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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

A. The State of Markan Research

This dissertation had its genesis in an acute sense of frustration with the history and present state of Markan research. Scholars of international repute, using allegedly scientific techniques, had for 70 years been arriving at various, and often contradictory, estimates of the Gospel's nature, purpose and Sitz im Leben. Of course, there were pockets of consensus which continued announcing advances in knowledge, but even here there was internal division and a tendency to ignore research being conducted elsewhere.

We may illustrate this state of affairs by examining scholarly opinion regarding three major issues in Markan research: the nature and purpose of the messianic secret, the nature and purpose of the Gospel, and the circumstances within which the Gospel emerged, i.e., the Sitz im Leben.

1. The Messianic Secret

   a. Its Nature

   It is probably no exaggeration to say that the current situation in Markan research owes its complexion to the ways in which scholars have responded to William (not Wilhelm) Wrede's classic study, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien (1901). During the 19th century, when the

---

Gospel of Mark was widely regarded as a reliable, historical portrait of Jesus' career, the secrecy phenomena were regarded as his attempts to avoid and re-interpret Jewish-nationalistic messianic expectations. However, the popularity of this understanding was dealt a severe blow by Wrede. He argued that Jesus' attempts to conceal his identity by teaching in parables designed to mystify and by refusing to let his disciples and those whom he had healed make him known, belonged to an artificial, theological scheme which the Evangelist used to harmonize two conflicting traditions about the origin of Jesus' messiahship: the earlier placed it at his resurrection (9:9 in keeping with Acts 2:36 and Rom. 1:3f), whereas the later located it within his earthly career (viz. the baptism, Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, the transfiguration, the triumphal entry, etc.). Therefore, Wrede argued, the secret belongs not to the history of Jesus, but to the history of dogma.

The debate which was launched as a result of Wrede's study proceeded along two main avenues. On the one hand, there were those who, acknowledging the overly-simplistic approach of the 19th century biographers of Jesus whom Wrede had attacked, nevertheless attempted to justify their basic historical conclusions about the secrecy phenomena. On the other hand, those who had been convinced by Wrede about the nature of the secret, sought to define its precise theological significance. All of the attempts to solve the significance or the purpose of the secret to the present day fall into these two basic estimates of the nature of the secret:

---

2. Ibid., 12. See n. 1 for a list of those scholars whom Wrede felt were the chief exponents of this point of view.
3. Ibid., esp. 209-36.
4. The most complete, published survey of this early period is by H. J. Ebeling in Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Markus-Evangelisten (1939), 3-113.
historical or theological.

b. Its Purpose

Despite more than a half century of research, Ulrich Luz felt obliged to admit that the messianic secret remains "noch immer geheimnisvoll". Part of the reason for the lack of consensus among scholars about the nature and purpose of the secret is that Mark nowhere himself provides an explanation. All attempts to arrive at one have had to be inferred. Consequently, a variety of opinions about the secret's purpose can be discerned among scholars who share the same basic view of its nature.

1) Historical

The older view, which Wrede attacked, has been maintained by Oscar Cullmann and Vincent Taylor in recent years. But other advocates of the secret's essential historicity have sought to find more adequate explanations. C. E. B. Cranfield believes that Taylor's explanation of 8:30 ("...a counsel of prudence in view of the political repercussions of such a confession") "...hardly goes deep enough." More probably, it reflects Jesus' unwillingness to contravene the nature of divine revelation, which

---

is never neutrally ascertainable. Even so great a revelatory event as the incarnation remains paradoxical and hidden from the world at large until the parousia.  

Still others have claimed to find an explanation of the secret from contemporary Jewish thought. Erik Sjöberg, for example, has proposed that secrecy is indissolubly linked to current, apocalyptic speculation about the Son of Man. Now in heaven, he would be revealed to the world only at the parousia. Consequently, appearance on earth before that time would necessarily be hidden. Richard Longenecker, following a hint by David Flusser, has suggested that Jesus' reluctance to publicize himself as Messiah reflects the belief of some Jews that one could not properly be called the Messiah until he had performed the messianic task. Finally, although this does not exhaust the possibilities, John O'Neill has found another rationale from contemporary Jewish belief: only God had the prerogative of naming the Messiah. One who claimed this himself could not be the Messiah but a blasphemer worthy of death.

2) Theological

The majority view is that the significance of the secret is to be found in the needs and beliefs of the early church rather than in Jesus' ministry. However, here, too, there is a great variety of opinion about

---

8. Ibid. 157, 286.
9. E. Sjöberg, Der Verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien (1955), 125f.
the precise theological function that the secret serves. We may name a few of the more prominent opinions and their proponents:

J. Schreiber is of the opinion that the concealment of the Redeemer is a necessary consequence of joining the Christ myth (esp. Phil. 2:6ff and Romans 3:24) with the tradition about Jesus. A popular view from the first has been the apologetic one: that Mark wished to explain why Jesus had been rejected by his own people and crucified as a criminal.

E. Schweizer believes that the Evangelist uses the secrecy phenomena to stress that one can only perceive Jesus as the Son of God by following him on the way to the Cross.

Now most of those who took the Wrede Strasse maintained that Mark, whatever his purpose employed the secret in a story about Jesus' past, i.e., it is a theme within the narrative. But, beginning with Hans Conzelmann, some scholars have argued that the secrecy theory was a device used to bring traditions saturated with an unparadoxical christology into conformity with the paradoxical christology of the kerygma. The secret is not a theme but "...the hermeneutical presupposition of the genre, 'Gospel'." It functions to keep the Gospel, like the gospel, kerygmatic.

---

2. The Gospel

a. Its Nature

One's estimate of the nature of the Gospel is determined by his view of the secret. No one who attributes these phenomena to the history of Jesus denies the Gospel's essential historicity. Conversely, no one who denies the historicity of the secret affirms the historicity of the Gospel.

b. Its Purpose

Given the two basic alternatives about the nature of the Gospel, there is still the question of the Evangelist's purpose in writing it. In other words, what was the reason which led Mark to write an historically trustworthy account of Jesus' life? Or, taking the other view, what theological purpose did Mark have in writing thus about Jesus of Nazareth? (The close relation between purpose and need is obvious here.) Among the scholars who hold to the essential historical reliability of Mark, Cranfield regards the Evangelist's special purposes to have been: "...to supply the catechetical and liturgical needs of the church in Rome, to support its faith in the face of the threat of martyrdom and to provide material for missionary preachers". 16 C. F. D. Moule argues for this latter point, but stresses that the entire document itself came into being for this purpose 17 in a community which "...recognized that their faith stood or fell with the sober facts of a story, and that

---

it was vital to maintain the unbroken tradition of those facts.\textsuperscript{18} Ralph Martin maintains that Mark wrote in order to prevent docetic tendencies from taking root in post-Pauline Gentile Christianity: "...Paul's dying-with-Christ mysticism needed to be fleshed out in the gospel story of a human person in touch with our concrete existence.\textsuperscript{19} Although we have mentioned only three scholars, the opinions which they express cover most of the statements of purpose which have been made by those who regard Mark to have been concerned to relate the story of Jesus accurately: catechesis, liturgy, evangelism, apology (or polemic), paraenesis.

As one might have expected from our analysis of the messianic secret, those who maintain that Mark reflects the beliefs of his church rather than the history of Jesus are in the majority. But once again there is a wide variety of opinion as to what precise purpose the Gospel served. Bultmann has suggested that Mark wanted to unite "...the Hellenistic kerygma about Christ, whose essential content consists of the Christ myth as we learn of it in Paul (esp. Phil. 2:6ff; Rom. 3:23) with the tradition of the story of Jesus."\textsuperscript{20} This is an instance of a traditio-historical explanation. Sometimes the purpose of the Gospel corresponds to that of the secret as in the case of apologetic interpretations (Dibelius, \textit{loc. cit.}). Standing in a class by itself, so far as the theological explanations are concerned, is Georg Strecker's thesis that "...Markus das Leben

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 109.
\textsuperscript{19} Ralph Martin, \textit{Mark: Evangelist and Theologian} (1972), 226.
\textsuperscript{20} R. Bultmann, \textit{The History of the Synoptic Tradition} (ET 1963, of \textit{Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition}, 1931\textsuperscript{-}), 347.
Jesu als ein in sich geschlossenes Geschehen zu schreiben versucht...; ...das Heilsgeschehen ist als Heilsgeschichte dargestellt". 21 Most recently, Werner Kelber has proposed that Mark wished to write a history of the Kingdom in order to encourage Galilean Christians whose faith had been shaken by the fall of Jerusalem. 22 Finally, although not exhaustively, we may cite an exponent of the "kerygmatic" understanding enunciated by Conzelmann. Norman Perrin avers that ". . . a major aspect of the Markan purpose is christological: he is concerned with correcting a false Christology prevalent in his church and to teach both a true Christology and its consequences for Christian discipleship." 23

3. The Sitz im Leben

In our review of suggestions regarding the purpose for which the Evangelist wrote, we were implicitly treating aspects of the Gospel's Sitz im Leben: circumstances (persecution, heresy, etc.), function in church life (catechesis, apologetic), ideology (theologia crucis).

Other pertinent information in determining the setting in life are provenance (e.g., Rome), time (just before or after A. D. 70), and culture (e.g., Gentile readers). Ordinarily, a description of the situation for which Mark wrote will not include all or even most of these; but the more we know about such details, the more accurate our assessment will be. Of course, it is extremely important

to get the most important categories correct. But, since there is such a lack of consensus about the Gospel's purpose, there is implicitly an uncertainty about the Sitz im Leben, for the two are implicitly related.

So far as provenance is concerned, early Christian tradition has, for the most part, said Rome. Only Jerome and later writers associate it with Alexandria. In recent years however, some opinion about provenance has been shifting eastward towards Palestine. Kümmel has proposed a "Gentile-Christian congregation of the East." Schreiber advocates Syria (Tyre, Sidon, or the Decapolis), Marxsen and Kelber have promoted Galilee. Could the shift eastward imply a shift in ideology?

B. Reasons for the State

Is it possible, without its seeming like the height of presumption, to suggest some reasons for this vast and complex situation in such short space? Perhaps whatever is valid in the rest of the thesis will vindicate the following criticism.

1. Wrede's Unrealized Legacy

What should have become a legacy to subsequent scholarship was

27. Willi Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist (ET 1969, of Der Evangelist Markus, 1959)
missed both by Wrede's supporters, opponents, and by Wrede himself. At the very beginning of his book he announced three principles which he said should guide all criticism, the second of which is especially crucial. First, Wrede lamented, "We are in too great a hurry to leave the terrain of the evangelists' accounts. We urgently want to utilize it for the history of Jesus itself." Our first task must always be only that of thoroughly illuminating the accounts on the basis of their own spirit and of asking what the narrator in his own time intended to say to his readers; and this work must be carried out to its conclusion and made the basis of criticism. However, although he deplored those who prematurely left "the terrain of the evangelists" to write their own biographies of Jesus, Wrede himself eventually abandoned the text of Mark to find "...the historical context in which the idea [of the secret] arose," i.e., in the history of the church's beliefs. The temptation was probably very strong, for Wrede, alongside his analysis of the text, was engaged in a continuous, anti-supernatural and anti-historical polemic with the biographers of Jesus. In so doing, however, Wrede fell into the same sort of error for which he had criticized the liberal questers. In arguing against the historicity of the messianic secret, "...he seemed

29. In the first principle, Wrede chided scholars for not taking seriously enough the implications of an axiom of historical criticism which stresses that in the gospels one has only a later narrator's conceptions of Jesus' life which is not the same as the life itself. In the third canon, Wrede attacked the sort of psychologizing, often disguised with the term "historical imagination", which could not be justified by any concrete data. (In other words, in certain circumstances, it is proper to "psychologize" and use historical imagination, op. cit., 59).
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., 209. See the entire discussion through p. 236.
34. See ch. V, n. 7.
35. Similarly, W. C. Robinson, Jr. observes, "...by abandoning his first principle he failed to understand how the data he studied function in the Gospel of Mark. That task therefore remains to be done." See "The Quest for Wrede's Secret Messiah", Int., 27.1 (Jan. 1973), 10.
unaware that such argument is not the same as the pursuit of Mark's intention. 36

In the debate which raged following the publication of Wrede's book, both his supporters and his opponents made the same methodological mistake. Rather than get at Mark's intention first, they plunged immediately into the attempt to deny or advocate the historicity of the secret and the Gospel. Furthermore, the publication of K. L. Schmidt's Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (1919), 37 convinced many that the narrative framework connecting the originally separate traditions was in fact a most general and historically unreliable creation of the evangelists. 38 It was almost inevitable then that the gospels subsequently came to be regarded as merely compilations of individual traditions, like pearls on a string. No longer viewed as wholes, they could be mined for further information about the development of the church's beliefs about Jesus.

The rise of redaction criticism after World War II was a welcome corrective to the atomizing effects of form criticism. It represents, in one way, a return to Wrede's ideals; but, in another respect, as we shall see shortly, it has not fulfilled the letter of Wrede's second principle. Consequently, we are in a situation where perhaps the most important aspect of Wrede's legacy is yet to be realized.

2. Atomistic Analysis

Although this may seem to be a highly subjective criticism, a

36. Ibid., 15.
38. See n. 8 in ch. VI, p. 140.
glance at the literature on Mark indicates that there is a high degree of specialized and isolated study. Only rarely does one find important themes studied in concert. Against this prevailing practice, Leander Keck has made a timely protest:

Mark's own intent has yet to be grasped and set forth in the light of the whole, for even the major monographs devoted to Mark's themes tend to leave them out of their setting and thus make them more prominent than the Evangelist intended them to be. 

Though it is much easier to select a theological theme to analyze in Mark, it is much more fruitful and doubtless more accurate—though more intricate and the results more tenuous—to investigate Mark's theology through the ordering of all the material.

It makes sense that a theme important enough to be isolated for study should not be isolated. This is especially crucial with the christological titles in Mark. Although a great deal has been written about them, attention has been devoted mainly to questions of their fundamental meaning, their authenticity, and their history in the tradition before becoming incorporated into the written gospels. The gospels have been used as mines of information for this enterprise. Only recently have scholars been investigating the way in which each evangelist employs them.

Most of this latter type of study has been done in the Gospel of Mark, but even this has been rather rare. Of the massive literature on the Son of Man, only a few extended essays and only one monograph have been devoted to Mark's use of this expression. Likewise, only two essays

39. For such a rare occurrence, n. b. Moule's essay referred to in n. 6.
41. Ibid., 369. Cf. nn. 2f.
43. Most commentators discuss the titles, but usually only in a brief introduction, and never, to our knowledge, discussing the relationship among them.
44. The latest, full-scale study is by C. Colpe in his article," 
have appeared which study the title, "the Son of God" in Mark, although it is commonly regarded as the most important one. The situation is somewhat different with "Christ", since analyses of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi abound. But despite the attention which \( \kappa \rho i \tau \o \) receives in such discussions, some writers regard it as the least important christological designation in the Gospel. Furthermore, the significance for Mark of the christologically-important theme of the Kingdom of God has only recently been examined in two monographs.

Of equal importance to the need for more intensive study of each of these themes in the Gospel is the study of the relationship between them. So far as I am aware, no one has attempted to relate the three titles to one another and to the Kingdom of God.

\[ \tau \o \ \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \ \text{in TMT, v. 8(1972), 400-77.} \]


47. See the list of studies given by John Reumann in Jesus in the Church's Gospels (1970), 424-27.


49. Aloysius M. Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom (1972) and Kelber op. cit.

50. It might be thought that such a relationship may be seen between at least two of the titles if the Son of Man christology be regarded as Mark's antidote to a heretical \( \theta \iota \iota \sigma \ \kappa \nu \gamma \rho \) christology as represented by the designation of Jesus as the divine Son of God, a view which we shall examine in ch. V. However, two objections may be raised against it in that the Son of Man functions merely as a cipher for suffering, which is the operative factor in Mark's alleged antidote. The reasons for the appropriateness of the Son of Man here are not usually discussed. Furthermore, the dynamics of the relationship between the Son of God and the Son of Man do not occur between the dramatis personae on the level of the narrative but directly between the evangelist and the reader.
C. A New Proposal

The problem dictates the solution. Consequently, in the remainder of this chapter, we shall endeavor to provide a more theoretical basis for Wrede's second principle of criticism and then apply it in subsequent chapters.

In ch. II, our aim will be to show that Mark did not confuse his christological categories but maintained their discrete connotations. This relatively easy enterprise will provide the basis for a more challenging task in ch. III: to relate the titles to one another and to the Kingdom of God. In so doing we shall be able to involve most of the Gospel's contents.

The positive values of such study, if it can be done successfully, are obvious; but the disadvantages loom fairly large. It may be that in our attempt to see both woods and trees we shall miss both. Without a precedent to follow, it is all the more difficult to keep from being distracted by issues and literature which, though important in their own right, are not directly relevant to the exclusive issue of the titles' relationships. The problem becomes even more acute when one's net is cast so widely. The danger of omitting relevant material and the probability of making errors increases substantially. Yet it is hoped that the values and results of such an integrative approach will prove to be more significant than the errors and omissions.

On the basis of our observations in these chapters, we shall, in the remainder of the dissertation, attempt to suggest fresh answers to the issues which we used to illustrate the state of Markan research: the nature and purpose of the messianic secret, the nature of purpose of the Gospel (chs. IV and V), and its Sitz im Leben (ch. VI).
Thus, the heart of the dissertation consists of the christological section. This is so, not simply because an analysis of this sort has not yet been attempted and therefore needs to be done. Rather, the point is that anything which contributes to our knowledge of Mark's christology gets us closer to the heart of his gospel. E. Trocmé is right in reminding us that

There is no denying that the person of Jesus stands at the centre of the whole Markan Gospel. The narratives in which others play the main part are few and far apart: John the Baptist in 1:1-8 and 6:14-29; Peter in 14:66-72; some women in 16:1-8. The summaries which the evangelist uses as connecting links between small groups of anecdotes all report about Jesus or the reaction of other people to his teaching or his actions.

While this is fundamentally true of the Gospel as a whole, it is also true that christology is the fundamental ingredient of every disputed issue which we have considered. Although it seems to be easily forgotten, the theme of the messianic secret is patently christological. When one inquires about the purpose for which the Gospel was written, he always confronts the christological issue. If Mark wrote as an apologist, then he is involved in either justifying or rebutting certain claims about Jesus. If he was concerned to prepare Christians for persecution, then there is abundant material in the Gospel to suit such a need, for the Gospel portrays Jesus as the Son of Man, not only as one who will shortly appear to vindicate his own, but also as one who himself suffered and called his disciples to follow in that way. Furthermore (and we need not belabor this point), one cannot get at the kerygma of Mark until he understands its christology; that is, until he discovers how the Evangelist depicts the

identity and soteriological significance of Jesus. Finally, having come to some conclusions about the christology of Mark one can be in position to suggest a Sitz im Leben (at least the ideological aspect of it) within early Christianity by comparing it with other NT documents, themselves primarily concerned about Jesus, the Christ. It is to this task that we now turn.

D. Method

Anyone who has attempted to study the Gospel of Mark seriously, knows immediately what Morna Hooker is getting at when she describes the problem which faces the interpreter of Mark's gospel:

"...this is at once the easiest and the most difficult of the gospels to discuss: the easiest, because if it is indeed the first of the gospels, then there is no 'control' by which to measure the evangelist's achievements and his manipulation of the material, and the scope for discovery is therefore limitless; the most difficult for precisely the same reason: the dangers of reading one's own interpretation into the gospel are manifold.

Norman Perrin, that distinguished and passionate advocate of redaction criticism, has expressed a similar realism about Markan research:

The problem in connection with Mark is one of method. Redaction criticism in this case is possible only to a limited extent, and it needs to be supplemented by other critical methods. As yet there is no scholarly consensus with regard to what particular blend of methods should be used in a historical investigation of the Gospel of Mark and the theology of the second evangelist.

Fundamental to Perrin's own idea of what ingredients that blend

might consist of, is the proposal that scholars take more seriously the implications of a cardinal tenet of redaction criticism: that the evangelists are not simply compilers of tradition, but authors in their own right, who therefore "...must be studied as other authors are studied." 55

Summarizing the conclusions of the Society of Biblical Literature's Task Force on Mark, Perrin reported their reluctance to confine their analysis of the Evangelist's theology to his creative editing and arranging of traditional material.

Any form of the evangelists' literary activity which we could observe would be equally important, and the next step therefore was clearly indicated: we had to concern ourselves with the literary activity of the evangelists above and beyond their redaction of tradition [underlining mine]. 56

By the "above and beyond" of redaction, Perrin refers to three concerns of the evangelist which involve the whole of his Gospel. The first is the composition and structuring of separate traditions around a definite plan which serves to indicate the author's intention. 57 Consequently, if the evangelists have structured their gospels carefully, then it is important to interpret any particular part of the structure in terms of the whole:

...no interpretation of any pericope within, or section of, these works can be adequate which does not raise questions about the place and function of that pericope or section within the structure of the work as a whole. 58

The second meta-redactional concern of the gospel authors which Perrin discerns is for protagonists and plot.

55. Norman Perrin, "The Evangelist as Author: Reflections on Method in the Study and Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts", BR, 17 (1972), 10, hereafter cited as "Evangelist as Author."
56. Ibid., 14. 57. Ibid., 16.
58. Ibid. Would its function affect its form?
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It is not too much to say that within the broad outline of a movement from a baptism by John in the Jordan River to a death on a cross outside Jerusalem, each evangelist presents a distinctive version of the story with a plot of its own. Moreover, the characters function quite differently in each version of the story. Neither the disciples nor Peter play the same role in the Gospel of Matthew that they play in the Gospel of Mark, and the Jesus of Luke's Gospel is a paradigm of Christian piety in a way that he is not in the other synoptic gospels.59

Finally, the redaction critic who views Mark as an author should be more alert to the thematic concerns of the Evangelist. Wrede called attention to the messianic secret theme; but one ought to be aware of others, for example, Mark's "...thematic concern for a particular understanding of Christology and of Christian discipleship...and as having a concern for a particular understanding of eschatology..."60 Although he realizes that these principles are taken as axiomatic by those who are engaged in literary study outside biblical research, Perrin acknowledges that this kind of analysis of the gospels is yet "...in its infancy."61 As we suggested earlier, the fault for this state of affairs may be laid at the door of William Wrede.

Sometimes Perrin gives the impression that literary analysis of the type which he has proposed was not possible until after the principles of redaction criticism had become established and had been vindicated by its results. However, it seems abundantly clear, both from the fact of Wrede's research and the claims of Perrin himself, that literary analysis may be done prior to and independently of redaction criticism, and, it might be added, of form criticism. Wrede, whom Perrin regards as the source

59. Ibid., 17. 60. Ibid. 61. Norman Perrin, "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark", in Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage. A Discussion with Norman Perrin, ed. H. D. Betz, (1971), 63. Hereafter, this work will be cited as "Interpretation."
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from which redaction criticism sprang, analyzed the secrecy theme almost two decades before the first form critical works appeared and over half a century before redaction criticism.

Further support for the point that literary study of the result of Mark's redaction may be conducted independently of his analysis of the materials and process of redaction comes from Perrin himself. After discussing the origin of Mark 10:45, he claimed that

...the origin of the saying is less important than the use to which Mark puts it, and that is clear enough. He uses it to climax the three-fold teaching on discipleship in the Passion prediction units and in this way to link that teaching decisively to the Son of Man Christology which for him is its essential basis.

The same is claimed regarding the passion predictions. After reviewing the various opinions about their origin (in the tradition, and/or in the redaction), Perrin maintains,

Be that as it may, the use of the predictions by Mark is not in dispute. He uses them to develop the Passion-oriented element of his own Christology and to form the basis for the consequent teaching on the essential nature of his disciple-

63. Willi Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, 21, comments that "redaction history is not merely the continuation of form history. It was simply taken up at a later date." "Theoretically, it would have been possible for redaction-historical research to have begun immediately after literary criticism." His statements are reminders that the sequence of one's investigation should not be confused with either the sequence of a tradition's history (Jesus—the church—the Gospel) or the history of research.

64. Quentin Quesnell, The Mind of Mark. Interpretation and Method Through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52 (1969), 52. His statement is strikingly similar, although I had formulated this distinction before reading his book. On the text itself being called the redaction, Quesnell says, "This sense of redaction, 'the redactional achievement', must be distinguished from the process by which it is produced. That process too is called 'the redaction', the final redaction of the gospel of Mark, but it is an activity, 'the redactional process'."
ship which follows each of them in the stereotyped pattern
of the three Passion-prediction units (8:36-9:1; 9:30-37;
10:32-45). 66

We agree wholeheartedly with Perrin so far, but wish to argue that
literary analysis not only may be done prior to and independently of form
and redaction criticism but also that it must be done so and, to use
Wrede's words quoted above, be made the basis of all criticism. We must
begin at the end. But, as we saw, Wrede failed to carry out his principle
to the end. Furthermore, he never attempted to justify his statement.
However, there are important epistemological and methodological considerations
which demonstrate that he was right.

Generally speaking, at first, if one takes seriously the status
which both the evangelists and their literature enjoy as a result of
the insistence of redaction criticism, then he must admit that the plan
for the Gospel's structure existed in Mark's mind (or beforehand, say,
in preaching) before he began to write. 67 Subsequently, the traditions and
sources were arranged to fit the plan. Therefore, if the plan existed in
the Evangelist's mind first and if it governs the arrangement (and modifica-
tion?) of his traditions, then one ought to examine this plan and their
relationship to it before examining the individual traditions. This is
another way of saying (again) that the result of the redaction should be
examined before the process and materials of redaction.

But one must go further and insist that one only knows that process
and those materials by virtue of the resultant documents which we possess.

66. Ibid., 187. N. b. the even stronger assertion by Kelber, op.
cit., 67, 110, a former student of Perrin's.
67. Austin Farrer, A Study in St. Mark (1951), 22, likewise insisted
that "the pattern of the whole comes first. Every sentence of a book is
formulated by the mind which writes the whole." Hereafter, this work will
be cited as St. Mark.
This is especially the case in the Gospel of Mark. Put more specifically, the kind of literary analysis which Perrin advocates as the final step must be done first because literary analysis is the epistemological foundation of all other criticism. This can be demonstrated from the history of gospel research. Classical form criticism could determine pre-canonical oral forms, and the laws governing their formation and transmission, only by observing the literary phenomena of the canonical and post-canonical documents.

In other words, our only evidence for the process of the evangelists' redaction (redaction criticism), for the history and transmission of the forms in the church prior to their redaction (form criticism), and for the history of Jesus is the result of the evangelists' redaction, the gospels as we have them.

The second reason for starting at this level first instead of beginning with form and then proceeding to redaction criticism is because the cardinal principles of redaction criticism and the practice of leading redaction critics raise questions regarding the possibility of ascertaining the forms, their history and the history of their transmission according to classical, form critical principles. Erhardt Guttgemanns points out how important it was for the pioneer form critics to maximize the tradition-historical continuity between the period of oral transmission of traditions by and about Jesus and their transmission in the written synoptic gospels.

This was achieved by minimizing both the status of the evangelists as authors and the literary quality of the gospels. 68 Rudolf Bultmann had claimed,

Da sie [die Komposition der Evangelien] aber nicht etwas prinzipiell Neues bringt, sondern nur vollendet, was mit

68. Erhardt Guttgemanns, Offen e Fragen zur Formgeschich- te des Evangeliums (1970), 73, 103f.
der ersten mündlichen Tradition schon beginnt, so kann sie nur im organischen Zusammenhang mit der vor den Evangelien liegenden Geschichte des Stoffes betrachtet werden.69

Martin Dibelius likewise minimized the literary role of the evangelists:

"The composers are only to the smallest extent authors. They are principally collectors, vehicles of tradition, editors."70 K. L. Schmidt, on the basis of a comparison of the gospels with contemporary literary works, judged them to be "...nicht Hochliteratur sondern Kleinliteratur, nicht individuelle Schriftstellerleistung, sondern Volksbuch, nicht Biographie, sondern Kultgente."71

By thus stressing the tradition-historical continuity between the pre-canonical, oral tradition and the canonical and post-canonical, written tradition, the form critics posited that the changes which the oral tradition underwent (mirroring the church's changing theology and circumstances) could be determined by observing

...how the Marcan material is altered and revised by Matthew and Luke, and how Matthew and Luke have presumably edited the text of Q (the sayings document). If we are able to deduce a certain regularity in this procedure then we may certainly assume that the same laws held good even earlier, and we may draw conclusions as to the state of the tradition prior to Mark and Q.72

But Willi Marxsen protested against all but the last of these estimates of the pioneer form critics by insisting that the multiplication and diversification of the forms which form criticism had described actually contradicted Bultmann's assertion. On the contrary, he said,

69. Rudolf Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (1931), 347. The paragraph begins, "Eine prinzipielle Grenze zwischen der mündlichen und der schriftlichen Überlieferung gibt es nicht..."
70. Dibelius, op. cit., 3.
"...the traditional material scatters in every direction!" 73 Although similar forms, such as parables, might become grouped together, "...it is not at all obvious that this totally disparate material should finally find its way into the unity of a Gospel." 74 Mark's giving a centripetal counteraction to a centrifugal movement "...cannot be explained without taking into account an individual, an author personality who pursues a definite goal with his work." 75 Marxsen thus contended that a definite discontinuity in the tradition-historical process occurred in the writing of Mark's gospel.

But the implications of these assertions for the entire enterprise of classical form criticism are staggering. If Marxsen is correct in insisting that the evangelists not only pass on tradition but interpret and shape it as well, then it must be allowed that changes usually attributed to the anonymous community may be redactional ones. While it is true that Marxsen saw the evangelist's hand primarily in the framework of the pericopae, 76 other redaction critics claim to discern more drastic alterations. H. J. Held, for instance, in a volume widely praised as illustrative of the abiding value of redaction criticism, maintains that Matthew's "...abbreviation of the Markan miracle stories serves the interest of interpretation." 77 Sometimes this abbreviation

73. Marxsen, op. cit., 18.
74. Ibid., 17.
75. Ibid., 18. Farrer, writing four years before Marxsen's pioneering redaction critical study of Mark, three years before Conzelmann's study of Luke, Die Mitte der Zeit, objected to form criticism's "question-begging assumption" that Mark was simply a compiler of tradition. See St. Mark, 24.
76. Ibid., 28.
is "far-reaching" as in the case of Mt. 8:28-34 and 9:18-26. But Held is not aware of the far-reaching implications of his own claim that "There can be no question that Matthew has standardized his healing miracles as conversations and has approximated their form to that of the controversy and scholastic dialogues." Changes in form, heretofore attributed by classical form criticism to anonymous communities, are here attributed to the creative activity of an individual evangelist. And the more the evangelists' individuality and unique accomplishments are emphasized, the more they are responsible for modifying their traditions, then the less we can be certain of determining the role and beliefs of the anonymous communities which preceded them.

Let us assume that somewhere our analysis is askew or entirely illegitimate or (much less likely) that the problem of traditio-historical continuity and discontinuity discerned by Guttgemanns is unreal, that the tendencies of the written, canonical and post-canonical gospels do reflect those of the pre-canonical, oral tradition. We would still be prevented from beginning our analysis of the gospels with form criticism with any confidence because, according to E. P. Sanders, certain fundamental conclusions drawn by the form critics about the tendencies of the canonical and post-canonical traditions were mistaken, Sanders' conclusions are significant enough to be quoted in full:

1. The form critics did not derive laws of transmission from a study of folk literature, as many think.
2. They derived them by two methods: (a) by assuming that purity of form (or, in the case of Taylor, impurity of form) indicates relative antiquity, and (b) by determining how Matthew and Luke used Mark and Q, and how the later literature

78. Ibid., 167.
79. Ibid., 242. That this is not an isolated example can be seen from Held's statements on p. 244, top and para. 1; 245 top and para. 3.
is "far-reaching" as in the case of Mt. 8:28-34 and 9:18-26. But Held is not aware of the far-reaching implications of his own claim that "There can be no question that Matthew has standardized his healing miracles as conversations and has approximated their form to that of the controversy and scholastic dialogues." Changes in form, heretofore attributed by classical form criticism to anonymous communities, are here attributed to the creative activity of an individual evangelist. And the more the evangelists' individuality and unique accomplishments are emphasized, the more they are responsible for modifying their traditions, then the less we can be certain of determining the role and beliefs of the anonymous communities which preceded them.

Let us assume that somewhere our analysis is askew or entirely illegitimate or (much less likely) that the problem of traditio-historical continuity and discontinuity discerned by Guttgemanns is unreal, that the tendencies of the written, canonical and post-canonical gospels do reflect those of the pre-canonical, oral tradition. We would still be prevented from beginning our analysis of the gospels with form criticism with any confidence because, according to E. P. Sanders, certain fundamental conclusions drawn by the form critics about the tendencies of the canonical and post-canonical traditions were mistaken. Sanders' conclusions are significant enough to be quoted in full:

1. The form critics did not derive laws of transmission from a study of folk literature, as many think.
2. They derived them by two methods: (a) by assuming that purity of form (or, in the case of Taylor, impurity of form) indicates relative antiquity, and (b) by determining how Matthew and Luke used Mark and Q, and how the later literature

78. Ibid., 167.
79. Ibid., 242. That this is not an isolated example can be seen from Held's statements on p. 244, top and para. 1; 245 top and para. 3.
used the canonical Gospels.
3. The first method is based on a priori considerations.
4. In so far as it depends on the use of Mark and Q by Matthew and Luke, the second is circular and therefore questionable.
5. The two are sometimes in direct conflict, although the form critics did not observe this.
6. In any case, the form critics did not derive the laws from or apply the laws to the Gospels systematically, nor did they carry out a systematic investigation of changes in the post-canonical literature. 80

The lasting merit of Sanders' study is that he does undertake to investigate the gospels, both canonical and post-canonical, and the textual tradition systematically, employing the three criteria which the form critics claim to have used in determining the relative age of traditions: length, detail, and semitisms. They had held that the shorter, less detailed, and more semitic a tradition, the more ancient it was. Sanders' specific conclusions, borne out by the evidence fully-displayed, are:

There are no hard and fast laws of the development of the Synoptic tradition. On all counts the tradition developed in opposite directions. It became both longer and shorter, both more and less detailed, and both more and less Semitic. Even the tendency to use direct discourse for indirect, which was uniform in the post-canonical material which we studied, was not uniform in the Synoptics themselves. For this reason, dogmatic statements that a certain characteristic proves a certain passage to be earlier than another are never justified. 81

After such a negative evaluation of what has become the cornerstone of modern gospel study, a disclaimer and a suggestion of an alternative approach are in order. To support the foregoing analyses is not to deny the fundamental insights of form and redaction criticism. That the form of individual units of tradition were determined in some measure by their use in the various aspects of the church's life and betray those circumstances by their form seems beyond serious question. That the evangelists,

81. Ibid., 272.
by their alteration and arrangement of tradition, likewise indicate
their concerns and circumstances is also an insight which cannot be
gainsaid.

However, a new approach is necessary because redaction criticism
has proposed an entirely new estimate of the origin and nature of the
gospels 82 (our only direct evidence for the oral form of the traditions
and their history in the church) and because classical opinion about the
latter rests upon an erroneous set of conclusions drawn from an outmoded
understanding of the gospels. 83 But what shall be offered in its
place? 84 With a great fear of presumption, we propose the following
line of approach: Ultimately, the history of the synoptic tradition needs
to be rewritten. Another attempt must be made to describe each form,
plot its growth, and discern the process of each form's transmission.

---

82. Farrer, St. Mark, loc. cit., also saw (without drawing further
conclusions) "...that if St. Mark is in fact after all a living whole,
then the work of the form critics is, every line of it, called in doubt.
So far from its then being probable that their detailed conclusions will
stand, it is more likely that an appreciation of the form of the whole
will place their premature examinations of the separate parts in an un-
favorable light."

83. Guttgemanns, op. cit. claims that since form criticism
was based upon folklore studies, the study of literature, and linguistics
which are now obsolete, its principles must be re-examined.

