

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**BIBLICAL STUDIES**

**9484/42**

Paper 4 Christian Understandings of God, Life and the Universe

**May/June 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 May/June 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **12** 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.

**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**.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Level 4	<p><b>Detailed accurate knowledge with good understanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a range of detailed, accurate and relevant knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates understanding through a well-developed response.</li> <li>• Fully addresses the question.</li> <li>• Good understanding of the context, if relevant.</li> </ul>	9–10
Level 3	<p><b>Mostly accurate knowledge with some understanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a range of mostly accurate and relevant knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates understanding through a developed response.</li> <li>• Addresses most aspects of the question.</li> <li>• Some engagement with the context, if relevant.</li> </ul>	6–8
Level 2	<p><b>Partially accurate knowledge with limited understanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a range of knowledge which may be partially accurate.</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding through a partially developed response.</li> <li>• Attempts to address the question.</li> <li>• Attempts to engage with the context, if relevant.</li> </ul>	3–5
Level 1	<p><b>Limited knowledge and basic understanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies a limited range of knowledge which may not be accurate.</li> <li>• Demonstrates basic understanding through a limited response.</li> <li>• Response is relevant to the topic, but does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• Little or no reference to the context, if relevant.</li> </ul>	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.**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Level 5	<p><b>Effective conclusion with analysis of points of view</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyses the importance and/or strength of different points of view in detail.</li> <li>Uses accurate evidence to support a sustained and well-structured discussion.</li> <li>Effective conclusion to the question which evaluates knowledge.</li> </ul>	13–15
Level 4	<p><b>Coherent conclusion supported by evidenced points of view</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discusses different points of view in some detail.</li> <li>Uses accurate evidence to support a well-structured discussion.</li> <li>Coherent conclusion to the question which evaluates knowledge and points of view.</li> </ul>	10–12
Level 3	<p><b>Satisfactory conclusion with different points of view</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognises different points of view and discusses at least one in some detail.</li> <li>Uses accurate evidence to support discussion.</li> <li>Satisfactory conclusion to the question which is linked to a range of knowledge and points of view.</li> </ul>	7–9
Level 2	<p><b>Basic conclusion with a supported point of view</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discusses one point of view.</li> <li>Uses supporting evidence for one or more relevant points. The support may not be wholly relevant or accurate.</li> <li>Attempted conclusion to the question which is linked to knowledge and/or a point of view.</li> </ul>	4–6
Level 1	<p><b>Limited interpretation with a point of view</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States a point of view.</li> <li>Little or no supporting evidence.</li> <li>Attempted interpretation which may not directly address the question.</li> </ul>	1–3
Level 0	No relevant material to credit.	0

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>‘Archaeological developments are the greatest challenge to a literal interpretation of Genesis.’ Discuss.</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Award up to 10 marks AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks AO2 Analysis and evaluation.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.</p> <p><u>Archaeological developments are the greatest challenge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may suggest that different specific archaeological developments present the greatest challenge to a literal interpretation of Genesis or may instead discuss archaeological developments as a collective. Either is a reasonable approach.</li> <li>• Some candidates are likely to suggest that whilst a literal reading of Genesis presents an internal chronology suggesting that the humans have existed for less than 10,000 years, there are archaeological finds from pre-historic civilisations that are significantly older than this. This would indicate that at least parts of Genesis should not be read literally.</li> <li>• Some candidates may take a view, similar to that of T L Thompson, that biblical archaeology has shown that Genesis is not only ahistorical, but extremely unlikely.</li> <li>• Candidates may suggest that biblical minimalism is now the predominant school of thought in biblical archaeology, and as such archaeological developments have already successfully challenged literal interpretations, at least in most scholarly circles.</li> </ul> <p><u>Archaeological developments are not the greatest challenge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates are likely to present one or more of the other challenges to creation narratives as being a greater challenge than archaeology, such as similarities with other ancient sources, scientific developments or internal incoherence.</li> </ul>	25

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some candidates may suggest that the similarities between Genesis and the Enuma Elish presents a greater challenge than archaeological developments to a literal reading of Genesis. They may suggest that the similarities between the two texts indicate that Genesis is not entirely original, and therefore should not be read literally, as it is itself an interpretation of an earlier work. Candidates may make similar points with regard to the Epic of Gilgamesh or other ancient texts.</li> <li>• Other candidates may suggest that scientific developments pose a greater challenge to a literal reading of Genesis. They may suggest that developments in scientific understanding, such as the Big Bang theory, present a better explanation for the origins of the universe than a literal interpretation of Genesis, and that therefore Genesis should be interpreted metaphorically.</li> <li>• Some may suggest that the differences between the Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 accounts show an internal incoherence to Genesis, and this is the greatest challenge that a literal reading of Genesis faces.</li> <li>• Some may suggest that biblical maximalism, whilst a minority view, still has a significant number of active scholarly supporters.</li> <li>• Some candidates may suggest that rather than being a challenge to a literal interpretation of Genesis, archaeological developments instead support such a view. Candidates may use discoveries such as those of the Hittite civilisation being argued to promote the authenticity of Genesis as a whole.</li> <li>• Some candidates may suggest that there are no substantial challenges to a literal interpretation of Genesis; such a view should be argued, not merely asserted.</li> </ul>	



