

# DIVINITY

---

Paper 9011/01

Prophets of the Old Testament

## Key Messages

In **Section C**, answers to the ‘gobbet’ questions should contain an explanation and analysis of the context, background and meaning of each text. Candidates who give explanation and analysis are likely to score more marks than candidates who simply paraphrase the text.

For the convenience of Centres, mark schemes are written using bullet points, but candidates’ answers should be written using complete sentences and paragraphs, and should not use bullet points.

## General Comments

Standards were generally high, and some candidates were outstanding. Some candidates could improve their marks by paying more careful attention to the wording of questions.

**Questions 2, 4, 6 and 7** were the most popular. Some of the most sensitive writing was seen in answer to **Question 8**, on the personality of Jeremiah.

## Comments on Specific Questions

### *Section A*

#### *Prophecy in general and Pre-canonical Prophets*

##### **Question 1**

The best responses acknowledged that nearly all prophets must have had something to do with the cult, since the books of the Old Testament record them as being in the Temple at Jerusalem (e.g. Isaiah at his call), or in other sanctuaries (e.g. Amos at Bethel), or contesting with the prophets of Baal (e.g. Elijah). Most candidates referred to the appearance of ecstatic prophets in sanctuaries (1 Samuel 3); to Samuel, Saul and the band of prophets (1 Samuel 10:10); Elijah on Mount Carmel; Nathan’s concern for the building of the Jerusalem Temple (2 Samuel 7); Jeremiah’s Temple sermon, and Hosea’s involvement with Gomer, who was possibly a cultic prostitute. Some candidates needed to focus on the more obvious narratives instead of making statements that could not be justified, such as, ‘All false prophets were cultic prophets and all true prophets had nothing to do with the cult’. Many candidates took the view that true prophets were not critical of the cult itself but were critical of the cult when it became meaningless. There was good use of Amos and Hosea in this connection. Some of the very best writing examined the meaning of the term ‘true prophet’.

##### **Question 2**

The general consensus was that Moses was indeed more than a prophet. Many took the view that his role was ideal in this sense, since later writers have exaggerated Moses’ various functions in the same way that Samuel and Elijah were gradually idealised by tradition. The main approach was to look at Moses’ roles as judge, priest, mediator, law giver, politician, administrator, miracle worker and so on, and to justify whether each particular role fell within his prophetic title or not. Candidates often reached different conclusions, but the important thing was to make the effort at analysis. Some candidates simply outlined what they thought belonged to Moses’ role as a prophet followed by another list of what made him more than a prophet, but with no attempt at giving a specific answer to the question of whether he in fact was ‘more than a prophet’.

### Question 3

The best answers answered the question, which was about the *importance* of symbolic acts, e.g. how and why they were important, and in what circumstances. Most referred to the various symbolic acts by Jeremiah and Isaiah. Some branched out into Hosea's marriage, explaining the symbolism of the marriage and the children of the marriage, in terms both of judgement and of God's grace. The very best essays considered both the importance of symbolic acts by individual prophets in specific situations and their importance as an aspect of prophetic technique in general. Some simply listed symbolic acts, often confusing one prophet with another and one situation with another. Some spent a lot of time comparing symbolic acts with other prophetic techniques such as visions, dreams, miracles and oracles, none of which was really within the remit of the question, although it gained some credit if it contributed towards assessing the importance of symbolic acts.

### Question 4

Most candidates gave good answers to this question. The level of analysis was particularly good on Samuel. For example, many argued that answering the question depends on whether it is referring to prophecy in the Ancient Near East as a whole, prophecy before the settlement in Canaan, or prophecy after the time of settlement. Most argued that Moses was the first true prophet, but since Moses did not set foot in Canaan, the claim in the question is correct for Samuel, since there is a strong case to be made that Samuel was the first to make the transition from seer to prophet, and his prophetic office evolved in connection with the institution of the monarchy. The Elijah part of the question was on the whole not quite so well done; nevertheless many candidates made a strong case for his success in overturning Jezebel's scheme to eradicate Yahwism. Some candidates wrote with less purpose about everything Elijah did, without saying why those things prevented Yahwism from dying out. Quite a few made the interesting claim that Samuel and Elijah were merely the prophets selected by God for starting and reviving Israelite prophecy, and since God is all powerful, he could have used any particular prophet he chose. Had Elijah not done as well as he did, for example, God would simply have raised up somebody else to do the job.