84. Guttgemanns, ibid., 79 comes very close to making these
fundamental points of criticism, but does not offer the positive alter-
natives. "Wenn Mark tat>sächlich die Form als erster geschaffen hat,
dann gehört die übrige Traditionsgeschichte in die 'literarische'
Variationsgeschichte der Form, nicht in ihre 'voraliterarische' Werde-
geschichte, von der das 'literarische' Stadium nur mittelsbare Reflexe
wiedergibt." A few lines later, Guttgemanns observes, "Wir haben
direkt und unmittelbar nur das 'literarische' Stadium der Tradition vor
uns, das uns die Reichweite unserer Analyse der 'voraliterarischen'
Stadium vorschreibt. Sollten wir uns lieber an F. Overbecks Urteil
vom trümmernhaften Character der 'Umliteratur' halten?"
To facilitate this, the full implications of redaction critical theory (if it is correct) and of E. P. Sanders' investigations will have to be taken seriously. In more concrete terms, this will involve becoming intimately acquainted with the whole of each evangelist's theology and his particular tendencies and interests from the gospels, as we now have them. Now, to suggest this to a gospels specialist may seem like Elijah's suggesting to Naaman that he bathe seven times in the Jordan, for there seems to be a general feeling that the gospels are well-known on this level. But we recall that neither Wrede, nor his successors carried this out for Mark (or the other evangelists), and we have Norman Perrin's admission that the structural, dramatic, and thematic examination of the gospels is yet in its infancy.

Only when this has been done is one ready to attempt separating tradition from redaction. How else can one get at Mark's distinct theology apart from knowing his total theology? How else can we know what to attribute to his account and what to ascribe to his sources? Therefore, when examining any single tradition or two or three synoptic versions of it, one would be obliged to account for every aspect of the form and content of that tradition (or its versions) in terms of the evangelist's (or evangelists') theological and stylistic tendencies. Only then would we have some idea of the form of the tradition as it reached the evangelist(s). And only then could we posit that what remained might reflect the form and history content of the tradition(s) before being incorporated by the evangelist(s). 85 We have deliberately used the subjunctive

85. This may be more difficult than imagined, so far as Mark's style is concerned, if Frans Neirynck is correct in maintaining that there is a strikingly pervasive and uniform duality of expression producing "a sort of homogeneity in Mark, from the wording of sentences to the composition of the gospel." See his Duality in Mark (1972), 37. This study consists of long articles formerly published in Ephem. Theol. Lovan: "Mark in Greek", 47 (1971), 144-198; "Duality in Mark", 394-463; "Duplicate
because of the many unknowns which attend such study, especially in the case of multiple accounts of the same tradition: they might represent three independent traditions whose prior history is completely unknown and perhaps unknowable to us. To do this for each tradition and its parallels is obviously a monumental undertaking, but it will have to be done for research to proceed on surer foundations in isolating the forms and charting both their oral and written history. Only when we have thoroughly examined the known (i.e., the text), will we be in any position to speculate about the lesser-known or unknown pre-history of the sources which were incorporated into the text. This principle is especially crucial in the case of Mark, whose sources are only known to us from the Gospel itself. And, tortuous though it may be, it is crucial to building a firm foundation for studying the life of Jesus.

Quite obviously, this will involve a life-time's work. Yet, it would be desirable to apply some of these insights to the present investigation, which we hope to do by studying the significance of hitherto unexamined or little-examined aspects of the christology of Mark, especially aspects of the titles, "Christ", "Son of God", and the expression, "the Son of Man". In the spirit of Wrede's second principle of criticism, we shall studiously attempt to avoid falling into the error of himself and his successors: that of introducing questions of historicity and

Expressions in the Gospel of Mark", 48 (1972), 150-209. I owe thanks to the Rev. Prof. C. F. D. Moule, my supervisor, for calling my attention to Neirynck's works.

86. Quesnell, op. cit., and R. H. Stein are two rare examples of scholars who have sought to put redaction critical research on a more rigorous footing. Yet, they both employ classical form and redaction critical techniques in the usual order, failing to derive Mark's distinct theology only after determining his total theology. See Stein's article, "The 'Redaktionsgeschichtlich' Investigation of a Markan Seam (Mc 1,21f)" ZNW, 61 (1970), 70-94 and "The Proper Method for Ascertaining a Markan Redaction History", NovT, 13 (July 1971), 181-198.
Mark's place in the history of the church's theology into our initial examination of the text (although in themselves, they are legitimate subsequent issues).

Two assumptions underly this study. The first, which will receive formal justification in chapter 4, is that, in attempting to achieve his purpose(s), Mark intended to tell a story about the earthly Jesus. The second is that the story can and must be analyzed from the text as we have it, independently of any prior to all other types of analysis. This is not an attempt to by-pass or supplant form-, traditio-historical- and redaction-criticism. According to the discussion above, the type of study in which we are engaging is their epistemological ground and is yet in its infancy. Perhaps our investigation will in some way contribute to its becoming more mature. So we proceed to an investigation of Mark's christology with all of the attendant uncertainty, likelihood of error, and sense of inadequacy characteristic of early parenthood.
Our aim in this chapter is to demonstrate that Mark did not confuse "Christ", "Son of Man", and "Son of God" but maintained the discrete significance of each. The results of our concentrated survey of these three titles and of a more detailed analysis of the latter two will show that it is illegitimate to use them interchangeably or to subsume them all under a general category such as "messianic." Philipp Vielhauer, commenting on the confluence of these three categories at 14:61, makes a point which may be applied throughout the Gospel. Despite their close proximity,

...sind die Titel nicht einfach auswechselbar; sie gehören verschiedenen Aussagebereichen an, kennzeichnen verschiedene Aspekte der Person, der Funktion und des Schicksals Jesu und sind nur darin identisch, dass sie Jesu bezeichnen.1

A. Overview

1. "Christ"

Of the seven instances of Χριστός, two are personal names (1:14, 9:41); the rest are titular uses. The first
appearance of the title in the Markan narrative is at 8:29, in Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi. Here, in the only occasion of its use as a predicate, it is suppressed (8:30). Only once might it occur on Jesus' lips as a reference to himself (9:41), and here it is probably a personal name. At 12:35, Jesus uses it obliquely in a rhetorical question about the true nature of the Messiah. In the remaining instances, the title is found on the lips of opponents (13:21, false messianic claimants; 14:61, the High Priest; 15:31f, chief priests and scribes at the cross).

This general reticence is further illustrated by Jesus' tendency to shift attention to the Son of Man, when others, both intimates and opponents, use it (8:31, 13:26, 14:62). Mark's attitude towards the title is well expressed by

2. This is to be distinguished from the introductory statement in 1:1 where it is a personal name.


4. Ibid.

5. Although there is some strong external support for reading (τοῦ) ἄνθρωπος ἐφίλοια at 1:34 after αὐτόν (among others, B,C,Θ f° f13 33ем ), B. M. Metzger holds that the longer readings might have been derived from Lk. 4:41. "If anyone of the longer readings had been original in Mark, there is no reason why it should have been altered or eliminated entirely." A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (1971), 75. The intended sense might be that the demons knew Jesus to be ἄθλος υἱὸς θεοῦ on the analogy of the demon's claim, σωτῆρ αὐτός ἐστι in 1:25.
Best: "...he does not deny that Jesus is the Christ, nor does he stress it. In itself the title tells us nothing about the achievement of Jesus."\(^6\) This is indeed surprising when one considers how important Jesus' messiahship was to the early church. Yet, never are the themes of suffering, resurrection, parousia, and the scriptural prophecies concerning them linked to "Christ". They are reserved exclusively in Mark for "the Son of Man".\(^7\)

It is not strictly correct, therefore, to regard Peter's confession of Jesus, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, as expressing "...the Christian understanding of Jesus."\(^8\) Peter is employing language that any Jew might have used in addressing a figure who had raised messianic hopes. Of course, it is the intention of Mark as derived from the context which needs to confirm this. Peter's confession did rise above the popular level (8:28), but that it was misinformed and not "Christian" is very apparent from Jesus' rebuke after Peter balked at hearing that the Son of Man must suffer and die (vv. 31ff). The only appropriate name for Peter is "Satan" in this instance. His estimate of Jesus

---

7. Luke, in relating two post-resurrection appearances, has Jesus instructing his followers that scripture bore witness to the suffering and rejection of the Christ (24:26,46). The same theme appears in Luke's account of the church's preaching (cf. Acts 3:18, 17:3). In Mark, however, the Son of Man is the object of the scriptural testimony: esp. 9:12b and 14:21, but also 8:31. Cf. the discussion on p. 55f. below.
is not God's (οὐ φρονεῖς τῷ τὸν θεοῦ, v. 33, which would correspond to the Christian view, or Jesus' own view) but man's (φρονεῖν τῷ πνεύματι).

At this point Peter's understanding is not much different from that of popular expectation (Τίνα μὲ λέγουσαν οἱ ἀνθρώποι εἶναι; v. 27). For Mark and his readers, Jesus is more than the Messiah of Jewish expectation. The point is that within the narrative Peter only perceives him on the latter level.  

It is important to observe that Peter is not the only one in the Gospel to address Jesus messianically. Blind Bartimaeus calls him, "Son of David", twice in the hearing of a large crowd without being silenced (10:47f). Furthermore, the entourage (his disciples and a large crowd) which had been accompanying Jesus at least since Jericho (10:46; cf. v. 32) hails him in messianic terms as they enter Jerusalem (11:9f). Whatever might actually have happened here, it seems likely that Mark intended his readers to understand it so, since he portrays Jesus arranging this event in the presence of the crowd which had heard Bartimaeus' messianic address, had witnessed his cure, and had absorbed him in its trek with Jesus to Jerusalem (10:52). Consequently, Peter's address is on the level of what was possible for others to perceive. Contrary to Wrede,

---

9. F. W. Danker stresses this point in 'The Demonic Secret in Mark, a Re-examination of the Cry of Dereliction (15:34)' in ZNW, 61 (1970), 54: "...it is important to distinguish between what Mark and his readers know and the dramatic function of a given statement in the progress of the narrative.

10. This is true not only of the original incident and the subsequent pre-Markan tradition but also for the text of Mark itself, a fact which Erich Dinkler and others often overlook. See his essay, "Peter's Confession and the
it is not a supernatural revelation, given like the mystery of the Kingdom of God in 4:10.\textsuperscript{11} What he and the other disciples are privy to, which others generally are not, is specific instruction regarding the Son of Man who is to be vindicated after suffering.

This point is so significant for our contention, that Mark does not confuse his christological titles and keeps their meaning discrete, that it must be followed through in the remaining occurrences of Χριστός. When Jesus argues that the Christ is not only David's son, but David's Lord in 12:35ff, he is clearly introducing an idea which went beyond contemporary scribal teaching and the popular level of opinion expressed in the address of Bartimaeus. Here is further proof that a distinction should be made between that which Mark and his readers know to be true and that which the dramatis personae of the narrative can perceive.

It is virtually impossible to determine whether those who claim to be the Christ in 13:21f, and against whom a warning is given, are meant to be Jewish or heretical, Christian, messianic pretenders. In any case, the reference is to the post-Easter period and, once again, attention is diverted to the Son of Man, who is to appear at the end in


\textsuperscript{11} Wrede, op. cit., 78, 118f. This claim will be defended in ch. IV.
power and glory (v. 26).

It is precisely the Jewish - messianic sense of "Christ" which occurs in the trial and crucifixion narratives. In order to understand it in the High Priest's question at 14:61, we should note that at 15:32, Χριστός is in apposition with an unmistakably Jewish - messianic title which occurs five additional times in chapter 15 (vv. 2, 9, 12, 18, 26).

Mocking, the Jewish authorities at the site of the crucifixion invite δ Χριστός δ βασιλεύς Ἰσραήλ to descend from the cross so that they might believe in him.

Once again the characters in the drama and even the Roman titulus on the cross have got it right so far as Mark's and his reader's understanding are concerned, but on the level of the narrative they neither know it nor intend it beyond the Jewish sense. Furthermore, in his reply to Caiaphas, Jesus again shifts attention to the Son of Man as he did when Peter had addressed him as the Messiah (8:29). Were it of itself the supreme Christian confession, this reinterpretation or supplementation would hardly have been necessary.

2. The Son of Man

It is well known that in the entire synoptic tradition and in Mark, the written fountain head of that tradition,

12. There is no real difference in this case between Ἰσραήλ and τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Pilate's statement in v. 12 seems to imply that this was a popular appellation: τι δύνατον [ἄν] λέγετε τῶν βασιλέων τῶν Ἰουδαίων; δ' λέγετε, however, is omitted by Α D W f', all of
"The Son of Man" occurs only on Jesus' lips. Unlike "Christ," and "Son of God," it is never used as a predicate either in the second or third person (i.e., no one, supernatural or human, ever says, "he is" or "you are the Son of Man"). It is the supremely functional term which Jesus uses publicly with reference to his present authority (2:10, 28) and eschatological vindication (8:23, 14:62) and privately with reference to his suffering, death, and resurrection (8:31; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33f; 10:45; 14:21). Unlike "Christ" and "Son of God," neither this term nor teaching associated with it is ever suppressed. Significantly, none of the other major christological titles is ever directly associated with Jesus' suffering, death, resurrection, and eschatological vindication.

The old Latin version, vg syr s cop sa arm geo.

13. Luke 24:7 and John 12:34 are only partial exceptions since others repeat Jesus' own words. Elsewhere in the NT, the only person to use the term is Stephen at his martyrdom (Acts 7:56). In Hebrews 2:6, it appears in the quotation from Ps. 8:5 and at Rev. 1:13 and 14:14, which quote Dan. 7:13.


15. Jesus speaks allusively in public about his suffering and death in the reference to the bridegroom's being snatched away (2:20) and in the invitation to the summoned crowd and disciples to be willing to forfeit their lives in following him (8:34f). Only in the latter case is there an association with the Son of Man, but it is in his eschatological vindication (8:38). Here may also be mentioned the parable of the rejected son (12:1-12) which refers obliquely to Jesus' death in connection with the murder of the beloved son (vv. 6, 8) and to his vindication (vv. 10f).

Furthermore, as we noted, at significant points in the narrative, where he is addressed otherwise, Jesus shifts attention to the Son of Man. After Peter called him "the Christ" (8:29), Jesus then charged his disciples to tell no one about him and began to teach them about the necessity of the Son of Man's suffering, death, and resurrection (v. 30f). Later, the inner circle of disciples, who had seen him transfigured and had heard him presented by the divine voice as "Son" (of God) (9:7), are commanded to keep silent about what they had seen until the Son of Man had arisen from the dead (v. 9). His death, implied here, is reinforced by the reference to scripture which witnesses to the Son of Man's suffering and rejection (v. 12). On another mountain, an inner circle of disciples is forewarned about the advent of imposters claiming to the the Christ (13:21f, cf. v. 6). But after the cosmos collapses, the Son of Man will come in the clouds with great power and glory (vv. 24-26). In response to the High Priest's pointed question, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?", Jesus responds affirmatively, but again turns attention to the Son of Man (14:61f.).

18. His reply is affirmative, both in the oblique statement, τῷ υἱῷ τῆς ζωῆς (Θεοῦ arm Or) and in the more explicit answer. Sometimes a decision on one of these texts has been based on a particular understanding of the messianic secret. For example, Cranfield, op.cit., 444 seems to prefer the more oblique statement because it concurs with Jesus' studied reticence throughout the Gospel. But T. A. Burkitt, op.cit., 242f, 288 prefers the more explicit reading because it concurs with the increasing tempo of messianic disclosure since the Triumphal Entry.
3. "Son (of God)"

It has often been said that this is the most important title in Mark's christology.\(^{19}\) In some very important textual witnesses, it appears in the opening sentence of the Gospel.\(^{20}\) Even among those scholars who question the originality of \(\psi \iota \omega \omicron \ \theta \zeta \omicron \omicron \), there are those who regard its scribal addition to have been entirely appropriate to Mark's purpose.\(^{21}\) Elsewhere, this title occurs at key points in the narrative: at Jesus' baptism (1:11), at his transfiguration (9:7), and at his death (15:39). The Gospel begins and the passion ends with Jesus regarded as the Son of God.

In every instance, except one, whenever Jesus is addressed as Son (of God), it is by supernatural voices: God himself addresses Jesus as his Beloved Son (1:11) and presents him thus to the inner circle of disciples (9:7). Between these divine witnesses occur two demonic testimonies (3:11, 5:7). "Thus, the opposite sides of the spiritual

\(^{19}\) Cullmann, \textit{op.cit.}, 294. Best, \textit{op.cit.}, 167, V. Taylor, \textit{op.cit.}, 120.

\(^{20}\) Cranfield, \textit{op.cit.}, 38 has marshalled weighty arguments in favor of the originality of \(\psi \iota \omega \omicron \ \theta \zeta \omicron \omicron \).

\(^{21}\) E.g. N. Perrin, "Christology", 182 n.22.

\(^{22}\) \(\delta \xi \iota \epsilon \omicron \ \tau \omicron \ \theta \zeta \omicron \omicron \) (1:24) should be classed here as well.
world...agree in their witness."\(^{23}\) It is only at the end of the Gospel, at Jesus' death, that for the first time a man, a Gentile centurion, confesses that Jesus was the Son of God.\(^ {24}\) In two of the three remaining occurrences, Jesus uses υἱός (\(\gamma\nu\iota\omicron\omicron\) ) obliquely at 12:6\(^ {25}\), ambiguously at 13:32,\(^ {26}\) and affirmatively (if only indirectly) in his answer to the High Priest, who asks if he is Χριστός ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ (\(14:61f\) ).

This designation of Jesus is, as Ernest Best observes, "...pre-eminently the title of confession."\(^ {27}\) It is, first and foremost, a predicate rather than a function\(^ {28}\), telling who Jesus is, not what he does.

The latter point will be important in the subsequent discussion about the meaning of this designation of Jesus in Mark. We need only note that, as a title of confession, it is found either in private circumstances or is suppressed.

\(^{23}\) Best, _op. cit._, 168.

\(^{24}\) Eduard Schweizer, "\(\upsilon\omicron\omicron\) " (in the New Testament), TDNT, v.8 (1972), 379. Hereafter, this essay will be cited as _Son_. See below p. 

\(^{25}\) Χριστός ὁ υἱός is also found in the divine address to Jesus (1:11) and to the disciples (9:7). This is the only time that he uses it in Mark.

\(^{26}\) Schweizer, _Son_, 372 thinks that this is rooted in the Son of Man christology. He notes that Mk. 8:38 and par. have the triad, the Father, the Son of Man, and the angels and that both passages occur in apocalyptic contexts.

\(^{27}\) Best, _loc. cit._

\(^{28}\) Against Vielhauer's thesis that a pattern of apotheosis (1:11), presentation (9:7), and enthronement (15:39) underlies Mark's gospel, "Christologie", 166-69, Schweizer, _Son_, 379 n.324, argues that "...it is doubtful whether Mk. takes the Son of God title so functionally that divine sonship only begins with institution to office [i.e. the crucifixion]. But the main point is that Jesus has already been proclaimed as Son of God by God and the demons."
At the baptism, apparently only Jesus hears the divine voice. Subsequently, only Peter, James and John hear it (9:2, 7) when they witness Jesus' transfiguration. Afterwards, Jesus forbids them to tell anyone about what they have seen until the Son of Man has arisen from the dead (9:9). Furthermore, whenever the demons address Jesus as the Son (or Holy One) of God, they are enjoined to silence (1:24f, 34; 3:11f).

B. The Son of God and the Son of Man in Mark

1. The Issues

Having shown that Mark does not confuse these major christological categories, we now turn to a closer examination of the significance of the Son of God and the Son of Man christologies in the Gospel.

There is a vigorous debate and a mountain of literature on the meaning of "the Son of God" in Hebrew and Greek thought and on its history in hellenistic Judaism, in Jewish Christianity (both Aramaic-and Greek-speaking), and in Gentile Christianity. One holds that in the Gentile


30. Scholars are coming to recognize how artificial these distinctions are. We retain them solely for the convenience of discussion. For a recent discussion of the issues, see I. Howard Marshall, "Palestinian and Hellen-
community for which Mark wrote, the title would have taken on
the reference to Jesus' nature. Another school, in direct
opposition to this ontological understanding of the term,
maintains that in the synoptic tradition and in the Gospel
of Mark itself, the OT and Jewish notion of relationship
still predominates.

A prominent exponent of the latter view is Oscar
Cullmann, who insists that "the Son of God" is to be
understood as an expression of obedient, suffering sonship
as this is epitomized in the role of the Suffering Servant.

Although Cullmann attempts to ascertain Jesus' self-
consciousness as expressed throughout the synoptic
gospels in his investigation of these terms, he does maintain
that Mark, though not himself stressing the ebed Yahweh
title or role, nevertheless reproduces tradition which
does. At the baptism, the voice from heaven says:
"You are my only Son; you must fulfill the role of the
ebed Yahweh." Admittedly, "Jesus did not designate himself

istic Christianity: Some Critical Comments", NTS, 19.3
(April 1973), 271-287.
31. E.g., Hahn, op.cit., 300ff, 305f.
33. Ibid., 69f.
34. Ibid., 284. A key point in the exclusivist
view of Cullmann, Jeremias and others is that the Gentile
church prior to Mark had made explicit with υἱός the
sonship implied in παις, which can mean "child" as well
as "servant." Cf. n. 49 below. However, an examination
of the full text of Is. 42:1 and the use of παις in subsequent
servant songs indicates that in these contexts, the more
probable meaning is "servant." Is. 42:1 reads, ἸΔωρα ὥ τπαις μου,
ἀνθρώπου ἐκλέξατο σου Ἰακωβ, υἱός μου, Ἰς ὥ τπαις μου. It is significant that nowhere in this section of Isaiah
does παις occur in connection with υἱός. In fact,
υἱός in the singular fails entirely. However, ΣΩΛΟΙ is
used interchangeably with παις and precisely in connection
by the title, 'Suffering Servant,'..." Fundamental though the concept was, especially in explaining his death as the "central act of salvation", it did not encompass his whole work. Jesus did, however, incorporate the idea of the Suffering Servant with the title, "Son of Man" [sic], the only one he applied to himself, because,

The Son of Man idea is more comprehensive. It both refers to Jesus' future work, and at the same time, with regard to his work as the incarnate one, visualizes his humanity as such. It was therefore more appropriate to subordinate the ebed Yahweh concept to that of the Son of Man. Jesus did this in such a way that the vocation of the ebed becomes, so to speak, the main content of the Son of Man's work.

with "Israel" and "Jacob." We find in 48:20, Ἰσραήλ κύριος τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ. More striking are statements in the early part of chapter 49: σοφὸς μου εἰ σοῦ Υφρακηλ. (v.3). Δοῦλος appears even where child imagery is explicit: σύνω λέγει κύριος, ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας σῶλον ἐκυτῶ ...(v. 5). When Πῶις does occur in the following verse, it is within this context that it should be understood: μεῖξα τοίς ἐπὶ τῶν κλητον ἀρχαὶ τῷ πατρὶ μου. (v. 6). Therefore, while "child" is a possible meaning for Πῶις, "servant" is the more probable one in these contexts.

35. Ibid., 79. 36. Ibid., 82. 37. Ibid. Nearly everyone, except perhaps C. F. D. Moule, fails to note the almost exclusively articular form of this expression in the gospels. Thus, the term in Greek is εὐνὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and must be rendered "the Son of Man." Everywhere in the Old Testament (including the LXX) it is anarthrous. Cf. Prof. Moule's essay, "Neglected Features in the Problem of 'the Son of Man,'" in Neues Testament und Kirche. Festchrift für Rudolf Schnackenburg, herausg. J. Gnilka (Forthcoming), 419f. Hereafter, this essay will be referred to as "Neglected Features". 38. Ibid., 137. 39. Ibid., 161. Cullmann, with others, shares the view that the merging of the Servant role with the title of the Son of Man is to be seen most clearly at Mark 8:31 and 10:45, the latter being regarded as "classical" (160).
The same sort of concession is made regarding the Son of God. After reviewing the OT and Jewish understanding of sonship, Cullmann concludes that it is,

...essentially characterised not by the gift of a particular power, nor by a substantial relationship with God by virtue of divine conception; but by the idea of election to participation in divine work through the execution of a particular commission, and by the idea of strict obedience to the God who elects.\(^40\)

The synoptic emphasis regarding Jesus' sonship is similar: not "...primarily miraculous power, but the absolute obedience of a son in the execution of the divine commission."\(^41\) The same sentiments are expressed by Lewis Hay, who relies heavily on Cullmann but writes specifically on the Son of God in Mark: "To be God's Son means to be obedient to God."\(^42\)

However, C. K. Barrett, after making a detailed examination of 10:45, concludes that neither the linguistic nor the ideological details are explicit enough to link this verse directly with Isaiah. Rather, they represent ideas which are widespread in the OT. See "The Background of Mark 10:45", in New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (1959), 7, 9. Morna Hooker, (cf. n. 49) comes to similar conclusions with regard to the consciousness of Jesus and the New Testament in general.

\(^40\) Ibid., 275.  \(^41\) Ibid., 276.  
\(^42\) Hay, op.cit., 108, cf. 110. Hay stresses obedience to the extent of humiliation (108), but completely neglects the title when it occurs in divine and demonic addresses.
Although stating his position so absolutely, Cullmann feels obliged to qualify it, but fails to notice the serious implications of his qualification:

Jesus usually prefers the title 'Son of Man', to 'Son of God' because the former expresses in a more unmistakable way what is important to him in the latter; that is, 'Son of Man' also points to the complete identity of Jesus' will with that of the Father as expressed in his obedience to the divine plan, but unlike 'Son of God' it is not so likely to be wrongly misunderstood by the disciples and the people as a majestic claim only.\(^4^3\) [all underlining mine].

This statement immediately gives rise to a host of questions. If sonship in the OT and in Jewish thought describes a filial relationship based upon obedience, and if "Son of God" epitomises this relationship, why should another term convey this idea more unmistakably, and why should it be liable to misunderstanding as a majestic claim? Cullmann apparently feels that, so far as the people and even the disciples were concerned, the title primarily conveyed something other than filial obedience. That this seems to be the only conclusion is apparent in a subsequent statement about the reason for Jesus' reserve about the title (i.e. his infrequent use of it and his suppression of demonic addresses):

"...he did not want his consciousness of sonship to be included among analogous psychiatric 'cases'."\(^4^4\)

---

43. Cullmann, op. cit., 282. 44. Ibid., 283.
[i.e., "... the large class of miracle workers who could openly proclaim themselves as such to be 'Sons of God'"].

Again, we must ask why this should be problematical if "Son of God" simply meant filial consciousness? Why should "... the secret that he is related to God as no other man is", if defined in filial and functional terms rather than metaphysical, produce this sort of reaction if divulged? Why should something which in principle was possible for any Israelite and Jew be so jealously guarded?

There is good reason for Cullmann's ambivalence, for the understanding of the Son of God which he advocates does not fit the data of Mark neatly. In fact, Cullmann could only have arrived at his conclusions by failing to take into account the contexts of the passages which he adduced in support and by virtually ignoring the accounts of exorcism where the Son of God title appears so prominently.

Without denying the possible influence of ideas associated with the Isaianic Suffering Servant (esp. 42:1) or with an Abraham-Isaac typology, our bipartite thesis is that in its Markan context, "the Son of God" identifies Jesus primarily as a transcendent, royal-eschatological figure, especially when he is addressed by supernatural beings, but that it is not the primary means of conveying the idea

45. Ibid. 46. Ibid.
47. See note 49. 48. Best, op. cit., 169-73 and n. 87 below.
of obedient, suffering sonship, an idea which is better expressed by "the Son of Man".

2. The Supernatural Son of God

The Baptism and the Temptation (1:9-13)

Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀναπτύσσων, ἐν σελευκονήσῳ (1:11)

Evidence for the royal features of the Son is not limited to the possible influence of Ps. 2:7, which was originally addressed to the king (υἱὸς μου εἶ σὺ ), but is to be found also in the close connection between Jesus' baptism and temptation (1:12f), when according to Mark,

the Kingdom of God had drawn near. In support of this contention, we point to James M. Robinson's observation that Jesus begins his proclamation of the Good News by referring to events which, as the perfect tenses indicate, have already taken place: the time has been fulfilled (πεπλήρωται) and the Kingdom of God has nearly arrived\(^\text{50}\) (ἐγένετο, 1:14f).\(^\text{51}\)

Since vv. 2-3 contain a prophecy which is fulfilled in the ministry of John the Baptist (vv. 4-8),\(^\text{52}\) the Kingdom's near-arrival must be depicted in vv. 9-13, in the baptism and temptation of Jesus. These events are so intimately connected that perhaps it would be too artificial to segregate them in attempting to locate the precise moment of the Kingdom's near-arrival. But it might be helpful, for the purposes of analysis, to regard the baptism as the identification and divine equipping of the Kingdom's agent for the struggle with Satan, whose significance Robinson interprets thus: "In this initial encounter between the eschatological Spirit and the ruler of the present evil aeon, the Kingdom of God draws near."\(^\text{53}\) Therefore, it seems wholly justifiable

---

51. James M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark (1957), 24. Ambrozic, op. cit., 21f, strangely regards the πεπληρωται clause as looking backward to fulfilment, while the ἐγένετο clause looks to the present and future.
52. Robinson, op. cit., 24f. 53. Ibid., 32.
to see in the divine address a royal significance. Furthermore, whatever the range of meaning the title, "Son of God," possessed in the minds of Mark and his readers, it seems that the transcendent and divine predominate here. Once again we are indebted to James Robinson for calling attention to what he calls the "cosmic language" surrounding these events:

...we find the heavens splitting [σχζεσθαί, v. 10], the Spirit descending like a dove, a voice from heaven, God's son, the Spirit driving him into the wilderness, Satan tempting with the wild beasts and ministering angels.54

Eduard Schweizer is surely correct in observing that in this account, "...Mark depicts...the divine dimension in which the life and passion of Jesus will be enacted."55 This aspect of Jesus' baptism is ignored by Cullmann and Hay. Moreover, these events, especially the sending of the Spirit and the conflict with Satan, bear eschatological significance. Several writers have called attention to the description of the eschatological high priest in the Testament of Levi 18:56

54. Ibid., 27.
55. Schweizer, Son, 378. Also sharing this view are Vincent Taylor op. cit., 121: "The Markan Son of God is a Divine Being who appears in human form ..." Dennis Nineham, op. cit., 148, understands this title as referring to "...a supernatural being of divine origin..."
56. Best, op. cit., 170; Robinson, op. cit., 27; Schweizer, Son, 368f; Vielhauer, "Christologie", 161.
The heavens shall be opened [\(\alpha\nu\vartheta\omicron\omicron\eta\omicron\varphi\omicron\tau\alpha\lambda\)] ,\(^{57}\) and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification, with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac. And the glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him, and the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him. (vv. 6f)

And he shall open the gates of paradise, and shall remove the threatening sword against Adam. And he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life, and the spirit of holiness shall be on them. And Beliar shall be bound by him,\(^ {58}\) and he shall give power to his children to tread upon the evil spirits (vv. 10ff).\(^ {59}\)

This passage, in particular the reference to Abraham and Isaac, has been adduced as a possible source, both for the divine address in Mark and for the role of obedient sonship which Jesus fulfills in the Gospel.\(^ {60}\) But it must be pointed out that nothing is made of that role. The description stresses the priest's extra-ordinary qualities: the one who makes possible the return to paradise and the one who binds Beliar.\(^ {61}\) Therefore, it is legitimate to conclude that, in its Markan context the Son of God at 1:11 is primarily a royal, transcendent,\(^ {62}\)

---


58. Beliar is cast into the fire in the Testament of Judah 25:3.

59. The translation is by R. H. Charles in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, v. 2 Pseudepigrapha (1913), 314f.

60. Best, loc.cit. develops this theme, though he is aware of the problem of date. See below (n.87).

61. There is even a possible royal aspect to this priestly figure. Cf. v. 3: "And his star shall arise in heaven as of a king."

62. Minette de Tillesse, op.cit., 348ff, claims that the concept of a celestial Son of God is at home in semitic thought. He cites Job 1:6, Genesis 6:2, Ps. 82:1.
eschatological figure.

The Exorcisms

The "cosmic" dimension, both of Jesus' true nature and of his initial struggle with Satan, is extended into his ministry, especially in the exorcism of demons and unclean spirits. These are interpreted in 3:20-29 in terms of the struggle begun in the temptation. There is not only a verbal similarity between the opponents, the Spirit (v. 29) and Satan (v. 26)\(^{63}\) but also a thematic connection between the binding of the strong one (the temptation) and the plunder of his house (the exorcisms).\(^{64}\) The same powerful spirit which "drives" (\(\epsilon \kappa \rho \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \nu\)) Jesus into the wilderness (1:12) drives out the demons (3:22ff, 29)\(^{65}\) who, as supernatural beings, address Jesus as the "Holy One of God" (1:24), "the Son of God" (3:11), and the "Son of God Most High" (5:7). These are not simply honorific titles; they have "ominous implications" for the demons, revealing his role: "you have come to destroy us" (1:24).\(^{66}\) Once again, the connotation is less the obedient Son of God than

---

63. Robinson, op. cit., 30. 64. Ibid., 31.
65. Ibid., 29. Robinson observes in n. 4, "This is the normal Marcan term for exorcisms: performed by Jesus: 1.34; 7.26; by disciples: 3.15; 6.13; 9.18, 28, 38."
66. Ibid., 37. De Tillesse, op. cit. 357 concurs: "Le démon, être céleste déchu, reconnaît immédiatement le "Saint de Dieu" et la mission de jugement intimement associée à son essence céleste."
the supernatural, eschatological King. This evidence, too, tends to be ignored by those who advocate obedient sonship as the primary significance of "Son of God".

The Transfiguration (9:2-8)

οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός μου ἐξάγητος (v. 7)

The transfiguration marks a climax to the other-worldly phenomena begun with the account of Jesus' baptism and temptation. It is really a more "dramatic" occasion than the baptism. Although that event was accompanied by the tearing apart of the heavens and the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove, it is portrayed as Jesus' solitary experience. In this instance, however, there is an audience, a select group of disciples, who not only hear God present Jesus to them as his beloved Son, but who also receive a vision of his transcendent nature. Moreover, it is he who is to be obeyed, and the knowledge of his true identity must be temporarily kept secret (v. 9).

The appeal to vv. 9, 11-13 as evidence of obedient sonship, 67 with their stress upon great suffering and death, is legitimate only if it be noted that it is as the Son of Man that Jesus, the divine Son of God, obeys. This distinction should be kept because, as we have seen, Mark does not confuse his christological categories, even though he believed that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, and the Son of Man.

In Mark, as we saw, neither Χριστός nor οἶδα (Θεοῦ) are directly associated with the themes of suffering and obedience. After enjoining the disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ (8:30) and not to tell anyone about their vision of him as the divine Son of God (9:9), Jesus does not say that the Messiah or the Son of God must suffer in obedience to God's will. These themes are mediated in terms of the Son of Man.

The Parable of the Rejected Son (12:1-12)

εὕτε ἐνα ἔχειν, οὐδὲν ἀγαπητὸν (v. 5)

It may be that this passage will have to be regarded as an exception to our negative thesis, for the beloved son (cf. 1:11 and 9:7) is killed (v. 8). If so, then it should be noticed that Jesus' teaching about the Son is given obliquely, parabolically (vv. 1, 12). Furthermore, Psalm 118:22f, which is subsequently quoted as an interpretation of the Son's fate, contains the themes of rejection and vindication: the rejected stone has become the cornerstone or keystone (v. 10). 68 This is precisely

68. In an extremely stimulating essay, Matthew Black has suggested that parable and scripture citation are connected not only by the theme of rejection but also by means of the well-known word play on λίθος and θείος. According to Black, the parable of the rejected Son is a midrash on the Psalm which concerns the rejected stone. See "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament", NTS, 18.1 (Oct. 1971), 12ff.
the emphasis of the "passion predictions" about the Son of Man (8:31, 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33f), especially at 8:31 where the same term for rejection is used (ἀποσκομάζειν, cf. 9:12b and ἔσουσένειν).

