beliefs and practices as recorded in the Bible.

AO2 Analysis and evaluation

Analyse, evaluate and discuss evidence, points of view and issues in Christianity.

Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks)

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response for **Questions 1, 2 and 3**.

Level	Description	Marks
Level 4	Detailed accurate knowledge with good understanding • Uses a range of detailed, accurate and relevant knowledge. • Demonstrates understanding through a well-developed response. • Fully addresses the question. • Good understanding of the context, if relevant.	9–10
Level 3	Mostly accurate knowledge with some understanding • Uses a range of mostly accurate and relevant knowledge. • Demonstrates understanding through a developed response. • Addresses most aspects of the question. • Some engagement with the context, if relevant.	6–8
Level 2	Partially accurate knowledge with limited understanding • Uses a range of knowledge which may be partially accurate. • Demonstrates limited understanding through a partially developed response. • Attempts to address the question. • Attempts to engage with the context, if relevant.	3–5
Level 1	Limited knowledge and basic understanding • Identifies a limited range of knowledge which may not be accurate. • Demonstrates basic understanding through a limited response. • Response is relevant to the topic, but does not directly address the question. • Little or no reference to the context, if relevant.	1–2
Level 0	No relevant material to credit.	0

Table B: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 marks)

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response for **Questions 1, 2 and 3**.