### Question 5

The best answers to this question talked about the different functions of prophets in relation to kings, e.g. anointing, supporting, criticising, and so on, illustrating each function with different prophets and kings. Most discussed the adversarial role of Samuel, Nathan and Elijah in connection with Saul, David and Ahab respectively, pointing out that in some instances the prophets were very understanding of the human weaknesses of kings, especially in the case of Nathan and David. Some made very good use of Amos' comments about Jeroboam, pointing out that Amos was absolutely fearless in confronting Amaziah in the royal sanctuary at Bethel with his scandalous predictions about the fate of the monarchy. The dealings of Isaiah with Ahaz and Hezekiah, and of Jeremiah with the various kings of his time, were less commonly mentioned, although the political manoeuvring between Isaiah and Ahaz concerning the Syro-Ephraimite War produced some astute comment. Some responses simply told the story of various kings and prophets without discussing the relationship between the individuals referred to.

### Section B

#### ***Pre-exilic Prophets, with special reference to Amos, Hosea, Isaiah of Jerusalem and Jeremiah***

### Question 6

Stronger answers were distinguished by their evaluation of the claim made in the question. Whereas some simply listed all those verses in Amos which announce doom, and then went on to list all those which are about social justice, the best answers were generally those who argued that the prophecies of doom were given primarily *because* of social injustice. Knowledge of the text was particularly impressive for this question: some candidates appearing to know all nine chapters by heart. Some evaluation was equally impressive, e.g. those who argued that although Amos claimed to be defending the poor, the fact that his proclamation of doom included the poor meant that even his comments on social justice were in the end about doom. Others argued that as a prophet, Amos simply prophesied whatever he was commanded, so he was not, strictly speaking, a prophet of anything – he was Yahweh's mouthpiece. One or two thought that 'social justice' meant 'salvation'.

### Question 7

This question tended to differentiate between candidates mainly by how well they knew the text of Hosea. Candidates made all sorts of claims, but sometimes found difficulty in illustrating them. There was a lot of discussion about whether or not the instruction to Hosea to marry a prostitute was real or allegorical, but sometimes this discussion lost sight of the question. Some got so taken up with the story of Hosea, in recounting the details of the various punishments and misfortunes befalling his family, that they also lost sight of the question. For the most part, the best answers argued that God's grace included justified punishment, so 'grace' could be seen both through punishment and by restoration: grace is not just *hesed* – it is a reminder of the obligations of the covenant bond. Alternatively, some argued convincingly that if Hosea's marriage experience was real as opposed to allegorical or metaphorical, then his life would have been hard beyond imagining, so there is no sign in it of God's grace.

### Question 8

This was not a particularly popular question, but it did attract some very good answers. Candidates discussed those narratives and oracles that show Jeremiah's hesitation, modesty, humility, anger, and a range of other emotions. In particular, the 'confessional' material led Jeremiah to be labelled the 'weeping prophet', particularly where he cursed the very day on which he was born, since it led him to experience the misery of public rejection, and to feel anger that the wicked should thrive while the good undergo all sorts of torment. Good use was made of the view that Jeremiah was seen as a quisling – that his efforts to direct people's thoughts to a restoration after exile were tantamount to collaborating with the enemy. Some argued that if Hosea's experiences with Gomer were real, then Hosea's anguish over Gomer's unfaithfulness was as bitter as anything experienced by Jeremiah. Others compared Jeremiah's personality with that of Elijah, particularly the intensity of his contest with the Baal and Asherah prophets and the frenzied flight from Jezebel's vengeance, culminating in his encounter with the 'still small voice' at Horeb. Some candidates simply told the story of Jeremiah's life, which did not answer the specific focus of the question.

### Question 9

Candidates covered a range of prophets here, particularly Moses, Samuel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah. The best answers linked specific characteristics in each call to the work of the prophet concerned. For example, many argued that Moses' call to free the Hebrew slaves conditioned his various activities as a politician, judge, war leader, miracle worker, etc., so that his prophetic activities simply expanded with each new challenge. Some of the comment on Jeremiah was particularly good, with specific links between 'pluck up, pull down; destroy, overthrow; build and plant' and Jeremiah's decades of effort in dealing with the oncoming crisis of the destruction of the Southern Kingdom. Where candidates did not make such connections, it was usually because there was an over-emphasis on the general structure of call narratives, and simply on telling the story of each call, particularly those of Moses and Samuel.

