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ABSTRACT

This article attempts to provide a survey of the most influential research done on Mark's Jesus during the twentieth century. Since views on Mark's Jesus are closely related to matters such as method, the Gospel's supposed background and its text type, the relationship between the various views and these factors are pointed out. Lastly, a few conclusions are drawn as to the direction in which the research seems to have moved.

1 INTRODUCTION

During the twentieth century Mark's Jesus was viewed by New Testament scholars in a variety of ways. This article attempts to identify the most influential of these views.

Before coming to grips with the subject itself, a few preliminary remarks are relevant.

By formulating the topic in the above-mentioned way, it is more or less presupposed that Mark was the master of his material, so that it is possible to detect a Marcan view of Jesus. Although this view is not representative of the whole of twentieth century New Testament scholarship, the rise of redaction criticism during the fifties marked the beginning of an era in which Mark, first as redactor and, since the seventies, as a narrator, was awarded an ever more important role. Most of the important studies on the subject indeed followed either a redaction—critical or a narrative approach to Mark's Gospel. But even some New Testament scholars from the first half of the century (e.g. Bultmann) who in theory had another view of Mark's Gospel in practice ended up with a view of Jesus as presented in Mark's Gospel, which, in a certain sense, can be called Mark's Jesus. This 'problem', however, has been kept in mind in the choice of contributions for discussion. This means that especially those contributions will be discussed which have a bearing on the Gospel as a whole or which at least relate to the Gospel as a whole in one way or another.

Why speak of Mark's Jesus instead of Mark's Christology, as is usually done? The reason for the preference of Mark's Jesus is that no uniform definition of Christology exists (cf e.g. Cullmann 1957:6; Balz 1967:13; Keck 1986:...
362, 375; Botha 1989:78) and that some of the proposed definitions would, in fact, exclude views which will be discussed here (e.g. Jesus as teacher). When 'Christology' is used, it will serve as an equivalent term for Mark's Jesus.

A New Testament subject to which so many scholars contribute not only produces a variety of views, but also much repetition and less substantial contributions as far as both content and extent is concerned. This, inter alia, means that the massive amount of research on the subject can in the end be reduced to a few fairly representative views. Such a 'reduction' is undertaken in this article.

Views on Mark's Jesus obviously do/did not originate or exist in isolation. Apart from implicit presuppositions which, especially with a subject of this kind, always hover somewhere in the background, these views are closely interrelated to especially method and one's view of the text type of the Gospel. Developments in Gospel research in these areas indeed have definite implications for the way in which Mark's Jesus was and is seen. An attempt is therefore made to explain the relationship between the various views and these factors. Possible connections between the various views, which mostly do/did not exist independently from one another, are also pointed out.

The views on Mark's Jesus which will be discussed here, did not necessarily all follow each other chronologically. When a new view was put forward, it usually did not imply that a previous one was abandoned. As is to be expected with a subject on which so much research is done, most views continued to exist in one form or another, although some moved from the foreground into the background.

Although the Christological titles figure in all the influential views on Mark's Jesus, so that they will repeatedly be referred to, they are not specifically utilised here as an inroad into the relevant research. It would indeed be possible to cover a large part of the research by using the Christological titles as a starting-point (cf Jacobs 1991:55-194). In most views on Mark's Jesus, however, more than a Christological title is at stake. When a view is so closely bound up with a title that it is, as it were, generated by the supposed background/meaning of the title (e.g. some views on Son of God) it will be discussed in connection therewith.

Since it is not possible to discuss views on Mark's Jesus in abstraction, but only on the basis of specific contributions, a choice had to be made from the vast amount of available literature on the subject. Preference was given to the following kinds of investigations: Those which influenced the research on Mark's Christology profoundly, sometimes because they advanced new proposals as to Mark's Jesus, and those which adequately represent the research or, at least, a specific phase thereof. As has already been indicated, contributions were preferred which relate to the Gospel as a whole in one way or another.
2 WILLIAM WRENDE AND THE MESSIANIC SECRET

Highlights/turning-points in the research on a subject do not necessarily occur at temporally strategic moments (beginning, middle, end) of a century. It is therefore not necessarily justified to divide the research done on a specific subject according to centuries or, even worse, according to decades and to let the first year of the century or decade serve as the starting-point for a history of research. As to the research done on Mark's Jesus, one is not only justified but compelled to start in 1901. During that year William Wrede's *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* was published, a book which ever since has had a profound influence not only on the research on Mark's Christology, but on the entire Marcan research. Meye's remark is to the point: 'William Wrede's study of the Messianic secret in the Gospels has left its stamp upon the history of Marcan interpretation more than any other single study devoted to the second Gospel or the Gospels. In fact it is safe to say that the interpretation of no other New Testament book has been so decisively shaped by one man' (Meye 1968: 125).