Trial Before the Sanhedrin (14:61)

σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ

Since Χριστός here is being used in its Jewish-messianic sense, it is likely that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ (τ εὐλογητοῦ being a circumlocution for God), in apposition to ὁ Χριστός, is to be regarded as Jewish-messianic, so far as Caiaphas is concerned. It may be argued that it is even inappropriate on his lips, since "Son of God" does not seem to have been a messianic title in Judaism, even though certain statements in which the Israelite king was addressed by God as "my son" (e.g. Ps. 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14) were later clearly given messianic significance at Qumran. However, it has been recently announced that the first instance of a titular use in pre-Christian times has been identified in an apocalyptic text from Qumran, showing that "...the titles (bəreh

69. We omit from consideration 13:32, since the saying seems to be rooted in the Son of Man christology. See n. 26.
70. See p. 35.
71. John Allegro named the relevant texts, "4Q Florilegium", and published them in JBL 77(1958), 350–54; and in DJD, 5 (1968), 53ff.
72. By J. T. Milik in a lecture at Harvard in Dec., 1972 to be published in a forthcoming number of HTR. Milik has designated the document as 4Q ps Dan A. His discovery was reported to the SNTS meeting in Southampton, England on 31 August 1973 by Joseph Fitzmyer in a paper entitled, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament."
dī 'El, bar 'Elyôn) were clearly in use in Palestinian Aramaic writing. 73

The Centurion's Confession (15:39)

Δλθθωσ οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἡν.

At first sight, this passage seems straightforward enough. Usually it is taken to signify the first instance of a man's perceiving what hitherto had been known only to the demons. 74 It may be that this is indeed the correct interpretation, one which we shall consider more fully in the next chapter. But two other interpretations deserve to be mentioned.

Eva Løvestam 75 regards both this statement and the Lukan version ("Certainly this [man] was just" (δίκαιος, 27:54)), as allusions to the description of the righteous one of Wisd. 2:10ff who bears certain features of the Servant in Isa. 53. 76 The passage reads, in Løvestam's translation: "Let us see if his words be true, and let us prove what shall happen in the end of him. For if the just man (ὁ δίκαιος) be a Son of God (ὑιὸς θεοῦ), he will help him..." (cf. the mocking at Mk. 15:32).

73. From p. 1 of a typed summary by Fitzmyer of his address. It should be noted, too, that the High Priest asks Jesus if he is the Christ, the Son of God; he neither knows nor believes it. Cf. Lovestam, op. cit., 104 n. 2 (see note 49 above).

74. See p. 37 above.

75. Løvestam, op. cit., (n.49), 104 n. 2.

Philipp Vielhauer\textsuperscript{77} maintains, for contextual reasons, that the expression \textit{υἱὸς Θεοῦ} in this instance should bear a royal rather than a metaphysical connotation. The Roman \textit{titulus} on the cross (15:26) identifies Jesus as the King of the Jews. The Jews mockingly address him as the Messiah, the king of Israel (15:32).

3. The Obedient Son of Man

In order to avoid misunderstanding, it must be affirmed that neither the appropriateness of Cullmann's and others' analyses of the OT and Jewish concept of sonship\textsuperscript{78} nor its presence in Mark is here denied. Our point is that the title, "Son of God", is not the primary means of conveying it. Rather, whenever the idea of obedience is found associated with a specific christology, it is the Son of Man christology which one finds.

The first example of this association may be found in the interchange between Jesus and his disciples at Caesarea Philippi. In response to Peter's confessing him as the Christ, Jesus taught his disciples about the necessity (ἡμεῖς) of the Son of Man's suffering, death, and resurrection (8:31). Now, H. E. Tödt,\textsuperscript{79} among others,\textsuperscript{80} has argued that

\textsuperscript{77} Vielhauer, "Christologie", 164f.
\textsuperscript{78} The same view had earlier been expressed by T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (1935), 89-94. See also the discussion and OT texts cited by Schweizer, Son, 352.
\textsuperscript{80} Morna Hooker, Son of Man, 107 and n. 2 cites
the seemingly deterministic "must" has the same meaning as the χρήστης of 9:12b: "The reason for the 'must' of the Son of Man's suffering is...God's will as revealed in Scripture." Although Tödt relies on the above Markan passage and on other synoptic evidence in support of this interpretation, it is in fact verified by v. 33: the destiny of the Son of Man which Jesus outlines is in accordance with "minding (φρόνειν) the things of God" rather than the things of men. Thus, the criterion of sonship, obedience to God's will, which here specifically involves suffering and death, is epitomized in the vocation of the Son of Man.

The next significant confluence of obedience, sonship, suffering and the Son of Man christology occurs in the account of Jesus' ordeal at Gethsemane (14:32-42). Contrary to

81. Tödt, loc. cit. The passion "predictions" are therefore not really predictions, nor are they part of a messianic or Son of Man secret.
82. The contrast between God's way and man's occurs elsewhere in the Gospel, e.g.: the command of God vs. the traditions of men (7:7ff), things impossible with men are possible with God (10:27), the nature of worldly authority and the nature of authority in the community for whom the Son of Man is the example (10:42-45); baptism from heaven vs. that from men (11:30); God's vindicating the stone which the builders had rejected (12:10f); knowledge of God's power vs. the ignorance and decept of the learned (12:24).
83. Of course, the other passion predictions (9:31, 10:33f) as well as 9:9, 12b and 14:21 belong here by implication.
what one might expect and is sometimes led to believe, the Son of God title does not appear. That Jesus is the Son is clear from his address to God, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 36). But the only christological expression which we find in this passage is the Son of Man (v. 41). Under attack in the experience is the very basis of Jesus' sonship. The temptation with which he is confronted is to avoid drinking the cup, i.e., undergoing the impending suffering, the destiny which he had so resolutely embraced earlier in the face of Peter's satanic temptation (8:31ff). Now he is alone, with neither angels (as in the temptation by Satan, 1:13) nor friends to support him. The issue is whether he will follow his own will or whether he will choose God's way and the great cost which it involves (vv. 35ff). The victory is not won with the first resolution to obey. Three times he undergoes the agony of competing wills (vv. 39, 41). With the disciples asleep, "...at the end Jesus stood alone as the one fully obedient to God, i.e. as the Son of Man."  

84. Robin Barbour, "Gethsemane in the Tradition of the Passion", NTS, 16(1970), 236, 242, 247 shows a refreshing sensitivity to these christological distinctions.  
85. See Barbour's penetrating theological discussion, ibid., esp. 242-51.  
Thus, at crucial points in the narrative, Jesus' obedient sonship is christologically expressed in terms of the Son of Man: at the first announcement of his destiny (8:31, and by implication, 9:31, 10:33f, 14:21) and at the severest test of his resolution to fulfill it. 87

87. Best, op. cit., 171f, in seeking a more direct link between sonship and death than the Suffering Servant Christology provides, argues that in Mark's portrayal Jesus might be viewed "...as an only (i.11;ix.7) and obedient (xiv.32ff.) son who goes willingly to his death like Isaac, and whose death is a sacrifice for the sins of men." Again, not wishing to deny absolutely the presence of an Isaac typology, it is still important to note that Mark consistently associates Jesus' suffering and obedience with the Son of Man.
CHAPTER III.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF MARK: RELATIONSHIPS

The question which we shall attempt to answer in this chapter is this: "Does Mark's care in maintaining certain christological distinctions mean that he also presupposed a relationship among them?" Our answer, as might be expected, is, "Yes." We shall suggest that there is a natural, fundamental relationship that is rooted in certain aspects of the Kingdom theme in the Gospel and in its movement from the baptism to the crucifixion. The great danger is, of course, to force consistency and harmony upon materials and ideas which may be quite irreconcilable. But perhaps the values gained in studying themes in concert which have heretofore been analyzed in isolation will override the disadvantages and omissions which may occur along the way. Before examining the Gospel itself, however, we shall attempt to show that the book of Daniel has much to contribute to our quest.

A. Ideological Antecedents: Son of Man and Son of God in Daniel

In Chapter II, it was argued that the Son of Man christology in Mark is the primary expression of suffering, obedient sonship. But why should this be so? What led Mark (and Jesus?) to interpret it thus? It has been suggested by a number of scholars that the Danielic son of man symbolizes the Saints of the Most High, who, through suffering as a result of their utter loyalty to God, are destined to be vindicated.¹

While accepting this interpretation, it is our thesis that the Danielic son of man is therefore a symbol of obedience, the hallmark of the OT and Jewish concept of sonship. He is in effect a son-of-god symbol.  

Most scholars regard the Danielic son of man as a supernatural being, a member of the heavenly court. Now, there is no doubt that the Son of Man in later apocalyptic literature tended to be portrayed in this way. However, the phenomena of the book itself suggest that neither the animal-like figures nor the one like a son of man are supernatural realities which act as counterparts to historical entities and events. They are, rather, symbols of those events and of the attitudes which nations and their rulers adopt toward God. Since this view hardly commands universal acceptance, it will be necessary to present the main arguments in its support during the defence of the thesis advanced above.

The symbolic character of the beasts is uncontestably established by the interpretive comments of vv. 17f: "These great beasts are four kingdoms which will perish [ις επολαται βασιλε] from the earth, and the Saints of the Most High shall take the Kingdom and shall possess the


2. Hooker, The Son of Man, has stressed the importance of obedience as a characteristic of the Saints of the Most High and, therefore, of their symbol, the one like a son of man. However, she neither argued this from the earlier chapters of Daniel nor did she make the connection between obedience and sonship.

3. E.g., Todt, op. cit., 23f and the literature cited there. Recent dissenting opinions in addition to those in n. 1, have been expressed by R. Leivestad, "Der apokalyptische Menschensohn ein Theologisches Phantom", ASTI, 6 (1968), 49ff. An English summary of this essay, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," appeared in NTS, 18 (1972), 243-267. R. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity (1970), 82-87.

4. Moule, "Neglected Features", argues that, unlike Daniel 7, neither 1 Enoch 37-71 ('the Similitudes') nor 4 Ezra 13 can "...be proved early enough to have been used by the Evangelists, let alone by Jesus." Norman Perrin, from a very different perspective, holds that the imagery of Dan. 7 is very different from that in 1 Enoch and 4 Ezra, which along with the gospels, represent independent interpretations of that chapter. See his Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (1967), 166ff, 172.
Kingdom forever and ever." After this interpretive summary there
follows a fuller explanation given in answer to Daniel's query about
the fourth, most dreadful beast. Again, the reply indicates that
historical realities are being symbolized: "And he told me about the fourth
beast: a fourth kingdom shall be upon the earth...; and regarding the
ten horns of the kingdom [of the fourth beast, v. 7], ten kings shall
arise..." (v. 24). Furthermore, the vindication of the Saints of the
Most High, like the "beasts'" opposition, does not occur in the heavenly
realm but is historical, although eschatological (v. 18 and esp. v. 27).

But why is it that these nations are symbolized as beasts? Whence
is the imagery derived and what does it signify? Elsewhere in the OT,
the connection is made between man's rebellious self-sufficiency and the
irrationality and insensitivity of animal existence. Sometimes the imagery
is applied to man in general, as in Ps. 73:21f, where the psalmist confesses
that bitterness and stupidity had made him like a beast before God.
In Ps. 49:20 (21), the arrogant man is like the beasts that perish.

More specifically, he is a sheep, whose shepherd, death, leads him to

5. Although most aspects of this position would be shared by
the scholars mentioned in n. 1, they find their most explicit and
sharpened expression in the writings of C. F. D. Moule.
6. It is important to consult both the MT and the Septuagintal
text of Daniel. We would have expected the former to have been the
primary influence on Jesus and the earliest church. The LXX would have
influenced any subsequent development of the Son of Man theme in the
Greek-speaking church prior to and contemporary with Mark. But perhaps
Mark himself would have been conversant with both. Since our exclusive
concern is with his portrait of Jesus which hellenistic Jews and Gentiles
would have read, our primary text for this study is the Greek OT, although
the MT is not ignored. The most recent critical edition of the LXX
is SEPTUAGINTA, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, ed. Joseph Ziegler. Volume
16, part 2, Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco, was published in 1954 (Göttingen).
Since this edition departs from the more familiar pattern of
versification, the Greek followed by the MT in parenthesis, we shall
use the edition prepared by Rahlfis, without, however, neglecting Ziegler's.
7. It will become evident in subsequent discussion and notes
how indebted we are to Dr. Hooker's illuminating treatment of this
subject. Differences will occur in the arrangement and interpretation
of some of the data which she has put forward.
Sheol (v. 14(13)). By contrast, the psalmist is confident that God will deliver him (v. 19(14)).

On other occasions, the beast imagery is applied to Israel's enemies. In Ps. 80 (79 in the LXX): 18, for example, Israel (v. 16), or perhaps the king as its representative, is described as "the man of your right hand, the son of man whom you have made strong for yourself." Immediately preceding this verse, Israel had been described as a vine planted in a vineyard ravaged by a wild boar. In similar fashion, in Ezekiel 34, the prophet refers to Israel as sheep which had fallen prey to wild beasts (hostile nations) because they had been left unattended and exploited by their own shepherds (Israel's leaders, cf. vv. 1-5, 8). The final verse in the MT reads, "You are my sheep, the sheep of my pasture: you are men, and I am your God." Morna Hooker suggests that

It may well be that the prophet felt that ultimately his metaphor [i.e. of the sheep], while representing fairly the treatment the people had received from their neighbors and rulers, was inadequate to express Israel's true relationship to Yahweh. 9

It is entirely within this tradition that Israel's enemies are depicted as wild beasts, not only in Dan. 7 but also in chs. 4 and 8, 11 whereas Israel itself is represented by one who looked like a son of man. Because Nebuchadnezzar attributed the splendour of his kingdom to himself rather than to God, he was driven from human society to live with wild animals. His human mind 12 was changed to a beast's 13 so that

---

9. Ibid., 19. In the LXX (Ps 79, here) the "strengthening" of the son of man appears also at v. 16, where the MT has only, "son."
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., 15f. The following observations about Nebuchadnezzar in ch. 4 and the beasts in ch. 8 are essentially Dr. Hooker's, but references to and comments on features in the Greek versions are mine.
12. Literally, "his heart," ἠλάθη. Theod. has ἡ καρδιά αὐτοῦ, but the LXX omits this detail.
13. 4:16(13).
he looked and behaved like an animal. This condition was to remain
until he came to recognize that the Most High rules the kingdom (sing-
ular) of men and gives it to whomever he wills (vv. 17(14); 25(22); 26(23); 32(29); 5:21). It was at the moment that he lifted
his eyes to heaven that his reason returned and he blessed the
Most High.

On the other side of ch. 7, in ch. 8, the same connection between
the royal arrogance of Israel's oppressors and beastliness appears.
The animals and horns repeatedly magnify themselves (vv. 4, 8, 11, 25).
The last, most powerful king will "destroy mighty men and the people
of the Saints" (v. 24). This language is reminiscent of what is said
about the fourth, most ferocious beast in ch. 7, who will "speak
words against the Most High and shall wear out [make war with (vv. 9,
21) and prevail over (v. 21)] the Saints of the Most High (v. 25). In
view of these phenomena, Morna Hooker seems entirely justified in
concluding that

The fundamental basis of the antithesis between human and
beastly in Daniel would thus seem to be man's attitude to
God. Those who recognize his dominion and are subservient
to his will can be described as having human characteristics,
while those who rebel against his authority are akin to
beasts.

---

14. 4:15(12), 4:23 (20, Theod.) 4:32f (29f).
15. The Greek is given only by Theodotian.
16. Although the theme of God's sovereignty over the kingdom
appears, his determining its ruler is absent.
17. 4:31 in the LXX
18. Daniel recounts Nebuchadnezzar's experiences to Belshazzar,
who had ignored the lessons learned so painfully by his father.
19. The LXX has, "begged [ἐξίηποι] the God of gods" concerning
his ignorance and sins (4:30a, c).
21. 4:37(34). Note especially the elaborately extended prayer in
the LXX
22. Both Theod. and the LXX omit the reference in v. 25 to the king's
daring to attack "the Prince of princes". The LXX has him still pursuing the Saints.
23. Hooker, op. cit., 17. Farrer, St. Mark, 257 also makes the
connection between arrogance and brutalization.
Having examined the beastly side of the symbols in Daniel 7, we now turn to the human dimension as represented by the one who looked like a son of man. Put in the form of a thesis, one can say that just as the beasts symbolize the attitude of nations which rebel against the Most High and oppress his Saints, so the one who looked like a son of man symbolizes the loyalty of the Saints and their experiences under the "beasts". The symbolization of their experiences is most apparent in at least eight points of almost direct correspondence between the vision and its interpretation. The Ancient of Days (vv. 9, 22) arrives to give judgement (vv. 10, 22, 26). The beasts are deprived of their authority (vv. 12, 16), and it is transferred (vv. 14, 18, 22, 27) to one who looked like a son of man (v. 14)/ the Saints of the Most High (vv. 18, 22, 27 (אקשאא'א'). Their authority or kingdom (vv. 14, 18, 22, 27) is historical (vv. 14, 27) and eternal (vv. 14, 18, 27), and they are to receive universal obedience and service 25 (vv. 14, 27).

Now it may be objected that these points of correspondence occur only at the moment of vindication and that nothing is said about obedience either in the vision or the interpretation. Austin Farrer, for instance,

24. The primary vision is recorded in vv. 2-14, followed by a summary interpretation (vv. 17ff). Daniel then relates an expanded version of the primary vision concerning the fourth beast (vv. 19-22), which is interpreted in vv. 23-27. It is actually incorrect to speak of "the" Son of Man here, for the expression is anarthrous, and it is preceded by the comparative particle, כ. See the Excursus which follows for a discussion of a more precise definition of this expression.

25. This close correspondence makes it unlikely that at this stage the one like a son of man was meant to be a messianic figure, for he has no role as an intermediary between the Ancient of Days and the Saints of the Most High. This figure, like the Saints, is passive. It is the Ancient of Days himself who vindicates "him" and them (vv. 13f, 21f). The author and his readers are not subsequently concerned with the role of the son of man as an agent, but simply with the fortunes of Israel; and this is how the interpretation ends (vv. 27f). This is a far cry from the picture of the active eschatological judge of sinners and champion of the righteous which one finds for example in 1 Enoch 46, 62, 69.
maintains that the Saints only "...become the Son of Man in being enthroned; or, Son of Man in the name of the dignity which they put on." But Morna Hooker observes that there is no indication of a metamorphosis having occurred and, more important,

...in v. 13, where the Son of Man is actually mentioned, he has not yet been glorified:...so that it would seem that the Son of Man represents the Saints of the Most High before their glorification as well as after.27

Furthermore, it is the Saints' obedience before their glorification which is represented. If Nebuchadnezzar illustrated that worldly arrogance which in Hebrew thinking was appropriately characterized as "beastly", then Daniel and his three friends, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego epitomize the contrary attitude: submission to the sovereignty and will of God. They are really the heroes of the Saints of the Most High, as one can surmise from the commonly suggested situation in which the book was written and from the narrative in chs. 1-6.

If it is correct to date Daniel in the Maccabean period, during the persecution of Jewish loyalists, then, so far as the readers are concerned, the horn of the fourth and most terrible beast of the vision is yet making war with and wearing out the Saints (vv. 8, 21, 25).

As a means of encouraging loyalty in his readers, the author tells a story to show that such devotion was realized in the lives of these four Hebrew exiles. They exemplify that utter loyalty to God, are "worn out" by a succession of kings, one of whom, as we saw, was portrayed as becoming virtually a beast because of his vanity. Furthermore, the

26. The view of Austin Farrer, St. Mark, 260, quoted by Morna Hooker, op. cit., 28. In the same vein, Farrer remarks that the original author "...interprets the Son of Man not of the saints as such, but of the saints as glorified."

27. Hooker, op. cit. 28. Furthermore, as we shall suggest in the Excursus which appears at the end of this discussion, the term, "son of man", may refer to a lowly figure who, in receiving judgement, is subsequently exalted.
eschatological vindication of these Saints is repeatedly anticipated by a series of vindicatory experiences in which they find favor despite hostility and political flux, as power is removed from one king or nation and is transferred to another (5:11, 29; 6:1-4).

The first indication of their loyalty occurs early, in their resolve not to defile themselves with the king's food (1:8). As a result, God gave them intellectual prowess and wisdom, while Daniel possessed understanding of visions and dreams (v. 17). The king found them to be ten times more competent than the best which Babylon had to offer (v. 20). Subsequently, because Daniel both told Nebuchadnezzar his dream (2:31-35, cf. 2:9ff) and interpreted it (vv. 36-45), he was honoured with gifts, greater administrative authority, and charge over the wise men of the kingdom (v. 48). Furthermore, the king granted Daniel's request of promotions for his friends, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego (v. 49).

However, it is not long before they are put to the test by the fickle king. In defiance of orders to worship his newly-erected golden image, they vowed to serve God who would rescue them from the furnace (3:17f). Every school child knows what happened; and Nebuchadnezzar himself payed homage to God:

Blessed be the Lord, the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who has sent his angel and saved his servants, who trusted in him [τοὺς ἐλπίσαυστιν ἐπ' ἑαυτῶν] and set aside the king's command, and yielded up their bodies to be burned rather than serve and worship any god except their own God (v. 95).

After issuing a decree against profaning their God, the king promoted

28. Farrer, St. Mark, 253, comes to a similar conclusion, but limits his observations to a single instance: "The ultimate vindication and enthronement of the Saints over the whole world is prefigured in the deliverance of the three children from the furnace, in the king's recognition of their God, and in his promotion of them over the affairs of Babylon."

29. The LXX is not as tentative as the MT or Theod.

30. MT, v. 29
these three once more (vv. 96f).

The final example of loyalty, put to the test and vindicated, appears in chapter 6, just before the vision which we have said symbolizes the faithfulness of the Saints of the Most High in general and that of these figures in particular. Out of envy, a plot is hatched by jealous peers to pit Daniel against an irrevocable law which King Darius, against his better judgement, had endorsed (vv. 3-13). But Daniel, who served God continually (vv. 17, 21), was rescued from the lions, to the king's delight, because he was found blameless both before God and the king (v. 23). By royal decree, men were required to reverence Daniel's God (vv. 26-28), and Daniel himself prospered throughout the reigns of Darius and Cyrus (v. 29).

This historical struggle reflected in chs. 1-6 between the "beastly" attitude of Israel's enemies and the "human" attitude of the obedient Saints who were exiled (and of those who read Daniel in the later periods) anticipates the decisive conflict between them envisioned in ch. 7. Here the symbolism portraying this eschatological struggle and its aftermath contains motifs originating in creation mythology. Obvious points of contact between the myth and ch. 7 are "the emergence of the beasts from the sea, their defeat by Yahweh, and the bestowal of dominion on a human figure...".

While Babylonian influence on this pattern of thought is possible, there is nothing here which was not already integral to Hebrew thought by the time that Daniel was written. The myth of Yahweh's defeat of the

31. MT, vv. 16, 20. The subsequent verses in the MT are numbered one less than the LXX versification given in the discussion.
32. Once again, we are indebted to Dr. Hooker, this time for her succinct summary of widely held views, op. cit., 17.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., 18.
sea and dragon, Rahab and Leviathan, first applied to represent creation, was subsequently extended to symbolize the emancipation of Israel from its enemies in various historical situations, and finally came to represent Yahweh's ultimate deliverance of Israel from its oppressors in terms of the restoration of all things to that condition which prevailed in the original creation. The Saints of the Most High, symbolized by one who looked like a son of man, inherit, because of their obedience to God, that which the first man forfeited by his disobedience—dominion over the creation.

Applying the symbol of the one who looked like a son of man to represent the Saints before their vindication is therefore entirely appropriate, for it represents not only the event of vindication but also the attitude which was its necessary ground. The beast imagery is not appropriate to the four empires only at their judgement. It symbolizes an attitude which deserved that judgement. Just as Israel's oppressors had to be "beastly" (i.e. arrogant and rebellious towards God) in order to be judged, so the one who resembled a son of man represents what the Saints had to be (obedient to God) in order to be vindicated. He is a symbol of the loyal remnant of Israel in its historical attitudes and experiences and of man in his eschatological restoration, as he was originally intended to be—loyal and obedient to God, a son of God.

This perspective on the vision seems to provide further ground for believing that the one who had the appearance of a son of man symbolizes the Saints' suffering, for it is not simply obedience which he represents, but obedience put to the test, as seen both in the experiences of Daniel and

35. Ibid., 20, citing Job 9:8, 13; 26:12.
36. Ibid., citing Ps 74:12-17 and 89:10(9)f; Isa. 51:9f.
37. Ibid., citing Isa. 27:1; Jer. 51:34-7; Ezek. 29:3f.
38. Ibid., 25.
39. Ibid., 71.
his friends and in the experiences of the readers of the book, against whom the fourth beast was even then making war. And it is this primacy of obedience which should be stressed, for suffering may be ignoble, or deserved, or simply natural, that is, a result of man's mortality and vulnerability. Suffering, then, may serve as an index of the extent of obedience, as the ultimate consequence of one's loyalty to God.

Finally, in answer to the question posed at the beginning of this discussion, we may say that if it is correct to define the essence of sonship in the OT and Judaism as unswerving obedience to God, then the Saints of the Most High in Dan. 7 are primary examples of that relationship. Consequently, the one who looked like a son of man, in representing them, is a symbol of suffering, obedient sonship. He is a son of God, par excellence. It is not surprising, then that we find in Mark the Son of Man functioning as the primary expression of Jesus' vocation of obedience to God's will. It bears this sense because this is the connotation of the term in the Gospel's (and Jesus') most relevant ideological antecedent, Dan. 7.

EXCURSUS: On the Meaning of υἱός άνθρώπου and τοῦ άνθρώπου in Dan. 7

A possible, if not probable, case might be made for interpreting υἱός άνθρώπου as an expression of man in his lowliness and mortality. In this case, it would not be a symbol of a status to which one is raised. Rather, it would mean that Israel, represented as a lowly man, is vindicated and exalted to exercise universal and eternal dominion. In other words, τοῦ άνθρώπου of itself does not connote exaltation; this is provided solely by the context.

In support of this contention, we shall present certain linguistic and theological data. Although other words for man may be found to convey
the same notion, the use of the Hebrew equivalent of this expression in the OT, seems to be the primary term for conveying the idea of man in his lowliness and mortality. Outside the book of Ezekiel (where it occurs 87 times in the vocative), the expression is rare in the OT, being used chiefly in synonymous parallelism. Of the twelve instances where it is so used, at least seven times the phrase has the sense of weakness and frailty in contrast to the might and character of God.

The actual proportion, however, may be greater, since four of the remaining five passages—all in Jeremiah—seem to be repetitions of a single refrain.

Two of these instances call for special attention. Ps. 8:5 may be thought to contain a "neutral" sense, where man is viewed in true perspective: lower than God but over the created order (v. 6). But a closer look at this passage may show that it is nearer to the "negative" sense suggested above. It is when he stands in awe at the majesty and vastness of the universe (v. 4) that the psalmist exclaims, "What is man that thou visitest him?" In other words, the idea seems to be, God visits man despite his quantitative insignificance as compared to the

---

40. Ibid., 31, n. 1: e.g. Job 9:32, 32:13; Hos. 11:9 (ψάχε );
2 Chron. 14:10 (11); Job 9:2, 10:4; 33:12; Ps. 9:20 (19); 103:15 (ψάχε );
Job 12:21, 34:18 (ψάχε )
41. Mr. John W. Bowker, in lectures during the Lent Term (1974) at Cambridge (and in an abstract prepared by Prof. C. F. D. Moule approved by Mr. Bowker) suggests the expression, "man born to die". See n. 48.
42. Ibid., 30.
43. Ibid., n. 3: with ψάχε in Num. 23:19; Job 35:8; Ps 80:18;
Jer. 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43; with ψάχε in Job 25:6; Ps. 8:5; Is. 51:12;
56:2; and with ψάχε in Ps. 146:3. "An example of this literary convention in Aramaic may be found in the Targumic rendering of one of these instances, Is. 51:12: Xψάχε ΥΩΩΩ...Χψάχε "The Targum of Isaiah, ed. and transl. J. F. Stenning (1949), 175.
44. Ibid., n. 5: Num 23:19; Job 25:6, 35:8; Ps. 8:5, 146:3; Isa. 51:
12. Ps. 80:18 should belong in this list because the son of man has had to be "strengthened".
45. Ibid. 46. Ibid. 31.
It is this apparently insignificant one whom he has crowned with glory and honor and to whom he has given dominion over the creation (vv. 6f).

Before going further, we should stop to indicate how the vocative use of son of man in Ezekiel may be explained in light of the discussion thus far. The prophet is first addressed by God as "son of man" (2:3) immediately after his vision of God’s glory (1:4-28). The same vocative use occurs in Dan. 8:17. Dr. Hooker observes that

...it is noteworthy that it is applied to two men who have had visions of heavenly things, a fact which suggests that this special use arises quite naturally out of those features which are characteristic of its use elsewhere in the Old Testament—namely its poetic nature and its expression of the contrast between man and God.47

Ps. 80 (LXX, 79) contains several details which are strikingly like some of those in Dan. 7. We saw earlier how Israel's enemies are represented as wild beasts (a wild boar and scavengers) which ravaged and devoured the vine (Israel) that God had planted (vv. 9-13, 14). There is also the definite note of suffering (esp. vv. 6, 17a). Furthermore, the nation, referred to as the stock of the vine which God's right hand had planted (vv. 15f), seems to be spoken of in the next verse as "the son [of man, LXX] whom thou hast strengthened for thyself" (v. 16). Two verses later, this corporate reference is particularized in the king, who, in very similar language, is called "the man of thy right hand, the son of man whom thou hast made strong for thyself" (v. 18). This statement, and the context of the entire chapter, fit well the usage described above. The son of man (like Israel, the ravaged vine) is apparently powerless because he requires strengthening. Supporting this understand-

47. Ibid.
ing is the appeal to God, repeated four times, for restoration (vv. 4, 8, 15, 20).

The contacts between this psalm and Dan. 7 are perhaps already apparent: the son of man represents Israel, which is weak and harrassed by its enemies (described as beasts) and requires strengthening and restoration. Moreover, he is a royal figure, a point which, in the case of the Danielic vision, will become clearer shortly.

That the figure being vindicated in Daniel's vision is humble and of low estate is further supported by the theology of God's sovereignty over the affairs of men which permeates chs. 1-6. Early on, Daniel informs Nebuchadnezzar that God has given him his kingdom and authority (2:37). A time is coming when the kingdoms which have oppressed Israel will have run their destined courses, and "the God of Heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed...and it shall stand forever"

48. Bowker, op. cit., discerns three main uses of "son of man" in the OT: in Ezekiel, it is used in direct address as an individual designation; in Daniel it refers to the persecuted who are vindicated; elsewhere it occurs in circumstances "...emphasizing man's situation, in contrast to the angels (and God), as one who has to die." This is often the sense in Jewish literature. Bowker notes that in the targums, where the context suggests man's frailty and mortality, there is a strong tendency to substitute "son of man" for other words for man and, in synonymous parallelism, to give both references to man as "son of man". This is the sense lying behind the circumlocutory idiom in Hebrew and Aramaic whereby a speaker refers to himself or to another in an oblique way. For the most recent, full discussion of this idiom see G. Vermes, "The Use of וַיִּלְיָה / וַיִּלָּה in Jewish Aramaic", in An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (1967) by M. Black, 310-28. Mr. Bowker, in conversation with the writer, agrees that the three-fold distinction which he has noted seems to be determined more by context than by slightly different nuances which the expression itself bears. Thus the individualistic sense does not inhere in Ezekiel's use but emerges simply because the prophet, frail and mortal in comparison with God's majesty, is so addressed. In Daniel, the themes of persecution and vindication do not inhere in וַיִּלְיָה , but are given by the context; i.e., it seems rather that the idea is: one who looked like a lowly man, "a man borne to die", was vindicated.
(2:44). Until that time, it is God who deposes rulers and raises them up (2:21) according to his sovereign will.

This is the resounding message which is brought home to the king in ch. 4: it is God who rules the kingdom of men and gives it to whomever he wills (v. 24 and the notes there). Ordinarily, the succession of monarchs occurs in a straightforward fashion: one king follows another either through inheritance or because a more powerful successor deposes his predecessor. However, sometimes the transfer of authority is not necessarily to the most powerful or likeliest candidate. Sometimes God sets upon the throne the lowliest of men: Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κυρίου, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥουσαίην ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου. Μετά τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Κυρίου ᾧ ἐπὶ τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. (4:17(14)). Although the LXX does not translate this statement, it does have a very similar one later on for which there is no equivalent in the MT. Nebuchadnezzar is told,

The four beasts (who represent nations and their kings) are deprived of their authority (vv. 11, 26); then this authority, or kingdom, is given (διδόναι) to one who resembled a lowly man (v. 14). The Saints of the Most High, whom he symbolizes, are said to receive it (μαραλκυβάνειν in v. 18).

It is perhaps already obvious that in both of these instances,

49. See the significance of the various metals comprising the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in 2:26-45 and the reasons given for the fortunes of the kings in 8:20-25.

50. S. R. Driver, one of the few commentators who notices this phrase argues that "lowest", "in rank and position, not in character" is the force of ἡ ἐξωθισμένη θρονία Θεοῦ here. The Book of Daniel. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (1905), 51.

51. Theod. renders it κ. ἐξωθισμένην διέρχοντας αὐτήν ἐπὶ αὐτήν. Only twice does ἐξωθισμένης occur in the LXX, translating θάλασσα, "to despise", at Ps. 21 (22) 6 and ἱππος (?), "to pour, flood" at Ps. 89(90)5.
the same language of transfer appears in the use of διδόων and παράλαμβάνων. Furthermore, that which is transferred is the same, especially in 4:31 and 7:14: ἐμπαρχομένων καὶ εὑρίσκω, ἐμδοξα. But the most important element in this pattern is the subject to whom this transfer is to be made: ἐξουθενμένον καὶ ἐκθρισμόν, to a rejected man (N.B. τοῦ προμηθεός) in 4:17(14) and, if we are correct, to one who looked like a lowly man (ψυχὴ ζωής) and ὃς οὖς ἐκθρισμόν in 7:14).

Thus, in the light of the linguistic and theological arguments put forward, it seems appropriate to regard these terms as expressions of man's lowliness and mortality. God gives the kingdom to whomever he wills, and this is not always to the most powerful or most likely candidate. This dictum was extremely pertinent to the situation of the readers of the book. The nation of Israel, as represented by the captives in Babylon and by the Maccabean loyalists, were at the mercy of their powerful oppressors. But a time was coming when the tables would turn and they, the least likely among nations, would become the recipients of universal

52. In the MT, the words for giving and receiving are λαμβάνων and γίνομαι. In similar language, Daniel tells Belshazzar, "Your kingdom is about to be given [διδόων] to the Medes and Persians" (5:23). Subsequently, the kingdom was taken away from the Chaldeans and was given (διδόει) to the Medes and Persians (5:30); and Artaxerxes received (παρέλαβε) the kingdom (6:1).

53. In 7:27, μεγαλευτὴς appears instead of δοξα.

54. The verb form, ἐξουθενμένον (ἐξουθενοῦν), most often translates φησί (14 times) and ὁ δὲ ἐκθρισμένος, "to reject" (10 times). Only at 4:31 does the verb occur in the LXX of Daniel (Hatch and REB path overlook it), where it has no Aramaic original. At 11:21, where the author foresees the coming to power of a despised person, the Hebrew, מַלְשַׁנָּה, is rendered in the LXX by εὐκαταφρονητός, "easy to be despised, contemptible, despicable", and in Theod. by ἐξουθενωθή (which is made more smooth in one manuscript by the future passive form). This limited data makes it impossible to determine how the former translator would have rendered φησί.·
Before leaving Daniel, it is necessary to underscore more specifically the relationship between these themes and that of the Kingdom of God. The issue with which the four Hebrew youths and the readers of the book were faced is this: to whose rule should Israel be obedient? to God's or to man's? The narrative of chs. 1-6 shows that though the loyalty of Daniel and his friends was put to the test during a succession of several earthly kingdoms, it was vindicated each time, even to the extent that they rose to positions of great power over the kingdoms.

