



Pearson  
Edexcel

# A level Religious Studies

9RS0 03

New Testament Studies

Scripts for Feedback  
training





## Question 1:

The signs are significant to the fourth gospel of John and aim to explore Jesus as a challenge to the two realms according to Rivkin, of religious and political conflict. In the first sign, the wedding at Cana, Jesus is viewed as the provider of the new covenant and renewed eschatology. His act of turning water into wine signifies Jesus as fulfilling his purpose by representing the change of Judaism into Christianity. Also, Jesus conformed to his role as the bridegroom of Israel as he provided the wine. This was representative of Jesus' ministry. Furthermore, the ~~the~~ feeding of the 5000 represented Jesus through Salvation history as started by Moses. This was because Jesus would ease away the spiritual hunger of the Jews and Gentiles if they followed him. Also, representing Jesus as living up to his title "I am the bread of life". Furthermore, the literal approach as taken by Aquinas would show the person of Jesus as being divine by providing 5000 people with enough food provided with 5 loaves of bread and two fish. Furthermore, the healing at the pool showed Jesus as accepting sinners through universal salvation. People believed the man sinned this was why he was blind but Jesus said no. He upset the authorities by declaring <sup>later on leading to</sup> his crucifixion showing the person of Jesus as the <sup>the</sup> Son of God and <sup>and</sup> messiah through his life <sup>words of</sup> "I am".

(Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)





## Question 2:

- 2 Assess the view that the author of the Fourth Gospel might be John, the Beloved Disciple.

→ John, the Beloved/  
→ The Community  
→ John the Apostle

There are many views concerning who the author of the Fourth Gospel may be. Some argue that John, the Beloved, is a possible candidate for the authorship. Yet it could be argued that the John the Apostle being the author is the strongest argument due to <sup>more</sup> contemporary evidence. However, thus despite the Gospel being a possible community effort, John, the Beloved or other figures such as a disciple <sup>one could conclude that the</sup> ~~It is most convincing to conclude~~ author of the Fourth Gospel is most likely to be John the Apostle.

There are many factors to consider when addressing who the author of the Fourth Gospel could have been, and this may arguably factual details within the Gospel and the position of the author is most significant. In relation to John, the Beloved, he arguably as a figure close to Jesus would be able to recount key information. For example Jesus having a meeting with the High Priest or how many fish were caught. Additionally great knowledge of the area of Judea and other local areas may support the notion of John the Beloved being the author.



However, it could be argued that despite the strength in recalling factual instances, arguments such as strong geographical knowledge is weak. This is as his knowledge could be reflective of a local as opposed to John, the Beloved himself.

Another figure that is speculated to have written the Fourth Gospel is John the Apostle. Firstly, Irenaeus' Declaration as well as Polycarp's source is reflective and suggestive of this. There is reference to a John the Apostle <sup>being the key figure</sup> in the former and in the latter John's relation to Ephesus is also explored <sup>in his letter</sup>. Additionally, Robinson in (1993) also argues that John the Apostle seems the most likely figure to have written the Gospel.

This view is very strong for a multitude of reasons. Firstly, the contemporary evidence, though potentially biased, is reflective of significant figures believing John the Apostle to be the author. This observation is only ~~now~~ further supported through Robinson, who as a modern scholar has the



benefits of critical evaluation. This is able to only add theological strength to the argument that John the Apostle was the author.

Another proposition that has been speculated is whether the 4th Gospel was a community effect. Some believe that the repeated use of 'we' reflects this. However, there is little factual evidence to support the notion that a group as opposed to an individual was responsible for the Gospel. Thus, despite group influences such as Hellenistic and Jewish thought, it is argued that only an individual wrote the Gospel. A group were only an influence, not a group of authors.

In Conclusion, it could be argued that the view that John the Evangelist was the author of the Fourth Gospel is weak. One figure such as John the Apostle, are more likely to have been the author.



## Question 3:

Read the following passage before answering the question.

10:30 'A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, when he was attacked by robbers. They stripped him of his clothes, beat him and went away, leaving him half dead.