Wrede's contribution must be seen in continuity with, as well as in reaction against the way in which the Gospels were dealt with in his time. He wrote his essay on the task and method of New Testament theology (Wrede 1897), which forms the background to his book on Mark's Gospel, at the end of a century in which New Testament theology increasingly became a historical discipline. One is, indeed, struck by the enthusiasm with which he propagates historical investigation as the key to the understanding of the New Testament writings. On the other hand, his work is directed against attempts by liberal theologians to deduce a life of Jesus from Mark's Gospel (Wrede 1969: 9-22). His *Messiasgeheimnis* must in particular be regarded as a consistent query of Mark's Gospel as history. Utilising strict historical-logical measures, he argues that the secrecy surrounding Jesus' identity which one encounters in Mark's Gospel (the so-called Messianic secret) does not make sense as a historical motif which belongs to Jesus' earthly life (Wrede 1969: 47-49). It must, on the contrary, be regarded as a theological motif which originated with Mark and the Christian community before him (Wrede 1969: 66).

It is not necessary to enter into Wrede's detailed substantiation of his view. Of importance is that he regarded the Messianic secret as a comprehensive motif embracing especially the commands of silence (Mk 1:23-25; 1:34; 3:11-12; 5:6-7; 9:20; 8:30; 9:9), the disciples' inability to understand (Mk 9:10, 32) and Jesus' teaching in parables (Mk 4:11-12, 33-34). In fact, according to him, the Gospel is permeated with this motif from beginning to end, which means that the theological nature of the Messianic secret stamps the Gospel as a whole as a theological writing (Wrede 1969: 145).

According to Wrede, this view of the Messianic secret and, consequently, of
the nature of Mark's Gospel, has definite implications for one's view of Mark's Jesus. What we have in Mark is, in Wrede's view, 'keine historische Anschauung mehr vom wirklichen Leben Jesu' but an, 'übergeschichtliche Glaubensauffassung' (Wrede 1969:131). Both Christ and Son of God must be regarded as expressions of the Christian concept of Messiah, which means that they both have supernatural connotations (Wrede 1969:73-76).

Apart from the fact that Wrede's view of Mark's Jesus flows from his typifying of the Gospel as a theological writing, he substantiates his view of Mark's presentation of Jesus as an 'übergeschichtliche Glaubensauffassung' by referring to various incidents in the Gospel (Jesus' baptism, his miracles, his trial before the high priest, the Roman officer's confession at the cross). Even this does not tell the whole story. It would, in fact, be possible to interpret this material differently, as will be seen later on. From both Wrede's historical explanation of the Messianic secret at the end of his Messiasgeheimnis and his essay on the task and method of New Testament theology, it is clear that, in his view, more is at stake than what is initially made explicit in his book on Mark. In order to understand Wrede's view on Mark's Jesus, one has to keep in mind that, as a member of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, he regarded the New Testament writings, including Mark's Gospel, as the 'sediment' of a religion. When history does come into play, it is, in his view, not the history of Jesus, but that of the early Christian religion (Wrede 1975:109, 115). In the end his reconstruction of the Christological development within early Christianity is decisive for his interpretation of Mark's Gospel, the Messianic secret therein and the Christology thereof. From passages such as Ac 2: 36, Rm 1:4 and Phlp 2:6-11 Wrede infers that, according to the most ancient view, Jesus was only regarded as Messiah in the sense of a supernatural being after his resurrection. For Mark and the other Evangelists, however, Jesus' earthly life was already a Messianic life, as is evident from the way in which he is portrayed in the Gospels. To reconcile the two views, Mark makes use of the Messianic secret. Against this background it becomes clear why Wrede chose Mk 9:9 as the key to unlocking the Messianic secret. Since Mark's portrayal of Jesus as a supernatural being could only be valid after his resurrection, the disciples were silenced until this event.

Various criticisms were put forward against Wrede's view. In most instances the presence of a Messianic secret in Mark's Gospel was not disputed (cf however Trocmé 1973; Botha 1989:77-78), with the result that the Messianic secret became the object of extensive research (cf e.g Schweizer 1965; Aune 1969; Dunn 1970; Räisänen 1976; Blevins 1981; Tuckett 1983). Subsequent scholars, however, differed with Wrede on the question of the comprehensiveness of the Messianic secret (Luz 1965; Räisänen 1976), as well as on the kind of Christology with which it coheres (e.g Schweizer 1965; Kingsbury 1983). The question is indeed whether Wrede would have been able to detect such a comprehensive
Messianic secret and the accompanying Christology without his reconstruction of the Christological development within early Christianity (Robinson 1973:29). It must, moreover, be asked whether he does justice to the diversity within the New Testament, which is nowadays increasingly emphasised, and to Mark's distinctiveness by using Pauline material to reconstruct Mark's Christology.

Despite the limitations of his view, Wrede profoundly influenced both Mar­

can research in particular and New Testament studies in general. Regarding Mark's Christology, the importance of his contribution lies in the fact that, by means of his insistence on the theological nature of Mark's Gospel, he opened up the Gospel, including its Christology, to various interpretations. By doing so, he initiated a great part of the twentieth century research on Mark's Christol­

ogy.

Wrede's own view on Mark's Jesus was continued in various important studies on Christology (e.g. Wetter 1916; Bousset 1965:53-55). His view of the resurrection as the starting-point for a conception of Jesus which has little to do with the 'historical Jesus' has proved very influential in further research. It was especially adopted by the Formgeschichtler, who developed it into a rather un­

shakeable supposition. Wrede's work on Mark's Gospel, moreover, prepared the ground for various new methods. In this connection Robinson correctly re­

marks: 'Wrede was operating with the principles which later guided both form criticism and redaction criticism. These insights not only gave his work a fu­

ture...but Wrede applied them consistently enough to put an end to the then dominant phase of Gospel research, the nineteenth century's quest for the his­

torical Jesus, so that the book marks the close of an epoch in the history of the discipline and provided stimuli...for new directions.' Those who regarded Mark's Jesus as θείος άνήρ would interpret Wrede's view in a specific way.

