Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

DIVINITY **9011/12**

Paper 1 Prophets of the Old Testament 12 **May/June 2022**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 100

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 2022 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 **30** printed pages.

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 descriptors 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
	Section A ***Prophecy in general and Pre-canonical Prophets*** **Note** that all aspects of this Mark Scheme are only indicative. Any relevant material will be credited by the examiners.	
1	**Assess which of the many roles played by Moses was the most important.** Answers do not have to be given in the chronological sequence found in the text, so credit all coherent approaches and their justification. Candidates are likely to refer to some of the following roles of Moses: • His call (Exodus 2–3), seen as showing an archetypal role for the call of the prophets who followed him, and an important criterion for judging true from false prophets. • His liberation of the Hebrews from captivity in Egypt, as a necessary precursor for the eventual move to the promised land of Israel. • His status as a bridge between the world of the patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) and the later nation-state of Israel. • His role as a military leader during the exodus from Egypt and the years in the wilderness, without which the people might not have survived. • His warnings against and prohibition of the impure forms of religion to be found in Canaan; together with his assurance that God would empower a prophet like him who would reveal God's will. • His further indication of the test of a true prophet as one whose word comes to pass (Deuteronomy 18). • His part in the formation of the Sinai covenant and its later role in Israelite history. • His role in the institution of prophetic guilds and the role of prophetic ecstasy in transmitting the word of Yahweh (Numbers 11). • His priestly functions. Candidates might prioritise one or more of these and other criteria to judge which was the most important role for Moses. • Some are likely to argue in favour of Moses' development of the Sinai covenant which subsequent prophets took as the basis for their religious and moral pronouncements. • Some are likely to argue that there was no single most important role of Moses, since the totality of his actions and experiences make up his importance. • Some might argue that Moses was a fictional character through whom later editors established their own view of the national history, so the most important role of Moses is as a literary idea rather than one of historical fact. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**'Elijah's influence on the development of Old Testament prophecy was greater than that of Samuel.' How far do you agree?** In favour of Samuel, some might include: • F.M. Cross Jr and others raised the possibility that Samuel was (at least in part) responsible for the introduction of the monarchy in Israel, on the grounds that centralising power in the hands of a king would enable Israel to respond more successfully than the tribal amphictyony to external threats, particularly those posed by the Philistines. The role of prophets was then to advise the king, and this arrangement guaranteed the place of prophetic advisers in the courts of successive kings in the future. Since Samuel anointed the first two kings of Israel and appears to have brought about the removal of Saul in favour of David, his influence on the development of prophecy in Israel is arguably greater than that of any other prophet: prophets to some extent became a brake on the power of the king. • Samuel appears to have been the head of a prophetic guild based in Gilgal. Given that Samuel also revived the 'word and vision' of Yahweh (1 Samuel 3:1) and is generally credited with the transition from seer to prophet (1 Samuel 9), it seems that Samuel was instrumental in reviving the prophetic word generally – prophecy was brought up to date. • Samuel had multiple roles. As a priest he began serving Eli in the Shiloh temple; he was also the last judge of Israel, making circuits through Bethel, Gilgal and Mizpah. These roles would have underlined his influence generally and would have served to increase the role and importance of subsequent prophets generally. • Samuel was an effective military adviser during the Philistine wars: so powerful that Saul even sought his advice by bringing him up from the grave (1 Samuel 28:3–25). By the time of David and Solomon, the position of Israel was relatively secure. Moreover, the role of advising kings in this respect became a feature of court prophets. In favour of Elijah, some might include: • If Samuel's influence on the development of prophecy had been as great as the foregoing points suggest, then it seems odd that from Samuel in the 11th century BCE to Elijah in the 9th, things should have got so bad that Elijah was the only prophet of Yahweh left in the country (1 Kings 18:22), the rest having defected to Baal and Asherah. • According to the narratives in I and II Kings, Elijah confronted King Ahab and Queen Jezebel with such force that Ahab's 450 Baal prophets were killed. This might suggest that Elijah was the most powerful prophet, hence his influence on the survival of Yahwism and of Yahwistic prophecy. • Just as Samuel confronted King Saul, Elijah confronted King Ahab, and Ahab eventually died as Elijah predicted. The confrontation of kings by prophets is therefore seen equally in Samuel and Elijah.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	• Elijah performed powerful miracles, perhaps exceeding those of Moses (e.g. resurrecting the widow's son from death, 1 Kings 17). As far as we know, Samuel was not a miracle worker. This might have been a powerful influence on prophetic development, except that in the pre-exilic period prophets did not develop this ability, at least as far as we know. • Elijah was particularly influential in his concern for social justice, as in the case of Naboth's vineyard. In this respect his influence was greater than that of Samuel, since his concern for social justice appears in the prophets down to the time of the Exile and beyond, e.g. in Amos and Hosea. • In later Judaism, Elijah was regarded as *the* prophet (e.g. at Jesus' transfiguration). In particular, Elijah has prophetic messianic associations in later Judaism, far beyond the influence of Samuel. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Discuss the claim that all pre-exilic prophets in Israel were part of the cult.** • This claim is based on the view that prophets and cult appear to go hand in hand. For example, for those who accept the Moses narratives as historical, Exodus 35–40 shows in great detail how the instructions given by God to Moses to build the tabernacle (Exodus 25–31) were carried out. The cultic legislation in the books of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy is written in Moses' name. Those who doubt the historical provenance of these books, however, can point to Chronicles, where much of the role of cult-founder is ascribed to David. • Different prophets in Israel had an association with various sanctuaries, e.g. Samuel was associated with the Shiloh sanctuary (1 Samuel 3). In 1 Samuel 10, Samuel appears to be associated further with hilltop sanctuaries – a religious setup where a band of prophets functioned under a leader (1 Samuel 10; also in the Elijah narratives, e.g. 2 Kings 2). • Just as priests functioned within the cult, so did prophets. Priests would have overseen ritual practices, and priestly oracles were given through the divine 'lot' – *urim* and *tummim* – objects which were used to guide the priest in delivering *torah* – laws and judgements. Prophetic oracles were *dabar* – word (Jeremiah 18:18), where a prophet was thought to stand in God's heavenly council to hear, and then deliver, God's word (Jeremiah 23:18). • The presence of both priest and prophet within the cult