However, both Nebuchadnezzar's dream in ch. 2 and Daniel's vision in ch. 7 show that there is to come an ultimate eschatological vindication of this loyalty. God's sovereign Rule, which controls the destiny of the kingdom of men, is to become manifest in history. When the earthly kingdoms have run their courses, Nebuchadnezzar is told, the God of heaven will set up an eternal Kingdom which shall supplant all others (2:45). This Kingdom is in fact that stone in the king's vision which had been cut without hands from the mountain, which struck down the great image, and which itself became a great mountain that filled the entire earth (vv. 31-35).

What is forecast in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in ch. 2 is given fuller symbolization in Daniel's vision in ch. 7. With the "beasts" (i.e., the earthly kingdoms) defeated, the Kingdom is granted to the Saints of the Most High (symbolized by the one like a son of man) on the basis of their obedience to the primacy of God's Rule in the face of great

55. That the symbol of one who looked like a lowly man has royal connotations is apparent both from his being given dominion and authority and from what appears to be a common way of recounting the transfer of authority from one ruler to another. It is therefore not surprising that the Son of Man judging the nations in Mt. 25:31 is called ὁ βασιλεύς in v.34. Furthermore, scholars have long noticed parallel themes in certain royal psalms where the king is promised great authority and the defeat of his enemies (see esp. Ps. 2:1ff, 6ff; 110:1, 5).
suffering. By virtue of their loyalty, the Saints (representing ideal Israel and represented by the one who looked like a son of man) epitomize the ideal of sonship which qualifies them to be called sons of God. There is therefore a natural and recognizable relationship between son of man, son of God, and the Kingdom of God in Daniel.

B. Kingdom and Christology in Mark

The data from Daniel are important in at least two ways. They seem to provide an ideological basis for our observations in ch. II that the Son of Man christology in Mark is the primary symbol of Jesus' obedient, suffering sonship. Moreover, they suggest that there might be value in exploring the relationship between the major christological titles and the Kingdom of God, a relationship which, to our knowledge, has not yet been examined in the Gospel.

Although he does not pursue it further, Dennis Nineham has set forth a simple, yet fundamental truth about this relationship which merits more detailed consideration.

Just as different apocalyptists had different pictures of what the Kingdom of God would be like, so they pictured in very different ways the intermediary (if any) whom God would send to bring it into existence. If their picture of the kingdom was of an essentially earthly kingdom, they naturally tended to think of an earthly king raised up by God to found it, possibly by force of arms.

Those, however, who looked for more radical action on the part of God and a purely supernatural kingdom, tended to have their own nomenclature. They usually believed that the agent through whom the kingdom would be brought in would be a

56. M. Black, op. cit., 12 refers briefly to P. Carrington's suspicion that, given the well-known Hebrew word play on יְצִירָה and יְצִיתָךְ, the stone in Dan. 2 conceals the word for son, and thus is a cryptogram for Israel. But since Israel is represented in ch. 7 by one who looked like a son of man, there is a correspondence between son of God and son of man. Cf. Carrington's According to Mark (1960), 249f.
57. The basic point is valid, even though "apocalyptists" is being used more broadly than one might wish.
transcendent figure, specially sent from heaven, where he had previously existed at God's side, and possessed of power to carry through his work by purely supernatural means. What Nineham finds to be true of "apocalyptic" expectation in general is, in fact, particularly true in Mark's Gospel: each of the major titles reflects a different aspect of the Kingdom of God.


   a. The Supernatural Dimension

   Much of our discussion of the Son of God in ch. II (pp. 46-45) is relevant here and need only be highlighted to avoid repetition. James M. Robinson seemed to be entirely justified in concluding that the phenomena surrounding the occasion of the baptism, temptation, and the conflict with the demonic forces in the exorcisms pointed to the supramundane character of Jesus' identity and role.

   Either this aspect of the Son of God christology has been ignored by interpreters such as Cullmann, Jeremias, and Hay or, as we shall see in more detail in ch. V, it has been assigned to a christology which has been allegedly influenced by a hellenistic Divine Man motif. But an examination of Mark's understanding of the Kingdom in these chapters shows both of these attitudes to be unwarranted. Jesus appears as the supernatural Son in the early part of the Gospel because it is precisely the supernatural aspect of the Kingdom of God which comes to the fore.

58. Nineham, op. cit., 46f. T. W. Manson, in The Teaching of Jesus (1935), 211, held that Jesus' theology is the fundamental factor: "The fact with which we have to reckon at all times is that in the teaching of Jesus his conception of God determines everything, including the conception of the Kingdom and the Messiah." It is significant that, according to Luke, the content of Jesus' teaching during the forty days following his resurrection pertained to the Kingdom of God and that it was this which the disciples still misunderstood (Acts 1:3, 6).
in the accounts of the baptism, temptation and exorcisms. The character of the Kingdom's agent reflects the character of the Kingdom. It is supernatural, not only because it is God's Kingdom but also because it is in conflict with another supernatural realm—Satan's. Although the struggle takes place on the plane of history and involves historical persons, the real protagonists in the drama are the divine and the demonic. Therefore, the Son of God christology in these chapters is not a reflection of an alien, hellenistic Θεὸς ἀνήρ motif, but of a particular theology of the Kingdom.

b. The Historical Ambiguity

1) The Mystery of the Kingdom of God

Despite the cosmic language and phenomena which appear within the ministry of Jesus, the Kingdom of God is mysterious. Its near arrival is not generally perceived; it needs to be announced (1:14f) and elucidated in parables (4:33). Its mystery, even though it has been divinely "given" to a select group (4:10), is not perceived (v. 13; 7:18). This ambiguous nature of the Kingdom permeates the entire Gospel. Although it will be manifest to all (4:22) in power (9:1), its origin is insignificant (4:31). Its growth is both imperceptible to man and incapable of being controlled by him (4:27f). Only those with the attitude of infants may receive it (10:14f); for this reason the rich will find access to the Kingdom difficult (10:23-27). Not everyone gives his allegiance to the Kingdom, and even many of those who initially

59. A detailed treatment of this subject and of that which follows in 2), may be found in the next chapter; but its main conclusions will be anticipated here.
do, later fall away (4:14-20). No direct reason is given for this ambiguity. But one may be hazarded. Since the Kingdom of God has not yet arrived in power but has only drawn near, the mystery which has always shrouded the activity and purposes of God remains, even though they may be described as becoming more manifest.

2) The Secret of the Son of God

This christological secret shows signs both of continuity and discontinuity with the foregoing observations. The demons know that their adversary, Jesus of Nazareth, is the divine Son of God and address him as such. Jesus, however, repeatedly and consistently attempts to keep his identity as the divine Son of God from being made public. Apparently, he achieves some success because the scribes interpret Jesus' exorcistic activity to mean that he is possessed by an unclean spirit and that he is himself in league with Satan (3:22). In other words, Jesus' reserve about his identity results in the fact that it was not clear, at least to Jewish officialdom, that he was doing God's work and not Satan's. While it is true that Jesus attempts to correct this misunderstanding, he does not give the sort of explanation that the divine and the demonic worlds have given; Jesus replied ἐν πνεύματι θαλάττων (3:23). Here again the character of the Kingdom in Mark determines to some extent the character of the Kingdom's representative, i.e., as a mystery.

There are, however, two important points of discontinuity whose significance will be examined later (ch. IV). Apparently, since

60. Raymond Brown maintains that "...it is no novelty to Hebrew thought that the varied success of God's kingdom on earth is seen as a divine mystery." The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament (1968), 35.
the mystery of the Kingdom of God can only be divinely given, it cannot be divulged in the same way that a secret can. Only those who have the eyes and ears to see and hear may perceive it whereas others may not (4:11f). This seems to be borne out by the fact that no injunction ever occurs with teaching which the disciples receive about the Kingdom. But injunctions about keeping Jesus' identity secret are common. Although the Son of God secret may be divulged after the Son of Man has arisen from the dead (9:7, 9), the mystery of the Kingdom of God will persist until the parousia.

2. The Kingdom and the Son of Man (1), 2:1 - 3:6

In his book, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, Rudolf Otto placed a great deal of emphasis upon

...the relationship between the message of...a kingdom of salvation and the eschatological person himself who is accompanied by the kingdom in its present dawning. Both belong together. That they do so is not apparent on the basis of some psychological reconstruction, but on that of eschatological logic itself. For the Son of Man belongs to the Kingdom of God.61

Once again, here is an affirmation of the "logical" connection between Kingdom and christology. The task of spelling this out in Mark's Gospel is divided into two parts for the sake of following the course of the Gospel's plan as closely as possible. In the second part (pp. 87ff), the relationship is somewhat clearer and may justify a good deal of what is said here.

No explicit link exists between the Son of Man and the Kingdom in this section. There are, however, implicit ones. The first emerges from a consideration of the ideological antecedents to the

expression, "the Son of Man," which, as Morna Hooker has argued so successfully, are to be found in Daniel 7. We recall that Dr. Hooker concentrated primarily on the connection between the (one like a) Son of Man and his ἡγεμόν, which appear so closely associated both in Daniel 7 (vv. 14, 27) and in Mark 2:10b: "The Son of Man has authority to forgive sins upon the earth" and 2:28: "The Son of Man is Lord even over the Sabbath." 62

However, it should be noticed that just as prominent as ἡγεμόν in Daniel 7 is the Kingdom, ἡ βασιλεία, which also is granted to the one who resembled a son of man (7:14) and to those whom he represents (7:27). Therefore, when one encounters in 2:10 and 28 the twin themes of the Son of Man and his authority, it is natural, in the light of their ideological background, to think of the Kingdom.

It is appropriate, then, for these two sayings to appear in a context dominated by reports of exorcisms (1:22-27, 34; 2:10, 28); 3:11, 20-30), which, as we saw, are linked directly with the near-arrival of the Kingdom. The demons know that Jesus of Nazareth, the one who manifests his ἡγεμόν against them (cf. 1:27), is none other than the divine Son of God. But Jesus, in characteristic fashion, suppresses their acclamations and speaks here of his forgiving sins and interpreting the Law as an expression of the Son of Man's authority.

62. Hooker, The Son of Man, 81-93, 108-114. Besides implying authority from the context, κύριος and κυριεύειν often translate the adjective, ἀρχή; whose noun form, αὐτός, is regularly rendered by ἡγεμόν (e.g. 7:14, 27). The phrase, Χριστός [Χριστῷ, 5:21] ἀρχή, is translated in 4(17) 14 αὐτόν κύριος ἀρχήν (Theod.) and ...τῶν κυρίων του νου [κυριεύειν αὐτόν] (Origen); in 4(25) 22 and 4(32) 29 by κυριεύειν ἡ ψιστος (Theod.) and at 5:21 by κυριεύειν ὃς θεός ἡ ψιστος.
Now, is there more to this link between the divine Son of God and the Son of Man than their joint possession and manifestation of authority? Bearing in mind the danger of over-analyzing matters which might not have been distinguished by the Evangelist or his readers, we might tentatively suggest the following. On the one hand, the conflict between the Son of God and satanic forces reflects the cosmic aspects of Jesus' ministry and has a basically negative character. Although the struggle is waged on the plane of history involving human beings, it is pitched between opponents in the spirit world. In freeing men from the control of the demonic, the divine Son of God deprives Satan of his authority; he plunders his house (3:27). On the other hand, the Son of Man is the agent of restoration. Jesus' first words to the paralytic pronounce the forgiveness of his sins (2:7); the subsequent cure is a confirmation of this authority to restore the man to God (2:10). But Jesus also claims the Son of Man to be the ground and canon of the new authority which replaces the old. Currently, it was believed that certain activity was unlawful on the Sabbath. But the Son of Man is also κύριος even (καί) of the Sabbath (2:28). Furthermore, he not only sanctions his disciples' unlawfully picking grain on that day, but also demonstrates his sovereignty over it by healing in the synagogue (3:1-5). This is how one may keep the Sabbath: by doing good, by saving life (v. 4).

This teaching is so new that old categories and institutions burst when they try to contain or comprehend it (2:21, 22). It is, like the new teaching in Capernaum's synagogue (the scene of Jesus' first mighty work, an exorcism): ἐξος τῆς ἱματίας καὶ τῆς Λεγέων (1:27). Tragically, instead of

63. That the distinction should not be pressed too rigidly is apparent in the exorcising of the demon, "Legion" (5:1-20), for the possessed man was found to be clothed, in his right mind (v. 15), and bent on remaining with Jesus (v. 18).
gaining acceptance, this manifestation of the Kingdom in the Son of Man's εξουσία is rejected (3:2, 6), in anticipation of the ultimate rejection in Jerusalem (8:31).

3. The Kingdom, the Messiah, and the Son of Man (1), 8:27-33

If it is correct to view 1:1-8:26 as a description of the arrival, expansion, and nature of the Kingdom of God (even though this may not say everything) whose mystery is revealed to the disciples, then it is appropriate to regard 8:27-16:8 as a portrait of the nature of messiahship, whose mystery is revealed chiefly to the disciples. The pattern of its revelation is similar in both halves: Jesus is in effect saying, "The Kingdom of God has nearly-arrived (1:14f); it is like this..." (4:26, 30). "I am the Messiah; but messiahship is like this: the Son of Man must suffer..." (8:29ff). The issue at Caesarea Philippi is, to use T. W. Manson's words, not who is the Messiah, but what is messiahship?65 It is not so much a matter of identity as of role, and that role is predicated upon the nature of the Kingdom of God. Consequently, we must include it as the fundamental theological element in the christologically-focussed situation in 8:27-33.

Morna Hooker has argued that the suffering of the Son of Man is the inevitable result of opposing and rejecting his God-given authority.66 Although we have no serious objection to this position, we still find it important to ask, "Why was it rejected?". The answer seems to be that

64. This theme of expansion will be treated more fully below.
65. T. W. Manson, in his review of Die Gleichnisse Jesu by Joachim Jeremias (1952) in NTS, 1 (1954), 58: "...the real messianic secret in the Gospels is the answer not to the question 'Who is the Messiah?' but to the question, 'What is Messiahsip?'".
men are not willing to accept God's way, to subject themselves to the conditions upon which God's Kingdom is to be manifested. This is precisely the point which Jesus makes in his rebuke of Peter, who repudiated the concept of the Messiah's suffering: Ο θεος τον θεον θαλατον των ναυταρπίων (v. 33). 67 The reason, then, for Jesus' refusal to permit publicising him as Messiah was that, though it correctly identified him, it represented an inauthentic view of the Kingdom of God and consequently misrepresented the nature of his role. The Son of Man, on the other hand, represented it well. In his demonstration of authority, his suffering and vindication, the divine purpose will be achieved; and this is sufficiently important to the Evangelist that he makes the Son of Man the dominant christological emphasis of the rest of his gospel, as we have already indicated. 68

4. The Kingdom and the Son of Man (2), 8:34-9:1

At 8:38 and 9:1, we encounter the most explicit association of these themes in the Gospel. 69 Although the emphasis at 8:38 and 9:1 is triumphal and eschatological, each has a corresponding historical implication. Jesus is saying, in effect, that one's attitude to the earthly Son of Man and his words (about which embarrassment and shame are possible) will determine the response of the Son of Man when his vindication is apparent to all. Furthermore, since this is the only instance in which

67. For the contrast between God's way and man's elsewhere in Mark, see ch. II, n. 82.
68. See section "6" below and ch. VI for further discussion.
69. An even closer association appears at Lk. 17:20-25. Jesus tells the Pharisees that one cannot say of the Kingdom's coming, Ιδον έης ηπι έκειν (v. 21). But he warns his disciples against following those who say of the Son of Man, ιδον έκειν, Ιδον έης (v. 23). The variations in word order do not effect the point being made here.
the Kingdom's coming ἐν δυνάμει is mentioned, there may be an implicit suggestion that now, before that time, it is present but not "in power".

To this, the most explicit occurrence of these two themes in Mark, we shall return shortly. But there is yet another, more intimate connection between them which has not been noted. It is this: to follow Jesus, the Son of Man, in the way described in 8:34-37, is to receive the Kingdom. The demands made upon those in 8:34 (the crowd with Jesus' disciples) are essentially those made upon the rich man in 10:17-22, who failed to receive the Kingdom ὡς παιδίον. To demonstrate this, we shall have to compare certain parallel elements in each passage. However, a word must first be said about the structure and setting of 10:13-31. The encounter between Jesus and the rich man (vv. 17-22) is preceded in v. 15a by Jesus' pronouncement that receiving the Kingdom of God as a child is a condition for entering it (v. 15f). In vv. 23-27, Jesus and those around him discuss the implication of the ruler's refusal to meet the conditions for "entering into the Kingdom." Whereas receiving the Kingdom ὡς παιδίον is present possibility, entering it is eschatological (v. 30f). In vv. 28-31, Jesus assures Peter that all who, unlike the ruler, leave everything for his sake and the gospel's (v. 29) will be rewarded both in this life and in the next (v. 30).

The parallels between following the Son of Man and receiving the

70. Otto, op. cit., 147.
71. Manson, in Teaching, 205, makes a similar point, assembling data from the synoptic sources as a whole, although omitting several of the parallels adduced here: "The demands which God, according to Jesus, makes on a would-be citizen of his Kingdom and those which Jesus makes on a would-be disciple are practically identical."
72. Entering the Kingdom is an equivalent of eternal life, which is to be received ἐν τῷ χῶρω, τῷ ἐρχόμενῳ (v. 30). The decision of the ruler is not only an instance of one's not receiving the Kingdom ὡς παιδίον, but perhaps also an illustration of how riches and cares of the age choke the word of the Kingdom so that it does not bear fruit (4:19).
Kingdom have perhaps already become obvious. There are four significant points in which they are congruent, sometimes verbally, sometimes thematically:

(1) The goal - salvation

\[ \text{σωσία αὐτῆς} \] (8:35c) \[ \text{ζωήν αἰώνιον καταργηθῇ} \] (10:17b, 30)

(2) The negative condition

\[ \text{καταργηθῇ ἐαυτὸν} \] (8:34c) \[ \text{ἔσξα εἴσις πόλεμον κ. δὸς} \] (10:21b)

(3) The positive condition

\[ \text{κ. ἄκολουθω θείω μεί} \] (8:34d) \[ καὶ δέωρ ἄκολουθωθεὶ μεί \] (10:21c)

(4) The reference

\[ \text{ἐνέκειν} \] (8:35c) \[ \text{ἐνακούσων} \] (10:29c).

Several points need to be made to clarify these phenomena.

The ruler's desire to inherit eternal life (1) is defined subsequently as to be saved, \[ \text{σωθίσαι} \] (v. 26) and to enter the Kingdom of God (vv. 23ff). The negative condition (2) in 8:34c is understood, at least in part, in material terms: \[ \text{κερδίσας} \] (8:36), which corresponds to the reason given for the ruler's negative response: \[ \text{ἡ γὰρ ἔξων κτήματα πολλά} \] (10:22). Although "the reference" (4) does not appear specifically in Jesus' conversation with him, it does in his subsequent general comment to Peter, where precisely the same theme of forsaking everything to follow Jesus occurs.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the call to follow Jesus, the Son of Man, in 8:34-37 is a call to receive the Kingdom. Verses 8:38 and 9:1 may then be viewed as both a warning and an encouragement to persevere in this way. The Son of Man and the Kingdom, liable to shame and ambiguity, will soon manifest in majesty, judgment, and power.
5. The Kingdom and the Son of Man (3), 9:30-10:45

The question of concern here is, "How does following the Son of Man (receiving the Kingdom) affect inter-personal relationships?"

In other words, "What are the ethics of the Kingdom, and on what basis are they grounded?"

The issue of how rank among the citizens of the Kingdom is to be established arises in two formally similar accounts, the second of which is fuller. Each begins with Jesus' attempts to teach his disciples about the Son of Man's imminent death and resurrection (9:30-32, 10:32-34). But they are preoccupied with questions of rank: at 9:34 they debate who should be the greatest. At 10:35, 37, James and John desire the chief places in the coming messianic Kingdom. In his response, Jesus shifts their attention away from future glory to the prospects of their sharing his destiny. Having gained their allegiance, Jesus adds that God alone has the prerogative of determining one's status in the future Kingdom (10:38-40).

In both passages, in very similar language, Jesus announces the principle of authority which is to operate among them: ἐν τις Θέλει πρῶτος ἐίναι (9:35b)/δός ἂν Θέλῃ ... ἐίναι πρῶτος (10:44a); ἦσται πάντων ἐξήκτως καὶ πάντων διάκονος (9:35c)/ἦσται ὄμων διάκονος (10:43c). This is vastly different from the kind of authority exercised by the rulers of this world (κατακριβεῖν and κατασομβάλειν, v. 42). Until the future glory appears, the criterion for seniority among those who follow Jesus is the Son of Man. For even he (καὶ γὰρ), contrary to their expectations, came not to be served but to serve and to give his...

73. This is how Cranfield, op. cit., 337 interprets ἰδίος.
life a ransom for many (10:45).

Shortly after the first discussion about rank (9:33-35), there follows further ethical teaching. Its demands are incumbent upon those who already belong to Christ (v. 41, Ἐξεταστo ἔστε), i.e. who have received the Kingdom (cf. 10:15, 17-31 and the discussion above) and who anticipate entering it at the eschaton (v. 47, equivalent to εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν in vv. 43, 45). These are not merely individual matters; they have communal implications: the offense against the younger or less mature who trust in Christ (v. 42) is obvious enough. Sins of the limbs (vv. 43, 45) and eyes (v. 47) may refer obliquely to sexual sins which are not merely individual, or there may be a more general reference to sins of coveting, which, of course, involve one's brother.

In concluding sections "3" to "5", it is important to stress that, although it is correct to see in 8:27-10:45 the Evangelist's three-fold attempt to teach a Son of Man christology and a corresponding mode of discipleship, it should be remembered that both of these are predicated upon a certain understanding of the Kingdom of God.

---


75. This seems to be demanded by the references to gehenna (vv. 43, 45, 47) and the fire (vv. 43, 48).


77. T. W. Manson made a similar point in "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret", 216, "...there is a deep-seated difference between his conception of the kingdom of God and the Messiahship and that of his followers." Among recent writers, only Werner Kelber has noted, and only in passing, that the three kingdom sayings in 10:23-27 correspond to the three passion-resurrection predictions. See The Kingdom in Mark (1974), 88f and n.7. But this numerical correspondence may be fortuitous. More important is the fact that following each "prediction", the issues discussed are rooted in a concept of the Kingdom of God.
6. The Kingdom, the Messiah, and the Son of Man (2), 10:46-16:8

One could get the impression on the basis of Jesus' "reinterpretation", if not outright rejection, of the messianic ideals which Peter expressed (8:24-33) that they are simply dross which is worthy only of being discarded. However, Jesus (and of course the Evangelist) sometimes almost seems to contradict the refined messianic doctrine which Peter and his fellow-disciples find such difficulty in perceiving and accepting.

In ch. V, a rationale will be given for Jesus' consistent attempts to keep his identity as the divine Son of God secret. At the present time, we need only recall that at 8:30 Jesus strongly charged his disciples not to let it be known that he was the Messiah and severely rebuked Peter who rejected the kind of messianic role which Jesus began to teach. And we noted most recently how Jesus subsequently set the conditions both for becoming a disciple and for living in community according to the ethical standards of God's Rule. This teaching achieved its christological climax at 10:45, when the vocation of the Son of Man was presented as the ultimate criterion.

But at 10:46, Jesus begins to behave and speak in a manner which seems to undermine everything which he has taught thus far. He appears to tolerate at least some aspects of current expectation about the Messiah and the Kingdom, thereby risking the sort of public misconception which he had tried to prevent his disciples from instigating.

The first instance of this tolerance occurs in the healing of blind Bartimaeus (10:46-52), which happens to be the last miracle of the Gospel. Within the hearing of the large entourage which had left Jericho with Jesus (10:46a), Bartimaeus twice addresses him as υἱὸς
This is the only instance of someone's addressing Jesus messianically other than Peter (8:29). Significantly, Jesus neither silences Bartimaeus, as he had silenced Peter, nor does he remove Bartimaeus from public view to perform the cure as he had the blind man from Bethsaida (8:23). Jesus tacitly accepts this address and permits Bartimaeus to join the trek to Jerusalem (10:52). Since this all happens publicly, the messianic secret is in effect broken.

In the scene which immediately follows, Jesus not only tolerates popular messianic acclaim; he seems to invite it. Having secured a colt for the entry into Jerusalem, he does nothing to prevent the crowd travelling with him from addressing him in messianic terms (11:9f). Scholars have argued that there is nothing explicitly messianic about this occasion. Yet, the question is, How did Mark intend to portray it?

At first sight, the enthusiastic acclamation based in part on the OT, seems neutral enough: "Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord [Ps. 118:25]; blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David" (11:9f). Here, the Kingdom theme clearly appears in its Jewish sense, being linked to David and not to God, who is the object of Jesus' proclamation and teaching (1:15; 4:26; 30). And what of the relationship of the "One who comes in the name of the Lord" to this kingdom? Jesus is not specifically called the Son of David here. Yet, several factors warrant just such a connection. Three passages in adjoining chapters are linked thematically by some reference to Jesus

78. See ch. IV, n. 34.
79. See ch. IV, p. 118.
and David. We have seen that Bartimaeus had twice hailed Jesus as the Son of David (10:46ff). In 12:35ff (a passage to which we shall return), Jesus rhetorically raises the question about the Messiah's true status, arguing on the basis of David's own Spirit-inspired utterance in Ps. 110:1 that he is not David's Son but David's Lord. Here it is clear that Jesus sets right current messianic doctrine held by the scribes (v. 35). Flanked contextually by two such clear references to Jewish-messianic views, it seems entirely legitimate to interpret both Jesus' entry and the acclamation which he receives in the same light.

Another reason for taking this position is that those who address Jesus thus are not the population of Jerusalem. Rather, it is the entourage (including crowd and disciples) which had been travelling with Jesus at least since Jericho, which had heard Bartimaeus call Jesus υἱὸς Δαυίδ and which he had subsequently joined (11:9a, 10:46 and cf. v. 32).

Furthermore, in Ps. 118 itself the one who comes is an agent of God's salvation (v. 25). Apparently he comes to the Temple ("the house of the Lord," v. 26) just as Jesus does in 11:11, the exclusive locus of his subsequent public teaching (vv. 15, 27, 12:35, cf. 14:49). It should also be noted that Jesus ended his parable about the rejected Son (12:1-10), by quoting Ps. 118:22f, which is about the rejected stone that has become the head of the corner (12:11ff). Thus, it seems that, so far as Mark was concerned, the entry into Jerusalem had significant christological (here, messianic) connotations, connotations which, though cast in terms of current expectations about the Messiah and the Kingdom, were not totally rejected.

The third instance of this largely-overlooked phenomenon meets us in 12:35ff. Now, it is often alleged that here Jesus finally rejects
the Son of David messianism of his contemporaries (and allegedly of Mark's theological opponents). But, all Jesus does is to elevate the Messiah's status from being in some sense David's junior to being his senior, his divine Lord. Furthermore, we noted that although Jesus had charged his disciples not to tell anyone about his being the Christ, he failed to suppress Bartimaeus' messianic address. With the same apparent unconcern for popular misconception, Jesus teaches publicly, in the temple, about the Messiah's superior status without any mention of his need to suffer, even though he had been at pains to impress this teaching upon his disciples. In all of these events, Jesus seems to be reversing publicly all that he had tried without success to convey privately to his disciples. Apparently, Mark did not envision an absolute break with current views about the Messiah and the Kingdom. Something about Jesus' behavior and teaching led Peter, Bartimaeus, and Caiaphas to see in him the characteristics of a messianic claimant. Thus, Jesus neither rejects the title, "Christ" (8:30) nor does he reinterpret it so drastically that he totally rejects everything that the title might have implied to his contemporaries about the Messiah's role. To be sure, Jesus subsequently resumes his tendency to let the Son of Man have the last word, as it were; but this is not so much a matter of supplanting "Christ" as it is complementing it.

Before demonstrating this in more detail, it is necessary to pick up the theme of the Kingdom again. Unfortunately, explicit references to it are few, and these are among the most difficult to interpret. There is material which by implication could be construed as related to the Kingdom theme, but it is the sort which tempts one (the author at

80. E.g. Cullmann, Christology, 132f.
least!) to see "Kingdom" everywhere. Furthermore, it is often difficult
to discern a clear and natural link with the nearest specific christology.
But for the sake of completeness we proceed with great caution.

The account of the temple cleansing (11:12-16) seems to have as
its point Jesus' teaching about the merchants' trading in the Temple
had prevented God's will from being implemented, i.e. that all nations
might worship therein (v. 17). If this act is to be taken in conjunction
with the interpretation of the entry which we offered, then it may
perhaps be understood as demonstrating that the coming Kingdom is to
be genuinely universal.

This assertion of authority is not left unchallenged. When Jesus
visits the city on the following day, the chief priests, scribes, and
elders demand to know what authority lay behind his provocative actions
(vv. 27f). Jesus does not give a direct answer to their query but asks
a counter-question about their estimate of John the Baptist's ministry.
Was it divinely authorized, or were its roots merely human (v. 30)?
To avoid responding in such a way as to recognize both John's authority
as a prophet and Jesus' greater authority, they plead ignorance (v. 33a).
Now, if one is looking for intimations about the Kingdom, it is very
tempting to associate 'ξουσία in this passage with the 'ξουσία and
'.onclick which are granted to the one who looked like a lowly man in
Dan. 7:14 ( pp. 64, 74). We did invoke this passage in our discussion
of Mk. 2:10, 28 earlier on (pp. 80f); but at least both authority
and the Son of Man christology were present there. Probably it would be
overly subtle and too tenuous to suggest that the themes of the Kingdom
and the Son of Man lie just under the surface. However, it may not be
so far fetched to note that the parable of the rejected Son and stone
(12:1-12) continues the theme of authority begun in 11:27-33, especially
in the quotation of Ps. 118:22-23. The rejected stone has become the cornerstone or the keystone (v. 10). And, as we noted earlier, these motifs here applied to the beloved son (v. 6), are otherwise associated with the Son of Man (cf. ch. II, pp. 52f).

It would probably be unwarranted to regard the subsequent interchange between Jesus and some of the Pharisees and Herodians who were sent to trap him (12:13-17) as being at base about the locus of one's citizenship: in God's Kingdom or Caesar's.

More promising is the next pericope as interpreted by R. H. Charles who suggests that the Sadducees, in their question about the marital status "in the resurrection" of the woman who had seven husbands (12:18-23), reflect the sensuous concept of the messianic kingdom which one finds in 1 Enoch 1-36. Jesus' answer (vv. 24-27), Charles maintains, is more in the spirit of chs. 91-94. 82

The most explicit reference to the Kingdom in this section is, alas, extremely difficult to interpret. A scribe who had heard the debate with the Sadducean and Herodian agents is commended by Jesus for his understanding of the Greatest Commandment: he is not far from the Kingdom of God (12:34). Since the debate on whether this statement refers to the Kingdom as present or future is at a stalemate, it may mean that time is not the important point. A. Ambrozic seems wholly justified in maintaining that the purpose of the story is to show how intimate the connection is between love for God and one's neighbor and entry into the Kingdom. Were one to speculate what Mark believed the scribe still lacked, he might, on the analogy of 10:28-30, suggest that the scribe yet had to become a follower of Jesus. 83 So far as the christology

82. R. H. Charles, Pseudepigrapha (1913), 184.
83. Ambrozic, Hidden Kingdom, 177-181.
is concerned, Ernst Lohmeyer's observation seems entirely appropriate:
"'Here there speaks Someone who knows who is near the Kingdom of God
and who is far away from it.'"84

With ch. 13, the christology becomes explicit again. We have
already noted in the christological overview of ch. II (pp. 34f)
how the claims of messianic pretenders (vv. 6, 22) will be dis-proven
by the heavenly appearance of the Son of Man at the end of the age
(v. 26). In ch. 14, "The Son of Man" appears in the context of the Last
Supper and in the Garden as the most appropriate symbol of Jesus'
resolve to be the obedient Son in the face of the ultimate test of
suffering and death (vv. 21, 41, and see pp. 56ff). At the trial
before the Sanhedrin, Jesus replies affirmatively when the High Priest
asks if he is the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One (14:6lf). As
usual, Jesus' affirmative reply culminates in a reference to the Son
of Man. Again, it is not meant as a substitution. His answer is,
"Yes, and [not "but"] you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right
hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven."

In ch. 15, the messianic theme is even stronger by way of the
frequent reference to Jesus as ο̃ βασιλεύς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (vv. 2,
9, 12, 18, 26, 32). On the lips of the dramatis personae, the title
bears the nationalistic connotation. This is clear in the taunting
of the chief priests and scribes: "Let the Messiah, the King of Israel
come down from the cross now, so that we can see and believe in Him"
(v. 32). But this time, there is no explicit complementary reference
to the Son of Man. There is really no need of it for two reasons.
The context makes it abundantly clear that the Messiah suffers.

84. Ambrozic, ibid., 181, translates Lohmeyer's comment in
Das Evangelium des Markus (1953), 260.
Furthermore, the christology of the passion narrative had already been expressed as a Son of Man christology. Although the "passion predictions" were given between Caesarea Philippi and Jericho (8:31-10:33f), they in fact have reference to and are fulfilled in the final events in Jerusalem.

C. Summary

The most fundamental relationship between the three major christological expressions is this: "Son of God" and "Christ" correctly identify Jesus, but neither adequately conveys what it means to be God's Son and his Anointed. But the "Son of Man" does. It symbolizes the vocation of utter obedience to the demands of God's Rule.

However, this function of the Son of Man symbol is not new. We learned that the Danielic son of man symbolized the obedience to the primacy of God's Rule demonstrated by the four Hebrew exiles in the narrative (chs. 1-6) and by the Saints of the Most High in the vision (ch. 7). Seen in the larger context of the OT and Jewish notion of sonship as unqualified obedience to a father's will, the Son of Man, both in its Danielic and Markan expressions, is therefore a Son-of-God-symbol.

Since there had been a close connection between the Danielic son of man and the Kingdom of God, we examined this relationship in Mark, observing also that there seemed to be a correspondence generally, between Kingdom and christology: the description of the Kingdom's representative corresponded to the aspect of the Kingdom which was being stressed.

Early in the Gospel, it is clear that the Kingdom of God has a cosmic dimension. It is supernatural, more than political. Consequently, its agent or representative possesses a corres-
ponding nature: he is the divine Son of God.

Although cosmic, the Kingdom has a history. It draws near in the baptism and temptation of its divine representative (1:10-13), who thereafter heads its further advance by engaging the agents of Satan's hostile Kingdom in mortal combat (3:24-27). In these events, God's Rule subdues and replaces that of Satan.

Although the one who heads the advance of God's Rule is acclaimed both by God and the demonic world as the divine Son of God, Jesus himself interprets his authority in terms of the Son of Man (2:10, 28). It is in this self-designated capacity that he informs the notion of Messiahship and the concept of the Kingdom that goes with it (8:27-33). To be a citizen of the Kingdom is to embrace the same vocation of obedience to God's Rule which Jesus himself has embraced (8:34-9:1; 10:15-32). As the Son of Man, Jesus, both by precept and his own example, establishes the principle upon which the community formed by those who accept the conditions will function: the ruler of all must be the slave of all.

Despite these radical proposals, there is continuity with traditional expectations regarding the Kingdom of David and David's Son, whom Jesus is (10:47f, 11:9f). But he is also David's Lord (12:35ff), whose regal accession nevertheless takes place at the cross (ch. 15).
CHAPTER IV. THE MESSIANIC SECRET: THE PHENOMENA

One of the chief reasons why the messianic secret is still a secret is that Mark nowhere tells us the reason for it. Consequently, scholars have been forced to infer its meaning from the internal evidence of the text and from whatever external data might be available. Because of the high degree of subjectivity involved, it is important to set out the phenomena themselves and elucidate the relevant issues at the outset, keeping in mind the methodological rationale proposed in chapter I.