3 MARK'S JESUS AS ΘΕΙΟΣ 'ΑΝΗΡ

The view of Mark's Jesus as a θείος άνήρ, a very influential one during the twentieth century which still has its proponents (cf e.g Koester 1990:201ff), relates to Wrede's view in various ways. In general it can be said that this view also supposes a discrepancy between the 'historical' and the Marcan Jesus. Whereas, according to Wrede, Mark's Jesus was the product of an inner-Christian development, with the result that he did not look for a history of religions parallel which Mark might have used in his portrayal of Jesus, exactly this was done by the proponents of the θείος άνήρ view of Jesus. These scholars took seriously the other insight propounded by the history of religions school, namely the view that, in its origin and development, Christianity was decisively influenced by contemporary and neighbouring religions (cf Kümmel 1973:247, 257-258; Müller 1985:171-172). Consequently knowledge of concepts/figures from other cultures and religions were utilised in their understanding of the New
Testament, including its central figure. As far as Mark's Jesus is concerned, the choice fell on the so-called θείος ἀνήρ.

The view of Mark's Jesus as a θείος ἀνήρ is not a homogenous one. In fact, it passed through various stages, which implies that the overarching term actually embraces more than one view. It is therefore necessary to outline its historical course briefly. The historical survey is anticipated by an identification of the components which form part of this view. Who was the θείος ἀνήρ, and why was he chosen as a parallel for the Marcan Jesus? How do the various parts of this view of Mark's Jesus cohere?

According to the θείος ἀνήρ Christology, Jesus is portrayed in the New Testament, also and especially in Mark's Gospel, in terms of the θείος ἀνήρ, a figure from the Hellenistic world. Various definitions of this figure have been offered. The one by Betz recapitulates the essence well: 'He is exceptionally gifted and extraordinary in every respect. He is in command both of a higher, revelational wisdom and of divine power (dunamis) to do miracles. Yet he is not identical with a deity, but can be called a mixture of the human and the divine' (Betz 1968:116). Proponents of this view usually suppose that θείος ἀνήρ was a clearly defined concept in the first century AD, which could thus have influenced Mark's portrayal of Jesus (cf Bieler 1935:73-97, 129, 141; Betz 1968:114-116). The points of contact between the Marcan Jesus and the Hellenistic θείος ἀνήρ and therefore the validity of the correlation, are especially seen in the ascription of the Son of God title to Jesus (Wetter 1916:138, 140-141, 144; Bultmann 1968:131-133) and in his activity as a miracle-worker (Bultmann 1968:133; Keck 1965; Achtemeier 1972a; Georgi 1964:213-214). Basic to this view is the conviction that Mark's Gospel belongs to a Hellenistic environment (Bultmann 1979:372). With this conviction goes the supposition that the Marcan miracle-stories are of a Hellenistic nature (Bultmann 1979:255-256). Another important aspect of this Christology is the conviction that Hellenistic Judaism played an intermediary role in the portrayal of Jesus in the New Testament writings (cf Holladay 1977:24-42 for a discussion of Reitzenstein, Windisch, Bieler, Georgi etc). According to this view, writers such as Josephus and Philo portrayed the Old Testament men of God in terms of the θείος ἀνήρ, and by doing so prepared the ground for Jesus' portrayal in these terms in the New Testament.

Although the view of Jesus as θείος ἀνήρ only became influential during the twentieth century Baur, in his Apollonius von Tyana und Christus (1966), already pointed out resemblances between Jesus and Apollonius which would later on be placed under the θείος ἀνήρ denominator. He himself, however, did not yet refer to Jesus and Apollonius by means of this term (Brady 1992:9).

During the twentieth century Reitzenstein layed the foundation for the correlation of the Marcan Jesus and the Hellenistic θείος ἀνήρ in his two books Hel-
lenistische Wundererzählungen and Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. Reitzenstein was of the opinion that a general conception of the θείος ἄνθρωπος was established during the Hellenistic era. A person who fell in this category was characterised by a ‘higher nature’ and personal holiness which found expression in a special knowledge (e.g. of someone’s thoughts), the ability to foresee the future and to do miracles. These abilities resulted from the person’s union with the deity (Reitzenstein 1956:26-27). Although the figure that would be used to shed light on Mark’s Jesus for a great part of the twentieth century, had by now received a name (θείος ἄνθρωπος), Reitzenstein did not yet connect this figure with Jesus. He did, however, prepare the ground for the connection.

As has been pointed out above, Mark’s Jesus was related to the Hellenistic θείος ἄνηρ especially on account of the Son of God title and of his miracles. In fact, in the relevant research these two ‘factors’ were mostly closely interrelated. Wetter’s contribution (1916) is a case in point. In Wetter’s view the very fact that in Mark’s Gospel the title Son of God is used in the context of miracles suggests that it has to be understood in a Hellenistic sense, for it is in Hellenism that the working of miracles stamps someone as Son of God. Jesus’ acceptance of the title Son of God during his trial and the resulting charge of blasphemy (Mk 14:61-62) also points to a Hellenistic background for this title (Wetter 1916:140-144).