## Section C

### Question 10

- (a) This was popular and well known, with a wealth of detail about the nature of ecstasy, the origins of ecstasy, and whether or not this feature of the narrative is a read-back from a later editor. There was intelligent comment on Moses' need of help; on the tent of meeting; on the power of Moses; on the significance of the number 70; and on Moses' refusal to be upset that Eldad and Medad were prophesying in the camp. Some of the speculation about the motives and methods of those involved in the narrative was wildly imaginative but over complicated.
- (b) Comment was particularly good on Saul's personal characteristics as listed in the extract: for example that his height and personal attractions were perhaps editorial features to account for the choice of Saul, in so far as Saul's obvious physical qualities set him apart in people's eyes as an ideal/obvious choice for king. Comment was largely concerned with: the Philistine threat; Samuel's apparent approval of the choice of Saul in contrast with his later rejection of him; Samuel's earlier displeasure at the notion that a human king could be preferred to the lordship of Yahweh; the customary reference to Saul's genealogy, which is a feature of other biblical narratives; and on the ongoing story of the lost asses. Some candidates could have gained more marks by concentrating on these features of the extract as it was set rather than on background issues such as whether or not seers were paid for their services.

- (c) By contrast with answers to some of the other gobbets, candidates did very well here just by commenting on the three main features of the text: the death of Samuel and his burial in Ramah; Saul's earlier purge of mediums and wizards; and Saul's gathering of the Israelite army at Gilboa to face the Philistine troops massed at Shunem. Many candidates caught the psychological threat to Saul: the imminence and size of the Philistine threat; the death of his mentor, Samuel; the failure of *Urim* and *Thummim* in obtaining any knowledge of God's will; the ironic fact that Saul's obedience to covenantal law had led him to banish wizards and witches from the land, whereas now the witch of Endor is his only resource; Samuel's continued rejection of Saul even in his desperate extremity of summoning him from the dead. Weaker answers tended to focus on peripheral issues such as Saul's disobedience in not eradicating the Amalekites, and the reasons why Samuel anointed David.
- (d) This was probably the most popular gobbet, and most candidates scored highly on it, with many answers being as full as the mark scheme. Comment was, therefore, on: Naboth's being faithful to the inheritance tradition given in Leviticus 25; Ahab's childish behaviour contrasted with Jezebel's belligerence in bringing about the death of Naboth; the nature of the oracle and the oracular formula commissioning Elijah to confront Ahab; Elijah's stance on social justice; Ahab's description of him ('Have you found me, O my enemy?'); Elijah's (indirect) reference to the 6<sup>th</sup> commandment; and the prediction of Ahab's death, with its subsequent postponement after Ahab humbled himself before Yahweh.
- (e) A few candidates were aware of the immediate context of this extract, which follows Amos' notorious comments about the 'cows of Bashan' (4:1-3). Equally, a few argued that the oracle was probably delivered at Bethel itself, the royal shrine of the Northern Kingdom, and yet now described as the place where people go to commit yet more sin. Comment was particularly good on Amos' satire on the meaningless focus on ritual practices offered for form's sake: the practices satisfy the people but do not honour God. Candidates commented well on the following context of Amos' announcement of doom on the North. Sometimes the emphasis on doom was given too much prominence, in that some candidates made doom the entire focus of their comments, giving an abbreviated version of the whole of the Book of Amos. The focus of comment on all extracts should be on the extract itself. Background issues are of course relevant, but they should amplify something that is present in the text being commented on.
- (f) There was good comment on Amos' use of vision as a means of conveying the divine message, this particular vision being part of a series of four. The main point of this vision is on the word play between Hebrew *kets* ('summer/ripe fruit') and '*kets*' ('end'). Most candidates did comment well on the probability that the imagery of ripe fruit comes from Amos' agricultural background: ripe fruit does not last long, so shortly after the summer the North would be invaded and destroyed. Very few were aware of the specific pun. Most contrasted Amos' intercession on behalf of Israel in previous visions with Yahweh's clear refusal to entertain any further stay of punishment ('The end has come ... I will never again pass them by'). Only two candidates commented on the comparison here with the passing over of the angel of death at the Exodus. As with the previous Amos gobbet, some candidates noted the extended context following Amos' prophecy of destruction to Amaziah and Israel (7:14-17). Some candidates could have gained more marks by using the doom language specific to the context of Amos 8:1-2 as opposed to giving another abbreviated version of the entire book.
- (g) The substance of the complaint in this extract is that God's people are destroyed through 'lack of knowledge'. The best answers knew that 'lack of knowledge' is a technical term meaning 'lack of knowledge of the proper observance of the cult': neither priests nor prophets have this knowledge, since sacrifices are offered for the benefit of those in the cult rather than as a proper sacrifice to God. Nobody gave a full explanation of the form of the extract as a whole, which is that it is an example of the prophetic *rib* – the 'covenant lawsuit'. The legal phraseology is in words like 'accuse' / 'contention', and in the subsequent accusation that people 'have forgotten the law of God'. This applies particularly to the priests and the prophets, since they are supposed to be experts in the law. Some candidates answered this question without a clear understanding of its place in the Book of Hosea.
- (h) Most candidates who answered this question were aware of its specific concern, which is to spell out what Yahweh really wants from Israel: *hesed* and knowledge of God. Most made good comment on the metaphors of the people's love as 'like a morning cloud' and 'like the dew that goes early away': in other words, love vanishes at the first sign of heat (difficulty). The text contains a number of technical words, e.g. 'the words of my mouth' referring to the prophetic word

