Page 1 of 2

Course Code: IDE-T2P1 (M) 2005

UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

FINAL EXAMINATION PAPER, MAY 2005

TITLE OF PAPER

A STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

COURSE CODE

IDE-T2P1 (Part-time)

:

TIME ALLOWED

THREE (3) HOURS

INSTRUCTIONS

- 1. QUESTION ONE IS COMPULSORY AND MUST BE ANSWERED BY ALL
 - CANDIDATES.
- 2. CHOOSE ANY OTHER THREE QUESTIONS.
- 3. CANDIDATES MUST ANSWER A TOTAL OF FOUR QUESTIONS.
- 4. YOU ARE ADVISED TO READ EACH
 QUESTION CAREFULLY AND PROVIDE A
 SCHOLARLY RESPONSE TO THE ONE YOU
 HAVE ELECTED TO ANSWER.
- 5. GOOD ENGLISH, KNOWLEDGE OF THE APPROPRIATE LITERATURE AND GOOD SKILL IN WRITING AN ARGUMENT, WILL ACCOUNT FOR AN ACCEPTABLE ANSWER.

THIS QUESTION PAPER MUST NOT BE OPENED UNTIL PERMISSION HAS BEEN GRANTED BY THE INVIGILATOR.

Course Code: IDE-T2P1(M) 2005

QUESTION 1 [40] [This question is compulsory]

Write brief notes on each of the following:

- (a) Second Isaiah
- (b) Essence of the Torah
- (c) The Priestly Source ("P")
- (d) Salvation History
- (e) The abomination of desolation

QUESTION 2

Describe in detail the key themes of the Deuteronomistic History.

[20 marks]

QUESTION 3

Discuss King David's major challenges as the second King of Israel. How did he overcome these challenges? [20 marks]

QUESTION 4

Discuss the literary complexes in the biblical text that deal with Israel's shift from a tribal confederation to a monarchy. Indicate the advantages and disadvantages of this move according to some complexes.

[20 marks]

QUESTION 5

Explain the roles of Hezekiah, Manasseh and Josiah in the development of the monarchy state of Israel. [20 marks]

QUESTION 6

Describe in detail the historical context of the prophecies of Amos and Hosea.

[20 marks]

QUESTION 7

Compare and contrast the language and imagery used by Isaiah, Amos and Hosea, explaining the significance of each linguistic function carefully.

QUESTION 8

"Jeremiah could see that part of the problem lay in a blind and foolish faith in the theology of the royal court, which clung to the dogma of the inviolability of Jerusalem". (Ceresko 1992:207). Discuss.