

Cambridge International AS & A Level

BIBLICAL STUDIES

9484/32

Paper 3 Prophets of the Old Testament

May/June 2024

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **19** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

Guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

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

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

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

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

Annotation:

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

Assessment objectives**AO1 Knowledge and understanding**

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

AO2 Analysis and evaluation

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

Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (5 marks)

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

Level	Description	Marks
Level 3	<p>Accurate knowledge with good understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of detailed, accurate and relevant knowledge. • Demonstrates understanding through a well-developed response. • Fully addresses the question. • Good understanding of the context, if relevant. 	5
Level 2	<p>Partially accurate knowledge with limited understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of knowledge which may be partially accurate. • Demonstrates limited understanding through a partially developed response. • Addresses some aspects of the question. • Attempts to engage with the context, if relevant. 	3–4
Level 1	<p>Limited knowledge and basic understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies a limited range of knowledge which may not be accurate. • Demonstrates basic understanding through a limited response. • Response is relevant to the topic, but does not directly address the question. • Little or no reference to the context, if relevant. 	1–2
Level 0	No relevant material to credit.	0

Table B: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks)

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response for **Questions 5** and **6**.

Level	Description	Marks
Level 4	<p>Detailed accurate knowledge with good understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of detailed, accurate and relevant knowledge. • Demonstrates understanding through a well-developed response. • Fully addresses the question. • Good understanding of the context, if relevant. 	9–10
Level 3	<p>Mostly accurate knowledge with some understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of mostly accurate and relevant knowledge. • Demonstrates understanding through a developed response. • Addresses most aspects of the question. • Some engagement with the context, if relevant. 	6–8
Level 2	<p>Partially accurate knowledge with limited understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of knowledge which may be partially accurate. • Demonstrates limited understanding through a partially developed response. • Attempts to address the question. • Attempts to engage with the context, if relevant. 	3–5
Level 1	<p>Limited knowledge and basic understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies a limited range of knowledge which may not be accurate. • Demonstrates basic understanding through a limited response. • Response is relevant to the topic, but does not directly address the question. • Little or no reference to the context, if relevant. 	1–2
Level 0	No relevant material to credit.	0

Table C: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 marks)Use this table to give marks for each candidate response for **Questions 4, 5 and 6**