31 A priest happened to be going down the same road, and when he saw the man, he passed by on the other side.

32 So too, a Levite, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other side.

33 But a Samaritan, as he travelled, came where the man was; and when he saw him, he took pity on him.

34 He went to him and bandaged his wounds, pouring on oil and wine. Then he put the man on his own donkey, brought him to an inn and took care of him.

35 The next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper. 'Look after him,' he said, 'and when I return, I will reimburse you for any extra expense you may have.'

(Source: Extract from the Holy Bible, New International Version, Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, International Bible Society, Luke 10: 30-35, Edexcel Anthology)

3 (a) Clarify the ethical teachings illustrated in this passage.

*You must refer to the passage in your response.*

(10)

The passage describes the parable of the good Samaritan, it describes the journey of a man who was "attacked by robbers" when on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. They beat him and leave him half dead, showing that he is in desperate need of help. Yet a priest ~~was~~ "passes by on the other side" and so too does a "Levite". Then a Samaritan (A Jew from Samaria) took pity on him, bandaged his wounds, "put the man on a donkey, (...) and took care of him".





The passing by of the Priest and the Levite show the actions of immoral people. It shows their intentional neglect of the man who had been robbed as it says "when he saw the man, he passed by on the other side". This ethical teaching shows the immorality of neglect and the impracticalities of following mosaic law.

In contrast the Samaritan is shown as a compassionate figure who "took pity on him" and "bandaged his wounds" even though he did not know the man. This impersonal, *agape* love shown towards the man who had been robbed shows ~~an ethical duty~~ that Luke is trying to show that we have a moral duty to act compassionately to others - regardless of who they are. This is supported by the 'golden rule', which states that Christians should love thy neighbour, and every, as thyself.

The passage also shows ethical teachings on wealth and materialism. The fact that the Samaritan "put the man on his own donkey" and "took out two denarii and gave them to the ikeeper", shows that we should set aside motivations to be driven by material gain - we should give what we have, to those that need it. This is shown as he pays the ikeeper to 'look after him'. This teaching allows Christians to



reach the Kingdom of God. This is ~~shown~~ ~~as~~ linked to the teaching of the rich man and Lazarus, which shows the rich man - who does not distribute his wealth - not reaching heaven. The ethical teaching of distributing wealth shows how we can live ethically and ultimately inherit the Kingdom of God.



(b) Analyse the importance of Jesus' teachings regarding the poor, outcasts and wealth in Luke's Gospel.

(20)

~~The Luke's Gospel's teachings regarding the poor is extremely~~

Jesus's teachings regarding the poor is incredibly important as shown in Luke's gospel. This is shown by the Parable of the rich man and Lazarus - which shows that the poor man at the rich man's gate inherits God's kingdom, whereas the rich man - who is materially superior, is subject to hell as he does not give generously to those who are in need (the poor). This is incredibly important as the Kingdom of God is an ~~incredibly~~ essential concept for Christians, if ~~the~~ a futurist interpretation is used to suggest when the Kingdom of God will come, teachings on wealth are incredibly important in Luke's Gospel.

However, Rermenus ~~is~~ - who takes a sociological approach to interpreting scripture - views Jesus as non divine, and merely a ~~political~~ political figure in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century. The potentially political nature of Jesus ~~is~~ may suggest that the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus is not an ethical teaching on wealth - but is instead a ~~tear~~ spreading of the message about the nature of the Sadducees. The Sadducees were a ~~group of~~ religious group of Jews in the 1<sup>st</sup>



century. Although small in number - compared to the size of the pharisees - they were considered more wealthy and politically powerful. (This is also shown as the Sadducees made up the majority of the Sanhedrin). By suggesting that the wealthy go to ~~heaven~~ hell, Reimarus is suggesting that this is a political attack on the Sadducees and therefore not an important teaching.