How did this Hellenistic Son of God enter into the Synoptic Gospels? In Wetter’s opinion, the Jewish concept of the Messiah and the Hellenistic Son of God fused while the tradition about Jesus of Nazareth took shape in the Christian communities. It is even possible that the figure of the Messiah took on characteristics of the Hellenistic Son of God before the origin of Christianity. In Wetter’s view Christianity’s Son of God conception did not necessarily originate in pure Hellenistic communities. It could have stemmed from Palestinian soil, especially from among the Jews in Galilee who were more exposed and susceptible to foreign influences. Wetter already pointed to the interaction between Judaism and Hellenism (Wetter 1916:146), a factor not sufficiently taken into account in the later stages of the θείος ἄνηρ research with its rigid divisions between the various kinds of Christianity. For subsequent research on Mark’s Jesus as θείος ἄνηρ Wetter’s view that Son of God and θείος ἄνθρωπος converged in Hellenism is of great importance (Wetter 1916:82-83, 186-187). Although Wetter did not elaborate on the relationship between these two, he did indeed link them. By so doing, he paved the way for the understanding of the Marcan Jesus in terms of the Hellenistic θείος ἄνηρ.

The most comprehensive study on the θείος ἄνηρ came from Ludwig Bieler. His work comprises two volumes, in which he brings together a massive amount of material spanning several centuries. Bieler’s aim is to demonstrate that late antiquity and early Christianity had the same idea of the θείος ἄνηρ (Bieler
He therefore concentrates on sources of antiquity which are more or less contemporaneous with the Christian sources he discusses. Bieler is especially interested in the θεῖος ἄνδρας as a type. Although his investigation includes material from various centuries, he is not really interested in delineating the θεῖος ἄνδρας during the various phases of history. He rather intends to draw a composite picture of the qualities and activities of the various θεῖοι ἄνδρες (Bieler 1935:4-5). This picture can be summarised as follows: The θεῖος ἄνδρας is an exceptionally gifted human being, an ‘Übermensch’. He is marked by a very close relationship with the deity. In fact, what he does and is, flows from divine power and is meant as service to a deity (Bieler 1935:141).

It was especially Bultmann who, by means of his influential books Theologie des neuen Testaments (1968) and Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (1979) firmly established the view that in Mark’s Gospel Jesus is portrayed as θεῖος ἄνδρας. He makes use of the division of early Christianity into Judaism and Hellenism, a division which for a long time formed the background to Gospel research and also profoundly influenced the study of Christology. Bultmann’s point of departure was that Mark’s Gospel belongs to a Hellenistic milieu (Bultmann 1979:372). For the Hellenistic readers of Mark’s Gospel, Bultmann asserts, the θεῖος ἄνδρας was a well-known figure. For this reason Mark utilised this figure to explain Jesus’ nature and significance to them (Bultmann 1968:132). Two types of data in the Gospel especially support this view: the large number of miracle-stories, which, in Bultmann’s view, are of a Hellenistic nature (Bultmann 1968:133) and the occurrence of Son of God in the Gospel (Bultmann 1968:132-133). According to Bultmann, various sons of God were extant in Hellenism, one of them being the son of God as a miracle-worker. It is this miracle-working Son of God whom we encounter in Mark’s Gospel with its emphasis on miracles (Bultmann 1968:133).

Bultmann’s contribution is important in that, while building on the above-mentioned studies, he restricted the composite notion of θεῖος ἄνδρας which, for example, prevailed in Bieler’s work, to the θεῖος ἄνδρας as a miracle-worker (cf Tiede 1972:251). The subsequent study of this Christology would focus especially on Mark’s miracle-stories, which would be looked at in a more nuanced way than Bultmann did (cf e.g Keck 1965; Achtemeier 1972a).

Distinctive of the first phase in the θεῖος ἄνδρας view of Mark’s Christology (cf in addition to Bultmann e.g Keck 1965; Achtemeier 1972a; Georgi 1964:213-216) is that Mark’s Jesus was correlated with θεῖος ἄνδρας in a positive way (cf Kingsbury 1983:26). In Bultmann’s case this is evident. He defines Mark’s aim with the Gospel as the union of the Hellenistic kerygma of Christ, as it is extant in Paul’s letters (e.g Rm 3:24; Phlp 2:6-11), with the tradition of the history of Jesus, which implies that Mark is in agreement with Paul on the question of Christology. It is clear that, in Bultmann’s view, Son of God gives
adequate expression to the identity and significance of Mark's Jesus.

Under the influence of redaction criticism, with its distinction between tradition and redaction, the question of how the redactor Mark treated the traditions available to him became increasingly important in studies on Mark's Jesus. The miracle-stories were now mostly considered as belonging to the tradition, and the delineation of Jesus' suffering as Mark's own contribution in which his emphasis is detectable. Although at this stage a critical function was attributed to Mark, Jesus as miracle-worker and as the suffering one were initially not played off against one another. The former depiction, however, was regarded as one-sided and incomplete and as such had to be put into perspective by the latter (e.g. Luz 1965; Keck 1965; Betz 1968).