can be seen in Amos 7:10–17, where there is a confrontation between the priest Amaziah and the prophet Amos in the royal sanctuary of Bethel. Amaziah accuses Amos of sedition – of preaching against the royal house of Jeroboam II and his sanctuary – and tells him to flee back to Judah. Amos retorts that God had commissioned him to prophesy to God's people, Israel (v.15), so Amos has gone straight to a major cultic centre to deliver God's *dabar*. Some might argue that Amos' appearance at Bethel does not necessarily show that he was a cultic prophet. A mainstream royal sanctuary such as Bethel would have been an obvious choice to secure a large audience. • Some might refer to Elijah's contest with the prophets of Baal and Asherah, where he builds an altar to make a priest's sacrifice; but again, simply because Elijah exercised a priestly function here does not prove that all prophets operated within the cult. • There are clear links between various prophets and the cult, e.g. Nathan (2 Samuel 7; 1 Kings 1). Also, Isaiah received his call in the Jerusalem Temple. Also, Jeremiah gave his 'sermon' in the Jerusalem Temple (7:1–15). Nevertheless, however many instances are given of prophets operating in a cultic context, this would not mean that *all* prophets operated within the cult, despite the fact that the cult would have been a part of every prophet's social background. • Each case is ambiguous to some degree. For example, Jeremiah's Temple Sermon took place in that context because God instructed him to stand in the gate of the Temple and proclaim God's word, so this tells us nothing as to whether or not Jeremiah was part of the cult. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**'Israel's prophets were always critical of kings.' Consider this claim with reference to prophets of your choice.** • Some might argue that this has to be true, since one of the reasons why prophets emerged in Israel, for example, was to provide a check on the powers and actions of kings. It has long been conjectured that prophecy in Israel emerged with Samuel for exactly this reason. Since any king can turn out to be unsatisfactory, prophets have the ability to remind kings of the ultimate power of God. With Samuel, having participated in electing Saul as king, he was instrumental in denouncing Saul and electing David in his place, criticising Saul for ignoring Yahweh's commands, e.g. 1 Samuel 15 re the Amalekites. In 1 Samuel 28, the prophet's criticism comes even from beyond the grave, telling Saul that Yahweh has become his enemy (v.16). • The appointment of court prophets brought the prophetic critique into the daily life of the king, e.g. David's affair with Bathsheba and his arrangements for the death of Uriah the Hittite were met with a full-scale rebuke from Nathan: '… by this deed you have utterly scorned the LORD – the child that is born to you shall die.' (2 Samuel 12:14). • In the case of Elijah, the prophet was relentlessly critical of King Ahab. In his turn, Ahab resented Elijah, on one occasion greeting him with the question, 'Is it you, you troubler of Israel?' (1 Kings 18:17). Elijah's response was to name Ahab as the troubler for forsaking God's commandments and following the Baals (v.18). The contest on Mount Carmel then follows in which Elijah kills Ahab's prophets. • Elijah was also critical of Ahab for bringing about the death of Naboth (1 Kings 21): 'Have you killed, and also taken possession?' (v.19). The criticism is followed by a devastating verdict: 'In the place where dogs licked up the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick your own blood.' Moreover the dogs shall eat Jezebel, Ahab's queen (v.23). • That prophets were always critical of kings is clear from the narrative in 1 Kings 22, where Ahab's 400 court prophets advised him that his alliance with Jehoshaphat of Judah to recover Ramoth-gilead from Syria would succeed. In this case, Ahab seems to confirm that true prophets were always critical of kings, because Jehoshaphat is unconvinced, and asks for another prophetic judgement. Ahab grudgingly refers to Micaiah ben Imlah, and says, 'But I hate him, for he never prophesies good concerning me, but evil.' (v.8). Ahab ignored the advice and the dogs licked up his blood from his chariot, fulfilling Elijah's verdict also. This narrative seems to show clearly that true prophets were always critical of kings, whereas false prophets were yes-men. • Some might refer to the situation of Amos and King Jeroboam II, where Amos sent the king a message that he would die by the sword, and Israel's population would be exiled (Amos 7:11). Throughout his book Amos criticises Jeroboam's regime and those of Israel's neighbours for their social and religious evils.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	• Some will support a different view, that prophets were not always critical of kings, and that they regarded each other at least with a measure of approval. For example, Nathan's criticism of David was constructive. Ahab clearly felt that Micaiah ben Imlah had the merit of telling the truth (even if Ahab did not believe him). Jeremiah spoke of Josiah with a measure of approval: 'He judged the cause of the poor and needy; then it was well. Is not this to know me?' says the LORD. (Jeremiah 22:16). • Some might argue that prophets were critical of kings, but only when deserved. It is notable that when Ahab repented of the part he had played in Naboth's death, God told Elijah that he would not bring evil in his days but in his son's days (1 Kings 21:29). • Some might comment that criticism in itself is not a bad thing, particularly where the criticism is constructive as opposed to destructive. For example, Nathan's criticisms of David's affair with Bathsheba were expressed in such a way that David repented: David tells Nathan that he has repented, whereupon Nathan replies that God has put away his sins so he will not die. (2 Samuel 12:13). • Some might argue that whether or not prophets were critical, they engaged with the kings and the issues of the day; they were not solitary rebels appearing to make occasional attacks and then disappearing again. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
5	**'The pre-canonical prophets in Israel killed many people; therefore they cannot be seen as morally good.' Discuss.** Answers do not have to deal with all pre-canonical prophets. The wording of the question requires reference to a minimum of two. • The 10th plague (Exodus 11), brought about by God through Moses, killed the Egyptian first-born, many of which would have been innocent of any crime, not least the first-born of the cattle (v.4). It would be difficult to justify Moses' complicity in such an action. Some might argue that narratives such as this are symbolic, but that does not make the symbol morally good. • Similarly, the part played by Moses in the drowning of the pharaoh's army (and horses) during the exodus from Egypt is morally questionable. • At God's instigation, Moses attempted to 'blot out' Amalek (Exodus 17:14–16). Again, it is hard to see how Moses' attempted genocide of Amalek might be justified on the grounds that God desired it. • The issue of genocide against Amalek resurfaces in connection with Samuel, where Samuel/God rejects Saul as king for not prosecuting the war against Amalek with sufficient force. As a punishment, Samuel cuts Agag (the Amalekite king) to pieces. These acts might look more like military strategy than morally good deeds. • In 2 Samuel 12, the prophet Nathan confronts King David over his affair with Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite. Nathan tells David that because he has scorned God, the child that he has fathered with Bathsheba will die (2 Samuel 12:14). • Elisha appears on one occasion to have been cruel. While journeying to Bethel, some small boys jeered at him for being bald: 'Go up, baldhead!', upon which two she-bears came out of the wood to maul 42 of the boys to death, with no intervention from Elisha. Elisha may have been bald because of prophetic tonsure, but this hardly merits such a reaction. • In the incident on Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18), Elijah killed several hundred prophets of Baal and Asherah with a sword. Having already demonstrated the power of Yahweh, it might be seen as unnecessarily violent to annihilate the opposition. • Some might argue that moral goodness means obeying the commands of Yahweh, in which case the pre-canonical prophets can be described as morally good. Only God can know the ultimate good or evil of any action. • Some might refer to morally good actions of the pre-canonical prophets, e.g. Moses' compilation of the Law, Elijah's miracles, particularly the raising of the widow's son (1 Kings 17), and Samuel securing the nation against the Philistine threat. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