A. Injunctions and Privacy

1. Injunctions to Silence

Wrede stressed two main points about the injunctions in general: "...the form of the commands is quite stereotyped" by virtue of the "repeated" use of ἔφημεν (37), and that "...all the various commands in Mark have the same sense" (Ibid., ) that is, "...that everywhere the preservation of the messianic secret is contemplated" (38). More specifically, "...Jesus demands silence on the presupposition that his miracle would at once permit a conclusion about what his secret nature was, and his dignity" (Ibid., ). 1 But these assertions are highly questionable. The second one is based on Wrede's claim that

---

1. Wrede, Messianic Secret. Since we shall be referring to Wrede frequently, it will be desirable to minimize the number of footnotes by putting page numbers in the text.
all of the christological titles in the Gospel are interchangeable, and bear full supernatural and messianic connotations in each instance (18, 24, 77, 74). But our analysis in ch. II has shown that this generalization simply cannot be sustained, for Mark did not confuse his christological categories. Furthermore, the only unambiguously supernatural title is the "Son of God", which may be messianic in two instances (14:61 and 15:39). Only in one instance may "Christ" have supernatural connotations: at 12:35, where Jesus argues that, according to David's Spirit-inspired testimony, the Messiah is really David's Lord (vv. 36f). Twice, ἄρσις is part of a proper name (1:1, 9:41). Otherwise, it bears Jewish-messianic overtones. Moreover, the Danielic son of man, which influenced Mark's christology so significantly, seems to have been more a symbol of a role than a title for a person. Consequently, one cannot assign messianic and supernatural significance to this term with confidence.

Given these distinctions, it is important to note that injunctions to silence occur consistently with "Son of God" (see below), only once with "Christ", and never with "the Son of Man". Furthermore, the messianic secret is broken when Jesus fails to keep Bartimaeus from addressing him as "Son of David" (10:48) and when Jesus admits to Caiaphas that he is the Christ (14:61f). It is therefore more correct to speak of a divine Son-of-God secret.

So far as their vocabulary is concerned, there is not enough uniformity to warrant Wrede's claim that the form and vocabulary of the command is "quite stereotypic". The phenomena may be more easily studied in chart form on the following page.
a. To the Demons

Mark includes four accounts of exorcism and two summaries. The summaries state in the imperfect what regularly happened: Jesus "regularly prevented the demons from speaking because they knew him" (1:34). "The unclean spirits used to cry out saying, 'You are the Son of God,' and Jesus repeatedly rebuked them much so that they would not make him known" (3:11f). As J. L. Clark points out, the four accounts are consistent with these summaries if it is noted that Jesus enjoins silence only when there is the possibility of the public's hearing the demons address him in divine terms. The only time this possibility occurs is at 1:24, where Jesus commands the demon to be silent (φιλοθητίαν). There is no need for an injunction at the curse of the Gerasene demoniac because no crowd is present and because Jesus converses with the demon. No injunction to silence appears in 7:24-30 because the demon possessing the Syrophoenecian woman's daughter is remote. In 9:14-29, the demon, being πνεῦμα ἀκλόν (κ. κωφόν, v. 25), cannot speak, although he can shriek (v. 26).

---

2. 1:23-38 (in a synagogue at Capernaum), 5:1-20 (the Gerasene demoniac), 7:24-30 (the Syrophoenecian woman's daughter), 9:14-29 (the possessed boy); 1:34, 3:11f.

3. Although there is some strong external support for the longer reading, (τὸν) Χριστὸν εἶναι after αὐτῶν (among others, B C Θ 4 132 33 142), B. M. Metzger holds that the longer readings might have been derived from Mk 4:41. "If anyone of the longer readings had been original in Mark, there is no reason why it should have been altered or eliminated entirely." A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (1971), 75. The intended sense might be that the demons knew Jesus to be ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, on the analogy of the demon's claim, διὰ τοῦτο σε τῆς εἰς in 1:25.

4. "The Holy One of God" (1:24), "the Son of God Most High" (5:7).

Enjoining the demons to keep silent about Jesus' divine dignity is therefore thematically quite consistent but not really uniform in terms of vocabulary. In three of the four accounts of exorcism (1:24, 5:8, 9:25), the word of command to come out is the same ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma\epsilon\lambda\Theta \zeta$).

Finally, it should be noted that the injunctions with exorcisms clearly have a christological motive; that is, they function to conceal Jesus' identity—here as the Holy One of God or Son of God (Most High).

b. To the Cured

So far as the nine reports and three summaries of healings are concerned, there are only two absolute injunctions (5:43, 7:36), and these have not $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota\mu\iota\iota$ν, as with the exorcisms, but $\iota\mu\iota\iota\epsilon\Lambda\epsilon\Theta \alpha\iota$. A less absolute injunction occurs in 1:44, where the leper is instructed not to tell anyone but to get his cure certified by the priest. The command to the blind man from Bethsaida at 8:26 is problematical.

According to some texts, Jesus enjoins privacy or seclusion. One contains only an injunction against speaking to anyone. Others have both. This analysis shows that less than one fourth of the healing stories have clear injunctions, and these do not correspond in vocabulary with injunctions in exorcisms. Furthermore, Ulrich Luz has called attention

6. 1:40-40 (the leper), 2:1-12 (the paralytic), 3:1-6 (the man with a withered hand), 5:25-34 (the woman with haemorrhage), 5:35-43 (Jairus' daughter), 6:2-6 (Jesus at Nazareth), 7:31-37 (the deaf mute), 8:22-26 (the blind man from Bethsaida), 10:46-52 (blind Bartimaeus). Summaries are found at 1:32-34; 3:10; 6:53-56.

7. Metzger, op. cit., 99, argues that the first reading ($\mu\iota\Delta\epsilon$ ei $\tau\gamma\nu$ $\kappa\omega\eta$ν $\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\epsilon\lambda\Theta \zeta$) has the best textual support, with early representatives of Alexandrian, Caesarean, Eastern and Egyptian text-types ($\chi\epsilon$ B L f $\varsigma\rho\varsigma$ $\sigma\rho\varsigma$ $\beta\gamma$ $\varepsilon\iota\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota\iota\iota$). The second reading* is supported only by it. Others appear to be conflations and elaborations of these two readings. * ($\mu\Delta\epsilon\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\iota\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota$ $\tau\gamma\nu$ $\kappa\omega\eta$ν)
to the fact that, unlike the summaries of Jesus' exorcisms, no injunctions ever occur in the summary comments about Jesus' healings. In other words, it is not said that Jesus regularly enjoined those whom he healed to be silent about their cure.

Wrede asserted that "...everywhere the preservation of the messianic secret is contemplated" in the injunctions to silence; but he admitted that "...this is explicitly stated only in the commands given to the demons and in the passage 8:30 and perhaps [?] 9.9" (38). He further noted "...the peculiar capacity of the demoniacs for recognising Jesus as Messiah and about their peculiar inclination to address him as such" (24). However, Wrede failed to notice a corresponding "peculiarity" the almost total disinclination of those healed to address Jesus christologically. The only possible exception is Bartimaeus who addresses Jesus as μιχ Δαυίδ (10:47f). But this occurs before he is healed and he is not silenced by Jesus. Furthermore, responses to the healings which are not done in private are mixed. Some praise God (2:12); the Pharisees and Herodians plot murder (3:6); Jesus' townsmen react with astonishment, affrontery, and disbelief (6:2, 3, 6); Herod is convinced Jesus' powers prove him to be John the Baptist redivivus (6:14); and others bestow praise for the good which he has done (7:37).

---

9. In the Matthean parallel, 12:15f, to Mk 3:11f, it is the healed persons (not demoniacs) whom Jesus commands (ἡμεῖς ἀμαύου ) to be silent. This is said to be in fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy about the Servant's humility (v. 19).
10. In Matthew's account of the healing of the two blind men (9:27-31), they too address him as "Son of David", but here there is both withdrawal to a house (v. 28) and an injunction, δεῖτε μηδείς πινωσκέτω (v. 30).
11. Only two public reactions are mentioned regarding the exorcisms: the worshippers in the synagogue in Capernaum see it as a sign of Jesus' superior authority as a teacher (1:27), and his fame spreads throughout the region of Galilee (v. 28). Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem claim Jesus is possessed by Beelzebub, the demon ruler (3:22f).
It is not to be denied absolutely that the healings have christological significance. But it should be questioned whether they are christological in the same sense that the exorcisms are; that is, whether it is as christologically important to silence those who were healed as it is to keep the demons and the disciples silent. Although Mark does not provide a motive for any of these injunctions to the healed (as contrasted with the demoniacs), it might be possible to deduce the reason for one of them, the least absolute, namely to the leper. Earlier, Mark had described Jesus' intention to avoid prolonged contact with large crowds so that he could press on with his mission of preaching in as many towns as possible (1:37f). But as a consequence of the leper's publicising his cure, in violation of Jesus' command, Jesus was no longer able to enter openly into a (my) town, but was forced to stay in open territory (1:45). Of course, this motive for secrecy cannot automatically be applied elsewhere; but it does indicate that one cannot subsume every injunction under the same category and cannot impose a christological motive where none exists or where another motive, such as the desire to avoid publicity for a specific reason, may be operative.

It might be worth noting that the only other instance of an injunction's being broken follows the healing of one who had suffered deafness and a speech defect (7:36). Although Jesus issued an order (ΔΕΞΤΕΡΑΣΤΟ ) that those who had brought the man say nothing to anyone, he had to reiterate his command (ΔΕΞΤΕΡΑΣΤΟ ) because they kept on disobeying it. Is there some significance to the fact that only the

12. These phenomena have led Luz, op. cit., to posit two distinct secrets in Mark. The healings do not belong to the messianic secret: "Nicht die Messianität oder die Gottesschenschaft Jesu soll geheimgehalten werden, sondern das Geschehen der Heilung, das Wunder. Wir werden also das Geheimnismotiv in den Heilungsgeschichten besser als 'Wundergeheimnis' bezeichnen."
injunctions to the cured, which do not involve a revelation of Jesus' identity, are violated?

c. To The Disciples

A glance at the chart reveals certain interesting and possibly significant phenomena. The vocabulary of injunction seems to be a conflation of the vocabulary characteristic of exorcisms (ἐπηγγελματία) and of healings (ἀνακαταλλαγή). The ἃνακαταλλαγὴ clauses, too, seem to be extensions of those in the healing accounts. However, unlike the healing injunctions but like those with exorcisms these are clearly christological. The disciples are to tell no one concerning Jesus, the Messiah. Until the resurrection, they are not to tell anyone about the things which they have seen (i.e. Jesus transfigured and presented by God as his beloved Son).

Let us summarize our observations thus far. First, the vocabulary of injunction does not possess the stereotyped character which Wrede, and those who follow his analysis uncritically, claimed. Such uniformity as exists is confined within the exorcism accounts and within the accounts of healing. Mark seems to conflate this language in the injunctions to the disciples. Secondly, the injunctions are not the same in extent. We did observe a high degree of consistency so far as the reports and summaries of exorcisms were concerned; but the situation in the healings was quite different. Only three of the nine accounts of healing had injunctions, and one of these was less absolute than the other two, where the wording of the prohibition was almost identical. In none of the three summaries of healings was there a command to silence. Finally, only the demons and the disciples were enjoined to keep Jesus'
identity from becoming known. No clear christological motive could be discerned for the healings.

2. Privacy

As with injunctions, the vocabulary of privacy is not stereotyped.

a. With Exorcisms

Privacy with exorcisms is a rarity. Even if 9:25 means that Jesus was alone with the possessed boy, his father, and the disciples (and this is not at all clear since the crowd had run to and greeted him in v. 15), Jesus raised the boy, who appeared to be dead (v. 26), in full view of witnesses. Otherwise, exorcisms take place in public: in a synagogue (1:23), at a house where a large crowd had gathered (1:33), and at the lake where multitudes from many regions had come (3:7f).

By the very circumstances, Jesus, his disciples, and the Gerasene demoniac are alone (5:2); and the Syrophoenician woman's daughter is at home when Jesus' authoritative word exorcises the demon from afar (7:30). These are not examples of intended privacy.

b. With Healings

In the nine reports and three summaries of healings, there are only three references to withdrawal from public view, and the vocabulary is not stereotyped. Jesus, after personally evicting everyone else

(αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκ βαλλὼν πάντας), allows only the inner circle of disciples, Jairus, and his wife to attend the young girl’s cure (5:37, 40). Later, Jesus privately heals both the deaf and dumb man: καὶ ἀπολύθημεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀχλου καὶ ἤλθεν... (7:33) and the blind man from Bethsaida: ἐξῆλθον αὐτὸν εἴη τῆς κόμης (8:23). Interestingly, injunctions to silence accompany the private setting at 5:34 and 7:36, 8:26 being textually uncertain. Not only are injunctions to persons who were healed without christological motivation, but also withdrawal from public view seems to have had little christological significance. 15

c. With Teaching

1) Public Teaching—Private Explanation

In both the exorcisms and the healings, the privacy motif is fairly weak and not stereotyped in vocabulary. But the situation is somewhat different with teaching. The five instances where public teaching is followed by private explanation will be considered first. 16 Here the

14. Both have ἔφατε Λό (5:43, 7:36), and the latter is disobeyed. Neither a public nor a private setting is given for the healing of the leper.

15. Of course, form critical analysis would call attention to the traditional character of this detail, since withdrawal from public view is a motif which may be found in other biblical and in extra-biblical miracle stories. See Rudolf Bultmann, History, 224 (227).

16. Mk. 4:1-20 (the parable of the soils and its explanation), 4:33f (a summary of Jesus' parabolic teaching), 9:14-29 (the healing of the possessed boy and teaching concerning faith and prayer), 7:14-23 (the parable concerning defilement), 10:1-12 (teaching on divorce). The apocalyptic discourse in ch. 13 is not strictly relevant, although καὶ ἤλθεν and the disciples' inquiry both appear (v. 3), because Jesus' first statement, about the temple, is addressed not to the public but to the larger group of disciples (vv. 1f). The private teaching is given to a smaller disciple group, Peter, James, John and Andrew (v. 3).
vocabulary is more stereotypic, principally in the references to Jesus’ being alone. The most frequently occurring phrase (twice) is κατά ἑαυτὸν μόνοις (once): 4:10, καὶ ὢν ποιεῖται κατὰ μόνας. 4:34b, κατὰ ἑαυτὸν μόνοις, ἐπελευθήσεται πάντας (a summary statement); 9:28, καὶ ἐπεξεργάζεται κατὰ ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὅσοι οἱ μαθηταὶ κατὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐπεξεργάζονται αὐτὸν. In three instances (including 9:28), Jesus goes into a house where the disciples interrogate him: 7:17, καὶ όποιος ἐπιλεξθηκεν εἰς ὅσοι ἐπὶ τὸν σάκχαρον ...; 10:10, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αἰμήν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τοῦτον ἐπιρρήτων αὐτὸν.

Several facts are noteworthy here: nowhere, in teaching given partially to a larger audience and fully to a smaller group, does Jesus initiate the privacy for this purpose. He simply is alone or goes into a house. Furthermore, in five of the six instances, it is members of the narrower audience who instigate the private teaching by asking Jesus about what he had said. In the sixth, at 4:34, the fact is simply stated that Jesus explained everything privately to his own disciples. Significant is the absence of any injunctions to keep teaching a secret.

17. 9:33ff is not parallel because, again, only disciples are involved. 18. It would seem that going into a house initiates privacy; but the point here is that this is not privacy for the sake of teaching. 19. ἐπεξεργάζεται appears 25 times in Mark, ἐπιλέγεται, 3 times. The former is used 5 times in these scenes, and the latter occurs at 4:10. 20. This is a feature of 4 Ezra. In ch. 12 he is deemed worthy to learn the interpretation (called the “mystery of the Most High”) of a dream (vv. 35f). Then Ezra is instructed, “...write all these things that thou hast seen in a book, and put them in a secret place; and thou shalt teach them to the wise of the people, whose hearts thou knowest are able to comprehend and keep these mysteries” (vv. 37ff). Two chapters later, Ezra is told to prepare to record direct, divine revelations (vv. 23ff), some of which are to be made public and some of which are to be communicated secretly to the wise (v. 26). The book concludes on a similar note. The Most High commands Ezra to make public twenty-four books (the OT, which was read in the synagogue) which may be read by both the worthy and the unworthy. But the last seventy books are to be kept and delivered to the wise among the people (14:45f). See R. H. Charles, Pseudepigrapha, 614f, 622, 624.
Of course, it may be argued that each of these is implicitly christological because it is Jesus' authoritative teaching. However, the point is that it is valid to make such distinctions since the issue here is not about Jesus' identity,\(^{21}\) as with the exorcisms.

2) Private Teaching

Mark does show Jesus giving explicitly christological teaching in private. Where the privacy is most explicit, there is a certain uniformity of vocabulary in the use of παραλαμβάνειν. At 9:2, Jesus takes Peter, James and John along with him to a high mountain κατ' Ἰσραήλ μόνος. The transfiguration follows, and Jesus is declared to be God's Son by the heavenly voice (9:7). From the entourage headed for Jerusalem, Jesus takes the Twelve (πάντα) and tells them what is about to happen to him in terms of the terrible suffering which the Son of Man is to endure (10:32ff). Significantly, one of the two times in which Mark gives any reason for Jesus' injunctions or privacy appears in this connection. In 9:30, it is said that he did not want his journey through Galilee to be known (οὐκ ἦλθεν ἵνα οἱ άνθρωποι ἴσων) because he was teaching his disciples about the fate of the Son of Man (9:30f).\(^{22}\) The third and final instance where παραλαμβάνειν occurs in a context in which privacy instituted by Jesus and christological teaching appear together is at 14:32ff.

Jesus instructs his disciples at Gethsemane to remain at a certain point while he prays (v. 32). But he takes the inner circle with him (v. 33), requesting them to stay and watch, while he prayed a little distance away (vv. 34f). Had they been alert, they would have observed the agony of

\(^{21}\) Schuyler Brown, "'The Secret of the Kingdom of God' (Mark 4:11)", JBL, 92.1 (1972), 70, makes the same point.

\(^{22}\) In 1:34, Jesus did not permit the demons to speak because they knew him.
the Son of God (Ἀββάς ὁ Ναόν, v. 36) who finally embraces his father's will. The scene ends with Jesus' declaration of the Son of Man's imminent betrayal (v. 41).

In summary, it has been shown that in every instance in which Jesus institutes private teaching, it is christological. But it is not messianic, in the strict sense. It is about the suffering and vindication of the Son of Man (9:30f, 10:32ff, and 8:31 by implication) and about the glory and testing of the Son of God (9:2-8; 14:32-42). No injunction follows private teaching about the former, although a temporary one follows the latter (9:9). When the disciples institute a discussion privately after Jesus makes a public pronouncement, his reply is not christological, i.e. does not concern his identity or his destiny.

3. Parabola teaching

Wrede interpreted the closing verses of Jesus' parabolic discourse (4:33f) thus: "In this text is expressed with perfect clarity that Jesus is veiling himself from the people by his parabolic teaching" (56). This confidence, however, was based solely upon an inference which Wrede had made regarding Jesus' earlier statement to those who asked him the meaning of the parable of the soils (τοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείας, 4:10): οὐκ οὐκ ἔλεξεν τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. Yet, Wrede himself admitted that the Evangelist did not say what the secret of the Kingdom of God was; "...the content and scope of the concept is ... undefined" (59). Its exact sense, Wrede claimed, could be determined "...only in accordance with his total view" (60). The mystery of the Kingdom of God is "...that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God" (ibid.), for "if according to Mark Jesus conceals himself as Messiah, we are
entitled to interpret the mystery tes basileias tou theou by this fact" (ibid.). 23

In order to sustain this position, Wrede felt obliged to deny that the "secret" of the Kingdom of God had anything to do with its mysterious nature as it is elucidated in certain parables about the Kingdom.

What is the secret of the kingdom of God?

It has been said to mean the mysterious nature of the kingdom of God as the parables of Jesus have it (cf. the parable of the sower which precedes the reference in the text), i.e. the doctrine which is concealed in the parables of the kingdom of heaven. There is absolutely no special relationship between the general statements of 4:10-12 and specific parables. Even if Mark had not reported a single parable and if he had only given a general account of Jesus' teaching in parables it would have been possible to write exactly in the same way (58).

Unless this distinction were maintained, the phrase, τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ would simply refer to an ambiguous, theological phenomenon rather than to a point of christological information. Wrede's preference for the latter seems to be reflected in the way that he uses Geheimnis to mean "secret" rather than "mystery". J. L. Clark has observed that both the Greek, μυστήριον, and the German, Geheimnis, may mean either "secret" or "mystery". 24 The latter refers to ambiguous or enigmatic phenomena or circumstances, whereas "secret" conveys the idea of information which has been withheld. Especially clear examples of this latter sense are to be found in Tob. 12:7, 11: μυστήριον βασιλείως καλὸν κρύψκει, which the NEB renders, "A king's secret ought to be kept". But in the LXX of Daniel 2, μυστήριον and its plural refer not only to

23. Similarly, G. Bornkamm's definition is: "...Jesus Himself as Messiah", See his discussion in "μυστήριον", TDTT iv (1967), 819. The same view is held by Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom, 99.
25. So far as the English word "mystery" is concerned, the Oxford English Dictionary, vi (1933) defines it as "A matter unexplained", "A riddle or enigma" (815).
the divulgence of previously unknown information (the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, v. 19), but to an ambiguous phenomenon, the perplexing dream itself (v. 18). 26

Now this sense of mystery and ambiguity is precisely what characterizes the nature of the Kingdom of God in the near and immediate contexts of 4:10. Although it has nearly-arrived, it needs to be announced (1:14f). In 3:23, it is not clear to the scribes from Jerusalem whether Jesus' exorcisms represent the manifestation of God's Kingdom or of Satan's. In ch. 4 itself, the Kingdom's nature is ambiguous enough to require elucidation by means of parables, as shown by 4:26-29 (the man does not know how it grows) and 4:30 (it needs to be likened to something). Finally, it might be added that the parable of the soils and its interpretation which flank 4:10-12 are about the Kingdom of God. According to 4:33, it was with many such parables (i.e., about the Kingdom, cf. vv. 26, 30) that Jesus used to speak the word to the masses (ἐξαίλητα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον). Therefore, the seed in vv. 3-8, which in the interpretation is called "the word" (vv. 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20), is the word or message about the Kingdom of God.

Furthermore, at no point is an attempt made to identify Jesus with the sower or, for that matter, with any other person or symbol in the parables of the Kingdom in Mark. This is true, even when Jesus uses parables (or speaks parabolically) in 3:23 to clarify (albeit obliquely) the confusion of the scribes. There is an implicit reference to himself as the one who is heading the attack on Satan's kingdom (v. 27), but

26. Similarly, in 2:27 of Origen's rescension, Daniel refers to τὸ μυστήριον ὧν ἐκταλάσας ἔφανεν. However, Theodotian gives the verb as ἢπερευ, rendering the Aramaic, יָשַׁלָּה, which comes from יָשָׁל, "to ask", "to inquire". Thus, the interpretation is, as it were, the "secret" concerning the "mystery" (i.e., the dream).
nothing is said of his identity. In conclusion, we can say that in chapter 4, both the content of the mystery and of the parabolic teaching is clearly theological. It is neither specifically messianic nor christological, having nothing explicitly to do with Jesus' identity. We have here an example of the pattern that, on occasions where private explanation followed public teaching, the explanation was neither initiated by Jesus nor was it christological in nature.

It is therefore more true to the phenomena to distinguish between the mystery of the Kingdom, which is theological, and the secret of messiahship or sonship, which is christological.28 Besides the arguments just put forward, we may recall our observations earlier in this chapter (p. 99) that a Son of Man secret is non-existent, that the truly messianic secret is allowed to be broken by Jesus himself, and that the Son of God secret is to terminate at the resurrection. The mystery of the Kingdom of God, however, will persist until the Kingdom comes in power.29

Whereas evidence for the first of these assertions is plain enough, the latter requires some justification. Those to whom the

27. So also Schüler Brown, loc. cit.

28. Kelber, op. cit. (see n. 29), 42 points to a similar distinction made by Albert Schweitzer in The Quest of the Historical Jesus (ET, 1910 of Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung, 1906), 347 (not 349): "He [Wrede] is unwilling to recognize that there is a second, wider circle of mystery which has to do not with Jesus' Messiahship, but with his preaching of the Kingdom, with the mystery of the Kingdom of God in the wider sense..."

29. S. Brown, ibid., 61, distinguishes between the mystery of the Kingdom of God and the messianic secret, arguing that although the disciples are "given" the former (4:11), they only "grasp" the latter at 8.29. Immediately following the parabolic discourse, the disciples still have no faith after Jesus stills the storm (v. 40) and wonder who he is (v. 41). The same lack of insight persists in 6:51f and 8:17–21, where they fail to perceive the meaning of the feedings.
mystery of the Kingdom has not been granted (οἱ ἡμῖν, v. 11) are not simply
deprived of information. The consequences of their deprivation is
blindness and deafness which produce unbelief that leads to a loss of
salvation (failing to turn and be forgiven, v. 12). Furthermore, this
apparently is not a temporary condition; the mystery is not removed with
an event such as the resurrection. Were this so, it would mean that
some would be destined for damnation simply because they had lived in
the pre-resurrection period. It is not surprising that the church used
this text from Isa. 6 elsewhere (i.e. other than in the setting of
Jesus' ministry) to give a reason for unbelief: Acts 28:26f and Rom. 11:
8 (in both instances, about Israel's continued unbelief). The mystery
of the Kingdom of God remains after the resurrection, even though the
messianic and Son of God secrets have been divulged.

We find the same phenomenon in vv. 14-20, where another aspect
of the mystery is described. Whereas 4:10ff give a rationale for
persistent unbelief, vv. 14-20 seem to give various reasons for apostasy
and steadfastness. In other words, the interpretation has less to do
with explaining how or why outsiders fail to come "inside", so much
as it explains how it is that those who are in some sense insiders
become outsiders. Only v. 15 might be cited as an instance of why
unbelief occurs: Satan snatches the word away. Some hear and receive
the word joyfully, but because they lack depth, they survive only until
stress and persecution come (vv. 16f). Others have heard (aorist) the
word, but deceitful riches and the cares of the age choke it so that
fruitlessness occurs (vv. 18f). Those, however, who are sown on good
soil hear and receive the word and bear fruit (v. 20). Again, one must

30. Ambrozic, op. cit., 135 and Kelber, The Kingdom in Mark,
41f share this view.
ask whether these various responses terminate at the resurrection with
the termination of the Son of God secret or whether they accompany the
word or message of the Kingdom whenever it is preached.

Although a host of problems remains, it seems clear enough that
4:10-12 may not be so easily subsumed under the monolithic secrecy
theory which Wrede proposed. To speak dogmatically about the "secret"
of the Kingdom of God and to call it "messianic" at 4:10 is to neglect
important contextual and linguistic data to the contrary.

B. Publicity

Wrede candidly enumerated at least ten contradictions to the
secrecy theory, contradictions which highlighted the public nature
of Jesus ministry (70, 124ff): the many public miracles, the "...quite
open messianic utterances of Jesus or items such as the messianic
entry," and hints to people outside the disciple group about his death
("the death of the Messiah") in 2:19f, 12:6ff. Furthermore, Jesus' reply ἐν
πλησίον Beelzebub is presumed to have been understood (3:23-27); and Mark himself
says that the Jewish authorities perceived that Jesus had told the
parable of the rejected Son against them (12:12). To Albert Schweitzer,
and others since, these signalled the implausibility of Wrede's theory.
But Wrede himself gave them only superficial consideration, being content
to use them as evidence for the pre-Markan origin of the secret (145f).
The contradictions really have no positive value for Wrede except that
they make telling the story about Jesus worthwhile and possible.

Were the secrecy motif pressed to its logical conclusion, Jesus' life would have been incapable of description (125f).

But a closer look at the publicity motif shows that it does play a positive role alongside the secrecy and privacy phenomena. Although it is relevant to consider all of the teaching and miracles which are done publicly, we shall concern ourselves only with those public events and statements which are clearly christological. Having restricted our investigation to this, the heart of the matter, let us be clear about what precisely is publicized or disclosed. On the basis of our study in ch. II, we cannot simply say that it is Jesus' identity and role in general or, more specifically, his messianic identity and role. Rather, the data show Jesus both by word and action, selectively concealing and revealing various aspects of his identity and role. He consistently suppresses the demons who address him as the Son of God (cf. p. 101). Although he commanded his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ (8:30), he allowed Bartimaeus to address him as "Son of David" in public without suppressing him (10:48), and later admitted to Caiaphas that he was the Messiah (14:6lf). Although Jesus was concerned that his own disciples interpret the Messiah's role by the death and resurrection of the Son of Man (8:31), he failed to provide such an interpretation for Bartimaeus' acclamation, his entry into Jerusalem, and his only explicit public teaching concerning the Messiah (12:35ff). There is a selective use of "the Son of Man" as well. This term is employed publicly but only when it refers to his authority (2:10, 28) and his eschatological manifestation (8:38, 14:62).

32. C. F. D. Moule has recently attempted to put privacy and publicity into perspective. See "On Defining the Messianic Secret in Mark", in a forthcoming Festschrift for W. G. Kümmel.

33. For a recent treatment of these passages, see J. D. G. Dunn, "The Messianic Secret in Mark", Tynd. Bull. 21 (1970), 98ff.
Otherwise, Jesus confines his teaching about the Son of Man's death and resurrection to the disciples.

A possible exception may be his invitation to the summoned crowd and disciples to follow him (8:34-37). The conditions of self-denial and especially the cross-bearing are perhaps meant to reflect the destiny of the Son of Man, first announced privately to the disciples just before (v. 33). Prior to this there had been an oblique public reference to Jesus' death in the saying about the bridegroom (2:19).

Under what circumstances does Jesus disclose his identity or role? Before 8:27, it seems that he responds to those who have misunderstood something which he has done or said. Apparently, Jesus was so successful in preventing the demons from revealing that he was the Son of God that it was counterproductive; he was placed in their camp (3:22)! Thus, publicity arises out of privacy. So as to preserve the secret and yet rectify the misapprehension about himself Jesus tells the parable of the Stronger One, which portrays him as the one who has the power to bind Satan and plunder his possessions (3:23, 27).

On another occasion, it was something Jesus had said which produced the misapprehension. In claiming to forgive the paralytic's sins (2:5, 7), Jesus had incurred the charge of being a blasphemer. In defense, he claimed that curing the paralytic would certify the Son of Man's authority to forgive sins. The degree of explicitness here seems to fit the pattern of secrecy which we have observed: strict secrecy about the Son of God and openness about the authority of the Son of Man.

Of course, there are circumstances in which the public's ignorance is not informed. One such instance arises in the wake of Jesus' first exorcism. The worshippers in the synagogue at Capernaum are
astounded not at Jesus' identity as the Son of God but at his new and authoritative teaching. Their question is not "Who is this?", but "What is this?" (1:22, 27). Likewise, Jesus' compatriots recognize his superior wisdom and power, but these are overshadowed because he is a "local boy" (6:3). Instead of putting them right, Jesus points to the familiar phenomenon that a prophet only finds dishonor in his own country and among his family (v. 4).

By this time, Jesus has acquired quite a reputation. He not only achieves acclaim for his well-doing (7:37), but some imagine him to be Elijah or one of the other prophets. However, Herod is convinced that Jesus is John the Baptist redivivus because of the miraculous power evident in his deeds (6:14ff). It is against this background of popular opinion that Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah (8:28f).

After 10:46, as we saw in section 6 of ch. III (pp.89ff), the mood changes. Earlier, publicity had seemed to be determined by circumstance; but now Jesus takes the initiative in an unprecedented way. To be sure, the disclosure is not always of the same or of increasing explicitness; but the concentration of public disclosures following Bartimaeus' acclamation is greater than anywhere else in the Gospel: the entry to Jerusalem and temple cleansing (11:1-11, 12-19), teaching about the Messiah (12:3ff), the admission to Caiaphas (14:61ff).

Included in this list should be two public allusions to Jesus'

---

34. R. H. Lightfoot wrote of this account, "St. Mark's doctrine of the secret Messiahship of Jesus is here strained to the breaking point." History and Interpretation in the Gospels (1934), 121. We would only add that the strain begins at 10:48 and maintain that the messianic secret, or better, messianic "reserve", is only one aspect of the secrecy doctrine.
death. The first arises in connection with the temple cleansing (see section 6). In the parable of the rejected son and the scriptural reference to the rejected and vindicated stone (12:1-12), Jesus is in effect parabolically conveying to his opponents and the larger public the essential message of the passion-resurrection predictions. The beloved son's fate corresponds to the Son of Man's (see ch. II, p. 53). At the beginning of what has become known as the Passion Narrative, a woman anoints Jesus at Bethany in the home of Simon the leper (14:3-9). By her action, she indicates her anticipation of Jesus' approaching death. The deed would have remained misconstrued (vv. 4f) had he not interpreted its significance for the audience.

C. The Disciples' Ignorance 35

So far as Wrede was concerned, this phenomenon, too, belonged to the messianic secret. 36 Despite their privileged position, Jesus' followers failed to perceive the significance of his teaching and mighty works. However, in his analysis, Wrede (and many since) failed to observe important distinctions in the data. It was noted above (n. 16) that because of their ignorance, the disciples received private explanation of teaching which had been given publicly. Although there was a certain stereotypic quality to these accounts, in no case was the ex-

35. This theme as it appears in the context of 4:1-20 (and 7:14-23), is examined in detail in the EXCURSUS below.
36. Wrede, op. cit., 93-103, but esp. 101ff. The relevant passages will be discussed in the text.
planation given to the disciples christological. And this is the crucial factor so far as the messianic secret is concerned. The same is true in other instances where they are the recipients of special instruction: 8:14-21 (the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod), 9:10 (confusion about what "rising from the dead" meant), and 9:33 (concern for rank, cf. 10:37, 40).

On other occasions, their ignorance is christological. They wonder who it is whom the wind and sea obey (4:41). Because of their hardness of heart, it is impossible for them to make the connection between meeting Jesus on the lake and the feeding of the five thousand (6:51f). Having perceived that Jesus was the Messiah (8:29), Peter balks at his teaching about the Son of Man (8:32). Later, the entire group of disciples fails to comprehend this teaching and is afraid to ask for an explanation, even though Jesus traveled incognito through Galilee for the express purpose of instructing them about the impending destiny of the Son of Man (9:30ff). Finally, their ignorance comes to a climax in Peter's outright denial of Jesus (14:72).

Having sorted out the data along these lines, it is now incumbent upon us to interpret them. Wrede argued that the disciples' ignorance is actually a witness to the earliest belief about Jesus' messiahship. Since Jesus became the Messiah only at the resurrection, then it is only natural that his disciples could not have perceived this until then. But the

37. Ibid., citing Acts 2:36, Rom. 1:4 as support for this view. But it should be noted that Peter refers to Jesus as being the fruit of David's loins (2:30), as Θεοτόκος of God, who is not to see corruption (v.27), before the resurrection. According to Paul in Romans, Jesus was "descended from David", a
only evidence which Wrede can find for this theory in Mark is 9:9 and several extra-Markan passages which allegedly support this view of the resurrection as the ground of the disciples' perception of Jesus' identity and significance. However, 9:9 says nothing about Jesus' becoming the Messiah at the resurrection or about perceiving his messiahship at that time. The point is that the disciples may then divulge what they have just seen: Jesus transfigured and presented by God as his beloved Son (9:7). Both Jesus' identity as the Son of God and the possibility of the disciples' perception is assumed.