Level	Description	Marks
Level 5	Effective conclusion with analysis of points of view - Analyses the importance and/or strength of different points of view in detail. - Uses accurate evidence to support a sustained and well-structured discussion. - Effective conclusion to the question which evaluates knowledge.	13–15
Level 4	Coherent conclusion supported by evidenced points of view - Discusses different points of view in some detail. - Uses accurate evidence to support a well-structured discussion. - Coherent conclusion to the question which evaluates knowledge and points of view.	10–12
Level 3	Satisfactory conclusion with different points of view - Recognises different points of view and discusses at least one in some detail. - Uses accurate evidence to support discussion. - Satisfactory conclusion to the question which is linked to a range of knowledge and points of view.	7–9
Level 2	Basic conclusion with a supported point of view - Discusses one point of view. - Uses supporting evidence for one or more relevant points. The support may not be wholly relevant or accurate. - Attempted conclusion to the question which is linked to knowledge and/or a point of view.	4–6
Level 1	Limited interpretation with a point of view - States a point of view. - Little or no supporting evidence. - Attempted interpretation which may not directly address the question.	1–3
Level 0	No relevant material to credit.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	Evaluate to what extent Genesis 1:1–2:3 and Genesis 2:4–19 provide complementary narratives. Use Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks) and Table B: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 Marks) to mark candidate responses to this question. Award up to 10 marks AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks AO2 Analysis and evaluation. Indicative content Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited. <u>Genesis 1:1–2:3 and Genesis 2:4–19 do provide complementary narratives</u> - Some candidates may suggest that the two narratives each have a different focus, that Genesis 1:1–2:3 lists a series of events that culminates in the creation of humans, whereas Genesis 2:4–19 focuses on the creation of humans, and so can be seen by some as being a more detailed expansion of day 6. - Some may suggest that one or other of the narratives is literal, whereas the other is metaphorical, and that therefore they complement one another though they have different intents and approaches. - Some may argue that some of the suggested inconsistencies some scholars may point out are not inconsistencies at all, and argue around some apologetics-based ideas, such as the idea that Genesis 2:5 does not contradict Genesis 1, as Eden as a specific garden could have been planted after the first creation of plants on day 5. - Some may suggest that though they have significant differences, as they are both best interpreted as metaphorical narratives, any inconsistencies do not prevent their intended allegories being complementary. - Some may discuss the difference around the ideas of complementing as opposed to corroborating. <u>Genesis 1:1–2:3 and Genesis 2:4–19 do not provide complementary narratives</u> - Some candidates may suggest that the two narratives are simply too different to be complementary, and that they are actively in conflict with one another. - Some may suggest specific verses or themes which they may argue conflict with each other, and develop reasoned arguments around them, such as the differing timescale and order of creation in the two accounts. - Some may suggest that whilst they are not directly in conflict with one another, as they were likely written at different times for different purposes that they are not complementary, nor were they ever intended to be. - Some may suggest that, if interpreted literally, the narratives would be in conflict with one another. If interpreted metaphorically, the narratives would not be in conflict with one another, but that does not necessarily mean that the narratives would be complementary to one another.	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Analyse the significance of the use of the terms Sheol, Gehenna and Hades in the Bible. Use Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks) and Table B: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 Marks) to mark candidate responses to this question. Award up to 10 marks AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks AO2 Analysis and evaluation. Indicative content Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited. <u>General Points</u> - Some candidates may suggest that the use of the terms in question suggests that the biblical understanding of what happens after death developed and/or changed over time, particularly the difference between Old Testament Hebraic ideas and New Testament Christian ideas. - Some may suggest that the use of such different terms suggest that whilst ideas about heaven are fairly consistent within the Bible, ideas around hell (or similar) are less clear. Others may suggest that it is wrong to associate Sheol and Hades with hell, and that they suggest something different to a heaven & hell dichotomy. - Some may suggest that the relative significance of the terms has varied at different times, and focus on the context of specific uses of specific terms. <u>Sheol</u> - A Hebrew term for the death, meaning the pit. - Some candidates may suggest that the use of the term in Old Testament suggests that there was no clear understanding of a difference between a heaven or hell for the dead; that it was a 'neutral' place for the dead; even Jacob stating that he will one day go to Sheol. - Linked to the idea of the pit, Sheol suggests darkness and forgetting. Some candidates may suggest that this is symbolic of people existing after death in the memories of those that knew them, and being consigned to darkness in the pit when their remains no one to remember them. - Some may suggest that a key concept around Sheol is that it is generally stated to involve a level of separation from Yahweh, this is implied in its use.	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<u>Gehenna</u> • The name of a valley in Jerusalem that was the site of child sacrifice and later a rubbish dump and place where the unclaimed dead were placed; used as a counterpoint to the kingdom in the New Testament. • Some candidates may discuss the significance of using a notorious physical place to refer to the afterlife; some may draw comparisons with how Sodom is invoked as place of judgement. • Some may discuss the nature of ancient dumps, particularly the uncontrolled release of gases from rotting refuse, and how these lead to concepts of hell as sulphurous and fiery. <u>Hades</u> • The Greek term for both the god of the dead and the underworld, and often now translated as hell. • Some may suggest that as a place with hatred, pain and wailing, it is distinct from the blissful elysian fields, and that this may have influenced the development of ideas about heaven and hell. • Some may discuss whether this term was used as simply a general, known term for the idea of a hell-like place, or whether it has a more specific intrinsic meaning. • Some candidates may point out that in Acts 2:31, when Peter is quoting from a Psalm, the author of Luke-Acts replaces the word Sheol used in the Psalm, with Hades in his text; candidates may suggest arguments for why this may be. • Some may discuss how in Greek theology, Hades existed alongside another place of the dead, the Elysian Fields, and that use of Hades may suggest that, unlike Sheol, there is another, better conditional place that some people can go to when they die.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	‘Being omnipotent (all-powerful) is the most significant quality of God.’ Discuss. Use Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks) and Table B: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 Marks) to mark candidate responses to this question. Award up to 10 marks AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks AO2 Analysis and evaluation. Indicative content Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited. <u>Being omnipotent (all-powerful) is the most significant quality of God</u> • Candidates may discuss why God can be said to be all-powerful, through discussion of the key texts in the specification or other relevant texts or examples, for example the significance of Daniel 4:34–35. • Candidates may refer to the role of God being all-powerful in a Christian developing their faith, also its status as a key tenet of Christianity. • Links may be made to the ideas of creation and salvation in Christianity, and how that can be seen to support the significance of God being all-powerful, as being the only being capable of either. • Candidates may discuss how a belief in an all-powerful God helps Christians to comprehend the existence of evil in the world and suggests to Christians that the suffering they witness must serve some purpose. Candidates may link to the theodicies here. <u>Being omnipotent (all-powerful) is not the most significant quality of God</u> • Some candidates may suggest that the idea of God being all-loving and/or all-knowing are more significant than the idea of God being all-powerful, through discussion of the specified texts or other relevant texts or examples. • Candidates may instead discuss the idea that God’s qualities cannot be analysed in isolation from one another, and that therefore there is not a most significant quality of God, as all qualities are equally significant. • Some may discuss whether the idea of a transcendent divine being can properly be analysed. • Some candidates may focus on whether the qualities of God that are significant for Christians in the modern world are different from those that were significant in earlier times, drawing selectively on their reading of material in other units • Candidates could argue that there is little or no evidence for an omnipotent God, and as such being all-powerful is not a significant quality of God. Such a line of argument would be a valid one, but would have to be argued, rather than simply asserted.	25