The parable of the lost son is also an important teaching on outcasts in Luke's gospel. This parable ~~shows the~~ describes the importance of repentance and celebration of return of those who had been lost (outcast). Two sons ~~asked~~ inherit money from their father, one son stays and works tirelessly for his father but the other son uses this money to live a lavish lifestyle - indulging in promiscuous activities and ~~was~~ working with pigs (which was viewed as unclean under Jewish laws). The son returns to his father and is sorry, to which the father is elated - he throws a party and slaughters the fattest calf in celebration. The brother who had worked tirelessly is distraught with his father's reaction as he himself had remained loyal and worked hard. This parable, if interpreted symbolically - shows God as the father, ~~all rejoicing~~ rejoicing at the news of a repentant sinner - who now believes. The other son may represent Jewish groups of





the tree - who believe they are acting ethically, under Moses laws. But they are not, the brother should show love to his repentant brother instead of feeling hard done by. This is an important teaching on outcasts as it shows that, every sinner has a future and is able to inherit the kingdom of God.

However, some may argue that this parable is not important as it glorifies acting immorally. The idea that one is able to act immorally, but will be accepted by God by repenting, is a difficult concept for many people to agree with especially from a post enlightenment point of view. The rise of scepticism ~~leads~~, as a result of increases in scientific findings leads to a ~~lessening~~ lesser of a need to interpret scripture as a soul ethical guideline.

~~The~~ The parable of the lost coin is also a very important teaching regarding outcasts in Luke's gospel. This parable describes a woman with 10 silver coins, who has lost one - she lights her lamp and searches tirelessly for the lost silver coin. ~~Then is significant~~ When she finds the coin ~~she~~ she rejoices and celebrates with friends. This is ~~symbol~~ symbolic of teachings of outcasts, it shows that God (symbolized by the woman) ~~never~~ does not ~~never~~ continually seeks to bring people to faith and



is willing to accept those who he has 'lost'. It also shows God's faith in those who do believe in him, as he she does not obsess over the 9 coins she has - but seeks the one she has lost. This is ~~the~~ an important teaching on outcasts as it shows that anyone is able to be at one with God (be found) so long as they allow themselves to be found.

However, this teaching may be seen as less important as it appears to confuse teachings on wealth in other teachings of Luke. The idea that the woman is not entirely satisfied with the 9 silver coins she has, but instead ~~yearns for~~ seeks the one she has lost - shows a lack of gratitude for things that you have. If, literally interpreted to be about money and materialistic possessions, it may contradict teachings that those who are blessed with material wealth should show gratitude and give to the poor. Therefore, suggesting teachings on outcasts in Luke's gospel are insignificant.

In an overall perspective I think that Luke's portrayal of Jesus's teachings on the poor, outcast and wealth are extremely significant as they offer an alternative approach to other gospel writers. <sup>eg.</sup> Matthew's gospel seeks to appeal to a Jewish audience, and John's gospel portrays a Jesus as a ~~spiritual~~ means to achieve spiritual eternal life 'Zoe'. The



teachings on outcasts, poor and teachings on wealth are significant as it builds Christianity to be relevant to all members of society. ~~and it is necessary~~



## Question 4: Script i

### 4 Evaluate the theological significance of the Kingdom of God in Luke's Gospel.

In your response to this question, you must include how developments in New Testament Studies have been influenced by **one** of the following:

- Philosophy of Religion
- Religion and Ethics
- Study of Religion (excluding Christianity).

(30)

The Kingdom of God is an important element of Luke's Gospel, in that it depicts & how God's ~~opinion~~ will be ~~acted~~ set upon Earth and establish his rule. ~~to take~~  
The Gospel of Luke, one of the Synoptic Gospels, does not seek to convert audiences, rather appealing to those already of Christian faith, teaching them to live better and offering numerous parables to establish the teachings of Jesus and thus methods of ethical living as a Christian. It is important to consider that there are various approaches to understand the Kingdom of God. Whilst realised eschatology is a convincing viewpoint, this contradicts the imminent or future perspective as that the Kingdom of God is yet to come. Overall, however, it is clear that the theological significance of the Kingdom of God is best understood through the paradoxical notion that the Kingdom of God is both present and coming at the same time, otherwise known as the inaugurated tradition.