	Section B ***Pre-exilic Prophets, with special reference to Amos, Hosea, Isaiah of Jerusalem and Jeremiah***	
6	**Examine why the prophetic message of Amos was so difficult for his hearers to accept.** • Amos' message was focused on the imminent destruction of the Northern Kingdom of Israel for its religious and social sins. There are also a number of related themes, such as: Yahweh's universalism, judgement on the surrounding nations, and the possibility of some kind of restoration after exile. • Amos appears to have come from Judah/the South, and if so, his interference in the affairs of Israel could have been resented. • Moreover, in ch.7, Amaziah, priest of Bethel, sends a message to Jeroboam, king of Israel, saying that Amos has conspired against him by claiming that Israel must go into exile, and that Jeroboam shall die by the sword. Amaziah then tells Amos to flee back to Judah and never again prophesy at Bethel. Amos answers that he is not a prophet but is a shepherd and a dresser of sycamore trees, but God took him from following the flock and told him to 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel' (7:15). If this was the case, then this again might explain why Amos' message was so difficult to accept: he was a mere shepherd claiming to know God's will for Israel. • However, there is an issue here in that where Amos says, 'I *am* no prophet', the Hebrew could just as easily be translated: 'I *was* no prophet … I was a herdsman … until God took me from following the flock and said to me, 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.'' In other words, Amos may well have claimed that although he was not a prophet, he is one now. In this case, his appearance at the royal shrine of Bethel and his threats against Amaziah and the king could mean that Amos was a cultic prophet who had turned against the system, which would indeed have shocked his hearers. • Amos' criticisms of the behaviour of Israel were addressed to Jeroboam II, under whom Israel had achieved a level of territorial expansion, military security and economic success that was never again achieved. Amos accused the rich of social injustice, increasing their wealth by oppressing the poor. However, wealth and security were taken as signs of Yahweh's favour, so the people would not have been able to understand Amos' criticisms of their lifestyle. • Equally, Amos criticised religious practice in Israel on the grounds that it was based on empty rituals rather than righteousness (e.g. Amos 5:21). Israel's election theology was understood by the nation to mean that God's chosen people would not be punished. Amos perplexed them by announcing that this was not the case. God required religious practices based on covenant responsibility. • Further, Israel was to see that Yahweh is a universal god, and not just the god of Israel and/or Judah (Amos 9:7–10). To most of Amos' hearers, this would have been difficult to understand.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
6	• Probably the greatest problem in this respect would have been Amos' prophecy of the total destruction of the state. In particular, Amos contradicted the traditional understanding of the 'Day of the Lord' as a day when Israel's enemies would be crushed. Amos said it would be a day of darkness and not light (Amos 5:18–20). Again, his hearers would have been incredulous, since what he was saying contradicted their understanding of Israel's election. • Some might argue that at least one part of Amos' prophecies would not have shocked his hearers, namely his sudden change of tone at the end of the book. In the full flood of his prophecy that Israel would be razed to the ground, Amos suddenly switches from doom oracle to salvation oracle (Amos 9:8b, 11–15). This is so sudden and out of character with the rest of his oracles that his hearers might think he had lost touch with reality. Alternatively, in the opinion of many, the salvation oracle is a later editorial addition, so it may not have been heard from the mouth of Amos at all. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
7	**'Hosea's family life explains everything about his prophecies.' How far do you agree?** • Hosea chapters 1–3 contain material which appears to relate to the prophet's family life. The superscription to the book (Hosea 1:1) is similar to that for Amos, Micah and Haggai, for example. • Some are likely to agree with the statement, while at the same time arguing that no one understanding of Hosea's family life is likely to be fully accurate or fully explanatory. • Hosea 1–2 contains a biographical account of the prophet's marriage with Gomer. Broadly speaking, the account is a metaphor for God's relationship with Israel. Chapter 3 is in autobiographical form and does not necessarily refer to Gomer. There are many ways, here, in which candidates might answer the question, e.g. by picturing the marriage relationship as an allegory. The general theme of the book is that of Israel's betrayal of the covenant relationship with Yahweh. Broadly speaking the allegory shows that Hosea's sense of betrayal mirrors Yahweh's sense of rejection by his chosen people. Gomer's rejection of Hosea portrays Israel's rejection of Yahweh. The issue of the children's names develops the allegory, for example 'Jezreel' signifies that the northern kingdom (Israel) will pay for past bloodshed. 'Lo-ruhamah' shows that God will no longer have pity for Israel, and 'Lo-ammi' shows that Israel will no longer be God's chosen people. • Further, in 2:14–23, Hosea states that God will woo Israel back, renew the covenant and betroth her to himself in an unbreakable relationship based on *chesed* (steadfast love, v.19) – a special form of love meaning 'covenant-faithfulness, steadfast love, mercy'. Accordingly, God will rename Hosea's children: Jezreel becomes the sowing of a people in the land; Not-Pitied becomes Pitied; Not my People becomes my People. The unthinkable then becomes explicable in terms of God's *chesed*. • There are many routes candidates might take in considering this picture of Hosea's family life. Some will consider whether the story is allegorical, metaphorical, psychological, etc., although any understanding will need to address the question of whether or not Hosea's family life explains everything about his prophecies. Some suppose that Gomer was a cultic prostitute, although in any event Hosea was presumably not her children's father (2:4–5). Some might argue that the marriage of a prophet to a cultic prostitute would be inexplicable – the idea is so outrageous that it turns chapters 1–3 into an unbelievable story. • However, others will argue that chapters 1–3 can indeed be reviewed in the context of the main prophecies/themes of Hosea.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
7	• In 4:1–8:14, the main theme is that Israel has forgotten God and has turned to other gods and nations. In 9:1–11:12, Hosea says that by rejecting election by God to be his people, and by consecrating themselves to the Baals, the people will ultimately suffer the loss of king, cult and country. In 12:1–14:9, Hosea announces that Yahweh has an indictment against both Israel and Judah (12:2). These themes are collectively explored as a legal case (a *rib*) brought against Israel by Yahweh, announced in 4:2. The material in chapters 1–3 underpins this legal case: the behaviour of Gomer/Israel constitutes a rebellion that in the end will bring about annihilation (ch.13) but eventually will lead to restoration (ch.14). On this kind of reading, Hosea's family life does underpin everything about his message, although candidates are at liberty to argue any case they wish. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