With Weeden's contribution Mark became a reinterpreter, even a corrector of the traditions available to him. This phase in the θειος ἄνερ view of Mark's Jesus is thus known as the corrective phase. Weeden's view, which cannot be dealt with in full here (cf. Weeden 1971), boils down to the occurrence of two opposite Christologies in Mark's Gospel: the one of Jesus as θειος ἄνερ and the other of him as the suffering one. Weeden considers the negative portrayal of the disciples in Mark's Gospel as a purposeful polemic against them on account of a false Christology advocated by them. Although the two Christologies in Mark's Gospel are linked to historical persons (Jesus and the disciples), the Gospel of Mark is not really concerned with the historical situation of Jesus' life. It deals with a situation in Mark's community where a false Christology cropped up which Mark wanted to combat in his Gospel. He does this by using Jesus as his representative who, by means of words and deeds, gives expression to the suffering Son of man Christology, and the disciples as representatives of his opponents who advocate a θειος ἄνερ Christology (Weeden 1971: 163).

As far as method is concerned, it is important to note that Weeden not only made use of redaction criticism, but that he also implemented insights from literary criticism. In Mark's time, Weeden asserts, there was a tendency to read a writing by focusing on the characters. This implies that Mark's intention can be deduced from his depiction of his characters (Weeden 1971: 12-18). It thus becomes clear why Weeden concentrated on the characters in the Gospel and specifically on the negative portrayal of the disciples to such a great extent in order to discover Mark's intention and why he was able to infer so much from this portrayal. That the disciples advocated Jesus as θειος ἄνερ and that Mark wanted to combat this view of Jesus in his Gospel is, however, not to be deduced from the Gospel alone. It is clear that Weeden strongly relies on the work done by Georgi on Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians (cf. Weeden 1971: 60) and thereby on the tendency to read the New Testament writings as polemical.

Perrin, who agrees with Weeden on Mark's intention with his Gospel, paid special attention to Mark's use of Christological titles and indicated how, in his
opinion, the titles cohere with the supposed corrective Christology. According to him, neither Christ nor Son of God, in Mark's view, sufficiently expresses Jesus' identity. Both these titles have therefore to be interpreted and filled with content by means of the designation Son of man (Perrin 1970:55; 1974:112). This view, which boils down to the fact that Mark's own Christological emphasis is to be found in Son of man, for a long time determined the way in which the relationship between Christ, Son of God and Son of man was regarded (cf e g Donahue 1973; Achtemeier 1975; Boring 1985). Not everyone, however, who considered Mark's Christology to be expressed in the term Son of man thought that Mark wanted to interpret or even correct a θεῖος ἀνήρ Son of God by means of Son of man. Some (e g Boring 1985:131-132) merely thought that Mark used Son of man to interpret Son of God and Christ because their meaning is not clear from the contexts in which they appear.

Since the late sixties various aspects of the θεῖος ἀνήρ Christology have been criticised. Von Martitz (1969) questioned the most basic presupposition of this view of Mark's Jesus by pointing out that θεῖος ἀνήρ was not a clearly defined concept in the pre-Christian era, as has been commonly accepted by New Testament scholars since Bieler's contribution (cf also Tiede 1972:254). Tiede's research on the subject led him to the conclusion that the θεῖος ἀνήρ concept has to be dealt with in a much more nuanced way than was usually done in the mere identification of θεῖος ἀνήρ/miracle-worker by New Testament scholars (Tiede 1972:59, 289-290). Holladay put his finger on yet another questionable presupposition of the θεῖος ἀνήρ Christology by pointing out, on the basis of his study of Philo, Josephus and Artapanus, that it is problematic to merely accept that Hellenistic Judaism paved the way for the portrayal of Jesus as θεῖος ἀνήρ in the New Testament (Holladay 1977:239-241).

As to the so-called corrective phase of the θεῖος ἀνήρ Christology, it can be asked whether it is justified to regard the Gospel of Mark as a polemical writing aimed at correcting a false Christology. Is the most valid way of approaching the Gospel really to ask against what or whom it was directed (cf Holladay 1977:13-14, Best 1977:378)? Does the view of the disciples held by Weeden and his supporters do justice to all the disciple material in Mark's Gospel (cf Best 1977; Tannehill 1977)? And: Should Weeden's view on the disciples be regarded as the most adequate solution to their negative portrayal in Mark, or are there other better solutions (cf Best 1977:399; Vorster 1980b:151-152; Botha 1989:7, 138)?

It seems, however, that the above criticism is not yet the final nail in the coffin of the θεῖος ἀνήρ view of Mark's Jesus. Research on the subject is still in progress.
Especially since the sixties New Testament scholars have started paying special attention to Jesus as a teacher in Mark's Gospel. The following statement is typical of how Mark's Jesus has been viewed by many New Testament scholars since: 'One of Mark's intentions was to establish the idea that Jesus was pre-eminently a teacher' (Achtemeier 1980:476). Of course not all New Testament scholars agree that the depiction of Jesus as a teacher belongs to Christology. It depends on how one defines Christology (cf e.g Cullmann 1957:6; Hahn 1964:81n1; Dormeyer 1987; Kingsbury 1983:53-54). Since this designation/role undoubtedly forms part of Mark's portrayal of Jesus, and Christology is, for the purpose of this article, used as an equivalent for Mark's Jesus, the inclusion of material on Jesus as teacher is not further substantiated.