The idea of the Kingdom of God is established in Luke as simply the way in which this Kingdom & this message will be established through the ministry of Jesus, yet the Kingdom of God can certainly only be understood by following Jesus, and those who miss out on the opportunity for the Kingdom of God are thus fated to Hell in their ignorance of Jesus. This notion is unique to Luke, however John does discuss the eternal life (zöe) in following Jesus' teachings.

Although the theological significance of the Kingdom of God is primarily clear through the notion of inauguration, we must first evaluate the various eschatological approaches. Scholars such as C.H. Dodd argue that the Kingdom of God is already upon us, as demonstrated through Jesus' parables. It is important to consider that parables were a common method of teaching in the first century Palestine. Thus, C.H. Dodd would argue that the Parable of the Great Banquet demonstrates that the Kingdom of God is already upon us, as it states in Luke that the 'invitations have been sent'. This demonstrates that those who are welcome into the Kingdom are ~~not~~ already invited to the Banquet, which is thus symbolic of the Messianic Banquet in which Jesus is the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies for the Messiah (such as Isaiah 53, suffering



Servant) Therefore, as the invitations have been sent, it is clear that theologically we can understand God's Kingdom as present amongst us. Similarly, Leon Morris would support the view that the Kingdom of God is present rather than coming in an immediate or imminent sense. It is clear that through Luke 17, the Kingdom of God is 'all' around, demonstrating it is not yet to be established. Furthermore, when considering the Day of Beeldad, Jesus drove out spirits, and when confronted with accusations that he was a Satanic force, Jesus replied that when he drives out demons, we will inherit the Kingdom of God. In light of this, it is clear that there is a clear indication in Luke that the Kingdom of God is established in Luke, as the Gospel clearly establishes Jesus as a divine force even from conception in the Birth Narratives, and it is from his teachings of the parables that we can understand the Kingdom of God to exist through him as realised eschatology.

A strength of this position of realised eschatology is that there is clear scriptural basis for Jesus as bringing about the Kingdom of God through parables. Furthermore, realised eschatology is key to the foundation of the Christian Church as it is through Jesus' teachings that we can understand the Kingdom of God,



and perhaps diminishing their contemporary significance this diminishes their theological significance, as the Parables are a key source of ethical teachings.

However, the main challenge to the idea that the Kingdom of God is only evident as realised eschatology is the idea that this Kingdom of God is imminent or immediate, taking the perspective that this will be established in the future. Schweitzer takes a future approach, highlighting that the Kingdom of God is thus 'immediate'. Similarly, this approach uses the Parables in Luke's Gospel to support the notion that the Kingdom of God is coming, such as the Parable of the Sower. This parable is significant to the Kingdom of God theologically as it demonstrates that seeds must be sown and will flourish when the Kingdom of God has arrived, meaning it is not yet come. This parable is significant in establishing the Kingdom of God as the seeds that will grow are not those of the Jewish faith, where one follows a strict legalism and neglects loving God for fearing Him, but those who accept the teachings of Jesus, as those who do not will not grow. Similarly, one can use the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus to explain the Kingdom of God as that which is inherently imminent rather than established already as





a realised eschatological approach. In terms of the parable, both Lazarus and the Rich Man die at the same time, with Lazarus as a servant and his flesh being fed upon. Due to his loyalty and worship of Jesus and thus acceptance of the Kingdom of God, Lazarus is sent to heaven whilst the Rich Man goes to hell for his greed. In light of this parable, the Kingdom of God is imminent as it is predicted after death and thus not amongst us through Jesus. Another example supporting the immediacy of the Kingdom of God is the parable of the Narrow Door, in which it is Jesus who controls the entrance to the Kingdom of God and thus it is only through him and his parables that the Kingdom can be established in the future.