(*dabar*) from God, i.e. oracles given through the prophets; 'judgment' (*mishpat*); 'steadfast love' (*hesed*), and the 'knowledge (*dabar*) of God'. Some of these words were commented on by most candidates. As with (g), some answered the question without a clear understanding of its place in the Book of Hosea, so for example Yahweh's complaint about the people's vanishing love was taken in the reverse sense, to mean that Yahweh's love would never go away.

- (i) Answers to this were divided between those who identified the extract in the context of Isaiah's oracles concerning the messianic king and those who took it simply as a prediction of the birth of Jesus. The application of this oracle to Jesus is a matter for faith, and comments to that end are worthy of credit (for example that Christian exegesis has re-applied Isaiah's words to a Christian setting), whereas an unquestioned assertion that Isaiah was making a Christian comment gains no credit. Most candidates gained general credit for unpacking the language of the oracle.
- (j) The best answers combined an analysis of the particular phrases in the gobbet together with the question of false prophecy in general. Some raised the interesting question of the narrative in 1 Kings 22, which suggests that false prophecy comes from Yahweh himself, in so far as Yahweh sends a member of his heavenly council to be a lying spirit in the mouths of Ahab's prophets, to 'entice' the king so that he dies in battle. This is difficult to explain in the light of the gobbet, since, if Yahweh controls false prophecy, why does Jeremiah insist that prophets 'speak visions of their own minds, not from the mouth of the Lord'? Some raised the particular issue of Jeremiah's clash with Hananiah, since the torment this occasioned Jeremiah can be seen in the whole tone of the current extract. Many candidates could have gained more marks by dealing with the central issues raised by the gobbet, particularly the 'council of the Lord'.
- (k) This was done well by almost all those who attempted it. Many pointed out that the land purchase was a family matter involving Jeremiah's cousin Hanamel, and that the narrative bears a strong resemblance to the land inheritance issue concerning Naboth's vineyard in the clash between Ahab and Naboth; although the Jeremiah narrative is the most detailed account of such a contract in the Bible. Just about all candidates gave a good explanation of the symbolism of Jeremiah's land purchase.

# DIVINITY

---

<p><b>Paper 9011/02</b> <b>The Four Gospels</b></p>
---

1. **Questions 1-7**, relating to the specific Gospels, were the most popular choices. The questions on John's Gospel were attempted by fewer candidates. The **Questions 10-14** were less popular.
2. Overall performance was good with the range of marks reaching the 90's. There was evidence of satisfactory preparation by candidates but there was little evidence of the appropriate use of scholarly material within the written answers.
3. All questions succeeded at achieving differentiation. More candidates struggled with their use of time in this examination. Several candidates, (more than usual) failed to get four questions done in the time allowed. They did three very good answers but failed to do the fourth question. Overall the exam instructions were clearly understood.

The standard of writing was very good. No scripts were illegible, all were clear.