8	**Examine both the call of Isaiah and his prophetic message that follows from it.** • The call narrative appears in Isaiah 6. Uzziah reigned 783–742 BCE, and his rule and administration were relatively stable and prosperous. Uzziah died in 736, and the political situation changed markedly, so that this was only a few years before war broke out. • The call describes a ceremony within the cult, inside the Jerusalem Temple, which suggests that Isaiah himself was a prophet active within the Temple cult. At some point in the ceremony he became acutely aware of the presence of God. The descriptions that follow are not descriptions of God, but aspects of God's presence within the Temple. • The experience reinforces the Jerusalem theology in relation to the Davidic dynasty. • Isaiah becomes acutely aware of the holiness, power and universal sovereignty of Yahweh as universal King, in the manner of the 'Enthronement Psalms' (Psalms 93–100), where Yahweh is pictured as enthroned in royal splendour, as 'a great King above all gods' (Psalm 95:3). • The three-fold emphasis of the *trisagion* (Holy, holy, holy …) is the strongest emphasis conveyed by the Hebrew: God is utterly transcendent. • Mention of the Seraphim (v.6) suggests that beings of this type had been installed in the Temple by Uzziah in an acknowledgement of Assyrian power. Isaiah now understands that all such beings are bent to the will of the real king – Yahweh. • The purification of Isaiah's lips by burning coal is the prelude to his call, since by it he is purified and empowered as God's messenger. • Being thus purified, Isaiah will be able to deal with 'heavy ears and shut eyes' (v.10) – metaphors for those who may otherwise not be predisposed to heed his message. • Verses 11–13 now outline the prophet's task, which is disheartening to say the least: it must be carried out until the land has been invaded and destroyed. In terms of the historical situation of his day, where Judah lived an uneasy existence as an Assyrian tributary, Isaiah was looking at a task experienced a century later by Jeremiah in relation to Babylonian power. • Candidates might focus on different parts of Isaiah's prophetic message, particularly his involvement with the Assyrian crisis, during which Isaiah denounced Judah's alliance with Egypt and rebellion against Assyria, on the basis that the attempt was doomed to fail and that the results would be disastrous for Judah. • Isaiah's message made use of symbolic acts, for example when giving the sign of Shear-jashub ('a remnant shall return') during the Syro-Ephraimite War (Isaiah 7:1–9). This was to give Ahaz the assurance that if the situation deteriorated, it would still be the case that a remnant would return from captivity. Alternatively it might have been meant as a threat that *only* a remnant would return, emphasising an appalling disaster.	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
8	• Similarly, Isaiah gave the message of the sign of Immanuel – 'God (is) with us' (7:10–17): God would be with Ahaz and Judah despite the threats from the alliance of Rezin King of Syria and Pekah King of Israel. Although on paper Judah had no chance of withstanding the Syro-Ephraimite alliance, Isaiah assured Ahaz that invasion would not happen. Isaiah was impatient with Ahaz, who was frightened and unable to decide what to do (2 Kings 16), which in effect was being disloyal to God. • Isaiah goes on to give a third assurance to Ahaz (8:1–4) – the sign of Maher-shalal-hashbaz, followed by the description of the messianic king (9:2–7, perhaps Hezekiah; also 11:1–9); and the description of the messianic age during which God will recover the remnant of his people (11:10–16). • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
9	**'Jeremiah's message was intended to shock both those who saw him and those who heard him.' Discuss this claim.** • The idea that Jeremiah intended to shock those who saw and heard him stems from his life as a prophet in the period running up to the Babylonian invasion and the Exile. There was a tension in his life, deriving from his call, from being commissioned by Yahweh to 'destroy and overthrow' and 'to build and to plant' (Jeremiah 1:10). • Further, Jeremiah was commissioned as a prophet in 627 BCE, so he had to live through the period leading up to the Babylonian invasions and exile of 597 and 587 BCE. Jeremiah was passionate in his attempts to bring about behavioural changes in Judah that would avoid disaster, meaning that he felt compelled to shock those who saw and heard him in order to provoke a positive response. • Jeremiah's denunciation of false prophets is particularly shocking, e.g. 23:8 – 'In the prophets of Jerusalem I have seen a horrible thing: they commit adultery and walk in lies, so that no one turns from his wickedness; all of them have become like Sodom to me, and its inhabitants like Gomorrah.' In order to shock people both visually and audibly he once wore yoke bars round his neck to symbolise the yoke of the King of Babylon on Judah and her neighbours (27:1 – 28:17). Candidates are likely to refer to the actions of Hananiah, who broke Jeremiah's yoke bars and prophesied removal of the Babylonian yoke within 2 years, and Jeremiah's shocking response in predicting the death of Hananiah within a year. • Similarly, some will refer to further symbolic acts by Jeremiah that shocked all who heard and saw them, e.g. the parable of the waistcloth, the potter, etc. • Some might refer to Jeremiah's 'confessions', which would inevitably have shocked those who heard them, particularly where Jeremiah asks God if he is to become to him 'like a deceitful brook, like waters that fail.' (15:8). Addressing language like this to God would have been almost unthinkable. • Reference might be made to Jeremiah's Temple Sermon, in ch.7, where Jeremiah made a number of shocking statements in order to provoke reaction and action among his hearers, particularly where he tells them not to trust in meaningless repetition of the words, 'This is the temple of the LORD' (7:4), since this will not avoid the destruction of the Temple itself and long exile from the land. • On the other hand, not everything Jeremiah did and said was intended to shock his hearers. For example his purchase of his family field in Anathoth (ch.32) was intended as a visual symbol that eventually family life will begin again in the land, despite the fact that God ensured that Jeremiah's life would be devoid of family or close friends (except perhaps for Baruch).	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
9	• For some, Jeremiah's announcement of a New Covenant was intended both to shock and to reassure those who heard him. It was shocking to the extent that Jeremiah evidently supposed that it would eventually supersede the Mosaic Covenant; but at the same time it was an announcement of a time when God would have forgiven the sins of the people, and when his law would be written upon their hearts rather than upon a document (Jer. 31:23–40). • Some might conclude that the words of Jeremiah's call, where he is to 'pluck up and break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant' (1:10) emphasise further that Jeremiah's life would be one of both shock and reassurance. • Credit all relevant and coherent lines of argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
	Section C	
10	**Comment on points of interest or difficulty in <u>four</u> of the following passages (wherever possible answers should refer to the context of the passage but should not retell the story from which the passage is taken):**	**25**