There is much scriptural support for the idea that the Kingdom of God has theological significance in terms of its nature of future Kingdom. ~~This is also clear from~~ <sup>However</sup> when the Pharisees ask Jesus what the Kingdom of God is, he replies that it is the Kingdom of God established by the Son of Man, and since Jesus refers to himself as this figure, it is clear that perhaps it does not hint to a future Kingdom, but rather the present and realised nature through Jesus' Ministry. Furthermore, another issue with the future Kingdom idea is that perhaps it has





been redacted or edited to include this nation, following from Mark. After Mark predicted the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God, which then historically did not occur, Luke overcame this issue by mentioning the Kingdom of God being established instead at a later date. Therefore, it is clear that we cannot fully appreciate the theological significance of the Kingdom in light of these redaction changes to overcome elements of Mark, which simply ends with Jesus' resurrection.

Moreover, the Gospel of Luke as having a clear purpose of the individual author (redaction criticism) coupled with the idea of source criticism, the spending of source materials, overall diminishes its theological significance as it counters the view that the Bible is proportionally revelatory, in that it is the true word of God written by the author of the Gospel writer Luke, as it has been edited to serve a purpose. Luke's purpose, through parables and ethical teachings, is to instruct Christian audiences on how to act with their faith. Perhaps Luke's theological significance is furthermore diminished when we consider the concept of Markan priority, wherein 88% of Luke is similar to that of Mark, demonstrating perhaps it is not literally true.



However, despite the clear issues of Luke's Gospel, this does not diminish its theological significance as the whole, as there certainly are strengths to future Kingdom John Hick (LINK TO ~~THE~~ PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION) would argue that we can theologically verify the existence of the Kingdom of God in life & after death, in that the presence of heaven/hell will prove verifiability of this kingdom as we will empirically view the Kingdom of God.

On the other hand, perhaps talking of both realised eschatology and future Kingdom has no theological significance when understood through a non-cognitivist or anti-realist lens. For Ludwig von Wittgenstein, this notion of the kingdom only has theological significance for those inside the language game. In light of this, perhaps it is only through being introduced (THIS IS A LINK TO ~~THE~~ PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION) into the rules of what it means for a religious believer to be part of the language game and thus have significance.

Therefore, as both <sup>realised</sup> eschatology and the idea that the future coming of God in terms of the Kingdom of God in Luke fail, we should instead look to the inaugural perspective.



The inaugural perspective is the most convincing and most theologically significant idea surrounding the idea of the Kingdom of God, as it contains bible conflicting passages that suggest the kingdom is here and coming. When considering the parable of the Banquet, the invitations have been sent but the food has not yet been consumed, demonstrating it as supports this paradoxical notion. When considering the Parable of the Sower, the seeds have been sown yet the plants have not been grown or have bloomed. Thus, it is the inaugural approach that works, considering the other two perspectives and demonstrating we can learn the Kingdom of God through Jesus and there will also be a Second Coming of him, linking to the last book of the Bible, Revelations.

In conclusion, there are many critiques to both realised eschatology and the future coming of the Kingdom of God due to their conflicting perspectives. Thus, we should consider both perspectives as have theological significance, and appreciate the Kingdom of God through the inaugural tradition.



## Question 4: Script ii

### 4 Evaluate the theological significance of the Kingdom of God in Luke's Gospel. *-Preterist*

In your response to this question, you must include how developments in New Testament Studies have been influenced by **one** of the following:

- Philosophy of Religion
- Religion and Ethics
- Study of Religion (excluding Christianity).

(30)

The Kingdom of God has several implications in Luke, beginning with when the Kingdom of God will actually occur. The early Christians believed it to be imminent <sup>or futurist</sup> with the Second Coming (Parousia) of Christ bringing about the Kingdom of God - as Jesus himself in Luke's Gospel states "none here" shall die before this happens. Elaborately, this obviously did not happen, leading some to believe it occurred during Jesus' ministry. This is evidenced by the phrase "the Kingdom of God is in your midst" - one of Jesus' miracles in Luke's Gospel is driving a demon out of a man's body, which he uses to tell the Parable of the Strong Man and the House; only Jesus can protect the 'house' (body of a human) from 'robbers' (demons), which suggests his ministry is the Kingdom of God and thus, <sup>present/preterist</sup> present. However, some think it refers to the ~~best~~ great Kingdom of Israel in the past, under the rule





of King David, which will be brought about again by Jesus. Yet if this were the case, why does Jesus reference the Kingdom of God to be in the future, implying an afterlife?