## Specific Questions

### The Gobbets

#### **Question 1**

- (a) A popular question. Candidates recognised that this was a parable about the kingdom but not enough comment was focused upon the gobbet, much was said about parables as a whole. Few candidates gained the full marks available for the context of this gobbet.
- (b) It was important to identify the context of this gobbet correctly. This was not always done therefore inappropriate comments were made by some. For those who did identify it as part of the overall confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi they were able to make very detailed comment.
- (c) All candidates who did this gobbet answered it very well. It was a very popular choice. All were able to identify the context as 'the raising of Jairus' daughter'. Some candidates merely retold the incident without making comments on the specific gobbet.
- (d) A popular question which was well answered. Candidates identified this as part of the resurrection appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene. Some candidates included comment on the person of Mary Magdalene and her inclusion in the gospel elsewhere.
- (e) Many candidates used this as an opportunity to comment upon the identity of Theophilus. This was a popular question producing a lot of very good answers.
- (f) The specific context of this gobbet was not identified well. A lot of good comments about the cost of discipleship were made but little about the position of this gobbet in the ministry of Jesus.
- (g) Not as popular as some of the other gobbets but for those candidates who had a good understanding of John's Gospel this was answered well. Few made mention of this being part of the call of the disciples in John and peculiar to his Gospel only.
- (h) A popular choice amongst the candidates and answered competently. There was much good comment about the Spirit as Counsellor but some candidates were not as good about setting it in its immediate context.

## **Essays**

### **Question 2**

This was a very popular question. Candidates gave good answers on the whole as many identified the importance of the Sermon on the Mount as a key feature to the answer. Better answers included comment about the book having five 'sermons' and linked this with the Mosaic tradition. Some spoke about the early ecclesiastical matters.

### **Question 3**

There was some confusion of the Matthean parables with those found in the other Synoptic Gospels therefore some essays were not specific and did not answer the question asked. This was a popular question but few candidates elaborated on the distinctive nature of the parables found in Matthew. This question, on the whole, was not satisfactorily answered by all.

### **Question 4**

This was a popular question which was well answered by many candidates. The dominance of the passion narrative in Mark was expanded and many also commented on the mental and emotional suffering of Jesus when he was rejected by his home town and his disciples.

### **Question 5**

This question gave candidates the opportunity to discuss the role of Peter as a key member of the disciples. Generally this was well answered and candidates used the Petrine material to its best advantage. Many discussed the identity of John Mark and his relationship with Peter as well as showing that the gospel had the traits of being written as an eyewitness account. This question brought about some high scoring answers.

### **Question 6**

Questions on Luke are always very popular choices but, as with answers to **Question 3**, the importance of this question was to deal with the distinctive nature of the Lukan teaching on the kingdom of God. It was important not to just write about the kingdom of God in general.

### **Question 7**

This was a very popular question and was generally well answered by all who attempted it. Many expanded upon the role of Mary and Elizabeth in Luke's birth narrative. Fewer candidates spoke about the role of other women who are found in Luke but all comments were relevant.

### **Question 8**

This question was about the authorship of John. Fewer candidates attempted this, as questions about John's Gospel are not as popular as questions about the Synoptic Gospels. On the whole it was clear that those who did answer it were well prepared for this.

### **Question 9**

This was not a very popular choice of question but those who did attempt it needed to be more specific to the relevant passages. Many spoke about the significance of the prologue as setting the scene as a spiritual gospel and they mentioned Jesus' encounter with Nicodemus but few developed deeper answers. There was a wide range of material which could have been commented on but did not get any mention.

### **Question 10**

This was a popular choice amongst the questions which are not specific to one gospel. This was largely well answered and much was written about the Jewish traditions and customs.

**Question 11**

This was another popular question which gave candidates the opportunity to discuss the baptism and transfiguration stories of Jesus. Both were well known stories amongst candidates therefore this gave the opportunity for well-balanced answers which addressed the question asked.

**Question 12**

This was not widely selected. Many who did attempt this question expanded on the teaching of Jesus through parables. Few linked the ethical teaching with his teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. It was clear that some candidates were unsure what was meant by 'ethical teaching'.

**Question 13**

This was an opportunity for those candidates who had learnt about it to give a detailed discussion of the synoptic problem. A few candidates did not make this link and therefore struggled to show what they understood by 'a literary relationship' amongst the Gospels.

**Question 14**

This question demands that a candidate is aware of the differences between the gospel writers relating to the crucifixion, death and burial of Jesus therefore it is easy to get them muddled together if unsure of the differences. Few candidates chose this question and few candidates achieved high marks.



# DIVINITY

---

**Paper 9011/03**  
**The Apostolic Age**

## **Key Messages**

The overall standard of scripts was extremely good.