Furthermore, Wrede's interpretation of the extra-Markan passages breaks down. In the synoptic gospels and Acts, it seems clear that neither the resurrection, nor an appearance of the Risen Lord is sufficient of itself in altering the disciples' perception. In Mark, the women at the tomb respond with bewilderment and fear when they learn of Jesus' resurrection (16:6ff). According to Matthew, seeing Jesus did cause most of the eleven to worship him, but some of them doubted (28:17). Likewise, the two men journeying to Emmaus do not realize that their fellow traveller is Jesus of Nazareth, who has been the subject of their discussion (Lk. 24:16, 19-24). Only in the breaking of the bread are their eyes opened (vv. 30f, 35).

Furthermore, Luke reports that before he departed, Jesus opened his disciples' minds so that they could understand the scriptures concerning him (v. 46). Later, Luke relates that messianic qualification which he had before being "designated Son of God in power...by his resurrection from the dead" (RSV).

38. Ibid., 218-32 for the full discussion. For a recent elaboration of this in terms of the nature of Christian belief, see Conzelmann, "Present and Future", 43 (295).
for forty days, Jesus taught them about the Kingdom of God (Acts 1:3). Yet, even after this, the disciples seem as imperceptive as before (v. 6). Only after Pentecost does their uncertainty and ignorance disappear. For the connection between resurrection and understanding, we must look to the Fourth Gospel (e.g. 12:16, 13:7, 16:25 and cf. 2:22).

It may very well be, therefore, that the disciples' ob-tuseness in Mark belongs to a phenomenon which persisted among Jesus' followers (some of them, at least) even after the resurrection. However, there seems to be some evidence in the Gospel to suggest that the reason for the disciples' ignorance was a moral one: a lack of faith (4:41) and a hardened heart (6:52, 8:17f). This point will receive further attention in the EXCURSUS which follows.

Before leaving this topic, it is necessary to respond to those scholars who interpret Mark's criticism of the disciples as an all-out vendetta and a total rejection of them since they have rejected Jesus.39 However, although it is possible to argue this latter point (that they reject Jesus), it must be emphasized that Jesus does not reject them, as 14:28 and 16:7 make perfectly clear: the disciples who abandoned him and Pe-ter who denied him are to see him in Galilee.

39. According to some recent writers, Mark conducts this anti-disciple polemic against a point of view held by his theo-logical opponents. T. J. Weeden, Mark--Traditions in Conflict (1971), 26-51, 54-59. Kelber, The Kingdom in Mark, 45f, 49f, 63f, 82ff.
D. Summary

Our examination of the most important evidence for secrecy, privacy, publicity, and the disciples' ignorance has revealed several important points to be considered in any reconstruction of the secret's significance in the Gospel. It is imperative to distinguish between a divine Son-of-God secret, a messianic reserve, and a selective public and private use of "the Son of Man".

Only the injunctions to the demons and to the disciples are clearly christological. Absent was any christological motive for injunctions to those who were healed of ailments not resulting from demonic possession. Rarely was the cure in these cases performed privately. In neither the exorcisms nor the healings, was the vocabulary so standard that it would be called stereotypic.

Private explanation given to disciples of teaching which had been given publicly was not christological. The language was more standard in these instances and in those where Jesus did initiate private teaching, which was christological. Furthermore, it was argued that the mystery of the Kingdom of God should not be equated with the Son of God secret. The former is theological, describing the ambiguity which will attend divine activity until the parousia. The latter is christological and is to terminate at the resurrection.

The publicity phenomena should be examined alongside the privacy phenomena. Both indicate a selective concealing and revealing of various aspects of Jesus' identity and role.
Sometimes circumstantial factors determine the occasion and the explicitness of the disclosure. After Bartimaeus' acclamation, the tempo of christological divulgence increases, until Jesus reveals to Caiaphas that he is indeed the Messiah.

The data belonging to the motif of the disciples' ignorance should be distinguished between those which are christological and those which are not. The little evidence available seems to indicate that moral factors lie behind the disciples' obtuseness.


Not long after Wrede published his classic study, scholars began to adduce parallels to some of the secrecy phenomena from contemporary Jewish and pagan literature. For example, E. Rohde produced evidence from the hellenistic period which showed that the verb \( \phi\mu\sigma\gamma\nu \) ("to muzzle") is a characteristic of binding (\( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon\nu \)) a demon\(^{40}\) (cf. 1:25, \( \phi\mu\omega\Theta\eta\tau\varepsilon \)). Bultmann adduced examples of public withdrawal when a miracle was performed\(^{41}\) (cf. Mk. 5:40, 7:33, 8:23): 1 Kings 17:19; 2 Kings 4:4, 33, 9:5f; and Ta'an 23b.\(^{42}\) More recently, David Daube cited and discussed instances of rabbinic teaching from

---

\(^{40}\) Erwin Rohde, Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks (ET, 1925 of Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen, 1910\(^{,4}\)), 630f (p. 424 of the 5th German edition). Bultmann, History, 224 adduces Pap. Osl., Fasc. 1 (1925), no. 1, col. 6, l. 164. But this magical papyrus dates from the 4th century A.D., and the imprecation is for the purpose of preventing another person's (not a demon's) wrath.

\(^{41}\) R. Bultmann, loc. cit. (see n. 40).

\(^{42}\) Bultmann, ibid., cites E. Bickermann, "Das Messias-
the second half of the first (one instance), second, and third centuries A.D., illustrating the pattern of public pronouncement followed by private interpretation which one finds in Mk. 4:1-20, 7:14-23, elsewhere in his Gospel (see n. 16), and in the synoptic parallels. 43

There are several ways of interpreting these traditional features. Bultmann held that the privacy motif should not be included among the secrecy phenomena. 44 But it may also mean that Mark simply uses anything in his tradition that might suit his purposes. 45 Our task is to call attention to biblical and extra-biblical data which might shed further light on the Evangelist's compositional activity and his intention in this much-discussed passage.

1. The Data

a. The Markan Pattern: 4:1-20 (and 7:14-23)

The most fundamental feature of the Markan arrangement is parable (vv. 3-8) followed by explanation (vv. 14-20). Between these two elements lie two transitional questions. The first, asked by oi peri koune ouv tois geheimnis, betrays their ignorance:

---

44. Bultmann, loc. cit.
The second shows Jesus' surprised and critical response to their lack of comprehension: οὐκ οὖσκε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πᾶσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεις; (v. 13). Thus, there appears the four-fold pattern: (1) parable, (2) incomprehension, (3) critical response, and (4) explanation.

For the purposes of this study, we need not be concerned with the detail that the disciples in v. 10 inquired about the parables, whereas Jesus' question implies that they asked about "this" parable, i.e. the parable of the soils or about his statements in vv. 11f. The point is that both reveal the disciples' ignorance. Furthermore, in a formerly similar situation in ch. 7, the same pattern recurs without this inconsistency: parable (vv. 15, 17b); incomprehension, evident in the disciples' request for the meaning of the parable (v. 17); critical retort (v. 18a); interpretation of the parable (vv. 18b-23).

b. The Pattern in the OT

It is not difficult to find instances in the OT where elements (1), (2), and (4) occur in parabolic and other types of teaching. Examples in Ezekiel include the parable of the boiling pot (24:3-14, 19, 21-24), the prophet's vacating his house to symbolize the Exile (12:3-7, 9-16), and the symbol of the sticks (37:15-28). In Zechariah, this three-fold pattern oc-

46. See n. 52.
curs in the visions of the variously-colored horses (1:8-11),
the four horns (vv. 18-21), the ephah (5:5-11), and the four
chariots (6:1-8).

However, so far as the author has been able to determine
in this preliminary study, the full, four-part pattern is less
common. The earliest example of it occurs in Ezekiel 17. Now
it has been noted that the image of the tree in whose shade
birds will nest and under whose boughs all kinds of beasts
will dwell (v. 23, cf. 31:6) is reflected in Mk. 4:33. However,
no NT scholar and only a few OT scholars have noticed,
and only in passing, that between the parable of the Eagles
and the Vine (vv. 3-10) and its explanation (vv. 12b-24),
there appears the same sort of critical retort (v. 12a) as one
finds in Mk. 4:13a. Here, as in Mk. 4, the retort strongly
implies the audience's incomprehension. The full, structural
similarity may be more clearly displayed in chart form:

48. For a recent evaluation of the influence of Ezek.
17:23 and similar motifs in 31:5f, Daniel 4:12 (MT, 4:9) and
4:21 (MT, 4:18) on the imagery of Mark 4:32 and par., see H. K.
McArthur, "The Parable of the Mustard Seed", CBQ 33:2 (April
1971), 202-05. See also R. W. Funk, "The Looking-Glass Tree
is for the Birds", Int. 27.1 (Jan. 1973), 3-9.

49. It may be valid, on the basis of external criteria,
to call this "allegory", but it should be kept in mind that
nowhere in the Greek OT does ἀλληγορεῖν or ἀλληγορεῖν occur.
Only once does either of these appear in the NT: in Galatians
4:24, Paul uses a participial form. The passage in Ezek. is
introduced in the LXX (v. 2) by διηγήσεως διηγήματα καὶ εἰπον ἠρμ- βολήν and in the MT by §υρ ἔννυ ἡ ἐν ἦν τῆν.

50. G. A. Cooke remarked only that "Teaching by parable
is meant to set people thinking". See The Book of Ezekiel
(1936), 187. More recently, W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel (1969), 384,
compared the two passages with others in Ezek. where a question
comes between a parable or symbolic act and its interpretation:
12:9; 21:5, 12; 21:19; 37:18. Strictly speaking, however, these
instances are not really as comparable to 17:12a and Mk. 4:13a
as they are to Mk. 4:10, since the audience (part of it in the
latter instance) requests the interpretation, whereas in Ezek. 17:12a,
Ezek. 17:1-24

(1) Parable

Parable of the Eagles and the Vine
vv. 3-10

(2) Incomprehension

(implied: ἡρώτων αὐτὸν τῇ γῇ ταῦτα.

(3) Critical Retort

οὐκ ἐπίστασθε τῇ γῇ ταῦτα; v. 12a

(4) Interpretation

Parable Explained
vv. 12b-24

Parable of the Soils
vv. 3-8

Mark 4:1-20

(1) Parable

Parable Explained
vv. 12b-24

(2) Incomprehension

(implied: ἡρώτων αὐτὸν τ. παραβολὴν. C.f. v.10 ἡρώτων αὐτὸν ... τὰς παραβολὰς.)

(3) Critical Retort

οὐκ οἶδατε τ. παραβολὴν ταύτην; 52 v. 13a

(4) Interpretation

Parable Explained
vv. 14-20

Two further instances of this pattern appear in their full form in Zechariah.53

Zechariah 4

(a) (b)

(1) Revelation

Vision of the Golden Lampstand
(vv. 2ff)

(A Detail of the Vision)

(2) Incomprehension

τί ἐστίν ταῦτα, κύριε; (v. 4)

Concerning the Olive Trees (vv. 1ff)

(3) Critical Retort

ὁ λῆσκεις τί ἐστίν ταῦτα; (v. 5a)

ὁ λῆσκεις τί ἐστίν ταῦτα; (v. 13)

(v. 5b-10)

Detail Explained
(v. 14)

(4) Interpretation

and Mk. 4:13a, it is the giver of the parable who responds to their request with a question which is critical in tone.

51. In the LXX, ἐπίστασθε τῷ ὑπερικά, like ἐπίστασθε τῷ ἡρώτων, chiefly translates ὡς.

52. This may, of course, be either a question or a statement. Taylor, op. cit., 259, notes that Luther took it as the latter. If only the Greek were available, Ezek. 17:12a could be read as a statement as well. But the Hebrew Vorlage demands a question. Furthermore, if the pattern in Mark does reflect
Noteworthy here is that, in the Hebrew, the wording of (3) in each case (more a surprised rather than critical retort) is almost identical to the question in Ezekiel. Not as exact, but still very close, is the rendering of the LXX. In Zech. 4:4, 13, δὲ καὶ and γλυφομεν seem to be interchangeable, a fact which is not surprising since each, like ἐπιστραμμένος, translates μὴ ἀναθίμετε most often. Furthermore, the appearance of the pattern in a vision shows that it is not confined to parabolic teaching. Consequently, category (1) may be broadened to include revelation or teaching in a more general sense.

c. Later NT Instances

Matthew retains the pattern of Mk. 7:14-23 at 15:10-20 but omits Jesus' critical retort (4:13) from his parallel account (13:1-23). Luke retains only elements (1) and (4) -- parable and explanation -- in his version of Mk. 4 and fails to reproduce 7:14-23 altogether.

Still later, and outside the synoptic tradition, our four-fold pattern emerges in the Fourth Gospel. 54
Gospel of John

(1) Teaching
Birth from Above
3:3, 5-8
To Know Jesus is to Know the Father (14:7)

(2) Incomprehension
πῶς δύναται ἀνθρώποις γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὑμῖν? (v.4)
πῶς δύναται ταύτα γενέσθαι? (v. 9)
Philip: Show Us the Father (v. 8)

(3) Critical Retort
Σὺ εἰς διδασκαλος τοῦ Ἰησοῦν
κ. ταύτα ὡς γινώσκεις? (v. 10)
tος ὁ χρόνος μεθ' ὑμῶν κ. σύκον
ἐγνωκας με, φιλιππε; (v. 9a, cf. 9c, 10a)

(4) Explanation
Explanation
vv. 11-21(?)
He who has seen me has seen the Father (v. 9b, cf. 10bf)

d. Post-NT Examples

Two instances from the Shepherd of Hermas indicate that the pattern survived into the middle of the second century, occurring both in a parable and a vision.

Shepherd of Hermas

(1) Teaching
Parable of the Vineyard
55(V:2):1-11
Vision of the Tower:
White and Round Stones
10(III:2):8

(2) Incomprehension
ἐγώ ταύτας τὰς παραβολὰς σοὶ γινώσκω
56(V:3):156
Concerning their Ill-
Fit 14(III:6):5a

(3) Critical Retort
πανούργος εἰ κ. αὐθαίρετος, ἐπερωτῶν
τὰς ἐπιλέσεις τῶν παραβολῶν.
58(V:5):157
"Εας πότε μισέως εἰ κ. δασύνετος, κ.
pάντα ἐπερωτῶς κ. ὁδηγὺς νοεῖτις;
(v. 5b)

(4) Interpretation
Parable Explained
58(V:5):2-
59(V:6):8
Vision Explained
59
(vv. 5cf)

55. The two most recent critical texts have been edited by Molly Whittaker, Der Hirt des Hermas (1967) and Robert Joly, Hermas: Le Pasteur (1958). These editors have designated all of the paragraphs as chapters, thereby transcending, but not obliterating, the older classification of Visions, Mandates, and Similitudes. The versification in this essay combines both systems: the number and paragraph of Vision,
2. Evaluation

How shall we assess the significance of these observations for the redactional activity of the Evangelist at 4:1-20 and for the messianic secret theory? One thing may be said with a high degree of certainty. The data presented above, especially those from the OT, lead one to conclude that neither Mark nor a Christian predecessor (be that individual or community) created the structure of this passage ex nihilo. Such a four-fold pattern antedated both Mark and Jesus by more than 500 years.

a. The Secrecy Phenomena

This conclusion is extremely significant for at least one aspect of the secrecy theory, the disciples' ignorance despite their privileged position. We find this ignorance in its most acute form at 4:10, 13 (but cf. 7:18 and 8:16ff). It is

Mandate, or Parable are given in parentheses which are set between numbers indicating chapter and verse.

56. Another example of this component, set within the same parable, appears at 57(V:4):1.
57. Another instance of the critical retort also within this parable, may be found at 58(V:5):1.
58. Elsewhere in the Similitudes the pattern may be found at 78(IX)--110(IX:33). Cf. 79(IX:2):5ff for incomprehension and retort.
59. See the three-fold vision of the woman: 18(III:10):3ff, incomprehension: v. 6, critical retort: vv. 7ff, explanation: 19-21(III:11-13).
60. In keeping with the principles set forth in ch. I, we attempted to demonstrate in this chapter that Wrede's observations and conclusions could not be sustained from the text of Mark itself. In this excursus, we are consciously departing from our procedure in order to provide new evidence, from another level of inquiry, that reinforces our conclusions.
"most acute" here because Jesus criticizes it as culpable. They should have been able to perceive the meaning of the parable(s), since the mystery of the Kingdom of God had (already) been given to them, as the perfect form, 

in v. 10 implies. As we noted, Wrede took the disciples' obtuseness as Mark's way of maintaining that only after and because of the resurrection was it possible to perceive that Jesus was the Messiah. But besides being unable to find support for this notion either in the Gospel itself or elsewhere in the New Testament, we have found several examples of a pattern in which the inability of privileged persons to perceive the significance of a revelation or teaching is regarded as being culpable in some sense, and this without any reference to a future event or date which would bring understanding.

In Ezekiel, the privileged group is Israel (e.g. 16:1-14) which, however, is in perpetual rebellion against God (17:12a). Especially instructive here is 12:2-16, where the language is reminiscent of Isa. 6:9f and where rebellion, failure to understand, and parabolic action are closely related. Nicodemus is "the" teacher of Israel who ought to have been able to perceive Jesus' teaching (Jn. 3:10). Although the author of the Fourth Gospel at times attributes the disciples' inability to perceive the significance of Jesus' words and actions because he had not yet been resurrected (12:16, 13:7, 16:25 and 2:22), it is precisely because they had been closely associated with

61. 4:41 and 6:52 might be included here, the latter instance being a comment of the Evangelist's.
62. Further study is needed to determine how much these ideas have influenced Mk. 4:10ff.
Jesus for some time that he expressed incredulity at their failure to perceive who he was (14:9). Although it was through Hermas that the revelations were to be communicated to the entire church, he himself receives stinging rebukes for his moral deficiencies. Sometimes these are alleged to be the cause of his perpetual inquisitiveness. For example, at one point he is told that fasting will cultivate the humility which is required for understanding the meaning of a vision (18(III:9):6). On another occasion, Hermas is accused of being doubleminded and of not having a heart turned to God (18(III:9):9). In Mark, Jesus links the disciples' failure to perceive the significance of the two feedings with the hardness of heart characteristic of "those outside" (cf. 8:14-21 and 4:11). In 4:40, the Evangelist attributes the disciples' lack of understanding to a lack of faith. Only Zechariah seems blameless. The response to his ignorance is the least harsh of all. Thus, Wrede's appeal to this motif as support for his interpretation of the secrecy phenomena is groundless. In both the Gospel and in other examples of the framework within which such dialogue between teacher and pupil occurs, there is a strong suggestion that the pupil's ignorance is morally-determined and is therefore culpable.

63. A command to make the teaching known to the church occurs in the passage which we have cited from the Similitudes, 58(V:5):1, Snyder, op. cit., 9 adduces 8(II:4):3, 16(III:8):11 and 24(IV:3):6 from the Visions.

64. Snyder, ibid., 46 cites the following passages from the Visions: 1(I:1):8, 3(I:3):1, 6(II:2):2, 7(II:3):1, 18(III:10):9.
b. Traditio-historical Issues

Although the above analysis seems straightforward enough, there are matters pertaining to the nature and history of this pattern which are not yet clear. Is it possible, on the one hand, to interpret the apparent stability of the pattern, despite several variables, as evidence of its formal character? Or, on the other hand, when examined in larger contexts, may its persistence be seen in another light? This uncertainty caused us to avoid the term "form", preferring instead more tentative expressions such as "pattern", "structure" or "phenomenon."

So far as time is concerned, the pattern has appeared over a period of nearly 700 years in didactic or revelatory contexts, where the modes of teaching/revelation included parable, vision, and discourse. Although in each instance, as we saw above, the audience was in some way specially qualified to receive the teaching, it varied from the largest group, Israel (Ezekiel) and the church (Hermas), to a select group, Jesus' disciples (Mark and John); to individuals, Nicodemus and Zechariah.

Now the consistency of the pattern in the midst of these variations might be regarded as proof of its formal character. However, this stability must be viewed with care and in context. There is some indication that the strength, and even presence, of the response to ignorance may be determined by the moral character of the recipient. 4 Ezra is instructive here. While it is true that the seer lacks understanding (4:2, 10f; 5:39)\(^65\) and confesses his sinfulness (4:12), these are overshadowed by the worthiness which

\(^{65.}\) Ibid., 8.
he later attains because of his humility (8:49f). In fact, it is his righteousness and deep concern for the plight of Israel which merit his receiving the interpretation of the vision (iv) of the disconsolate woman (10:39, 57). Instead of criticizing Ezra for his ignorance, the angelic revealer attempts to encourage and console him in the face of his bewilderment and terror (10:25c-28, 30-37). Consequently, in the only instance of the pattern in 4 Ezra, component (3) is modified accordingly:

4 Ezra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Teaching</td>
<td>Vision (iv): The Disconsolate Woman 9:38-10:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Incomprehension</td>
<td>&quot;intellectus meus alienatus erat&quot; v.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;quoniam vidi, quae non sciebam, et audio quae non scio&quot;) v.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Response</td>
<td>&quot;utquid conturbatum est intellectum tuum...?&quot; v.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Explanation</td>
<td>Vision Explained 10:40-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the reason why element (3) of this pattern is apparently absent in 1 Enoch is that criticism of moral culpability would be unthinkable of one whose righteousness merited his translation to heaven (70:1-4) and of one who himself was

67. The text is that edited by Bruno Violet, Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra). (1910), 302, 304.
named the Son of Man (71:14).

As a further precaution against positing formality too hastily, this pattern should be examined in relation to its use in each of the works cited. Clearly, the suspected "form" is not employed slavishly. As we saw earlier, in Ezekiel, only once does the critical retort (3) appear, whereas several instances of parable (1), incomprehension (2), and explanation (4) occur. The same is true in Zechariah, where the full, four-part pattern appears twice, and this in regard to the same vision (ch. 4). In three other visions, only components (1), (2), and (4) are found. An examination of the Fourth Gospel and Hermas shows the same phenomenon to be true. Even in Mark, where the pattern occurs twice (4:1-20 and 7:14-23) or possibly three times (8:14-21), there are three other instances of teaching misunderstood by the disciples where element (3) is absent: 9:14-21 (the possessed boy), 10:1-12 (the question of remarriage after divorce), 13:1-4ff (the apocalyptic discourse). Seen in this contextual frame of reference, it must be admitted that the "form" is not employed slavishly, even though opportunities existed for its employment. Incomprehension is not always followed by critical retort. This is especially significant in Mark where the disciples are spared little by way of criticism from Jesus.

With so little firm data to go on, it is extremely precarious to be dogmatic about the origin and history of our pattern, if, indeed, it had a history. Thus far, the earliest example of this framework appears in Ezekiel's own account of his frustrating ministry among a people who repeatedly misconstrued and misunderstood the point of his symbolic and parabolic teaching. The interchange between Ezekiel and Israel-
in-exile describe in the book emerges out of the prophet's historical experience.

But what of the subsequent appearances of the pattern? On the one hand, it may be that all of the later instances are directly or indirectly dependent on this account. Or, on the other hand, all of these passages, including the one in Ezekiel, may reflect a kind of interchange between teacher and pupil which was so common to pedagogical experience that it became formalized and applied in relating teaching whose import was not readily perceived.

What, then, is the origin of the pattern in Mark 4:1-20 and 7:14-23? Did the Evangelist himself apply it to these traditions? If it is true, as some scholars argue, that Mark used a source which contained vv. 3-8, 10, 13-20, then the pattern would have come to him in the tradition. Whatever, the traditio-historical itinerary, is it possible that the interchange between teacher and student reflects, in a stereotyped way, the historical experience of Jesus (as it did in the case of Ezekiel)? Perhaps further research will enable us to determine where the probability lies.

68. Maintained, for example, by J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (1963), 14, n. 11. Willi Marxsen, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus", ZTK 52 (Jan. 1955), 258-63, reprinted in Der Exeget als Theologe (1968), 16-20. Minette de Tillesse, op. cit., 155. A. Ambrozic, op. cit., 50-53. Of course, these scholars differ from each other in their estimates of: where in the pre-Markan history of tradition this source took shape; how much additional tradition it contained; how much the Evangelist retouched, added, and created. Despite these differences, the source which each scholar has proposed reflects the four-fold pattern which we have been discussing.
A. From Wrede to Conzelmann

1. Wrede's Legacy

To criticize Wrede's position further is perhaps to beat a straw man, for his real legacy to modern scholarship is not the particular explanation which he suggested for the significance of the secret, which no one espouses today, but the more general one that whatever the precise explanation, it is not to be sought in the history of Jesus but in the history of the church. Scholars since Wrede have sought either to refute this tenet or to confirm it further and find a more suitable, specific explanation than Wrede offered.

2. Post-Wredian Developments

Simply to repeat the kind of analyses which other researchers have made of the alternatives and refinements which have been proposed for the secrecy phenomena since Wrede would be redundant. However, we would add to the analyses already available that in nearly every case, the solutions which scholars have proposed deal with only part of the data or treat evidence, which should be distinguished, as a unified whole.  

---

1. A most helpful, recent analysis is by W. C. Robinson, Jr., "The Quest for Wrede's Secret Messiah", 10-30.
2. Kümmel, Introduction, 66f, is still very useful. It has been reported that B. G. Powley is producing a detailed historical survey of the discussion.
3. A rare exception is C. F. D. Moule in "Defining the Secret".
Those who place the locus of the messianic secret's meaning in the history of Jesus as evidence of his desire to avoid or transform nationalistic Jewish messianism and those who place the locus of the secret's meaning in the church as an attempt to explain why Jesus was rejected by his people and condemned to die as a criminal also fail to see in Mark more of a messianic reserve than a secret and do not account for the prominent Son of God secret. Furthermore, both groups of scholars who see the secret as an expression of the nature of divine revelation and the necessary human response, though differing on the Sitz im Leben of that theology, share the same tendency to equate the mystery of the Kingdom of God which is to persist until the parousia and the christological (i.e., Son of God) secret which may be divulged at the resurrection. Finally, advocates of a Son of Man secret, be they proponents of its historicity or of its locus in the church's christology, do not recognize that there is no Son of Man secret in Mark.

There is yet another criticism which could be leveled consistently at the protagonists in the messianic secret debate. Without fail, there is a common tendency to resort prematurely either to the history of Jesus or to the history of the church for explanations of the data before the analysis is complete. Wrede had at least attempted the ideal in stressing that all criticism should be based upon an examination of the text itself (5f). Although he deplored those who prematurely left the "terrain of the evangelists" to write their biographies of Jesus (ibid.), Wrede himself abandoned the text of Mark to find...the historical context in

4. See ch. I for the survey of scholars and their views and the observations in ch. IV.
5. Sjöberg, Verborgene Menschensohn, 105, in order to sustain his position, is forced to regard 2:10, 28 as "accidental slips" (zufällige Entgleisungen) by the Evangelist.
which the idea of the secret arose" (209), i.e., in the history of the church's beliefs. The temptation to do so was probably very strong, for Wrede engaged in a continuous, anti-supernatural and anti-historical polemic with the biographers of Jesus. W. C. Robinson, Jr. is quite correct in observing that Throughout Wrede argued against the view that the Messiah secret had been a part of the actual history of Jesus, and he seemed unaware that such argument is not the same as a pursuit of Mark's intention.

3. Radical Wredianism

a. Thesis

One thing common to all of the interpretations of the secret thus far, both historical and theological, is the supposition that the secrecy phenomena belong to the fabric of the narrative. Whatever the purpose of the secret, the Evangelist used it to address a need in his community by telling a story about Jesus' past. But those who hold the understanding of the motif which we may call the "kerygmatic" deny this premise. The secret is not a theme integral to the narrative but an hermeneutical device whereby the Evangelist sought to bring the unparadoxical christology of certain miracle traditions, which portrayed Jesus as a thaumaturgic divine man, into conformity with the paradoxical christology of his kerygma. Therefore,

6. See the entire discussion through p. 236.
7. E.g., "Mark actually has a large share of unhistorical narratives in his Gospel. No critical theologian believes his report on the baptism of Jesus, the raising of Jairus' daughter, the miraculous feedings, the walking of Jesus on the water, the transfiguration, or the conversation with the women at the tomb, in the sense in which he records them" (10). This judgment is made against the exorcisms (49), miracles in general (50), and Jesus' teaching in parables (62).
the secrecy phenomena are not integral to the story of Jesus' past. Instead, they enable the Evangelist to address his readers directly in narrative which mimetically reflects the circumstances, issues, and their protagonists in Mark's church. The disciples are made to advocate the false understanding which the Evangelist is trying to combat; Jesus is made to advocate Mark's point of view.\textsuperscript{9} In the words of Hans Conzelmann, the secrecy motif is "...the hermeneutical presupposition of the genre, 'gospel'.\textsuperscript{10}

This is Wrede's theory in its most radical form. With Wrede, Conzelmann and others affirm that the Sitz im Leben of the secret is within the church rather than within the life of Jesus, but they deny that it has anything to do with the past. Rather, the secrecy phenomena are meant to function in the reader's present.

Since this position is held by many prominent scholars and since it is gaining new adherents, it is important to understand the complex of issues which undergird it. Only then will it be possible to attempt an evaluation.

1) Ideological Foundations

Basic to this thesis is the application of the "Kerygma-theologie" expounded by Martin Kähler both to form-critical analysis of the synoptic tradition and to redaction-critical analysis of the gospels. Kähler, the ideological mentor of

\textsuperscript{9} For a succinct statement of this position by one of its most passionate advocates, see Perrin, \textit{Redaction Criticism}, 41f.

\textsuperscript{10} See n. 23.
this group, expounded a cardinal tenet of *Kerygmatheologie*
which stresses what might be termed the "pregnant individuality"
of the traditions by and about Jesus which the church preserved:

In jedem Tropfen der betaunten Wiese spiegelt sich wider-
strahlend der Sonne Licht; so tritt uns in jeder kleinen
Geschichte die volle Person unsers Herrn entgegen.¹¹

Kähler's dictum that each tradition, even the smallest, re-

flects the entire person of Christ penetrated much of German
scholarship. Günther Bornkamm, a distinguished pupil of Rudolf
Bultmann, and himself one of the pioneer redaction critics,
maintains, regarding the pericopeal and anecdotal nature of the
traditions about Jesus, "These story scenes give his story not
only when pieced together, but each one in itself contains the
person and history of Jesus in their entirety."¹²

Furthermore, the same applies to the transmission of Je-
sus' sayings:

Here again each word stands by itself, exhaustive in
itself, not dependent on context for its meaning or
requiring a commentary on it from some other word.¹³

Allied with the intense emphasis upon the pregnancy and in-
dividualism of the traditions is the theory of their "kerygmatic"
use. Once again, Bornkamm is its most articulate spokesman.

The tradition is not really the repetition and transmission
of the word he [Jesus] spoke once upon a time, but rather
is his word today. From this standpoint alone can we grasp
the different rendering of his word in the tradition.

In the relating of past history they proclaim who he is,
not who he was.¹⁴

2) Traditio-historical Application

It was Hans Conzelmann who first applied these principles
rigorously to

¹¹. Martin Kähler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und
der geschichtliche, biblische Christus, (1896-), 60f.
Nazareth, 1959-), 25.
¹³. Ibid.
¹⁴. Ibid.
the Gospel of Mark in 1957. The solutions to the secret which had been proposed by Wrede, Bultmann and, in principle, all of the representative positions mentioned earlier, were rejected as "historical constructions". Mark did not employ the secret as a literary theme for the purpose of overcoming the discrepancy between originally non-messianic traditions about Jesus and the church's belief in him as Messiah. The phenomena are not meant to explain that Jesus knew himself to be the Christ but kept the fact secret from all but a few trusted followers.

Against such solutions, Conzelmann maintained that "...it is not the non-messianic character of the units in the tradition which causes the evangelist trouble [Mühe], but rather their messianic character." Mark's solution lay "...in his putting together a mass of material already understood christologically in such a way as to conform to the kerygma (understood in the sense of secrecy christology)."

Two years later, Conzelmann indicated more precisely what he meant by "secrecy christology" of the kerygma and specified how the Evangelist went about making his troublesome "messianic" tradition conform to it.

Sie [the secrecy theory] dient vielmehr der positiven Darstellung eines in Sinn des Paradoxes konzipierten Offenbarungsgedankens. Es ist bezeichnend, das sich Markus (der wohl der Schöpfer

16. This is the expression used by Conzelmann in a later discussion of the same issue. See his An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, (ET 1969 of Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments, 1968), 139. Hereafter this work will be cited as Outline.
17. Ibid., 42f (293f).
18. Ibid., 42.
der Theorie ist) mit ihrer Durchführung an denjenigen Stellen am meisten Mühe geben muss, wo der Überlieferungsstoff (schon im Vomarkinischen Stadium) am stärksten 'messianisch' durchformt war, z.B. im Zusammenhang der Verklärung (Mk 9,9).

This, of course, is where Jesus enjoins the inner circle of disciples, who had seen him transfigured and presented by God himself as his Son (9:7), not to recount (διαψευδώντος) what they had seen until the Son of Man had arisen from the dead. Subsequently, Conzelmann proposed that other examples of Mark's response to christological trouble spots could be found at Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah (8:30) and at the demons' acclamations of Jesus as the Son of God (1:24, 34; 3:12).

Thus, the secrecy christology of the kerygma refers to its paradoxical portrayal of Jesus. The problem with the traditions is that their christology lacks this paradox. By joining the injunctions of the messianic secret to the most blantly unambiguous assertions about Jesus, Mark brought them in line with the character of his kerygma. Furthermore, the Evangelist employed the secrecy phenomena for a larger purpose. He structured his gospel into two divisions which centered around Galilee, the place of Jesus' "concealed epiphany" and around Jerusalem, the place of his "public passion". In so doing

Mark presents no psychological development of the personality of Jesus and no biographical association of events, but depicts the twofold way in which the revelation is presented to the world, first by means of the proclamation. This is directed towards a public. But its meaning, i.e. its truth, remains concealed to some extent even after Easter. For even after Easter, the Exalted One is visible only in such a way that he is also recognized at the same time as the Earthly One and that means as the Crucified One. 22

20. Conzelmann, Outline, 139.
21. Ibid., 138.
22. Ibid., 143.
With this filled-out picture of Conzelmann's views we may attempt to interpret his famous dictum that "The secrecy theory is the hermeneutical presupposition of the genre, 'gospel'." The principle issues being addressed here have to do with the nature of the kerygma, the nature of the pre-Markan tradition, and the relationship which the Evangelist sought to forge between them. If it is not overly simplistic, we may say that Mark used the messianic secret to relate kerygma and tradition in such a way that the resultant literary genre, Gospel, had the same paradoxical nature as the proclaimed gospel.

Willi Marxsen shares Conzelmann's basic stance but holds that christology became problematical when individual traditions, formerly kept kerygmatic (i.e. paradoxical) by the kerygma, were compiled. With the aid of the secrecy phenomena

...Mark seeks to remove the difficulty that arises immediately one places along side each other the kerygmatic units that have been handed down separately and so inevitably sets them out as a historical sequence. This would produce a history of Jesus which gave an account of a permanent, historically verifiable manifestation of his Messianic nature, but this is not what the evangelist wants. His work would then no longer have been a kerygma, but the account of a quite open and manifest revelation. In order that his work as a whole should remain what the separate traditions already were (i.e. kerygma) Mark makes use of his theory. In this way he prevents his work from becoming a historically verifiable sequence of epiphanies; instead we have secret epiphanies which now become manifest as they are proclaimed. Dibelius therefore described MK, very aptly as the book of secret epiphanies. The fact that Mark himself is engaged in post-Easter proclamation in no way takes away from these epiphanies their secret character (N.B. ix.9).

Besides the danger to the kerygma posed by verification, is the threat

of salvation's becoming an event of the past. The compilation of tradition implies an interval of time between the reader and the content of the tradition.