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

Section AAnswer **two** questions.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Outline points of interest or difficulty in the following passage.</p> <p><u>2 Kings 2:6–8, NRSVA</u></p> <p>Then Elijah said to him, ‘Stay here; for the LORD has sent me to the Jordan.’ But he said, ‘As the LORD lives, and as you yourself live, I will not leave you.’ So the two of them went on. Fifty men of the company of prophets also went, and stood at some distance from them, as they both were standing by the Jordan. Then Elijah took his mantle and rolled it up, and struck the water; the water was parted to the one side and to the other, until the two of them crossed on dry ground.</p> <p>Use Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (5 marks) to mark candidate answers to this question.</p> <p>Award up to 5 marks.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all relevant material must be credited.</p> <p>The context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The context includes the approaching ascent to heaven by Elijah, together with Elijah’s succession by Elisha <p>The content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some might note that Elijah’s life as a prophet leans heavily towards legendary and miraculous acts. This can be a point of difficulty, in so far as these acts include killing many people gratuitously (e.g. as in chapter 1). These characteristics are found also in Moses, not least in the drowning of the Pharaoh’s army (Exodus 14). • 2 Kings 2:6–8 is part of the larger narrative of 2:1–25, where Elijah is taken up into heaven, apparently without dying first, the latter being a distinction shared in the Bible only by Enoch (Genesis 5:24). • Chapter 2 verse 3 anticipates 2:6–8 in that the ‘sons of the prophets’ in Bethel and Jericho ask Elisha if he knows that Yahweh will take away his master today. In 2:6, as in 2:2, Elisha refuses to leave Elijah, presumably because of what is about to happen. The ‘sons of the prophets’ here refers to members of the prophetic order – bands of prophets with a leader. The sons of the prophets stand at a distance while Elijah and Elisha stand by the river Jordan. Elijah now performs the same miracle as Moses in splitting the waters of the Jordan (Exodus 14:29) – the waters stand in a wall which allows Elijah and Elisha to cross over on dry ground. 	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2:9–12 shows the result: Elisha inherits a double share of Elijah’s prophetic spirit, while Elijah is taken up to heaven on a whirlwind. Again, some might ask for example whether the language of 2:6–8 is factual, symbolic or mythological.• There is no doubt of the importance of Elijah in the prophetic tradition. In the New Testament, for example, in the narrative of Jesus’ transfiguration, Elijah is present to represent prophecy, and Moses stands with him to represent the Law. The material in 2 Kings 2:6–8 is part of what underpins that view.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Outline points of interest or difficulty in the following passage.</p> <p><u>Isaiah 31:1–3, NRSVA</u></p> <p>Alas for those who go down to Egypt for help and who rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but do not look to the Holy One of Israel or consult the LORD! Yet he too is wise and brings disaster; he does not call back his words, but will rise against the house of the evildoers, and against the helpers of those who work iniquity. The Egyptians are human, and not God; their horses are flesh, and not spirit. When the LORD stretches out his hand, the helper will stumble, and the one helped will fall, and they will all perish together.</p> <p>Use Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (5 marks) to mark candidate answers to this question.</p> <p>Award up to 5 marks</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all relevant material must be credited.</p> <p>The context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an oracle primarily against Egypt. Assyrian power is growing exponentially, so Judah is looking for help from Egypt against Assyria and Sennacherib its king. From the surrounding material in Isaiah, it appears that an embassy was sent to Egypt around 703 BC, asking for help against Assyria, and 31:1–3 is a prophetic oracle pouring scorn on asking Egypt for help instead of trusting in Yahweh. 	