Within the view of Mark's Jesus as a teacher one again encounters a variety of viewpoints, which are related to factors such as method, theological context, view of the text type of Mark's Gospel, etc.

Although Bultmann (1979:367) already drew attention to the fact that Jesus as a teacher is a 'feststehende Anschauung' in Mark's Gospel, it seems that it was especially Eduard Schweizer who initiated the research on Jesus as teacher in Mark's Gospel with his article published in 1963 (see also his 1970 article and his 1975 commentary on Mark). Research on this facet of Mark's Jesus, especially that done during the sixties and seventies, was, to a great extent, a continuation or a criticism of (facets of) his viewpoint.

Schweizer's contribution on Jesus as a teacher is, like most of the initial ones on the subject, of a redaction-critical nature. In the sections of Mark where he detects the hand of the redactor, διδάσκω and related terms, are, according to him, nearly solely ascribed to Jesus. From this he deduces that, for Mark, Jesus' distinctiveness lies in his teaching (Schweizer 1963:93-95). Although Mark emphasises Jesus' activity as a teacher, especially the authoritative nature thereof, he is, according to Schweizer, not really interested in the content of Jesus' teaching. The only exception to this is the Passiondidache (Schweizer 1963:96). From the supposed lack of interest in the content of Jesus' teaching and also from other material in the Gospel (e.g the depiction of Jesus' baptism, the interrelatedness between teaching and miracles and Jesus' teaching by means of parables) Schweizer concludes that Mark is not really interested in history. He is, on the contrary, concerned with God's revelation which falls in a different category (Schweizer 1963:103; 1970:22, 36).

It is clear that Mark's supposed disinterest in history should be ascribed to Schweizer being influenced by dialectical theology (cf Räisänen 1976:10-11). His interpretation of the teaching material in Mark was, furthermore, affected by his acceptance of Pauline influence on Mark. The 'secret' in Mk 4:11 must, for example, in his view, be regarded as 'the word of the cross' (cf Rm 16:25;
Col 1:26ff; Eph 3:3ff, 9; 6:16; 1 Tm 3:16; Schweizer 1970:31). Although Schweizer drew attention to teaching activity as characteristic of the Marcan Jesus, the theological context in which he dealt with this facet prevented him from doing full justice to it. He nevertheless raised various matters which were followed up in subsequent research (cf e g Meye 1968; Howe 1979; Achtemeier 1980; France 1980).

Concerning Jesus' teaching as presented in Mark's Gospel, a considerable number of New Testament scholars shared Schweizer's view that Mark was not really interested in the content of Jesus' teaching (e g Evans 1968:48; Martin 1972:112-118; Egger 1976:144). This view was in due course questioned by various Marcan scholars (cf Meye 1968:41; Achtemeier 1980:475-476; France 1980:113-123) and various parts of Mark's Gospel were identified as teaching material (Mk 4, 9, 10, 12 and 13 in the main, as well as large parts of chapters 7, 8 and 11; France 1980: 113-123).

Of greater importance for our subject are the attempts to ascertain how Jesus as teacher fits into Mark's broader Christological conception. How do the various aspects of Jesus' work in Mark (teaching, miracles, suffering) fit together?

Special attention was paid to the relationship teacher/miracle-worker, teaching/miracles in Mark's Gospel. As a matter of fact, Mark himself raises the question concerning this relationship by interweaving an exorcism with Jesus' teaching early in his Gospel (Mk 1:21-28). This pericope thus plays a key role in establishing the relationship teacher/miracle-worker, teacher/miracles.

Different answers were given to the question as to where Mark's emphasis lies. Evans (1968:46) was of the opinion that Jesus' mighty deeds are predominant and that Mark selects a specific kind of teaching material—especially Jesus' controversies with his opponents in which he is victorious—to fit the nature of his Gospel. However, most New Testament scholars were of the opinion that Mark focused primarily on Jesus as teacher (e g Meye 1968:46-47; Egger 1976: 159-160, 166; Achtemeier 1980) and that the miracles are subordinate to Jesus' teaching. This view was especially substantiated on the basis of Mk 1:21-28 (cf also Mk 2:1-12), from which it was deduced that Mark intended to illustrate the authoritative nature of Jesus' teaching by means of an exorcism (Meye 1968:46; Egger 1976:149; France 1980:110-111; Achtemeier 1980:479). According to this view, Jesus' authority as teacher is manifested in an exorcism and in other miracles.

Schweizer's view that in the Gospel of Mark Jesus' suffering forms the content of his teaching, was inter alia taken up by scholars who regarded Mark's emphasis on Jesus' suffering to be the answer to a deficient Christology. The view of Mark's Jesus as a teacher fitted neatly into their view: In Mark's Gospel the teacher Jesus teaches the readers the correct Christology (cf e g Müller 1973).
In a few studies it was attempted to ascertain how teacher coheres with the other names or titles which are ascribed to Jesus in Mark's Gospel. Howe, for example, detected a connection between teacher and Son of man. Apart from the fact that from the beginning of the Gospel both are openly ascribed to Jesus (Mk 2:10,28) and are marked by authority (Mk 1:22,27; 2:10,28). Mark, according to Howe, relates the two by juxtaposing them (e.g. in Mk 2:10 and 13). He is, furthermore, of the opinion that Mark purposely connected the three facets of Son of man (his earthly authority, suffering and future activity) with Jesus as teacher (cf Howe 1979:222).