Comments on texts set in **Question 1** should follow the pattern of a commentary. They should focus on the content of the passage set, and should explain key words and ideas in that text. Full marks can be achieved by this concentration of the answer on the actual verse(s) on the question paper. Context is generally required and should briefly indicate the section of the book and the immediately preceding passage.

Quotations from scholars should be from the writer's own work and not be the scholar's paraphrase of the biblical text: so not 'the Jerome Bible Commentary tells us Paul attended the Council of Jerusalem', but 'C K Barrett comments on Paul's use of typology in Romans 5 as skilful and persuasive'.

Essays should be planned to ensure that candidates achieve the highest possible level. This can be either chronologically through a book or analytically in discussing the relevant material.

## **General Comments**

Candidates responded well to all the questions on the paper. Both Romans and James as the letters set for special study were well known and understood, though there were occasional gaps in many candidates' awareness of central themes.

Essays were generally sound, though there were examples where not planning led to a slightly confusing piece of work. The best candidates wrote fluently and assuredly, and made accurate references to the biblical texts to support their argument. There was a good range of scholarly sources cited, though Centres should note the comment in Key Messages about quoting the actual views of scholars rather than a paraphrase of the biblical text. It would be good if candidates could show awareness of the differing views of scholars about various aspects of the apostolic age. There is an absence of the much more positive view of the Pharisees in contemporary scholarship.

## **Comments on Specific Questions**

### ***Section A***

#### **Question 1**

- (a) This was a popular text for comment. The context was generally well known. The 'law' was accurately identified. There was an almost complete absence of comment on 'righteousness'. This central Pauline concept, crucial for an understanding of the whole argument in Romans 1-8 needed to be commented on.
- (b) The Adam typology was well known. 'One man's trespass' was correctly identified as referring to Adam in Genesis 3, and the parallel with Jesus Christ as the Second Adam was mentioned or explored. Little attention was paid to 'trespass' as a going over or a going beyond the divine will. 'Grace' was thoroughly understood as a free gift, and the meaning of 'many' as a synonym for all was noted.
- (c) The significance of 'By no means' as Paul's standard rhetorical escape from unacceptable implications was missed. This is important in this verse as leading into the debate about dying to sin and living the new life in Christ. Good answers explored the importance of baptism, though

most missed the sacramental dimension of baptism allowing the believer to participate in Christ's saving acts by the incorporation of the candidate into the experience of death, burial and new life.

- (d) The context of this passage was well known, but candidates did not always show the same awareness of the olive tree grafting analogy. They identified the Jews as the 'natural branches' and the Gentiles as those from the 'wild olive tree'. However the impossibility of re-grafting natural branches, which is discussed in many commentaries, was missing.
- (e) This was a very popular text. Candidates knew the context thoroughly and drew the contrast with Paul's teaching in Romans accurately and sensibly. There were good illustrations taken from surrounding verses of works revealing faith.
- (f) All candidates correctly identified 'it' as the tongue. There were sensible and thoughtful comments about blessing and cursing. The main omission was comment about 'made in the likeness of God'. This reference to Genesis 1:26-28 is rare in the New Testament, and might have provoked further comment about the impact of sin on human beings.

## Question 2

The debate about the date of Romans was generally accurately known. There was a more limited acquaintance with the complexity of Pauline chronology towards the end of the apostle's ministry. The discussions about Romans' purpose were less successful, illustrating the importance of careful planning to achieve a satisfactory analysis in such answers. It was recognised that Paul did not found the church in Rome, so the idea of an introductory letter was common. However there was very little about the significance of the extended argument in chapters 1 to 8 as summarising Paul's understanding of the gospel and of salvation. Some candidates noted that Paul is here developing his thought from the argument about justification by faith in Galatians, but did not go on to explore the richness of Romans 5 to 8 in terms of the Adam-Christ typology, the discussion of baptism, the treatment of sin and grace. There was some discussion about Jews and Gentiles based on chapters 9 to 11. Treatment of the more ethical sections of the letter in chapters 12 to 14 tended to be superficial and over-generalised. The problem of chapter 16 and a possible link to Ephesus could have been included but tended not to be.