In other Parables, Jesus discusses the Kingdom of Heaven as something that will be achieved <sup>in time</sup>. He uses the Parable of the Sower to explain the seed that falls on fertile soil will grow - representing the attentive and believing Christian who will be granted access into the Kingdom of Heaven. This is ~~an example~~ <sup>an example</sup> of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Jesus however is unclear as to what the Kingdom of Heaven actually is (John interprets it as Eternal Life), and what it does mean, is that there are certain criteria one must fit in order to get into the Kingdom; essentially following Jesus and believing in him.

This belief extends to believing Jesus to be the Son of God. In one Parable, Jesus talks about going back to where he was sent from, which means returning to God. Jesus is an integral part of the Kingdom of <sup>God</sup> Heaven, which again suggests that the Kingdom itself is merely believing in him, which adds to the idea that it was something that



The First Century Palestinians who were following Jesus were in.

However, the urgency in tone of the Parable of the Sign of Jonah suggests an oncoming Apocalypse (mirrored by the repentance of the people of Babylon ~~was~~ resulting in God's mercy in the Parable). If this Apocalypse ~~was~~ <sup>were</sup> not imminent, why is Jesus so desperate to make the Kingdom of God obvious by stressing the importance of ~~us~~ following him? The answer may be Jesus did actually think the Apocalypse would come ~~on~~ about immediately after his death, but ~~a~~ many have actually been prophesying the destruction of the Temple in ~~Jeru~~ Jerusalem.

It may actually be that the Kingdom of Heaven will be achieved in the distant future, with the coming of Judgement Day (the Pharisees themselves believed in the Afterlife coming about at Judgement Day). This form of eschatology was used by Hick during the Verification Debate, as studied in the Philosophy of Religion, where he used Eschatological Verification to explain his parable of the Celestial City; only when we die will we know whether the Kingdom of God actually exists or not.



If the Kingdom of God did not exist, the theological impact would be immense. It would remove Christian ideas of the afterlife and even the idea of Jesus being the Son of God. For Luke however, the existence of the Kingdom of ~~Heaven~~ <sup>God</sup> is solidly grounded in Jesus' teachings. He also establishes ways of ensuring a place in the Kingdom of ~~Heaven~~ <sup>God</sup>, as explained in the Parable of the Banquet. In the Parable, ~~like~~ Jesus describes a ruler throwing a Banquet (God allowing his Kingdom to be entered by humans) but his guests choose not to attend which ~~is~~ represents those who choose to ignore the word/invitation of God. As a result, the ruler allows the poor and ostracised (a common point of focus in Luke's Gospel) to his banquet, representing how God will allow those who accept his invitation into heaven. Yet it is apparently quite vague as to how one will actually do this.

There is a theory however, that suggests by following the example of Jesus' life (being in a perfect and Holy relationship with God), that one will enter the Kingdom of God. It is known as Moral Example Theory, that harnesses the themes of Jesus' innocence to argue that people should be inspired by Jesus' death to live as he did, in order



To access the Kingdom of Heaven. That being said, this approach of low Christology reduces Jesus himself to a mere martyr, or a person who was later exalted to Godlike status after his death due to his personal relationship with God. This has deep theological implications that many Christians would find troubling.

The Kingdom of God plays a hugely important role in Luke's Gospel, due to the amount of references and parables to it throughout the Gospel. That being said, the scholarly differences in whether it is ~~that~~ imminent, preterist or far in the distant future may possibly imply the theological importance is downplayed by the lack of detail. What is arguably more important in Luke's Gospel is the theological significance of Jesus being a messiah for all, and that he is the key to accessing whatever the Kingdom of God actually is.