As a result of giving an account in sequence which is inevitable when the material is linked, the past appears as a succession of events. The result of this interval—and of this succession—is that the kerygma as it was expressed in the earlier units of tradition, which was meant to be a direct proclamation, succumbs to a process of 'historicising'. Salvation comes to be presented as something belonging to the past.25

3) Religio-historical Refinements

Later writers who shared this same view of the nature of kerygma and its relation to tradition in general and of Conzelmann's analysis of their relation in Mark in particular, sought to make more precise the kind of tradition it was and to specify its christology, the nature of Mark's kerygma, and the circumstances in which the Evangelist wrote. The answers which they provided did not emerge so much from the text of the Gospel as from phenomena in the history of pagan and Jewish religion in late antiquity and from the history of Christianity itself prior to the time Mark wrote. In other words, literary phenomena, interpreted first by Conzelmann in traditio-historical terms, were subsequently given more precision by religio-historical ones.26

Now, it had long been held that the miracle tradition in Mark and the other gospels bore the same form and function as collections of miracle stories which circulated throughout the ancient, pagan world: as proofs

25. Ibid., 144.
26. Gütgemanns, Offene Fragen, 230 notes that in this step one has gone beyond the bounds of form criticism.
of the divinity or special relationship to the divine, enjoyed by the subjects of these stories, who were called Θείοι ἄνθρωποι or divine men.  

But only recently was it proposed by Dieter Georgi, in his Heidelberg dissertation (1958), that Paul's opponents in 2 Cor. were hellenistic Jewish Christians who had cast Jesus in the mold of a great Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος. Furthermore, these "super-apostles" claimed that the miraculous power which Jesus had exercised on earth was now working in them, as attested by on-the-spot demonstrations of and reports of their thaumaturgic ability. Denied, or at least neglected, were Jesus' ignominious suffering and death as in any way constitutive for christology or discipleship. In his rebuttal, Paul, refusing to argue on their terms, rejected this *theologia gloriae* with a *theologia crucis* by stressing the very aspect of Jesus' career which they had ignored—that of a Jesus crucified in weakness—and by offering his own experience of suffering as the authentic index of Christian existence.  

Georgi further suggested that the Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος understanding of Jesus was actually reflected in Mark and Luke, especially in their use of the miracle traditions. But a number of scholars have argued that Mark's redaction of this tradition actually mirrors Paul's attack on the purveyors of the divine man view of Jesus. This is what the secrecy phenomena allegedly signify. In the exorcisms accounts, Mark makes Jesus silence the demons who address him as the Son of God (supposedly a divine man title). He shows Jesus commanding those whom he had cured not

---

29. Ibid. 213-16.  
30. E. g. Helmut Koester and James M. Robinson, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (1971), 48f, 187-93, 216ff. So far as I am able to determine, it was J. Schreiber who first proposed that Mark criticized miracle traditions impregnated with a Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος christology by means of the *theologia crucis*. See "Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums", *ZThK*
to make him known. When his disciples confess him to be the Christ and when they hear him presented by God himself as his son, they are commanded, on the one hand, not to make him known and, on the other hand, are instructed about the need for the Son of Man to suffer. Finally, the account of Jesus' mighty works is placed under the aegis of the Passion Narrative, thereby making the entire Gospel be dominated by a theologia crucis.

The Sitz im Leben of Mark is thus said to be very near to that of Paul in 2 Corinthians. The Evangelist faced the same threat in his church which Paul had in Corinth twenty years or so before. Moreover, his response to it was fundamentally the same, the only difference being the format he adopted: Mark by the use of narrative, chose an indirect approach, whereas Paul had mounted a direct, frontal attack.

b. Evaluation

1). Nature of the Secret

a) In the Injunctions

A number of approaches could be taken in evaluating this influential position. We could point to the researches of several scholars who have raised fundamental objections about the extent and character of the Θεός ὄνημ concept in Jewish and pagan thought contemporary with Mark. 31

58 (1961), 158f. Schreiber gives Conzelmann, "Present and Future", p. 294 credit for this view, but Conzelmann nowhere uses the term or idea of the Θεός ὄνημ in this article. So, apparently Schreiber is unknowingly the originator.

31. Some of the more weighty protests have been made by W. von Martitz, "Ψιτέ", TDNT, 8(1972), 338ff, E. Schweizer, in the same article, 376f, H. C. Kee, "Aretology and a Gospel", JBL 92.3 (Sept. 73), 402-22, David L. Tiede, The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker (1972), and most recently by my friend, Carl R. Holladay in his Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation (1974),
From another perspective we could argue against the view of the relationship between kerygma and tradition in the pre-Markan period proposed by the advocates of kerygmatheologie. However, it might then be argued that the hypothesis advocated above was still true so far as Mark himself was concerned. Consequently, the real test is if certain crucial phenomena in the Gospel can sustain the hypothesis. We are convinced that they cannot.

The place to begin is with the nature of the messianic secret theme. Here, as perhaps nowhere else, one's explanation of the secret determines his view of the Gospel. Is it fundamentally a hermeneutical device, as Conzelmann and others hold, which serves to address the reader out of the narrative, or is it a literary theme having a function within the narrative?

Our first objection to Conzelmann's position is that it fails to take into consideration Mark's christological precision in general and his restricting of the secrecy phenomena almost exclusively to the Son of God christology in particular. Conzelmann is being too general in referring simply to the "christological" or "messianic" problem facing the Evangelist and in describing the function of the secret in these general terms.

A more serious strain on Conzelmann's thesis occurs at the point where he alleges the secret's hermeneutical function is most apparent, at 9:9. The privileged disciples are commanded not to tell anyone what they have seen (Jesus transfigured and presented by God as his Son, v. 7) until the Son of Man had arisen from the dead. According to Conzelmann,

"Theios Aner in Hellenistic-Judaism: A Critique of the Use of this Category in New Testament Christology".

32. As Jürgen Roloff has done in Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus (1970), 52-109, 223-36.
the Evangelist is, in effect, saying to his reader that the Exalted Lord cannot be understood except as the earthly Jesus, that is, as the crucified one. Another way of putting it is that Jesus' divinity cannot be understood adequately apart from his suffering.

However, this interpretation completely neglects the fact that this, the last of the injunctions, is temporally determined. On Conzelmann's showing, it must always remain in force. But, as Georg Strecker has insisted, the secret ends at the resurrection. That which was once inappropriate to divulge before this event will be appropriate afterwards. The injunction does not therefore serve to invest the super-christological tradition with the paradoxical character of the proclamation but specifies the point at which the proclamation, heretofore restricted, may begin.

Consequently, there is no way for the reader to obey Jesus' command to the inner circle of disciples. So far as the narrative is concerned, the resurrection is still future; but for the reader, the event which was to have marked the terminus for the injunction is past. For Conzelmann's interpretation to hold, this injunction should not have been temporally limited. Since it is, one cannot maintain that it functions in the time of the reader.

This conclusion does not go down well in the present climate of redaction-critical research, which has sought to reduce the distance between the time of Jesus and the time of the church for which Mark wrote. Against this trend, Aloysius Ambrozic has offered some valuable correctives. Yet, he himself wonders how so prominent a feature of the Gospel as the messianic secret should play as limited a "kerygmatic role" as the type of

33. See Ambrozic's expression of this view on p. 151.
34. Strecker, "Messiasgeheimnistheorie", 103f.
35. Ambrozic, Hidden Kingdom, 8-13.
interpretation suggested by Strecker allows. "If the messianic secret has lost all meaning with the resurrection of Jesus, why does Mark stress it so much?" With this question in mind, Ambrozic addresses himself to the temporal limitation of 9:9:

Read...with contemporaneity in mind, the 'before' may be transcategorized into a 'without.' Mark is thus telling us that we must not proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ without proclaiming his death on the Cross as the supreme manifestation of his sonship. The similarity to Conzelmann's view above is obvious. But also obvious is what it takes to maintain it in Ambrozic's "transcategorization" of \( \mathcal{E} \mathfrak{w} \) \( \mathfrak{v} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{v} \). Exegetical controls are dissolved and words are made to support whatever the exegete thinks they ought to say.

If this injunction should be explained from the level of the narrative, i.e. from within the ebb and flow of plot and between the inter-action of the dramatis personae, as we have argued, so should the others. Otherwise their emphasis is moralistic and primarily anthropocentric. It becomes concerned too much with the history of the reader and his understanding rather than with the events alleged to have comprised the history of Jesus. This is not to deny that Mark intended to influence the reader's history, but it is to be questioned whether he wished to do so at these points (of the messianic secret) and in such a way as to

36. Ibid., 28f. 37. Ibid., 31. 38. Ibid. 39. The injunctions in the accounts of exorcisms themselves should be seen in connection with Mark's summary statements of Jesus past exorcistic activity (n.b. the imperfect tenses, 1:34, 3:11). A similar observation might be made regarding 4:11f, which Marxsen sees as a direct address to the readers of the Gospel. In 4:33f, however, Mark reports how Jesus used to speak (imperfect tense again) the word to the masses with many such parables (of the Kingdom), but he used to explain everything to his disciples. See Marxsen's "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenanten Parabeltheorie des Markus", ZThK, 52 (1955), 266f.
dissolve his narrative. Much more serious consideration should be given to the possibility that recounting the past history of Jesus may be precisely the need which Mark's community felt most acutely. In such a situation, both the secret and the narrative as a whole would have significant, kerygmatic import.

b) In the Gospel Setting

This past-orientation of the secrecy motif corresponds to the past-orientation of the Gospel as a whole, a fact which may seem obvious enough but needs to be argued formally in response to the influential point of view which is being analyzed.

Parenthetically, it may be noted that these assertions are not demanded by a form-critical analysis of the gospel tradition. Jürgen Roloff has argued convincingly that even in the pre-Markan period, there was a conscious retrospection to Jesus' past in the individual narratives, as illustrated by the Sabbath conflicts, the pericope on fasting, and the cleansing of the Temple. And, significantly, Conzelmann himself allows this in the essay which launched the kerygmatic understanding of the secret. Furthermore, the instances in the NT in which Jesus traditions are most clearly employed, apart from the gospels, contradict the claims of Kähler and Bornkamm that each tradition "...contains the person and history of Jesus in their entirety" and is able to stand alone, independent of context and commentary. One need only refer to Paul's use of dominical logia in I Cor. 7:10 and 9:14 in order to observe that

40. Roloff, loc. cit.
they depend very much on their context for meaning and on Paul's own commentary. And where is the entire person and history of Jesus? his deeds, death and resurrection?

The data of the Gospel of Mark itself, the most important evidence, militate against the "kerygmatic" understanding of the tradition and its hermeneutical function. A most illustrative section is chapter 13, where several "levels of address" are found. They range from the most direct and explicit address to the reader to the most general of exhortations. Of course, the former type occurs at v. 14b, \(\delta\ \kappa\nu\gamma\iota\nu\iota\upsilon\omega\sigma\kappa\omega\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\varepsilon\iota\nu\). Although the chapter begins with Jesus communicating information about the end of the age to an inner circle of four disciples (v. 3), it ends with a most universal utterance, \(\delta\ \varepsilon\ \delta'\mu\nu\ \lambda\dot{e}\gamma\omega\), \(\pi\alpha\iota\tau\iota\nu\ \lambda\dot{e}\gamma\omega\), \(\gamma\rho\eta\mu\rho\alpha\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\) (v. 37). It is not elitest or esoteric information.

Now, this may appear to justify Bornkamm's assertion that it is the risen Lord who addresses his church directly through the traditions and the Gospel. But it must be noted that, according to v. 11, the heavenly address is to be given by the Holy Spirit when believers find themselves arraigned before magistrates and rulers in times of persecution. Most important, however, is the statement that preparedness for the advent of false Christs depends upon Jesus' advanced word: \(\delta'\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \varepsilon\ \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\cdot\ \pi\rho\alpha\-\varepsilon\iota\rho\gamma\eta\varsigma\ \delta'\mu\nu\ \pi\alpha\tau\iota\nu\) (v. 23). And it is this word of the earthly Jesus which abides forever (v. 31).

Even before arriving at ch. 13, the reader would have experienced varied levels of involvement and response. For example, someone in

42. See the recent study of these logia and their synoptic parallels by D. L. Dungan in The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul (1971).
43. See p. 142. The moral of this story is that traditions are not like drops of dew.
need of physical healing might have uttered with the distressed father in 
9:24b: ἀσθένει αὐτοῦ, δοκεῖς μοι ἐμχρίστω. Furthermore, many readers 
would have empathized with the disciples’ wavering loyalty to and under-
standing of Jesus. Others, sympathetic and perhaps on the verge of 
becoming Christians would have felt particularly challenged by Jesus’ 
invitation to discipleship in 8:34ff and the moving description of one 
who rejected the invitation (10:17-22). But there is no way that a 
Gentile reader in Mark’s day could have obeyed Jesus’ command to the 
leper not to tell anyone of his cure but to get it certified by a priest 
(1:44). 

Not only is a distinction to be made in the relationship between 
the earthly Jesus, the exalted Lord, and the reader of the Gospel on what 
may be termed the level of address, but there are also significant differences 
in the content of the gospel which Jesus preached and that which Mark 
preached and the notion of faith in the stories which he relates and the 
larger concept which he holds. First, Jesus preached τὸ ἑλπίδιον 
τοῦ Θεοῦ (1:14). Mark’s gospel is τὸ ἑλπίδιον Χριστοῦ Χαίρῃ (Ἰὲν ὁ 
Θεὸς) (1:1). Second, Mark is extremely reserved about intruding his concept 
of faith in Christ into the narrative. Of the five instances of πίστις, 
it is qualified only once; and here it is πίστις τοῦ Ὁ ἐξεῖλθε (11:22). Of 
the ten instances of πίστεις, only three have an object: in 1:15,

44. This, like most all of Jesus’ public preaching and teaching about 
the Kingdom, is theological rather than explicitly christological. 
Kelber, The Kingdom in Mark, fails to make this distinction in his claim 
that Mark attempts to convince his readers that Jesus preached the same 
Gospel as they believe and proclaim (2f, 11 n. 36). But there was a 
distinct difference between the kerygma of Jesus and the kerygma of the 
church. Although Jesus announced that the Kingdom of God 
had drawn near, God’s decisive act still lay in the future, 
albeit near future. The church’s preaching was theological 
and christological, concerning what God had done in raising 
Jesus from the dead. Cf. the kerygmatic statements in 1Cor. 
15:2ff and Rom. 10:9f.
it is ἐν τῷ ἐυαγγελίῳ[τοῦ Θεοῦ, v. 14]; in 11:31, it is John the Baptist (ἀμνό), where the implication is his message. Only at 9:42 is there a reference to faith or trust in Jesus that approximates the Christian sense. Even if εἰς ἡμέρα should be omitted from the text, and this is by no means certain, πίστευεῖν in this context would mean more than faith in Jesus or God to heal, as most of the other instances imply. There is not the slightest reference here to healing; the "little ones" are either children or sincere but immature believers. Of course, it is true that Mark and his readers embrace the notion of faith in Jesus' or God's power to heal, but it does not constitute their primary definition and fits more into the narrative of how people in need "once" appealed to Jesus for help. Like εὐαγγέλιον in 1:14, πίστις and πίστευεῖν appear at points where a distinction is maintained between the past of Jesus and his current status as the exalted Lord. 46

Therefore, Bornkamm, Marxsen, and others pose false alternatives when they claim that the early Christians, in their use of individual traditions and Mark in the writing of his gospel, were not concerned to tell about who Jesus was but about who he is. 47 Putting matters this way confuses the distinction between Jesus' identity and his role, or status. The identity of the Jesus who was and the Lord who is risen remains

45. The attestation of three different text types, the Alexandrian; Western; and Caesarean, should caution one against rejecting this reading too quickly as an attempt by a scribe to assimilate it to Mt. 18:6.
46. Instances of different levels of address and response could be multiplied. The conditional relative, clause ("whoever wishes...") or "does...") makes Jesus' appeal universal. Yet, only the original readers knew who Alexander and Rufus, sons of Simon the Cyrene who carried Jesus' cross, were (15:21). Only Gentiles would need to have Jewish customs explained (7:3f), etc. See pp. 163f.
47. See p.142 and Marxsen, Introduction, 143.
constant. Therein lies the continuity. But, as the word "risen" itself implies, there was a time when Jesus was not yet risen and exalted, that is, his status or role underwent a change. Herein lies the discontinuity. As we shall attempt to demonstrate below, Mark is concerned to show how Jesus, the divine Son of God, came to be the object of the church's gospel.

2. The Secret's Purpose

Already, in discussing the nature of the secret as understood by the kerygmatic interpreters, we were confronted with the secret's purpose: to conform the super-christological miracle traditions to the paradoxical christology of the kerygma. It is almost impossible to determine the validity of this thesis solely from the Gospel. An hypothetical dialogue between proponent and

48. It is lost entirely in this paradoxical formulation of the message of Mark's gospel which Marxsen offers: "the Risen Lord (the glorified One, the Son of Man, the Son of God) goes to his Cross. This makes it quite clear that the story is not meant to be read as the account of an historical sequence of events" [1]. This is Marxsen's formulation of the kerygma of the Passion Narrative which he says is identical to that of the Gospel (cf. Introduction, 132 and 137).

and inquirer will illustrate how almost any point of criticism could be turned aside.

CON: Sometimes Mark does not command a demon to be silent and most of his miracles are public.

PRO: Well, we can't expect him to have been entirely consistent. Anyway, there is the Passion Narrative which qualifies any miracle which Mark might have missed.

CON: But there is such an emphasis on the humanity of Jesus. His family thought he was mad at one point (3:21), and his compatriots were scandalized by him, even though they had heard his teaching and observed his mighty deeds. His power seemed to be attenuated by their unbelief (6:1-6).

PRO: This is a good example of Mark's attacking the Θεός ζωή idea in another way. In fact, one of the ways in which the Evangelist attenuated two miracle catenae was by dismembering them and relocating the pericopae among the sort of traditions which you mention. 50

CON: Some scholars believe that they can discern a Θεός ζωή emphasis in the Passion Narrative. 51 Would this not undermine the point that unqualified miracle traditions were qualified by the Passion Narrative?

50. Paul Achtemeier, "The Origin and Function of the Pre-Marcan Miracle Catenae", JBL, 91.2 (June 1972), 218.
51. Schreiber, Theologie, 41-49 (see n.49 above).
PRO: Not necessarily, because it is possible to see an anti-θεός ἀνήρ passion narrative resisting the θεός ἀνήρ passion narrative. 52

Now, it will not do to ridicule or dismiss such reasoning without formal argument. The problem is to know where to begin. Perhaps one way of doing it is to pay more attention to the contexts in which the traditions in question appear. Where the injunctions occur most consistently, i.e., with the exorcisms, the christology cannot be that of the divine man because it is intimately related to the theology of the Kingdom. As we saw in ch.III, Jesus' manifestation as the divine Son of God corresponds to the nature of the Kingdom which is supernatural and is at war with Satan's kingdom. 53

However, as we observed, this fact is not generally perceived. The scribes have anything but a divine man notion of Jesus (3:22).

Lest this be construed as itself an anti-θεός ἀνήρ tactic of Mark's, it should be noticed that Jesus' reply could be construed as itself leaning in that direction, for he relates the parable of the one who is stronger than Satan himself (v. 27). The same may be said of 2:1-12. Some of the scribes accuse Jesus of blasphemy, 2:6f, an anti-θεός ἀνήρ

52. Weeden, Traditions in Conflict, 165f, takes this position. In ch. 15, vv: 25,26, 29a, 32c, 33, 34a, 37, 38 portray Jesus' death as a triumph of the divine man over his enemies. Mark countered this view by blending it with a primitive Palestinian tradition consisting of 15:20b-22, 24, 27 and his own redactional creations (15:23, 29b, 30-32b-36, 39-41).

53. Leander Keck, "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology", JBL, 84(1965), sees two cycles of miracle stories in the first half of the Gospel. One, "the strong man" cycle, belongs to the Kingdom theology; the other contains θεός ἀνήρ features. H. C. Kee also notes the presence of the Kingdom emphasis but minimizes the extent of the divine man influence. See his essay, "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories", NTS, 14.2 (Jan. 1968), 245.
interpretation to be sure; but Jesus clarifies the issue christologically and justifies it with a miracle (v. 10). His authority to forgive sins as the Son of Man would have gone unrecognized apart from the cure. This probably could not be claimed as a Markan slip since it may belong to the kingdom theology of this section (see pp. 80ff.)

In some instances where the miracle or exorcism remains unqualified, it is possible to discern a point other than the miraculous power which Jesus possesses. For example, the cure of a man having a withered arm (3:1-6) is set within a context where the issue is: what is lawful to do on the sabbath? (cf. 2:24 and 3:2). The healing is an example of the good which one may do (v. 4). Likewise, the exorcising of the Syro-phoenician woman's daughter (7:24-30) only comes about after a dialogue on Jewish-Gentile relations. The point is not so much that Jesus had the power to heal as it is that she had said the right thing (v. 29).

Furthermore, although we would not endorse Austin Farrer's elaborate theory of symbolic numbers and patterns, he notes a movement which runs counter to that which a θεῖος ζυζόρ interpretation requires. Farrer observes that there are two sets of healing miracles, the first of which is to be kept secret while the other (not vice versa) is deliberately done in public: the unclean leper is silenced (1:44), but the unclean woman is exposed by Jesus (5:30ff). Similarly, the deaf stammerer is isolated (7:33), whereas the boy possessed by a deaf mute demon is deliberately cured in public (9:25-27). 54

Of course, the best kind of argument is the positive one, one which attempts to offer a more satisfying explanation of the phenomena than any of its rivals. This is now the task at hand.

54. Farrer, St. Mark, 224.
B. Some New Proposals

1. The Divine Son-of-God Secret

a. Disclaimers

It should be recalled that nowhere does Mark explain the meaning of the secrecy phenomena. The summary statement in 1:34 is only a partial explanation: Jesus silenced the demons because they knew him (to be the Son of God). But no reason is given as to why this knowledge needed to be suppressed. Consequently, the interpretation offered here shares the hypothetical, inferential nature of all the explanations which have been given for these phenomena heretofore. We therefore proceed with the utmost tentativeness and reserve.

b. Purpose

Already we have suggested that the secrecy phenomena, like other major themes in the Gospel, belong to the past story of Jesus. Now the question is, to what aspect of that past do they pertain? What purpose do they serve in the story? Two things are clear. They do not mean that Jesus did not become the Son of God until the resurrection. This notion is controverted both by demonic and divine testimony. Nor is the point that Jesus' divine sonship could not have been perceived until then. Otherwise, why were the demons consistently enjoined to keep silent about it? Why make it a special point of revelation to the disciples and then suppress it? Furthermore, if the centurion's christology at 15:39 is to be taken in its full, Markan sense, then here is an instance of a non-disci-
people's perceiving Jesus' true identity before the resurrection.

A possible answer may be forthcoming if we recall that "the Son of God", which Jesus consistently suppresses, and "the Son of Man", which he uses exclusively to describe his own vocation and never suppresses, pertain to different aspects of his sonship. As we observed in ch. II, the former refers to Jesus' status as the divine Son of God and the prerogatives of that relationship (e.g., the authority to wage war against Satan's kingdom). The latter represents Jesus' vocation of obedience to the primacy of God's Rule.

Interestingly enough, at 9:9, there is the conjunction of these two aspects of Jesus' sonship with the most important component of the secrecy phenomena: in 9:7, Jesus is presented to the three disciples by God as his divine Son whom, on the one hand, they are to obey but, on the other hand, about whom they are not to speak until the Son of Man is raised from the dead. And, we recall, the resurrection is the vindication of that history of obedience which is perfected, having passed the ultimate test of suffering and death. The issue, then, so far as secrecy and christology are concerned, is not one of messiahship nor simply of christology in general. Rather, it has to do with the nature of sonship.

It is perhaps possible to be even more specific by noting that, according to Gullmann, Schweizer, and Hay (see ch. II), to be a son, in the thought of the OT and Judaism, is to be obedient. In other words, sonship involves both status and responsibility. Perhaps the reason that Jesus (according to Mark) consistently suppresses his identity as the divine Son of God until the Son of Man is raised from the dead is because to reveal only his status and its prerogatives gives an incom-
ple's perceiving Jesus' true identity before the resurrection.

A possible answer may be forthcoming if we recall that "the Son of God", which Jesus consistently suppresses, and "the Son of Man", which he uses exclusively to describe his own vocation and never suppresses, pertain to different aspects of his sonship. As we observed in ch. II, the former refers to Jesus' status as the divine Son of God and the prerogatives of that relationship (e.g., the authority to wage war against Satan's kingdom). The latter represents Jesus' vocation of obedience to the primacy of God's Rule.

Interestingly enough, at 9:9, there is the conjunction of these two aspects of Jesus' sonship with the most important component of the secrecy phenomena: in 9:7, Jesus is presented to the three disciples by God as his divine Son whom, on the one hand, they are to obey but, on the other hand, about whom they are not to speak until the Son of Man is raised from the dead. And, we recall, the resurrection is the vindication of that history of obedience which is perfected, having passed the ultimate test of suffering and death. The issue, then, so far as secrecy and christology are concerned, is not one of messiahship nor simply of christology in general. Rather, it has to do with the nature of sonship.

It is perhaps possible to be even more specific by noting that, according to Gullmann, Schweizer, and Hay (see ch. II), to be a son, in the thought of the OT and Judaism, is to be obedient. In other words, sonship involves both status and responsibility. Perhaps the reason that Jesus (according to Mark) consistently suppresses his identity as the divine Son of God until the Son of Man is raised from the dead is because to reveal only his status and its prerogatives gives an incom-
plete or imperfect view of the nature of his sonship. Only when the obligations of sonship are fulfilled, i.e., when Jesus as the Son of Man perfectly obeys, will it be appropriate to reveal the fact of his special relationship to God.\(^5\)

2. The Gospel of Mark

Without denying that the Gospel was meant to address the needs of the reader, we maintained earlier in this chapter that Mark intended to meet those needs with a story about Jesus' past. On the basis of our analysis of the secrecy phenomena, it is now necessary to say more precisely what the nature of that past story was and what purpose it served.

a. Nature

Wrede and Conzelmann both maintained that the connection between the secret and the Gospel was intimate. For Wrede, the historical reliability of the Gospel crumbled after the secrecy phenomena failed to endure the crucible of his radical criticism.

55. Minette de Tillesse, op. cit., 363 also views the secret as part of Jesus' desire to obey the will of God. However, he neither defines it as a Son of God secret, nor does he view the Son of Man as the primary symbol of this obedience. Perrin, "Interpretation", 49 mentions only briefly Jesus' "... refusing to allow Son of God to be applied to him until the conditions are such that it can be used properly". Unfortunately, Perrin does not say what these conditions are. He does affirm that the title must be interpreted by the Son of Man, but never says why.

56. Since we are attempting to see if an answer to this question may be discerned in the text of Mark itself, it is not legitimate to introduce as primary evidence a very similar notion which Flusser and Longenecker (cf. ch. I, n. 10) have discerned in certain circles of Jewish thought contemporary with Jesus: a reluctance, both on the part of the messianic pretend- er and his supporters, to use the term, "Messiah", until the messianic task had been accomplished. Strictly speaking, this phenomenon would be more relevant to the messianic reserve which we discerned in the Gospel. Even here, however, it would have to be determined if Jesus' reserve were strict enough to reflect this belief.
According to Conzelmann, the connection was even more intimate and in a sense more important, for it concerned the very nature of Christian preaching of which Mark's Gospel was an extension.

Our own proposal also takes this relationship seriously, but it runs counter to prevailing interpretations. Rather than dissolve the distinction between the time of Jesus and the time of the church, the secrecy phenomena, as we have analyzed them, help to maintain it. This assertion can be illustrated by comparing the christology of Mark and the christology of Christian preaching. The Son of Man christology is the most important christology in Mark's Gospel in that it interprets the other titles and alone appears associated with the themes of the church's preaching about Jesus: his suffering, death, resurrection, and parousia. Nevertheless, "the Son of Man" is never found in examples of the church's preaching. Yet, "the Son of God", which is so much a part of the church's gospel is consistently suppressed in Mark until the resurrection (the point after which the church's proclamation of Jesus as the Son of God began).

Therefore, we are led to conclude that if it is not appropriate to speak openly of Jesus as the Son of God before the resurrection, but only as the Son of Man, then there is not yet gospel as the church proclaimed it. In other words, that Jesus

57. For examples from Pauline, Lukan, and Johannine literature, see Rom. 1:3, 9, Acts 9:20 (cf. 8:37). Cf. 1 Jn. 4:15; 5:5, 10, 13 for the credo which mirrors the kerygma. Of course, that Jesus is the Messiah, is even a more common theme of Christian proclamation, much more common than in Mark's gospel where, though not consistently suppressed, this title is used with extreme reserve.
is the divine Son of God before the resurrection is true but not yet gospel until he has perfectly obeyed and has been vindicated by the resurrection. Consequently, it seems as though Mark represents, strictly speaking, the prolegomenon or the beginning of the gospel. The Evangelist was concerned to describe the foundation of the church's preaching; i.e., how the gospel began. He recounts how Jesus of Nazareth, the divine Son of God, took upon himself the vocation symbolized by the Son of Man, and, having perfectly obeyed God, became the object of the church’s preaching and worship.

b. Purpose

If these interpretations are correct, then for whom might such a message have been appropriate, i.e., what Sitz im Leben in the church might we posit? There is, of course, no way of achieving any degree of certainty in one's answer. But it might be at least possible that a document about origins or fundamentals might have been appropriate for beginners or, as C. F. D. Moule has suggested, for those who would, in evangelism and apologetic, minister to beginners. Interestingly, if not significantly, both Papias of Hierapolis (the earliest com-

58. Perhaps the Ἄρχης in 1:1 does refer to the entire Gospel. Cranfield, op. cit., 34f lists ten possible ways of relating 1:1 to what follows. Among those who advocate this verse as the title of the entire work are Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament (ET 1953, of Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1900), vol. 2, 456-60. Vincent Taylor, op. cit., 152 concurs, formulating his understanding in terms very similar to ours: "Mark proposes to relate how the good news about Jesus Christ the Son of God began".

59. However profound it might seem to say with Marxsen that Jesus is the gospel (Mark, 13:1-13:28), it is in reality an absurdity when one has regard for the limits which language and grammar impose on usage. Helpful points at which to test this view are 1:1 and 1:15. In order to sustain Marxsen's interpretation, the genitive of Τὸς ἔσχος ἑλέον must be regarded as in apposition to τὸς ἔσχος ἑλέον. While there is justification for the grammar, the sense is nonsense,
mentator on the Gospel, ca. 1140) and Clement of Alexandria (early third century) believed that the Gospel had been written for beginners. Papias, who is not as explicit as Clement, claims, in words all too familiar, that the Gospel is not an orderly or systematic arrangement of the Lord's sayings but is a faithful record of teaching just as it was given by Peter, i.e. as necessity demanded. The contrast here is between the formal, and by implication, more profound, and the ad hoc or circumstantial.

In a recently-published copy of what appears to be a

for the statement then reads, "The beginning of the gospel (that is) Jesus Christ" or "The beginning of Jesus Christ". Furthermore, if the message which Jesus preached (or preaches) and the message which the church preaches are one and the same, then 1:14f, on Marxsen's definition, also makes no sense: "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel [read, "Jesus"] from God...; repent and believe in the gospel [read, "Jesus"]. But it is absolutely clear from the Gospel as a whole and from the secrecy phenomena in particular, that the Evangelist does not show Jesus preaching about himself in this way.

60. Moule, Phenomenon, 106, 110, 113.

61. As long ago as 1914, W. D. Allen lamented that the quotations from Papias preserved in Eusebius' Historia Ecclesiastica have been sifted ad nauseum, and by every man according to his ability and prejudice. See "Papias and the Gospels", Exp. 8th series, 8 (July-Dec. 1914), 83. The text widely regarded as the best critical edition is by Eduard Schwartz, Eusebius Werke, vol. II, part 1, (Leipzig, 1903), 290, 292. The passage in question appears at iii, 39. 1-17.

62. Απομνημόνευσεν earlier are ambiguous because each can mean either "re-membered" or "related". Consequently, it is extremely important to determine the sense from the context. Both meanings may occur close to each other as in iii, 39. 3 and 4. In our passage "relate" or "recount" (in reference to Peter) seems to be suggested by the context. The emphasis is upon Mark's relationship with Peter. The point is not Mark's accurate recording of his own recollections but of his fidelity to Peter's preaching.

63. For a recent discussion of the opinion that refers to Peter's casting his teaching in the form of Χρείασθαι, see Josef Kürzinger, "Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäusevangeliums", BZ, 4 (Jan. 1960), 23, n. 7.

64. This opinion may be considerably older if, at this
genuine fragment of a letter by Clement of Alexandria to a certain Theodore, a distinction is made between our canonical Mark and a subsequent expansion of it. Clement recounts,

[As for] Mark, then, during Peter's stay in Rome he wrote [an account of] the Lord's doings, not, however, declaring all [of them], nor yet hinting at the secret [ones], but selecting those he thought most useful for increasing the faith of those who were being instructed. But when Peter died as a martyr, Mark came over to Alexandria, bringing both his own notes and those of Peter, from which he transferred to his former book the things suitable to whatever makes for progress toward knowledge [gnosis]. [Thus] he composed a more spiritual Gospel for the use of those who were being perfected."

Thus, in Clement's judgment, too, the Gospel according to Mark was a beginner's book.

But may we say more? Is it possible to determine more precisely who these "beginners" were? To what stream of Christianity did they belong? Answering these questions is the task of the next chapter, which deals specifically with the question of the Gospel's Sitz im Leben.

point, Papias is still quoting a certain Elder who had been a follower of Jesus. Making due allowances for his age, Papias would probably have heard the Elder sometime in the last decade of the first century.


66. All of the underlining is ours except for "gnosis".
It was mentioned in the Introduction that there are many aspects to the notion of Sitz im Leben: time, locale, culture, function in church life (the primary form critical definition),\textsuperscript{1} circumstance, and its related idea, purpose. Fundamental to most of these aspects is the ideological, or theological; and fundamental to the theological is the christological. To illustrate this point, let us take as an example a familiar view of the circumstances in and purpose for which Mark wrote as it has been concisely expressed by Norman Perrin. The Evangelist "... is concerned with correcting a false Christology prevalent in his church and to teach both a true Christology and its consequences for Christian discipleship."\textsuperscript{2} In achieving this goal, "... he uses 'Christ' and 'Son of God' to establish rapport with his readers and then deliberately reinterprets and gives conceptual content to these titles by a use of the Son of Man...."\textsuperscript{3} The Evangelist was able to establish rapport by means of the first two titles because they (especially the latter) made sense to the hellenistic Gentile, who would have associated Jesus with a thaumaturgic divine man figure allegedly known throughout the hellenistic world.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} Bultmann, History, 4: "... every literary category [Gattung] has its 'life situation' (Sitz im Leben: Gunkel), whether it be worship in its different forms, or work, or hunting, or war. The Sitz im Leben is not, however, an individual historical event, but a typical situation or occupation in the life of a community" [underlining mine]. This form critical definition would render untenable many interpretations of Mark which seem to depend exclusively upon circumstantial reasons for its emergence.

\textsuperscript{2} Perrin, "Christology", 178.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., 181.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 180 and 178, n. 17.
Here, christology (Son of God, divine man) and culture (hellenistic, Gentile) are linked.

In proposing an alternative suggestion for the purpose of Mark, we were, on the understanding above, suggesting one aspect of the Sitz im Leben. Now we shall attempt to specify it further by demonstrating how the christology of Mark can provide us with a clue about the kind of community for which he wrote. We shall do this by examining, even more closely than we did in ch. V, the christology of Mark's "kerygma".

A. The Christology of the Markan "Kerygma"

1. Problems

At the very outset, there are problems to overcome because scholars are divided over the definition of and criteria for the kerygma. A few notable examples will illustrate the nature of the dilemma. In his celebrated book, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, C. H. Dodd argued that the structure of Mark's gospel reflected the pattern and themes of a common, apostolic kerygma which could be distilled from the early sermons in Acts and reconstructed from fragments of kerygmatic and confessional formulae which may be found elsewhere in the NT. Although Dodd's arguments won many supporters, there were other scholars, who with Rudolph Bultmann,

distinguished between the preaching of the earliest, Palestinian church and the later, hellenistic community. We recall that according to Bultmann, Mark affected "... the union of the Hellenistic kerygma about Christ, whose essential content consists of the Christ myth as we learn of it in Paul (esp. Phil. 2:6; Rom. 3:24) with the tradition of the story of Jesus." Still others were inclined to see 1 Cor. 15:2ff as the basis of Mark's hellenistic, Pauline kerygma.