## Question 3

Again answers to this question were less successful because of a failure to plan the analysis. Obviously Romans 8 is the heart of any adequate response. This was not always the case. There are other relevant texts earlier in the letter as in chapters 2 and 5, and later on especially in chapter 15. Romans 8 with its discussion of the Spirit of God and of Christ, the Spirit as adopting believers as children of God and co-heirs with Christ, the Spirit interceding and supplying the words of prayer to those in distress, must be the heart of the essay. Many answers were generalised accounts of Paul's thought without specific reference to Romans.

## Question 4

This popular question was often answered with reference to the two texts set in **Question 1**. Essay answers need to go beyond the textual comment required in **Question 1**. However they did allow a good structure to essays, though the concern with true religion from James 1 could then be missed. The comparison with Paul inevitably focused on the apparently contrasting understandings of faith. This was sensibly and in many cases well done. The idea of faith as a relationship in Paul, which is prominent in Romans 3 to 5, as well as in other passages, was not always fully understood. This can helpfully move away from a more static understanding of faith as a quality in a believer and so support the ultimate agreement between Paul and James which many candidates wanted to argue for. James' concluding discussion of the Church was missed by some candidates.

## **Section B**

### **Question 5**

This was a very popular question. Every candidate who attempted it agreed with the thesis in the question. This is a legitimate approach, though it would have been even better if candidates had engaged in a real debate. The main weakness was again planning. Candidates supplied a range of passages to support the argument. But many leapt around the book in a confusing way. More successful answers started with the promise of Acts 1:8 and the election of Matthias. They then moved to the first Pentecost in chapter 2. After this it might have been wise to look at the succession of Pentecosts through the rest of the book as in chapters 4:31, 8, 10, and 19. Other elements might include the inspiration of speeches such as Stephen's, Peter and James at the Council and Paul during his missionary journeys, or the Spirit's direction of missionary activity from chapter 8 onwards. Better answers tackled the difficult episode about Ananias and Sapphira testing or lying to the Spirit.

### **Question 6**

This produced some good answers as the two characters essentially supplied candidates with a basic structure. Stephen's abilities and career were generally accurately known and discussed, though his entry into the prophetic tradition of denouncing the Temple and sacrificial worship was underplayed. Barnabas had a longer and more extensive career. The key elements of his initial generosity towards the communist experiment, his relationship with Paul and his wider missionary preaching were usually covered. There was a tendency to under-value the impact of Stephen's death and its linked persecution as the trigger to allow the gospel to be preached to the Samaritans.

### **Question 7**

This attracted some good responses. The authorship of the letter is obviously essentially linked with its date. If Paul was the author, then the letter has to be dated somewhere around 60, unless candidates argued for the early date of 53-54 during an Ephesian imprisonment. If the letter is not by Paul, then a date in the 70s or 80s becomes plausible, particularly if gnostic elements are identified in the targets of the letter. The high number of *hapax legomena* and the absence of many central Pauline ideas would support an alternative author. Candidates who favour Paul as the author cited the appropriate textual evidence and references to known associates of the apostle.

### **Question 8**

This question attracted very few candidates. There were sound understandings of faith, though there might have been more extensive discussion of Hebrews 11 beyond verse 1. Discussion of faith in Galatians needed more on how Paul's comments are shaped by the controversial context of the letter. In both writings, trust is an important element in the understanding of faith. This was not always made sufficiently clear.

### **Question 9**

This attracted some good answers. The basic pattern in the question allowed candidates to look back at the saving events of the cross and resurrection, using largely material from Romans, and at the present experience of salvation in Christian experience. There could have been more on the ethical implications of Christian living in Paul's thought. The weakest element tended to be discussion of the future hope of salvation. This is where candidates needed to range outside Romans to I Corinthians, Philippians or I Thessalonians.

### **Question 10**

This was another popular question. The question asked about 'opposition' which should have opened up a rich range of material from Acts, either the Stephen episode in chapters 7 and 8, or examples from Paul's missionary journeys as in Lystra and Iconium and Derbe, in Corinth or in Ephesus. There were frequent notes about Paul's threat to the economic well-being of the Ephesian silversmiths, but few references to Gallio's reaction to the Jewish prosecution of Paul before a Roman court in Acts 18. The charges of the Philippians in Acts 16 that Paul was breaking the law by trying to convert Romans were missed. The actual persecution of Nero in Rome was often omitted, as was Paul's own account of his sufferings for the faith in II Corinthians. Some candidates misunderstood the meaning of Gentiles in the question which limited the award of levels. A key element in the Roman response to Christianity was its lack of status as a *religio licita*.