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>The content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content is expressed as an oracle against those who support the alliance, pouring scorn on the ability or the will of Egypt to defend Judah, hence the opening statement of 31:1 – ‘Alas for those who go down to Egypt for help’. Egypt was renowned for its chariotry, but this is a false hope – horses and chariots are useless in the wrong terrain, and Israel’s terrain is a case in point, regardless of how many chariots and horses there are. For the same reason, there is little point in relying on horses to pull chariots in unsuitable terrain. • Equally, the author is probably thinking of the fate of the Egyptian chariotry during the Exodus, where horses and men were drowned in their chariots. Defence of Israel would need to come largely from infantry, and because of the small size of Judah, the Assyrian infantry is immeasurably superior. For the same reason, Judah has insufficient resources to finance a campaign against Assyria. Therefore, Israel should look to the all-powerful Holy One of Israel (Yahweh) and consult the Lord through an oracle (31:1). • 31:2 develops the idea of consulting Yahweh: this is the obvious course of action because Yahweh has complete wisdom, he does not change his mind, and can bring disaster wherever it is appropriate, including Assyria. • In 31:3 Isaiah develops the logic of Yahweh’s rejection of Egyptian help: the Egyptians are merely men, whereas Yahweh is God; Egyptian horses are flesh, whereas Yahweh is spirit. Yahweh has merely to stretch out his hand, and helper and helped alike will stumble and fall and perish together - probably another reference to the destruction of Pharaoh’s army during the Exodus: men cannot successfully confront God. • Some might add that this theme is developed in 31:4 – just as a lion growls possessively over its prey, fearing nothing, Yahweh fears nothing, and will descend to fight like a hovering bird upon Mount Zion. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Outline points of interest or difficulty in the following passage.</p> <p><u>Jeremiah 24:1–3, NRSVA</u></p> <p>The LORD showed me two baskets of figs placed before the temple of the LORD. This was after King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon had taken into exile from Jerusalem King Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim of Judah, together with the officials of Judah, the artisans, and the smiths, and had brought them to Babylon. One basket had very good figs, like first-ripe figs, but the other basket had very bad figs, so bad that they could not be eaten. And the LORD said to me, ‘What do you see, Jeremiah?’ I said, ‘Figs, the good figs very good, and the bad figs very bad, so bad that they cannot be eaten.’</p> <p>Use Table A: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (5 marks) to mark candidate answers to this question.</p> <p>Award up to 5 marks.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all relevant material must be credited.</p> <p>The context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘parable’ of the good and bad figs is set against the historical backdrop of those who were taken into exile in Chaldea and those who remained in Judah and elsewhere. The good figs are those taken into exile; the bad figs are represented by those who remained in the land. The text is explicit: those taken into exile by Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon include Jeconiah, son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, together with the princes of Judah and a full spectrum of Judaeans royal and political life. <p>The content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeremiah 24:1 - the parable is straightforward: two baskets of figs are placed before the Temple of the Lord. • 24.2 – The good figs are good because they are first-ripe. By contrast, the basket of bad figs contains fruit that is so bad that it cannot be eaten. • 24.3 – Yahweh asks Jeremiah what he sees, and Jeremiah describes the two baskets as in v.1. • The explanation of the parable is then given: the good figs are those exiled from Judah to Chaldea. God will in the end bring them back to Judah and will build and plant them (the same words emphasised during Jeremiah’s call) back into the land. They will become the centre of a restored relationship with God. 	