Some Marcan scholars paid attention to the connection between teacher and prophet in Mark's Gospel. Strictly speaking the word 'connection' is misleading, since the question mostly was: Does Mark portray Jesus as teacher or as prophet? Yet in a certain sense the relevant investigations are concerned with the relationship between these two. The studies by Dodd (1930) and Kee (1977) both subscribe to the view that Mark repeatedly calls Jesus teacher, but that the role which he fulfils according to Mark is nearer to that of a charismatic prophet. According to Dodd, Mark fills, as it were, the one designation or role (teacher) with the activity of the other (prophet). Although there are resemblances between Jesus' activity and that of a Jewish rabbi, he differs from them, especially in his independent interpretation of the law (Mk 1:27; Dodd 1930:56-57). In various respects Mark's Jesus is similar to the Old Testament prophets: He has similar experiences (e.g. at his baptism, Mk 1:9-11). Just like the prophets, He foresees the future (Mk 13:2) and acts in a symbolic way (Dodd 1930:57-60). Despite many similarities between Jesus and the Old Testament prophets, he does, however, not fit neatly into this category (Dodd 1930:66).

Kee, who also thinks that teacher is Mark's favourite designation for Jesus, is of the opinion that Mark's Jesus fulfils another role than that of a Rabbinic interpreter of Scripture. According to him, Jesus acts as 'a charismatic, divinely authorized spokesman of God'. He, for example, voices an opinion on the same kinds of issues as the prophets (the sabbath, divorce, one's attitude towards possessions, responsibility towards the neighbour, etc). Like a prophet Jesus foretells future events (Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34; 14:3-9, 14, 17-18, 36) although he is not called prophet in these contexts. His mighty acts call to mind the prophetic tradition of Israel and he is, indeed, associated with Moses, Elijah and John the Baptist (cf Mk 1:2-3; 6:31; 8:23; 9:2-13; Kee 1977:117-118).

That the category of prophet has in fact to be taken into account in the study of the Marcan Jesus follows from the parable in Mk 12:1-12. Here Jesus is also portrayed as more than a prophet. He is indeed referred to as the wine-grower's son. And yet his coming is regarded to be in line with that of the prophets (cf Blank beneath).

The studies on Jesus as teacher discussed so far were mostly of a redaction-
critical nature: What Mark intended to say about the teacher Jesus were usually inferred from the supposed redactional sections of Mark's Gospel. In most cases there was no serious reflection on the background of Jesus' role as a teacher. When such reflection did, in fact, occur, the Jewish rabbi was regarded as the background to Mark's teacher-Jesus (e.g. Dodd 1930:54).

Since the eighties various developments in Gospel research have taken place which have had decisive implications for the study of Jesus as teacher in Mark's Gospel. As far as the question of methodology is concerned, redaction criticism's domination of Gospel interpretation was terminated in that its limitations were increasingly recognised (cf e.g. Gütgemanns 1979; Black 1988). New methods (cf e.g. Robbins beneath) which influenced the study of Jesus as teacher in Mark's Gospel appeared on the scene of Gospel research. Another development which influenced this research is the fact that the question of Gospel genre (in the sense of generic type) has been asked anew in all seriousness since the late seventies and especially during the eighties and nineties (cf e.g. Talbert 1977; Robbins 1984; Aune 1987, 1988; Burridge 1992). This question is, of course, nearly as old as the Gospels themselves and has popped up regularly since the second century (cf Dormeyer 1989). New Testament scholars have, however, for long been satisfied with form criticism's typifying of the Gospels as unique writings (cf Schmidt in Smith 1992:1786-1787). Besides, form criticism's influential view of the Gospels as Kleinförme (cf Schmidt) prevented them from being compared with the more sophisticated writings of their time. However, redaction criticism, with its growing emphasis on the part played by the Evangelists in the origin of the Gospels re-opened the possibility of comparing the Gospels with contemporary writings. In the relevant studies the Greco-Roman biography in particular was considered to be suitable comparative material. Although at this stage no unanimity exists regarding the genre of the Gospels (Stuhlmacher 1991), the differences between them and contemporary Greco-Roman biographies are not ignored (Dihle 1991) and in some recent important studies the Gospels are still regarded as unique or at least distinctive writings (e.g. Meier 1991:143-144) a growing number of New Testament scholars consider Mark's Gospel to be akin to ancient biographies and implement this kinship in the interpretation of the Gospel, including its Christology.

Robbins's Jesus the teacher: A socio-rhetorical interpretation of Mark (1984) is one of the important contributions on Jesus as teacher in Mark's Gospel which must be understood against the background of the changing situation in Gospel research. The name of his method already indicates that Robbins intends to take both the Gospel itself and its context, that is the social and cultural milieu in which it originated, seriously. A combination of these leads to his view of Mark's Jesus. Concerning both text and context, Robbins intends to extend the boundaries which formerly applied. Instead of the smaller forms identified
by form criticism, he pays attention to the overarching rhetorical forms in the Gospel (Robbins 1984:192). Besides, he regards the social and cultural milieu in which the Gospel of Mark is rooted to be broader than its Jewish and Christian components (Robbins 1984:12-13). He therefore includes other writings of the Mediterranean world of the time in his interpretation of Mark's Gospel and especially in his detection of Mark's Christology.