10(a)	**And the LORD said to Moses, 'Gather for me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them; and bring them to the tent of meeting, and let them take their stand there with you.'** **(Numbers 11:16)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is where the people's desire to eat meat in the wilderness coincides with Moses' concerns about his leadership. • There are two themes interwoven in the account: first, the staple diet of the Hebrews in the desert is manna, and the people craved meat, which angered Yahweh. Second, Moses becomes impatient with his burden of responsibility as leader, since he believes that the task of providing meat will fall on him, so he complains to Yahweh that the burden is too heavy for him to bear (vv.10–15). • The immediate context is Yahweh's solution, which requires Moses to appoint 70 elders to share the responsibilities of leadership (vv.16–17). • God solves the meat-eating issue (vv.16–23) by announcing that the people shall eat meat until they are sick of it, as a punishment for their ingratitude after what he has done for them. • The leadership issue is addressed by v.16: Moses is to appoint the 70 elders. Comment is likely to be made on the 'tent of meeting' – a device where God can meet humanity (as in the parallel narrative in Exodus 33:7–11). • Some of Moses' spirit (*ruach*) is to be shared among the 70 (v.17) in order to share the burden of leadership. • The spirit is apparently contagious (vv.24–30), and comment is likely to be made on the phenomenon of ecstatic prophecy. • Some will comment on the origin of prophetic bands. • The case of Eldad and Medad (vv.26–30) raises the question of the power of the phenomenon, since they are taken over by the spirit of prophecy and prophesy outside the camp. Some might comment on Joshua's request that God should stop them prophesying (perhaps because he was jealous), and Moses' reply that he would rather wish that all the Lord's people were prophets. • Some might note the association of this narrative with the E tradition.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	**Now the asses of Kish, Saul's father, were lost. So Kish said to Saul his son, 'Take one of the servants with you, and arise, go and look for the asses.'** **(1 Samuel 9:3)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the choice of Saul as king. The introduction (vv.1–2) gives some of Saul's kingly characteristics: his father, Kish, was a man of wealth; Saul himself was handsome: there were none more handsome than he; Saul was taller than any of the people. In other words, he looked the part. • The immediate context is the story of Saul's father's lost asses, in the course of which Saul meets Samuel, as a prelude to Saul's eventual anointing. • The asses belonging to Kish would have represented a part of his wealth. In the Book of Job, Job had 500 she-asses (as well as other stock), which made him the richest man in the east (Job 1:3), so Kish is a force to be reckoned with. • Kish had lost his asses and sent Saul and a servant to find them. They went through several territories, but nothing was seen of them, whereupon Saul suggested that they should return to Kish, who would be more worried about him than about the asses. The servant proposed that since they were near the city of Ramah, they should enquire first of a famous man of God – a seer (*roeh*), since all that he says comes true (v.6). • Some will comment on the editorial note in verse 9: 'Formerly in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, he said, 'Come, let us go to the seer'; for he who is now called a prophet (*nabi*) was formerly called a seer (*roeh*).' • The seer is later identified as Samuel. As a seer, Samuel in this narrative is not the judge of all Israel. He is a local man, held in honour, so some might comment on the different traditions about Samuel. • Seers expected to be paid for their services, hence Saul and his servant agree to use the servant's 'fourth part of a shekel of silver' to pay Samuel (9:8). • Samuel has come down from 'the high places' (vv.13–15), presumably a hilltop shrine (10:5). • Samuel informs Saul that his father's asses have been found (10:2), as further evidence of Samuel's powers as a seer. • Some will refer to Samuel's anointing of Saul as *nagid* (prince) over Israel (9:16; 10:1).	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(c)	**The woman said to him, 'Surely you know what Saul has done, how he has cut off the mediums and the wizards from the land. Why then are you laying a snare for my life to bring about my death?' But Saul swore to her by the LORD, 'As the LORD lives, no punishment shall come upon you for this thing.'** **(1 Samuel 28:9–10)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the Battle of Gilboa and the death of King Saul. • The immediate context is Saul's consultation with the spirit of Samuel through the witch (medium) of Endor. • Saul's purge of mediums and wizards (v.9) complies with Moses' instructions to avoid the 'abominable practices to be found in the land of Canaan', e.g. the practice of divination, soothsaying, augury and mediumship (Deuteronomy 18:9–14). The list includes necromancy (consulting with the dead), so despite Saul having banned such practices, he now approaches a medium in order to consult the spirit of Samuel in order to discover Yahweh's will. • Apart from the difficulty of finding a medium, Saul's desperation was three-fold. First, a large Philistine army was camped nearby at Shunem, and Saul was terrified at its size, and was uncertain what to do. Second, the usual means of divination, *Urim* and *Tummim* (the sacred lots) had failed, and third, he could gain no information from his prophets: Samuel himself was dead, hence Saul was driven to find one of the mediums he had banned, thus showing the depth of his despair. • Saul's disguising himself indicates his self-consciousness at wanting to do what he banned everybody else from doing. Equally, the woman's fear of him is that he is setting a trap for her in order to bring about her death (vv.8–9). • Saul's reply: 'As the Lord lives, no punishment shall come upon you for this thing', seems to have been a common formula for swearing an oath (e.g. 1 Kings 17:1, Jeremiah 4:2. Hosea 4:5). • The woman asks Saul, 'Whom shall I bring up for you?' This implies that the dead are in a pit below the earth's surface, which raises the question of what Samuel was doing there. Candidates might comment on several interconnected strands of the narrative, for example: • In the woman's description of Samuel as '*a god*' coming up out of the earth' (v.13), the word for 'a god' here is *elohim*, which can mean 'God', but applied to Samuel here means something like 'spirit' or 'god-like being'. • Saul asks what its appearance is, to which she answers: '… an old man … wrapped in a robe'. This is not meant to be contemptuous: the robe is a sign of status. • Saul asks Samuel for help against the Philistines, but Samuel tells him God has torn the kingdom from his hand and given it to David, because of Saul's disobedience concerning Amalek. • The narrative ends with Samuel's predictions that (1) tomorrow, Saul and his sons will join him in death, and (2) Israel will be defeated in battle.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(d)	**And he said, 'Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the LORD.' And behold, the LORD passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and broke in pieces the rocks before the LORD, but the LORD was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the LORD was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire, but the LORD was not in the fire; and after the fire a still small voice.