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parable is then explained further. The bad figs are bad because they appropriated the property of those deported to Chaldea (the good figs). The exiles will eventually return to become the nucleus of a nation faithful to God. The others (the bad figs) will be destroyed. The promise of a return after exile was a development of prophecy during the exilic period to encourage exiled Jews to be faithful to Yahweh and the Law whilst in captivity. • A point of difficulty can perhaps be seen with the scathing dismissal of those who remained in the land. It can hardly be supposed that all of those who remained – Zedekiah, his princes, the remnant of Jerusalem, etc., were uniformly so bad that they deserved to be made ‘a horror, an evil thing, to all the kingdoms of the earth – a disgrace, a byword, a taunt, and a curse’ in all the places where God would drive them. (24:9) 	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Read the following passage and then answer the question below:</p> <p><u>Amos 7:7–9, NRSVA</u></p> <p>This is what he showed me: the Lord was standing beside a wall built with a plumb-line, with a plumb-line in his hand. And the LORD said to me, ‘Amos, what do you see?’ And I said, ‘A plumb-line.’ Then the Lord said, ‘See, I am setting a plumb-line in the midst of my people Israel; I will never again pass them by; the high places of Isaac shall be made desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste, and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword.’</p> <p>‘The judgement by Amos of the social and religious sins of Israel was too harsh.’ Assess this view, referring to the passage above and other passages you have studied in your answer.</p> <p>Use Table C: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 marks) to mark candidate responses to this question.</p> <p>Award up to 15 marks.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.</p> <p>In favour of the view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amos’ vision of the plumbline (a straight line measure used in building) in 7:7–9 is not absolutely clear, but it appears to be saying that if Israel deviates from the straight path of truth and justice, God will never ignore it but will ‘flatten’ all the holy places of Israel, and the house of King Jeroboam II will be put to the sword. Those who heard this would probably have ignored it, since Israel was in a state of growing prosperity, which would have been taken by the king and the people as a sign of God’s approval. • The catalogue of Israel’s sins in the Book of Amos is very large. It begins in chapter 1, and concludes in 9:10, to be followed by a brief salvation oracle in Amos 9:11–15. The severity of Yahweh’s condemnation of social and religious sins would leave Israel without hope, so it seems pointless for Amos to have made it so harsh. 	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of punishment, and the language used to describe it, would be too harsh to be of any real effect, since most people reject heavy criticism of their behaviour. For example, speaking on behalf of God, Amos complains that: the people ‘sell the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of sandals’ / they ‘trample the head of the poor into the dust of the earth’ / ‘father and son go into the same girl’ / ‘they lay themselves down beside every altar on garments taken in pledge’ / in the house of their God they drink wine bought with fines they imposed’ (Amos 2:6–8). Criticisms like these addressed to the whole nation would annoy those who believed that they were following God’s commandments • The people of Israel believed that they were elected to be God’s chosen people. They would not have believed that God would destroy his chosen people, so it made more sense to ignore Amos. <p>Against the view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To label Amos’ criticisms of Israel as too harsh is unjust. Amos would have reasoned that Israel needed to understand the full depth of its sins against God and the people. That is exactly what the book of Amos contains. • During the reign of Jeroboam II, Israel was very prosperous. Prosperity was understood by the people of Israel as a sign of God’s approval, which means that the king and the people would have ignored Amos’ warnings. • It seems likely from the Book of Amos that Amos was from Judah, so his intervention in Israel’s affairs seemed intrusive, which could explain why many ignored it. In other words, his condemnation of Israel’s sins was ignored not because he was too harsh but because he was a ‘southerner’. • Whether or not Amos’ condemnation of Israel’s sins was too harsh, the fact is that Assyria attacked and destroyed Israel in 722. It is unlikely that Israel could have avoided submission to Assyria, in the same way that it is unlikely that Judah could have avoided Babylonian invasion and destruction in a century or so later. Both Israel and Judah were too small to avoid being annexed by major powers, regardless of anything Amos could have said. • Looking at Amos’ vision of the plumbline, its threat of desolation and waste was possibly not harsh enough. • Amos himself might have said to the people that they had been given enough chances to reform their ways, so action is now required. 	