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Analyse to what extent there is a conflict between biblical teachings on stewardship and dominion.</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Award up to 10 marks AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks AO2 Analysis and evaluation.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.</p> <p><u>There is a conflict</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may suggest that many of the teachings on stewardship and dominion do not merely conflict, but can appear to be in direct opposition to one another. For example, the difference between the Earth and everything in it being declared to be the Lord's in Psalm 24, whereas in Psalm 8 it states that all things have been put under the feet of humans.</li> <li>• Some may suggest that by their nature, the very concepts of stewardship and dominion are in conflict with one another, that caring for and controlling something are in essence too different to not be in conflict.</li> <li>• Some candidates may suggest that stewardship requires people to steward or shepherd resources and animals, and utilise them responsibly, to ensure that there is something to hand over to the next generation of stewards. Dominion has no such implication.</li> <li>• Some may discuss how the approach Christians take in understanding the conflict between stewardship and dominion tends to be linked to their views on creation, with those favouring a literalist approach tending towards dominion being predominate, whereas those who view creation more metaphorically tending towards pre-eminence for the role of stewardship amongst believers. Candidates may discuss why these links exist, and the role played by beliefs in creation in interpreting other teachings.</li> <li>• Some may suggest that whilst there is a conflict between teachings on stewardship and dominion, it is not one of sufficient extent to be a significant concern to Christians, and their focus should be on other issues or concerns, such as salvation or charity for example.</li> </ul>	25

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p data-bbox="338 217 584 245"><u>There is no conflict</u></p> <ul data-bbox="338 288 1928 628" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="338 288 1928 352">• Candidates may instead suggest that there exists little or no conflict between biblical teachings on stewardship and dominion, and that rather than overlapping they are intrinsically separate.</li> <li data-bbox="338 357 1928 485">• Some may suggest that teachings on dominion instruct Christians that they have authority over animals and the earth, and that teachings on stewardship give guidance on how to utilise that authority; that God should be seen as a model of dominion being used benignly and combined with stewardship and care for his creation, and that Christians should strive to reflect that in their own actions.</li> <li data-bbox="338 489 1928 553">• Some may suggest that there is no conflict, and that stewardship is a far more significant concept to Christians than dominion. The alternative view may also be suggested.</li> <li data-bbox="338 558 1928 628">• Some may suggest that whilst the views may have previously been in conflict, as understandings and ethical teachings have developed over time, they are now best seen in concert rather than in conflict.</li> </ul>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>‘The New Testament presents a clear understanding of how salvation is achieved.’ Discuss.</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Award up to 10 marks AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks AO2 Analysis and evaluation.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.</p> <p><u>The New Testament does present a clear understanding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may focus their response on the New Testament as a whole or may instead put forward specific teachings that they argue present a clear understanding of salvation; both approaches are reasonable.</li> <li>• Some candidates may argue that the New Testament presents a clear view that salvation is achieved by grace and may use teachings such as Ephesians 2:1–7 as the basis for such an argument.</li> <li>• Other candidates may argue that the New Testament presents a clear view that salvation is achieved by faith and may use teachings such as James 2:14–26 as the basis for such an argument.</li> <li>• Some candidates may use Ephesians 2:8 to argue that salvation is achieved through grace and faith.</li> <li>• Some candidates may argue that the sacrifice of Jesus itself presents a clear understanding of salvation.</li> </ul> <p><u>The New Testament does not present a clear understanding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some candidates may argue that the New Testament presents a clear understanding that salvation is achieved through and/or by Jesus, but that disputes exist amongst Christians about how this salvation is obtained, accessed or achieved.</li> <li>• Some may argue that whilst individual books of the New Testament may present a clear understanding of how salvation is obtained, but that taken as a collective the New Testament does not present a clear understanding. This is because the different books can be argued to present different ideas and arguments around salvation, which may not be mutually intelligible. Some may discuss the nature of the Bible as a book of books in developing such a line of argument.</li> </ul>	25

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some may suggest that through the nature of the arguments presented to the early church in the New Testament, it was not clear to the early church how salvation was obtained, as they clearly repeatedly held ideas that the epistolary writers felt they had to correct.</li><li>• Some may argue that in its first-century context, the New Testament may have presented a clear understanding of how salvation is achieved, but that over time as the context has changed, the teachings expressed have become less clear and more open to interpretation.</li><li>• Some may argue that the different means of attaining salvation described in different writings indicate that there cannot be one clear understanding, and that a composite or partial understanding is the best one can hope to achieve.</li></ul>	