** **(1 Kings 19:11–12)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the revelation given to Elijah on Mount Horeb: 1 Kings 19:11–18. • This follows on from Elijah's destruction of the prophets of Baal and Asherah at Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18:1–46). On receiving this information from Ahab, Queen Jezebel swears to take Elijah's life by the next day. • 19:3 states that Elijah was afraid, which is odd for someone who had killed so many at Carmel. Fleeing for his life he arrived at Beersheba, which is 130 miles south of Jezreel. • He subsequently travelled into the wilderness, sat down under a broom tree, and slept until being awakened and fed by an angel, and on the strength of this food and drink he now travels to Horeb. • The length of the journey is given as 40 days and nights (v.8), which is a parallelism with Exodus 34:28, where Moses is said to have been with God on Mount Horeb for the same time period without eating or drinking. Some might comment that this also corresponds with Jesus' 40 days and 40 nights of fasting and temptation in the wilderness. • Expect comment on Horeb (in the northern tradition) as the place of God's revelation of the Law to Moses, called Sinai in Judahite texts. Elijah is cast in the same mould as Moses (hence his importance in later Judaism). Elijah is frequently termed a 'second Moses'. • God then comes to Elijah and asks, rhetorically, 'What are you doing here, Elijah?', to which Elijah explains his killing of the prophets of Ahab and Jezebel, and the fears he has for his life (vv.9–10). • Verses 11–12 now follow as above. Mount Sinai is the place where Moses met Yahweh through the burning bush, so a parallelism seems to be drawn here between the call of Moses at Sinai, and that of Elijah's experience, in the same place, of the 'still small voice'. • In vv.11–12, God dissociates himself from wind, earthquake and fire, manifesting instead in a 'still, small voice'. Some might note a clear difference between the call of Moses and that of Elijah: for Moses, God manifests himself in the fire of the burning bush (Exodus 3) and further through earthquake (Exodus 19:18); for Elijah, God manifests himself in the still, small voice. Some scholars therefore see in this a new form of God's self-revelation. God manifests himself in silence, and Elijah has to cover his face with his mantle. • The experience concludes when God tells Elijah to anoint Hazael as king over Syria, Jehu as king over Israel, and Elisha as Elijah's successor as a prophet – their mission being to accomplish the eradication of Baal worship. Some might note that this was not achieved.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(e)	**And the messenger who went to summon Micaiah said to him, 'Behold, the words of the prophets with one accord are favourable to the king; let your word be like the word of one of them, and speak favourably.' But Micaiah said, 'As the LORD lives, what the LORD says to me, that I will speak.' And when he had come to the king, the king said to him, 'Micaiah, shall we go to Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear?' And he answered him, 'Go up and triumph; the LORD will give it into the hand of the king.'** **(1 Kings 22:13–15)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the plan of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, and Ahab, King of Israel, now allied, to remove the border town of Ramoth-gilead from Syrian control (1 Kings 22:1–4). • The immediate context is the part played by the 400 court prophets of Ahab and the lone prophet Micaiah son of Imlah. • It was the custom of kings to consult prophets or priests before venturing off to war, in order to gain the appropriate answer from God that the venture would succeed, e.g. 1 Samuel 23:2, where David asks God whether or not he should attack the Philistines. Hence Jehoshaphat suggested that approval should be gained: 'Inquire first for the word of the Lord' (22:5). • Ahab gathered together 400 prophets, who promptly supported the venture by delivering the oracle: 'Go up and triumph'. It is interesting that Ahab can muster 400 prophets, since Elijah had killed 450 prophets at Carmel (1 Kings 18). • Ahab's case was just, since Syria had promised to return Ramoth-gilead, but had failed to do so. • Jehoshaphat is cautious and asks for a second opinion; hence Ahab summons Micaiah, a lone prophet hated by Ahab because 'he never prophecies good concerning me' (v.8). • Meanwhile, Zedekiah son of Chenaanah wears a pair of iron horns to symbolise Jehoshaphat and Ahab pushing the Syrians until they are destroyed. Symbolic actions were believed to increase the power of decision. • Micaiah then repeats the verdict of the 400 prophets: 'Go up and triumph!' (v.15). • Ahab is suspicious and demands that Micaiah should speak nothing but the truth in the name of Yahweh. Micaiah then prophesies disaster (v.17: 'I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd'). Worse, Micaiah then relates a vision of God in the heavenly Council, asking for a volunteer to entice Ahab to attack Ramoth-gilead. One spirit volunteers to be a spirit of lying prophecy to persuade Ahab to go to war. Ahab disbelieves this, imprisons Micaiah, and then dies in the ensuing battle, which ends in defeat for the alliance. • Comment might be made on the 'spirit of lying prophecy', which amounts to an explanation of why God permits false prophecy: it is controlled by God for God's own ends.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(f)	**Thus says the LORD:** **'For three transgressions of Israel,** **and for four, I will not revoke the punishment;** **because they sell the righteous for silver,** **and the needy for a pair of shoes—** **they that trample the head of the poor into the dust of the earth,** **and turn aside the way of the afflicted;** **a man and his father go in to the same maiden,** **so that my holy name is profaned …'** **(Amos 2:6–7)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is Amos' indictment of the neighbouring nations, together with Judah and Israel (1:1 – 2.16). • The immediate context is Amos' indictment of Israel for social injustice. • Some will point out that the accusations of social injustice here are part of the larger unit of 1:1 – 2:16: they are a part of what Amos has to say about injustice carried out by the neighbouring nations. For example, the indictment against Damascus is for its barbaric mistreatment of vanquished Gilead – threshing Gilead with threshing sledges of iron, perhaps literally (1:3–5). Next, four Philistine cities are indicted and condemned for their slave traffic with Edom, who would sell-on slaves further south (1:6–8). The oracle against Tyre similarly laments the covenant of brotherhood (1:9) through its treatment of captives. The oracle against the Ammonites (1:13–15) accuses them of atrocities against Israelites – 'ripping up women with child in Gilead that they might enlarge their border'. By the time Amos gets to Israel (2:6–8), Amos is complaining bitterly about social sins that he himself has witnessed in the course of doing what God told him to do at his call (7:17): 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.' • 'Selling the righteous for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes' (2:6b-c). Amos is talking here about the righteous poor, whose rights were held in contempt by those who would sell anything and anybody for money (silver). Selling the needy for a pair of shoes shows simply what a poor man is worth, i.e. next to nothing. For the greedy rich, such people have no social or religious rights. • Where God says, 'For three transgressions and for four I will not revoke the punishment', this means that the level of crimes against the poor and those who cannot defend themselves is already enough to mean that the punishment cannot be revoked. • In 7b, the complaint that 'father and son go in to the same maiden' means, for example, that nobody has the right to sell their children for the purposes of cultic prostitution. For a woman to be subjected to this profanes the holiness of God. • Some will be aware that Amos also castigates those who use garments taken in pledge for their own purposes. The Law (e.g. Exodus 22:25–26) says that an insolvent debtor must hand over even his cloak to his creditor, but if it is the debtor's only covering then it must be returned before sundown. The implication in Amos is that even this is ignored by the rich.