However, Philipp Vielhauer and W. G. Kümmel have denied that it was either of these hellenistic kerygmata which informs Mark. Absent is the pre-existence motif, as Bultmann himself had recognised, the theme of humiliation, and the motif of the Redeemer's ascent from the cross. Furthermore, there is little reason to believe that Mark, like Paul and the earliest community, regarded Jesus' death as redemptive, as in 1 Cor. 15:3.

References to the significance of


9. P. Vielhauer, "Christologie".


15. Ibid., 68. Vielhauer, op. cit., 156: "Die Vorstellung vom Sühnetod Jesu... ist nicht konstitutiv für die markinische Christologie". Best, op. cit., who has provided the most thorough examination of Mark's soteriological thought
Jesus' death are few (10:45, 14:24) and fail to appear where one might most expect them: in the passion narrative and the passion predictions, which are controlled only by the divine necessity (Δε) of Jesus' death. Furthermore, the title, κύριος, which is especially characteristic of Paul, is missing. So far as Kümmel is concerned, "... there is no demonstrable, direct connection with the Pauline form of Gentile Christianity". The author wrote as a Jewish Christian in the Gentile Christian environment of the East.

2. Criteria

We need not agree with all that Kümmel and Vielhauer have proposed, and we need not carry the survey of opinions further in order to realize how important and unfulfilled is the quest for Mark's kerygma. Yet, how shall one proceed, what criteria are valid, for determining it more precisely? Indeed, our specific problem is part of a more general uncertainty among scholars about the meaning of the word itself. For example, Father Raymond Brown, contributing to a series of articles on the kerygma of various books of the Old and New Testaments, confessed, "... I am never quite sure what kerygma means, especially when a rigid divider is placed between kerygma and dogmatic content". Taking his clue from John to date, would strongly disagree. See esp. his analysis of 10:38f., 14:5; 14:23f, 36 (pp. 140-59).

17. Kümmel, loc. cit., 68.
18. Ibid. J. Schreiber attempted to support Bultmann's thesis by appealing to Mk. 12:1-12 as evidence for the pre-existence, sending, and exaltation of the Redeemer, and to 1 Cor. 2:8 as the basis for the messianic secret motif (see
he defined it, for the Fourth Gospel, as "... its central salvific message". 22

However, the text to which Father Brown appeals contains more than soteriology: salvation comes in believing that "Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God". Therefore, it would seem that kerygma (whatever else it might contain) should be expected to include both christological and soteriological statements, otherwise, one has either christology or soteriology. Obviously, as Robert Fortna rightly notes (also with reference to the Fourth Gospel), "There is no such thing as a Christology which is not also soteriological. The very concept of the Messiah carries with it a message of salvation". 23 Nevertheless, it is still legitimate in looking for the kerygma of Mark to expect to find both christological and soteriological elements, since they appear in the well-known kerygmatic formulations of the NT. 24 As it turns out, the criteria of

"Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums", ZTK, 58 (1961), 154-183. But Vielhauer finds the first argument entirely inadequate and notes that in 1 Cor., the Redeemer was unknown to the demonic powers, whereas in Mark they clearly recognised him (p. 156).

19. Ibid.

20. In particular, it seems that Kümmel and Vielhauer do less than full justice to the significance of such texts as 10:45 and 11:24, relying more on their relative infrequency than on their profundity and context. Best, loc. cit., sees these passages influenced by the connotations which the cup and baptism (n.b. 10:38f as well) had in the OT and Judaism. They are symbols of God's wrath and judgment which Jesus bears on behalf of others. 21. Raymond Brown, "The Kerygma of the Gospel According to John. The Johannine View of Jesus in Modern Studies", INT, 21.4 (Oct. 1967), 399, n. 25.

22. Ibid., 387. Similarly, Best, op. cit., IX cf equates his quest for the soteriology of Mark with the search for his kerygma.

christology and soteriology are those by which Kümmel compared Mark and the alleged Pauline kerygmata.

As a complement to this approach we may suggest another. Although it may not be as easy as it once was to maintain that the structure of his gospel reflects that of the earliest Christian preaching, it is valid, for the sake of argument, to see in it at least the form and content of preaching in Mark's own day which Luke adopted in his gospel and reproduced in the sermons in Acts. By examining the Gospel with this two-fold approach, perhaps it will be possible to discern Mark's kerygma with more precision. Dodd's approach will be considered first.

3. The Kerygmatic Framework

Dodd noted several more-or-less regularly-recurring

24. See n. 5. Because the soteriological element is absent or only implicit in Phil. 2:5-11, it might be more strictly regarded, if our criteria are legitimate, as primarily christological and only implicitly kerygmatic (bearing in mind Fortna's observation).


25. Because the soteriological element is absent or only implicit in Phil. 2:5-11, it might be more strictly regarded, if our criteria are legitimate, as primarily christological and only implicitly kerygmatic (bearing in mind Fortna's observation).
themes in the pattern: the dawning of the age of fulfillment promised in the scriptures, the proclamation of John the Baptist, Jesus' ministry of good works, his death and resurrection, and his coming (again). 27 Risking the charge of being overly-redundant, we again note that even though Mark believed Jesus to be the Christ and Son of God, these titles are not specifically found associated with the elements comprising the kerygmatic framework. Nor is it simply Jesus who is the subject. In fulfilment of scripture, Elijah (John the Baptist) has come and has restored all things, although, as scripture foresaw, men did to him what they would (9:13). The good which Jesus does in healing is a sign of the Son of Man's authority on earth to forgive sins (2:10). The Son of Man's lordship over the Sabbath (2:28) 28 enables him to do good on that day by healing a man's withered arm (3:1-6). It is the Son of Man who is to suffer, be rejected, die and be raised (8:31, 9:31, 10:33f). Although these statements, by virtue of their being "predictions", are placed prior to the Passion Narrative, they refer to events in Jerusalem. And, since the predictions are determined exclusively by the Son of Man christology, the christology of the passion, then, is a Son of Man .

27. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, 104-18, and the chart at the back of the book.
28. Scholars who view 2:10, 28 as generic, i.e., references to "man", must consider the significance of the fact, stressed by C. F. D. Moule, that the articular use is hardly found outside the Christian tradition (never in the Hebrew or Greek Old Testament) until 1 Enoch and only once outside the Gospels (Acts 7:56). The article, Moule suggests, might be accounted for by suspecting that originally it had demonstrative force, being a reference to the one who looked like a son of man in Dan. 7:13. See "Neglected Features", 419f.
christology; and this is borne out further by the implicit connection between the Son of Man and the Last Supper (14:21), the Temptation in Gethsemane (v. 41), and the trial before Caiaphas (v. 62). Finally, the parousia of Jesus is cast in terms of the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds, in great glory and accompanied by angels, and sitting at God's right hand (8:36, 13:26; 14:62).

At this point, it may be objected that we are being more precise than Mark's usage would allow. But this is not the case, for, as we saw in ch. II., Mark does not confuse his christological categories. This point is important enough to warrant a brief review of our main conclusions. The "Son of God" identifies Jesus as one who has a special relationship to God; "the Christ" identifies him in some way with the agent of God's salvation expected by the Jews. But neither of these tells what being Son of God and Messiah involves, whereas the Son of Man does: utter obedience to the primacy of God's rule.

Therefore, when the elements comprising the kerygmatic pattern in Mark are examined, they are seen to be dominated by the Son of Man christology. Before exploring what the implications of this may be for understanding the Sitz im Leben of the

The term in English, then, requires the definite article.

29. Best, op. cit., 164, notes that "The suffering sayings are not connected with any of the other major titles, for example, Son of God".
31. Not wishing to deny absolutely the presence of an Isaac typology, wherein obedient sonship and death are linked (Best, op. cit., 171f), we should like to emphasize that Mark clearly associates Jesus' suffering, death and the obedience which leads him there with the Son of Man.
Gospel within hellenistic Gentile Christianity (Part B), we shall apply our second set of criteria for discerning Mark's kerygma by noticing where christology and soteriology most explicitly converge.

4. Christology and Soteriology

Strictly speaking, Mark's soteriology cannot be confined merely to the events of Jesus' passion and resurrection, although they may be regarded as the climactic events of salvation. As Ernest Best has argued, in the most thorough examination of the subject to date, the negative aspect of salvation, so to speak, begins with Jesus' decisive struggle with Satan at the temptation (1:13) and in the subsequent "plunder of his house" (3:27) in the exorcisms. Satan and his demon hordes are deprived of their grip upon mankind by Jesus, whom they know as the all-powerful Son of God. But more is involved than release from the grip of the demonic world; man must be restored to God through the forgiveness of his sins. This "positive" side of the Evangelist's doctrine of salvation is expressed in his portrait of Jesus as the one who bears for others God's judgment upon sin. Clearly, on Best's showing, it is impossible to maintain (with Kümmel and Vielhauer) that the Evangelist ignored or did not affirm the redemptive significance of Jesus' death.

32. Best, op. cit., See Part I of his study, pp. 3-60.
33. Ibid., 35f, 60, and the core of his analysis, 134-59.
34. Ibid., 140-59, 191.
Now Best equated Mark's soteriology with his kerygma, judging it to be more in keeping with 1 Cor. 15:3f than with Phil. 2:5-11. However, it should be pointed out that where Mark's "positive" soteriology is most explicit, there one finds, rather consistently, a link with the Son of Man christology. The first clear convergence of these two kerygmatic elements occurs where we first meet Jesus as the Son of Man, who has authority on the earth to forgive sins (2:10) and who is "... superior to the law which defines what sin is (ii. 28)".

A more implicit conjunction of kerygmatic elements may be found in 8:34-9:1. Present here is the anthropological or subjective element which one sees more clearly in John 20:31, Rom. 10:9f, and in Acts. In other words, the response which one is required to make is spelled out: self-denial, cross-bearing, and following Jesus (v. 34). It is by losing one's life for Christ's sake and the gospel's that one saves it (v. 35). However, lacking is a direct reference as to how this is achieved, so far as Jesus is concerned. Only by inference does one draw the parallel between his own cross-bearing and Jesus' death on the cross. Likewise, an explicit christology is lacking, although there is an implicit link with the Son of Man, who will come as judge of those who have been ashamed of Jesus and his words (v. 38).

According to Julius Wellhausen, the gospel begins with 8:27: "Jetzt beginnt eigentlich erst das Evangelium, wie es

---

35. Ibid., xif.
36. Ibid., 191.
37. Ibid., 164.
38. The crowd which Jesus summons with the disciples (v. 34) has not been privy to the teaching about the Son of Man's passion and resurrection.
die Apostel verkündet haben; vorher merkt man wenig davon". 39

On another occasion, Wellhausen commented, "Bei Markus erscheint ... das Evangelium in dem Nesten zwischen dem Petrusbekenntnis und der Passion eingebettet". 40 In a similar vein, Bultmann said about the passion predictions at 8:31, 9:31, 10:33f, "In them we have, so to speak, a pattern of the christological kerygma, and we can see in the somewhat fuller third form how the pattern could be worked out in preaching". 41 However, according to the criteria which we discerned from other known kerygmatic formulae, we should have expected to find some statement regarding the soteriological significance of Jesus' passion, death, and resurrection. As a result of its absence, the so-called passion predictions remain primarily as christological statements about the divinely-determined destiny of the Son of Man. 42

The only instance of an explicit kerygmatic statement, containing both christology and soteriology and referring to Jesus' death, is at 10:45, καὶ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Θεοῦ σώκ ἡλθεν διὰ κοινωνίας κηδεμόνων καὶ δοκοκεί μὴ φυκήν κατ' θεόν· λατρευτικὴ πολλὰν. On this verse, Wellhausen observed,

Die ἡμελτρωσίς durch den Tod Jesu rast nur hier in das Evangelium hinein; unmittelbar vorher is er nicht

40. J. Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei Ersten Evangelien (1911c), 72. I owe this reference to J. M. Robinson, op. cit., 50, n. 47, who translated the comment from the first edition (1905), 82.
41. Bultmann, Theology, 83.
42. So also Best, op. cit., 139: "The predictions of the Passion do not tell us anything about what was achieved in the Passion. They make clear its importance: it was a divine necessity (δεῖ, viii. 31, cf. ix. 12)".
Several things should be noted here. In keeping with our findings above, the christology is that of the Son of Man. The soteriology expressed by λόγον ἀνίπτωσαν is found in the New Testament only here, in the exact Matthean parallel, and in a "hellenized" form in 1 Tim. 2:5. Therefore, we have several unique or at least rare factors converging here: the only instance of the Son of Man's death being directly associated with soteriology, one of the rare instances that soteriology is expressed thus, and the resultant, kerygmatic statement, as defined by our criteria, unique to the rest of the New Testament (except where Mt. depends directly on Mark). Furthermore, this kerygmatic saying is applied paraenetically by Jesus to instruct his followers about the basis of the authority which should govern them: the greatest among them should be the servant and the least of all, by virtue of the Son of Man's example (vv. 43f; cf. 9:33ff).

The final, explicit soteriological reference is to Jesus' death ὅπερ πολλάκια at the Last Supper (14:24). Here the statement is not connected directly with any title, although in the immediate context, Jesus pronounces woe upon the man, present at the meal, through whom the Son of Man is about to be betrayed (v. 21). Later, Jesus, having resolved, as the

43. Wellhausen, Marci, 91.
44. Although Best discusses Mark's christological titles at some length (op. cit., 60-177) and notes that as the Son of Man, "... Jesus is set out as the one who deals with sin either through forgiveness or punishment" which he bears (165), he does not link it with his examination of soteriology in any formal way.
obedient son (Ἄββας δ' Πατρός, v. 36), to do the Father's will, faces his arrest knowing that the hour has come for the Son of Man to be betrayed into the hands of sinners (v. 41).

Therefore, if with Dodd and his supporters, we determine the kerygma largely in terms of the over-all pattern of Mark's gospel, then we find it dominated by the Son of Man christology. If we define kerygma more strictly, that is, by noting where christology and soteriology converge, we find the same to be true. In this, Mark is unique, for nowhere else in the NT do we find this christology in the church's preaching or in its credal statements. Perhaps the Evangelist meant to emphasize the preaching of Jesus, which, though related, is not the same as the church's preaching but is rather prolegomenon, the presupposition of the church's kerygma but not its content, even though it contains kerygmatic ingredients.

Perhaps the overworked idea, kerygma, is not appropriate in any sense, and we are really talking about christology, pure and simple, a christology which was suited more to narration than to proclamation, narration which recounts when and how the gospel began. Whatever the precise answer, there is no denying the importance of the Son of Man christology in Mark and in the type of Christianity in which the Gospel emerged.

45. Only once in the NT, in John 9:35, does one encounter the idea of believing in the Son of Man. Robinson and esp. Koester, op. cit., claim that the transmission of traditions in general and of Son of Man sayings in particular (in the oral period) constitutes kerygma. But this remains on the level of hypothesis since they offer no real justification for their claims. Furthermore there is a most imprecise equation of the terms "kerygma", "symbol", "creed", and "belief". (cf. esp. 50, 68, 211-29).
B. The Son of Man and the Christology of Gentile Christianity

1. Little-Noticed Phenomena

In all of the discussion about the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark's Gospel, there is an important aspect of the Son of Man christology which has not received the attention that it deserves. It has been widely noted that the expression, "the Son of Man," in the NT is virtually confined to the gospels and therein to the lips of Jesus. However, the significance of this phenomenon has been variously assessed.

On the one hand, some scholars interpret it as proof that Jesus referred to himself as the Son of Man; whereas others attribute this scrupulousness to the early church. On the other hand, the phrase's absence from the epistolary literature of the NT is widely understood by scholars of all shades of opinion, to indicate its absence in hellenistic Gentile Christianity. Bultmann thus speaks of its "dropping

---

46. Public at 8:34-9:1, but implicit, private and explicit to disciples at 10:45, 14:23.
47. We recall that the only real exception is in Acts 7:56, where Stephen claims to see the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God. Some scholars see in this instance another of Luke's attempts to portray Stephen's martyrdom in terms of Jesus' death. See, among others, F. H. Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History (1967), 235. In Luke 24:7, the two men at the empty tomb remind the women of Jesus' prediction about the Son of Man's passion and resurrection. In John 12:34, the crowd asks Jesus to identify the Son of Man about whom he has been speaking. Elsewhere in the NT, only the anarthrous form, διὸς ἄνθρωπος, appears: Heb. 2:6 reproduces Ps. 8:5, and Rev. 1:13, 14:14 show dependence upon Dan. 7 and 10.
48. For the former view, see Taylor, op. cit., 120; Cranfield, op. cit., 273; Cullmann, op. cit., 155. An advocate of the latter view is Howard M. Teple, "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology", *JBL* 84 (1965), 246.
out" of hellenistic Christianity. H. E. Tödt argues that
the Q saying in Mt. 11:19 and par. originated in the Pales-
tinian church rather than in the hellenistic community:

We learn from the New Testament texts that the name
Son of Man was not current within the Hellenistic
community but was replaced [underlining mine] by
other names, especially by the titles Kyrios and
Christos.51

Usually, the reason given for its absence or replacement
has to do with its alleged incomprehensibility in a Greek-
speaking milieu. Herbert Braun's comment is typical:

In this world the Jewish titles such as Messiah and
Son of Man, which express the significance of Jesus'
teaching and activity for salvation, are incompre-
hensible, or at the very least strange. For that
reason either they are omitted - "Son of Man", for
example, has disappeared from the Pauline churches -
or they are transformed ...52

However, these opinions overlook the important facts that the
Son of Man sayings (and the tradition in general) of the

149. Although hard-and-fast distinctions between Pales-
tinian, Hellenistic Jewish, and Hellenistic Gentile Christian-
ity are being recognised by an increasing number of scholars
as artificial and misleading, they are retained for the sake
of discussion. The point being made here actually illustrates
the inadequacy of the older categories.

50. Bultmann, Theology, 80.
51. Tödt, op. cit., 117.
52. Herbert Braun, "The Meaning of New Testament Chris-
tology", (ET, JThC, 5 (1968) of "Der Sinn der neutestament-
lichen Christologie", ZTK, 54 (1957), 350f). Cf. R.
Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity
(1970), 91 and n. 125. R. H. Fuller seems to argue that the
title was replaced by others, even in Palestinian Christianity,
because of its virtual uselessness. "'Son of man' was not a
satisfactory term for kerygmatic proclamation, for confession
of faith, or for use in Christian instruction and worship.
For it naturally lent itself to use only in sayings of Jesus".
The Foundations of New Testament Christology (1965), 155. The
obvious question arises, in what setting were the sayings of
Jesus used? Why were they preserved, if no use were made of
them?
Aramaic-speaking, Palestinian church were translated into Greek and were appropriated in the oral tradition not only of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians but also, and more important, in the oral traditions of hellenistic Gentile Christians, the chief evidence being the Gospel of Mark itself. Our examination has shown that the Son of Man christology plays a major, if not the dominant role in a document, if not written primarily for Gentile Christians, was at least addressed to a mixed congregation of Jews and Gentiles, the latter of whom needed to have Jewish customs explained (7:3f, 14:12, 15:42). Yet, despite this, neither Mark, nor anyone in the tradition before him, attempted to give an explanation of or an idiomatic Greek equivalent for the original Aramaic expression even though the Evangelist or his predecessors regularly translate Aramaic expressions and names: 3:17; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 14:36; 15:22, 34.\(^53\) Concerning this phenomenon, Benjamin Bacon remarked, "The reader receives no explanation whatever. He is expected to know why Jesus speaks of himself as 'the Son of Man'..."\(^54\) If 1 Tim. 2:5 contains the hellenized version of Mk. 10:45 ("the man," Christ Jesus replacing "the Son of Man")\(^55\), then how is it that Mark retains the more Semitic

\(^53\) The only exception is 11:9f. Elsewhere, Mark gives a translation without announcing it: 3:22, 9:43, 10:46, 14:36. See Allan Menzies, The Earliest Gospel (1901), 36f. Of the semitic expressions given in the text, Luke omits them all; Matthew retains 15:22 (27:33). Of the preceding references in the note (unannounced translations), Matthew and Luke retain only the explanation of who Beelzebub is. Neither Mark nor Matthew translates παρασκευαστήριον. Luke omits the word. John, however, does translate it (1:36) and ἀρχηγός (1:41). Regarding Mark's or his predecessors' usage, Cranfield, op. cit., 190 points out that the presence of these Aramaic words has nothing to do with their being a feature of miracle stories, since they are translated and since only on one occasion are
form for his Gentile readers without interpreting it? Apparently, even Gentile Christians had some way of making sense of this term, which allegedly was as "... devoid of intelligible meaning in Greek as it is in English". Austin Farrer believes that the term would have evoked memories of the Greek Old Testament. Furthermore, understanding might have been facilitated by hellenistic Jewish missionaries or by those who had passed on their teaching. Whatever the reason (and this is not the point), Mark makes the Son of Man expression be the dominant christological element in the pattern and soteriological emphasis of his gospel. The very titles which are so often alleged to have been most understood in a Greek milieu are not used at these crucial points, although this is what one would have expected were intelligibility the issue.

---

55. Perrin, "Christology", 179, n. 17. Several lines before, Perrin expresses the common opinion that the Son of Man "... tended not to survive the movement of the church into the Greek-speaking world ..." Yet, several lines later he claims that "Mark develops the use of the Son of Man very extensively".
58. Fuller, *op. cit.*., 203, makes an important point which is often overlooked. "It is not the converts who did the translating of the Jewish-Hellenistic kerygma into their own terms, but the missionaries themselves. Of course, the converts' own presuppositions must have coloured their own understanding of the kerygma they received, and have contributed to its future development. But it was not they who shaped the kerygma and Christology which Paul and the other missionaries to the gentiles use in their writings".
59. Furthermore, if Mark is attacking a concept of Jesus' messiahship or sonship, prevalent in his church which had become divorced from suffering and obedience, why does the Evangelist never simply use these titles, which were both intelligible and represent the points at issue, in saying specifically that the Christ or the Son of God must suffer? Why
This phenomenon would still be noteworthy even if Mark were only preserving these sayings. But it deserves more attention the more one sees him using the sayings creatively. For example, Norman Perrin maintains that the Evangelist's achievement "... is not only the most creative moment in the use of the Son of Man in the New Testament; it is also one of the most creative moments in the development of the theology of the New Testament altogether".

What of the later hellenistic gospels? Until their uses of the Son of Man are studied more intensively, we shall not be able to know how they compare with Mark. The point is that Matthew not only reproduces all but one of Mark's sayings about the Son of Man, but also adds sayings both from Q and from his special source, thus incorporating, at least in the former case, traditions from the Palestinian church with which Mark either was not familiar or which he avoided. This may not be surprising, if Matthew wrote for Greek-speaking Jewish Christians. Given this sort of readership (and the possibility of a learned community involved in producing the

confuse the issues with a term which was not understood?

60. Fuller, op. cit., 197 maintains that "... the Son of Man sayings reached the peak of their development in the Palestinian-Aramaic stratum. In the Hellenistic stage only a few additions from LXX and the ποιμαντήτης (suffering) motif were added to the original stock".


62. According to G. Theissen and P. Vielhauer, D. Lührmann, Logiengquelle (a work unavailable to me), argues for a Gentile Christian provenance at a later date, since "the Son of God" title (Mt. 11:25-27), the delay of the parousia and the Gentile mission are presupposed. See R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, Ergänzungsheft (1974); 114.
Gospel), one is not surprised to find the Son of Man Christology preserved and perhaps more easily understood than in a Gentile environment.

And what of the "hellenist" Luke, whom some regard as a Gentile Christian? Yet, he too incorporates material from Q and his own special material containing sayings about the Son of Man. Although a Gentile, he is concerned to preserve, if not consciously imitate, the style and flavor of the LXX for his noble reader. If this presupposes his reader's familiarity with the Greek Bible, and if we may assume acquaintance with oral tradition explained by Jewish Christian teachers, then the possibility of appreciating the significance of the Son of Man sayings cannot be ruled out. It should be remembered that Luke is the only writer to record someone other than Jesus referring to the Son of Man, and this in a post-Easter setting (Acts 7:56).

For all of the differences in use and development which one might legitimately discern in the use of the Son of Man tradition in the Fourth Gospel, one has still to reckon with the fact that in a gospel written for Greek-speaking readers, some of whom were (Christian?) Jews and Gentiles (if this is what 20:31 implies), the Son of Man christology has not receded.

Thus, if it is true in any sense that the gospels reflect the beliefs of the communities in which they emerged, then it

---

64. Oscar Cullmann, *Christology*, 183 calls attention to the fact that the only other person to use the Son of Man title besides Jesus is Stephen, a hellenistic Jewish Christian (Acts 7:56).
must be concluded that the Son of Man christology was flourishing (if only in attempts to interpret the earthly career of Jesus for subsequent generations in different circumstances and along various lines) well into the latter part of the first century, not only on Palestinian soil and in Jewish contexts, but, more important, in the Greek-speaking Gentile world.

It is more correct, therefore, to say that this christological designation did not "drop out" of hellenistic (especially Gentile) Christianity because of its absence in the epistolary literature of the NT. Its virtual confinement to the gospels can mean only one of two things: either we must distinguish between a stream of hellenistic Christianity which preserved this christology from one (or those) which did not, or we must conclude that it was used in hellenistic Christianity but only in circumstances in which the life of Jesus was the focus of attention. In other situations, it might have been re-interpreted or avoided because it would not have been as appropriate to those situations as would the other titles.

This is the point of C. F. D. Moule's analysis of circumstantial influences on the use of christological titles. As a symbol (derived from Dan. 7) for the oppressed and vindicated martyr (or martyr people), "the Son of Man" was

... eminently suitable first on the lips of Jesus himself, and then afterwards as a reminder to martyrs of the 'pattern' of triumph through death, exemplified by the Archmartyr, the faithful and true μάρτυς. It is exactly consistent with

66. This does not mean, of course, that it was uniformly understood or understood in its pristine sense.
this that the only occurrences of the term, other than on the lips of Jesus himself in his ministry, are in martyr-contexts - the account of the death of Stephen and the Apocalypse.

More important is the fact that "...half its content was already a thing of the past and half was - at any rate in the eyes of the early church - yet in the future". Consequently, "It is more appropriate to the past and the future; but not to the present". So long as the church was in a Zwischenzeit, between Jesus' coming and going, the term had little or no relevance. "Far more relevant is the term Lord, which with its associations with Ps. cx, exactly fits the heavenly session. Ps. cx is, accordingly, one of the most frequent of all testimonia". Although there is a great need for filling out this picture, the conclusions seem irresistible that the Gospel of Mark would fit such circumstances and, if our contention has been correct, in a milieu comprised in part, at least, of Gentile Christians.

2. A Re-appraisal

What conclusions may we draw from these observations about the character of Christianity in which the Gospel emerged? First, we may say that by his adoption of traditions about Jesus in general and by his preservation and interpretation of traditions about the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man in particular, the Evangelist seems to be writing on behalf of

68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., 258.
70. Ibid., 257.
Gentile Christians who, before becoming Christians, had been influenced by the synagogue or who had been made catechumens by Jewish Christian missionaries who were keen to communicate certain fundamental tenets about God from the Greek Old Testament and about Jesus from their stock of traditions. Bultmann has well remarked that Christian missionary preaching "... could not simply be the Christological kerygma; rather, it had to begin with the preaching of the one God" and his role as Creator and Judge. If this were true about God, then in all probability it would have been so about Jesus. The markedly Jewish and Jesus-oriented heritage of Mark's Gentile Christian community should be given full recognition.

Once this is done, then the schema of Christianity's development proposed by Wilhelm Heitmüller and embraced by Wilhelm Bouset, Rudolf Bultmann, and many thereafter, will not be able to stand. Heitmüller proposed that between

71. Bultmann, Theology, 65.
72. Ibid., 65-75.
75. Wilhelm Bousett, Kyrios Christos (ET 1970 of the 5th German edition, 1964), 119, n. 1, 120f. In the first German edition (1913), see p. 92 n. 1. 93f and the second edition (1921), 75ff, which most scholars cite.
Jesus and Paul, one must allow for two intermediary stages of development: the Palestinian community and the hellenistic community. In order to achieve this, Heitmüller had dismissed Paul’s own testimony in 1 Cor. 15:11 that he and the apostles in Jerusalem preached the same gospel on the grounds that


However, Heitmüller and others failed to observe that our only sources for the tradition of the Jerusalem church (i.e., the sayings source and the basis of Mark’s traditions) come to us in documents (Mark and the other synoptics) originating in the very circles which he alleges were disinterested in that tradition, namely, hellenistic Christianity, both Jewish and Gentile. This, of course, has great importance for the Jesus-Paul question, which Bultmann has reinterpreted as, at base, the question: Jesus and hellenistic Christianity. However, in the light of the evidence of the synoptic gospels, the issue, if it exists at all, is not between Jesus and Paul or between Jesus and hellenistic Christianity but between Paul, who allegedly avoided referring to the earthly Jesus, and a significant stream of Gentile Christianity which preserved

77. Heitmüller, loc. cit.
78. Ibid., 331.
79. Bultmann, Theology, 189.
traditions about him.

We do not wish to become involved in the Jesus-Paul debate, although the observations above might provide the basis for a fresh approach to the question. We have argued that Mark's Gospel belongs to Gentile Christianity standing closer to its Palestinian origins than is often allowed, being rooted in basic Jewish theology and in a christology whose chief expression, though not natural to Greek ears, hardly showed signs of being entirely foreign, hellenized or dropped. Our main concern is to see if we can specify the cultural, christological, and functional aspects of the Sitz im Leben even more.

To accomplish this, we shall recapitulate the main conclusions of our study so far and see if a more precise setting may be found for the Gospel in early Christianity. Mark did not confuse the christological expressions, "Christ", "Son of God", and "the Son of Man". Each has a discrete meaning and function and each corresponds to a particular aspect of the Kingdom of God. The first two are predicates. "The Son

80. See Bultmann's remarks on the kerygma of Mark, page 177, above, and note a certain ambivalence about this matter reflected earlier in his History, 347: "Mark could well have been the normal gospel for Pauline Hellenistic Christianity". In a similar vein, Bultmann maintained that "... in order to retain the peculiar character of Christian faith [underlining mine] -- the union of the cultic deity with the historical person of Jesus -- a tradition about the story of Jesus was necessary" (Ibid., 369). Yet, earlier, Bultmann expressed the view for which he is more popularly known: "I do not believe it is possible to state sufficiently sharply the contrast in the N.T. Canon with the Synoptic Gospels on the one hand and the Pauline letters on the other. It must still be a puzzle to understand why Christianity, in which Pauline and post-Pauline tendencies played so dominant a role, should also have the motives which drove it to take over and shape the Synoptic tradition out of the Palestinian Church" (Ibid., 303).
of God" identifies Jesus as one who shares the divine nature and who heads the conflict between the supernatural Kingdom of God and the supernatural kingdom of Satan. "Christ" identifies Jesus as God's anointed agent of salvation, expected by Israel to inaugurate the kingdom of David. "The Son of Man" is primarily a symbol of obedient sonship, put to the test and perfected through suffering and vindicated by the resurrection. To follow Jesus, the Son of Man, in this vocation is to receive the Kingdom of God.

Since the Evangelist kept these christological categories discrete, it is legitimate to speak only of a messianic "reserve" rather than a messianic "secret". Strictly speaking, the secrecy phenomena belong to a divine, Son-of-God secret. A possible rationale for the secret might be found first by considering the most fundamental understanding of sonship in the OT and in Judaism: to be a son is to be obedient, i.e., sonship includes both status and obligation. Jesus' consistent attempts to suppress his identity as the divine Son of God until after the Son of Man is raised from the dead may mean that to reveal his status before the obligations of his sonship are perfectly fulfilled is to give an incomplete and imperfect view of the nature of his sonship.

The Son-of-God secret also helps to define the nature of the Gospel, for it distinguishes the time of Jesus from the time of the church. Although "the Son of Man" in Mark is used exclusively in reference to Jesus' suffering; death; resurrection; and parousia, it never appears in the recital of these events in the church's kerygma. Furthermore, "the Son of God" title, which was prominent in the church's preaching, is
suppressed in the Gospel until the Son of Man is raised from
the dead, i.e., the point after which the church's preaching
began. That Jesus is the divine Son of God is true, but it
is not yet gospel until he has been perfectly obedient and vin-
dicated by the resurrection. Consequently, one does not,
strictly speaking, have in Mark the church's kerygma but a
story of its beginning. The Evangelist how Jesus of
Nazareth, the divine Son of God, took upon himself the vocation
symbolized by the Son of Man, and, having obeyed God perfect-
ly, became the object of the church's preaching and worship.

If this was indeed Mark's purpose, and the purpose nat-
urally reflects the need for which he wrote, then where might
one find theology anchored in Jewish and OT presuppositions
and christology rooted in the earthly career of Jesus and
strengthening his divine sonship, but sonship being perfected
through obedience and tested by suffering? Although at first
glance it appears highly improbable, these christological
themes seem to be reflected at Hebrews 5:8f:

\[ \text{καὶ πέρ ὦν υἱὸς, ζημαθεν ἀφ' ὦν ἐπιθεν τὴν ὑπε-
κονίν, καὶ τελειωθεῖς ἐξενέστο πάσιν τοῖς διπλοσώ-
ουσιν κύριοι κατίοις σωτηρίας χιαννιού.} \]

The apparent improbability, of course, stems from the ob-
vious observation that Mark nowhere hints at the elaborate con-
ceptual furniture which permeates Hebrews. Furthermore, we
have argued that Mark wrote for Gentile Christians, whereas the
readers of Hebrews were patently Jewish Christians. Neverthe-

81. Hooker, *Son of Man*, 197f, discusses contacts between
the Son of Man christology in Mark and Heb. 2:6ff.
less, this aspect of Hebrews' christology is remarkably like that which seems to emerge from Mark. The same distinction is made between Jesus' identity as Son and his role as son. And that role is depicted in terms of obedience tested by suffering. And what of their soteriology? In Mark, the only instances where man's attitude or response is linked explicitly with salvation is by virtue of following Jesus. It is by denying oneself, taking up his cross, and following him (8:34), and it is by losing one's life for Jesus' sake and the gospel's that he saves it (v. 37). Similarly, the rich man, who wants to inherit eternal life (10:17, equivalent to being saved, v. 26), is told to sell all, give the proceeds to the poor, and follow Jesus (v. 21).82 Is this Markan motif the equivalent to Hebrews' idea of salvation which comes by obeying the one who perfectly obeyed?

Moreover, although it is debated how much theological relevance Paul ascribed to Jesus' life, there is little doubt about its importance for the author of Hebrews. Bultmann aptly notes that

...the N.T. writing which shows the clearest marks of relationship to Jewish Hellenism [which first took over the tradition about Jesus from the Palestinian church],83 the Epistle to the Hebrews, is also the N.T. writing which more than any other - apart from the Synoptics - has the greatest interest in the life of Jesus.84

It could be, then, that the Gentile Christianity within which the Gospel emerged had been influenced, both in its interest

82. Although the soteriological motif is not explicit, the same notion of the disciples' sharing Jesus' destiny is clear in 10:35-40.
84. Ibid., 303.
in the life of Jesus and in the particular christological significance which his life possessed, by Jewish Christian missionaries who shared certain aspects of the christology represented by the writer of Hebrews.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Biblische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td>Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>The Expositor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JThC</td>
<td>Journal of Bible and Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theology and Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pap. Osl.</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGG</td>
<td>Papyri Osloensis. (See bibliography under Eitrem, S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV</td>
<td>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TynBul</td>
<td>Studia Evangelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDNT</td>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThZ</td>
<td>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theologisches Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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