Section C

Question	Answer	Marks
EITHER		
5	<p>‘The confrontation between Micaiah son of Imlah and the 400 court prophets of King Ahab (1 Kings 22:1–38) proves that God controls both true and false prophets.’ Discuss this view.</p> <p>Use Table B: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks) and Table C: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 marks) to mark candidate responses to this question.</p> <p>Award up to 10 marks for AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks for AO2 Analysis and evaluation.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historical context is when Ahab King of Israel and Jehoshaphat King of Judah agree to an alliance to regain the territory of Ramoth Gilead from Syria. The 400 court prophets of Ahab predict success, but Jehoshaphat demands a second opinion, given by Micaiah son of Imlah, a lone prophet who never prophesies anything good for Ahab. In this account, the court prophets are seen as false, and Micaiah is seen as true. • Subsequently, the 400 court prophets are seen prophesying at the entrance of the gate of Samaria. One of them – Zedekiah son of Chenaanah – makes himself iron horns to mimic driving away an enemy, predicting victory for the Israel/Judah alliance. • Micaiah then tells Ahab that he will triumph, but Ahab knows he is lying, and demands that Micaiah should speak nothing but truth, whereupon Micaiah sees a vision of Israel ‘scattered like sheep without a shepherd’. • Micaiah goes on to give a vision of Yahweh’s heavenly council, surrounded by the host of heaven, in which Yahweh then asks, ‘Who will entice Ahab so that he will fall (dead) at Ramoth Gilead?’ The next part of the narrative then arrives at the hub of the issue given in the question: a spirit comes forward and says: ‘I will entice him’. Yahweh asks, ‘How?’ The reply is: ‘I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets – so you see that Yahweh has decreed disaster for you’ - whereupon Yahweh tells him to go out and do it. • On the face of it, Yahweh thus controls all prophets, both true and false. False prophets and prophecy can be moulded to Yahweh’s will by giving a message that suits Yahweh’s purposes. • In this story, then, true prophecy cannot be distinguished from false prophecy. Yahweh asks for a volunteer to entice Ahab, so the lying spirit of prophecy is simply a member of God’s divine council obeying God’s will. God engineers both the situation (the campaign against Ramoth Gilead / the death of Ahab) and the means (the false prophet of victory). 	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, it is the case that the issue of false prophecy was troublesome throughout the history of Judah and Israel. This is particularly true for example in the case of Jeremiah’s prophecies (e.g. Jeremiah 27–29). In chapter 27:1–11, for example, God complains that prophets who predict a quick return of those exiled to Babylon are prophesying a lie (verse 10). However, this then raises the question of why God cannot manipulate false prophets as he did with Ahab in 1 Kings 22. • The answer seems to be that human false prophets are false precisely because they have not stood in God’s council (Jeremiah 23:22), and God would not allow the attendance of those who are not properly inspired to do so because they are evil and ungodly (23:10–11). • Some might suggest that the answer to the question is that God can control whomsoever he likes, or that God’s ways are not knowable by humans, or that applying human logic to religious issues does not always work. • Some might argue, for example, that the figure of the Satan (the Accuser) in Job 1–2 is a development of the Lying Spirit of prophecy in 1 Kings 22. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
OR		
6	<p>‘Deutero-Isaiah is not clear about the identity of the Servant.’ Discuss this claim.</p> <p>Use Table B: AO1 Knowledge and understanding (10 marks) and Table C: AO2 Analysis and evaluation (15 marks) to mark candidate responses to this question.</p> <p>Award up to 10 marks for AO1 Knowledge and understanding. Award up to 15 marks for AO2 Analysis and evaluation.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For centuries, scholars have argued about the identity of the servant. The fact that no agreement has been reached suggests that differences of opinion will continue, with no overall consensus being reached; hence the servant’s identity cannot be known. • However, there are a number of dissenting views to this. For example, some scholars hold that in the first song (42:1–4), the servant is Cyrus of Persia. This is because the speaker in the song is God, and God calls the servant: ‘my chosen, in whom my soul delights’; and the same title, ‘chosen’, appears in 45:4, where Cyrus appears to be called ‘Israel my chosen’. Cyrus respected the religious beliefs of the territories he conquered, and in the case of Israel, Cyrus was active in sending Jews back to their home territory. Given that Cyrus is the only non-Jewish figure to be titled in the Bible as God’s ‘chosen’, some see this as a clear indication that the author of the first servant song was thinking of Cyrus as God’s chosen servant. Looking at 42:1–4, it is not difficult to read the text as referring clearly to Cyrus, e.g. that he would ‘bring forth justice to the nations’ and ‘establish justice in the earth’. • Others see the Cyrus identification as false: the servant is often called ‘the suffering servant’, and the idea that Cyrus suffered hardly fits what is known about him. Some think that the servant is a fictional character invented by the prophet as a way of describing clearly the prophet’s own ideas and feelings. There is insufficient information and clarity in the servant songs by which to make a judgement about this. • Some see the servant as the prophet himself – an individual who has suffered for the beliefs he holds. This could clearly be the case, but the verdict remains that this is the opposite of clear, since we have no external information. • Those who have studied the servant songs have found clarity / identity in one or another biblical personage. For example, some see a marked similarity between the servant’s situation and that of Moses, Elijah or Samuel as archetypal prophets who established God’s justice and other qualities in the world – prophets who would never be discouraged as long as they were ‘establishing justice in the earth’ (42:4). 	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the second servant song (49:1–6), other commentators see a deliberate identification of the servant as Jeremiah – perhaps the writer of 49:1–6 saw an identity between his own mission and that of Jeremiah. In the third servant song (50:4–9), the servant is struck, insulted and humiliated, but he is helped by God, who will vindicate him against his adversaries. • This is very like Jeremiah 11:18: ‘But I was like a gentle lamb led to the slaughter. I did not know it was against me they devised schemes ...’. Similarly, the fourth song (52:13–53:12), develops the idea of the servant who suffers pain and humiliation because of his mission. • Some might argue that the servant songs offer no one specific identification of the servant, but instead leave the reader / hearer to identify with their own interpretation of each song. • It needs to be considered that later editors may have introduced ideas that were not in the mind of the author, but have been added to the original text in order to match the minds of different readers. The biblical books have undergone a long process of editing, so it is difficult to be sure of any one interpretation of the servant’s identity. 	