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(f)	• Candidates are likely to point out that these are only a small proportion of Israel's social sins, so Amos goes on to say that Israel will be destroyed because of them: 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities' (3:2). • Some will locate Israel's social sins in the policies of King Jeroboam II, which had brought about a period of increased wealth and prosperity. Many believed that to be rich was a sign of God's favour – a belief which perpetuated injustices perpetrated against the poor. There are many passages that candidates might use to illustrate this.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(g)	**Wine and new wine** **take away the understanding.** **My people inquire of a thing of wood,** **and their staff gives them oracles.** **For a spirit of harlotry has led them astray,** **and they have left their God to play the harlot.** **They sacrifice on the tops of the mountains,** **and make offerings upon the hills,** **under oak, poplar, and terebinth,** **because their shade is good.** **Therefore your daughters play the harlot,** **and your brides commit adultery.** **(Hosea 4:11–13)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the 'controversy' God has with the people of Israel, that there is no faithfulness or kindness, no knowledge of God in the land, so God's judgement is upon Israel. The Hebrew for 'controversy' here is *rib*, a technical term which refers to a legal case: because of the sins of Israel (outlined in the biographical and autobiographical material in chapters 1–3), Israel will be judged, yet eventually Israel will be restored. • The immediate context is a survey of what has led Israel astray. The courtroom atmosphere of the writing takes up on that in ch.2, e.g. 2:2 – 'Plead with your mother, plead …' • Verse 11 – 'Wine and new wine take away the understanding' – all things from the earth are God's gifts, wine included. Too much wine leads to immoral behaviour, including sexual immorality, which in chapters 1–3 is the major issue. • Lack of understanding includes the stupidity of consulting something made of wood (such as a staff) for an oracle (v.12). • The 'spirit of harlotry' is a direct echo of the problem that beset Gomer and Hosea – Gomer's unfaithfulness, and the possibility that she had been a cultic prostitute. The people have 'left God to play the harlot'. • Verse 13 amplifies this point: to make sacrifices at sanctuaries on high places with sacred trees is the behaviour associated with cultic prostitution. Jeremiah 2:20 makes the same complaint: 'Yea, upon every high hill and under every green tree you bowed down as a harlot', and the context is, as in Hosea 4:13, God's *rib* – God's legal case against the nation. • At the heart of what Hosea says about cultic prostitution is the fact that any offerings or prayers made by the people to God are in effect offerings of lust. 'Your daughters play the harlot, and your brides commit adultery' – so God is saying that their worship is useless. • Some might refer to v.14, which goes on to say that God will not punish daughters and brides because it is the men who go with harlots and sacrifice with cult prostitutes. Seen in the context of the Book of Hosea as a whole, it seems that Hosea is arguing for a return to the original terms of the covenant with Yahweh, since the organised cult has lost its way. Chapters 1–3 set the scene for this.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(h)	**I will heal their faithlessness;** **I will love them freely,** **for my anger has turned from them.** **I will be as the dew to Israel;** **he shall blossom as the lily,** **he shall strike root as the poplar;** **his shoots shall spread out;** **his beauty shall be like the olive,** **and his fragrance like Lebanon.** **They shall return and dwell beneath my shadow,** **they shall flourish as a garden;** **they shall blossom as the vine,** **their fragrance shall be like the wine of Lebanon.** **(Hosea 14:4–7)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context here is the resolution of Yahweh's covenant lawsuit (*rib*) with Israel. Chapters 1–3 are an allegorical representation of Israel's relationship with Yahweh. Chapters 4–12 are a series of oracles showing why Yahweh is 'divorcing' Israel. Chapter 13 spells out the destruction (by Assyria) that follows a guilty judgement, and chapter 14 promises restoration after repentance, as in these verses. • The immediate context is a concluding salvation oracle. Since Yahweh loves freely (v.4), he will restore Israel to a fruitful life (vv.5–6). • This follows the conclusion to the lawsuit, in 13:14–16. The verdict is that God will have no compassion: he will not redeem his rebellious people from death ... Samaria will pay the penalty of guilt: the people will fall by the sword, and their little ones will be dashed in pieces. Following Assyrian invasion, the kingdom of Israel came to an end, c.722. This makes it rather difficult to understand the assurances of salvation in 14:4–7 – there would have been nothing left to save. • Verses 5–7 paint a picture of the restored Israel, where early dew waters and beautifies the land, as with the lily blossom. The beauty of the olive tree is long-lasting, and the 'fragrance like Lebanon' refers probably to the beauty and scent of its trees. The blossom of the vine is an enduring feature of many landscapes • This picture of beauty can be taken at its face value, but the language is also reminiscent of editorial reworking seen generally in the Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets. Many scholars believe that the Book of the Twelve has been edited by an exilic or post exilic redactor who added the language of forgiveness, love and restoration to give hope to the Jews who had been affected by the 6th century BCE Babylonian conquest, e.g. the salvation oracle in Amos 9:11–15. • Some might argue that a hopeful conclusion is required by the formative passages in chapter 2:14–23, where Yahweh is to woo Israel back to him, and 3:1–5, which ends with the assurance that, 'Afterward the children of Israel shall return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and they shall come in fear to the Lord and to his goodness in the latter days.' • Alternatively, perhaps ch.14 expresses Hosea's great hope for repentance and renewal, following which the prophet died without seeing its failure.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(i)	**The LORD spoke to me again: 'Because this people have refused the waters of Shiloah that flow gently, and melt in fear before Rezin and the son of Remaliah; therefore, behold, the LORD is bringing up against them the waters of the River, mighty and many, the king of Assyria and all his glory; and it will rise over all its channels and go over all its banks; and it will sweep on into Judah, it will overflow and pass on, reaching even to the neck; and its outspread wings will fill the breadth of your land, O Immanuel.'** **(Isaiah 8:5–8)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the 8th century Syro-Ephraimite War, which is the backdrop for much of Isaiah's prophetic activity, and candidates might explain this background at some length. The region was dominated by the neo-Assyrian Empire. Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel formed a defensive coalition and urged Ahaz of Judah to join it. When Ahaz became reluctant, Rezin and Pekah sought to force the issue by invading Judah, but despite inflicting damage, they failed to take Jerusalem. Other states, such as the Philistines and the Edomites, took the opportunity to raid towns in Judah. Ahaz asked Tiglath-Pileser III (the Assyrian king) for help. Tiglath-Pileser disposed of Philistia, Syria and Israel, but Ahaz now had to pay tribute to Assyria with money from the Temple treasury and with the presence of Assyrian gods in the Temple itself. Isaiah's view on this was that trusting Assyria rather than God was a bad idea, since large and powerful states have a habit of empire-building at the expense of states like Judah. • The immediate context is the part played by Isaiah in maintaining a degree of Judean independence. • In the passage above, Isaiah shows how Ahaz, a weak and vacillating king, will pay the price of lack of trust in Yahweh. • Shiloah (8:6) was a conduit from the spring of Gihon, and Isaiah contrasts its gentle waters with those of the Assyrian Euphrates. Isaiah tells Ahaz that making bargains with bigger powers is never a good idea, because the Assyrians, like their mighty river, will 'burst their banks' and 'flood' Judah along with all the rest. • By refusing the waters of Shiloah (v.6), Ahaz had also, in effect, abused the significance of their source in the Spring of Gihon on the south-east wall of Jerusalem. Gihon was where David had instructed Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet to anoint Solomon as king (1 Kings 1:38). To disrespect Gihon was to disrespect God's promises to the kings of Judah. • The final two words of the passage are 'O Immanuel', which refers back to the Sign of Immanuel given by the prophet to Ahaz in 7:10–17: 'a young woman shall conceive and bear a son, to be called Immanuel, meaning 'God (is) with us'. Before the child knows how to refuse evil and choose the good, the lands of Rezin and Pekah will be deserted. The Hebrew word for 'a young woman' refers to 'a woman of marriageable age': it does not mean 'virgin', so references to a virgin birth here are inappropriate.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(i)	• Some will refer further back to the previous sign given by Isaiah to Ahaz, namely that of Shear-jashub (Isaiah 7:1–9) – in the worst eventuality, 'a remnant would return' from exile, so God's promises to David concerning Jerusalem and its Temple would be carried out by that remnant (2 Samuel 7:8–16). • In 8:8, then, the words 'O Immanuel' are a reminder of the Immanuel prophecy, intended to raise some moral courage in Ahaz. • Some might refer to 9:2–7, the description of the messianic king whose name will be called 'Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God'.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(j)	**'But you, gird up your loins; arise, and say to them everything that I command you. Do not be dismayed by them, lest I dismay you before them. And I, behold, I make you this day a fortified city, an iron pillar, and bronze walls, against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, its princes, its priests, and the people of the land. They will fight against you; but they shall not prevail against you, for I am with you, says the LORD, to deliver you.'** **(Jeremiah 1:17–19)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is the call of Jeremiah (Jeremiah 1:4–19), during which the characteristics of Jeremiah's life as a prophet are defined, and candidates might refer to some of these. • The emphasis throughout the call narrative is on Yahweh's intentions for Jeremiah. As with Moses, these are clear in Yahweh's mind if not in Jeremiah's. No options are given, so in v.5 God knew him before he was formed in the womb and consecrated and appointed him before he was born as a prophet to the nations. • Jeremiah's objections (like those of Moses) are overruled (1:7) – 'Do not say, 'I am only a youth'; for to all to whom I send you you shall go, and whatever I command you you shall speak.' • Equally, Jeremiah will be unassailable by any foe, because God will put his words into his mouth. He is set over nations and kingdoms, 'to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant.' (1:9–10). • The immediate context (1:17–19) is further repetition of Yahweh's determination to support Jeremiah. The support is related to an ambiguous enemy – a foe from the north. This may relate to more than one entity: some scholars identify the foe as the Scythians, one of the earliest groups to master mounted warfare. It seems likely that the text is referring particularly to Babylonian expansion and aggression, and it was the Babylonians who eventually destroyed Judah, Jerusalem and its Temple. Jeremiah becomes aware that no matter which enemy is at Jerusalem's gates, it is Yahweh who holds real power, and Yahweh who will decide on Judah's fate. • 'Them' in verse 17 refers to the people of Judah: Jeremiah will have to say everything that God commands. Verses 17–19 are an expansion of what God says in verses 4–8. Jeremiah is not to be dismayed by any foe, because foes and history are all controlled by Yahweh. Jeremiah will be as immovable and indestructible as an iron pillar against the whole political establishment: kings, princes, priests and people (vv.18–19). • In short, Jeremiah is told to defy the whole status quo, since the reality will be that there will be national exile for continued sin. Moreover there will be the promise of eventual return from exile. • Some might point out that Jeremiah's proclamation in ch.2 is similar in format to the covenant lawsuit in Hosea. Jeremiah 2:9 introduces the covenant lawsuit (*rib*) against the nation as a whole. Verse 20 notes the crime to be punished – harlotry, and verse 23 refers to the defilement caused by going after the Baals.	

Question	Answer	Marks
10(k)	**Woe is me, my mother, that you bore me, a man of strife and contention to the whole land! I have not lent, nor have I borrowed, yet all of them curse me. So let it be, O LORD, if I have not entreated thee for their good, if I have not pleaded with thee on behalf of the enemy in the time of trouble and in the time of distress! Can one break iron, iron from the north, and bronze?** **(Jeremiah 15:10–12)** Candidates might comment on some of the following: • The general context is a formal structure used in Jeremiah – the personal lament. • There are 6 examples of this form in the book: 11:18 – 12:6; 15:10–21 (under consideration here); 17:14–18; 18:18–23; 20:7–13; 20:14–18. • The immediate context is the second lament: (15:10–21). The Book of Jeremiah is so large that it is difficult to detect any consistent structure beyond the prophet's certainty that Jerusalem was to be destroyed. Together with that, Jeremiah shows an ever-present undercurrent of personal grief for the fate of Jerusalem and for his treatment by those he is trying to warn: he was not allowed to have a family (16:2); plots were made against him (18:18); he was beaten by Pashhur the priest and put in the stocks (20:2) and debarred from the Temple (36:5). His personal lamentations show the effect of such treatment. • In 15:10, he addresses his mother, portraying himself as 'a man of strife and contention to the whole land'. 'Strife' here is Hebrew *rib* – used elsewhere of God's covenant lawsuit (e.g. in Hosea 4:1), so both God and the whole land contend (litigate) against him. • He expresses his woe that he had ever been born: a theme used at greater length in Job 3. • In verse 11 Jeremiah protests his innocence – he has even interceded for the guilty. • Verse 12 seems to refer back to Jeremiah's call, in 1:18, where God tells him: 'And I, behold, I make you this day a fortified city, an iron pillar, and bronze walls, against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, its princes, its priests, and the people of the land.' Jeremiah appears to be saying that despite God's promise, he (Jeremiah) cannot break iron or bronze, and so cannot stand against any enemy, whether from the north or from within. • Some scholars have argued that Jeremiah's laments show that he worked within the cult, because they have the form of a priestly oracle, e.g. 17:14–18. Someone suffering from a disease, for example, might go to the Temple and ask a priest to intercede with God and convey God's reply through a priestly oracle. 17:14–18 is Jeremiah's request to God for healing, and v.15 asks, 'Where is the word of the Lord? Let it come!' In 15:10–18, Jeremiah concludes his lament by asking God, 'Why is my pain unceasing?' Verses 19–21 then appear to be a reply from God, promising that if Jeremiah utters what is precious rather than what is worthless, God will make him a fortified wall of bronze. • Others reject the cultic explanation, and point out that, 'Woe is me, my mother, that you bore me …' does not sound as if it had a cultic background.	