In Robbins' view, the various rhetorical forms which he identifies in Mark's Gospel ('progressive form', 'repetitive form' and 'conventional form') co-operate to depict Jesus as a teacher who gathers disciples: 'The pattern of behaviour that Jesus repeats again and again reveals his social role as an itinerant teacher who transmits his system of thought and action to a group of disciple-companions' (Robbins 1984:47). He emphasises this even more strongly by saying: 'In Mark, the "gospel of God" is transformed into a biographical account of a prophet-teacher who embodies wisdom and power and transmits his mode of thought and action to a select group of disciple-companions who associate with him' (Robbins 1984:47). The other names attributed to Jesus in Mark's Gospel (Son of God, Son of man, etc) simply highlight additional features of Jesus' basic role as a teacher-Messiah (Robbins 1984:48).

Robbins chooses his comparative material from both Jewish and Greco-Roman circles. According to him, 'repetitive forms' in the biblical and Jewish tradition focus on the prophet of the Lord. Robbins specifically chooses the Elijah/Elisha narrative and the book of Jeremiah as comparative material, because in them, as in Mark's Gospel, the biographical information is restricted to the adult career of the persons concerned, that is, it does not include birth or childhood stories. In Mark's Gospel there are, moreover, explicit references to Elijah (Mk 6:15; 8:28; 9:4-5, 11-13; 15:35-36), whilst the depiction of Jesus' miracles in Mark corresponds to those of Elijah and Elisha. As to the Greco-Roman tradition, Robbins' choice chiefly falls on Xenophon's Memorabilia. The prominence of Socrates' disciples in this writing and the fact that it concludes with Socrates' trial and death makes it, in his view, suitable comparative material. In view of Mark's depiction of Jesus, it is significant that the 'repetitive forms' in Xenophon's Memorabilia focus on Socrates as a religio-ethical teacher who gathers disciples in order to transmit his system of thought and action to them (Robbins 1984:54-55).

In Robbins' view, Mark's teacher-Jesus in the end turns out to be an integration of a Jewish prophet and a Greek teacher who gathers disciples. That prophet alone does not aptly describe Mark's Jesus is to be inferred from the fact that the authority with which he speaks resides in himself and not in the word of the Lord which comes to him (Robbins 1984:55-60; 115). In the Marcan Jesus' own initiative, as well as in the prominent role of his disciples in the Gospel, Robbins detects the influence of Greco-Roman traditions, more specifi-
cally Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Plato's *Theaetetus* and Philostratus' *Apollonius von Tyana*. Mark's presentation must therefore be seen as an 'independent adaptation' of Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions (Robbins 1984:115). In Mark's Gospel the fluid first-century concept of the Jewish Messiah was filled with the activity of a religious teacher, who was killed as a result of his teaching and conduct (Robbins 1984:13-14).

Botha (1989) is also of the opinion that Mark primarily depicts Jesus as a teacher. His view of Mark's Jesus as a teacher forms part of a comprehensive study, containing various intertwined facets, which was initiated by Mark's portrayal of the disciples and the divergent interpretations offered to explain this. Although the disciples in Mark's Gospel are the focus of his study, he is also interested in Mark's Jesus, the portrayal of whom is closely interrelated with that of the disciples.

Of interest here is the way in which Botha arrives at his view of Jesus as a teacher in Mark's Gospel. It is clear that the choice of genre plays a decisive role in his view. According to him, Mark's Gospel must be regarded as a hero tradition which portrays Jesus as the teacher sent by God (Botha 1989:64). Facets of Mark's Jesus, usually viewed as specific Marcan accents, also fit the view of Mark's Gospel as the biography of a religious teacher. The prominent place allotted Jesus' suffering, for example, relates to the genre of Mark's Gospel. Unlike common opinion on the matter, this emphasis is not unique to the Gospels. The Gospels share this emphasis with a first-century sub-genre of Greco-Roman biography which focused on martyrdom. Botha quotes Aune in this connection: 'The focus on the death of Jesus which characterises all of the Gospels...is a theme characteristic of a development in Greco-Roman biography of the first century AD (Aune 1988:123 in Botha 1989:70). Mark does not really spell out the significance of Jesus' death. The few exceptions (Mk 10:45; 14:22-24) are related to martyrdom (Botha 1989:69): 'Die onderliggende logika van die lydingsgeskiedenis is dus verweefd met kontemporêre opvattings oor marte-laarskap.' (The underlying logic of the history of the passion is therefore interwoven with contemporary views on martyrdom [translated] Botha 1989:70.)

Not only are other aspects of Jesus' conduct and life in Mark's Gospel correlated with his being a teacher. Other titles/names attributed to him in Mark (Christ, Son of God) are also connected with teacher, filled with content by means of teacher and regarded as subordinate to it: 'Wat dit beteken om Gelsalde te wees, word duidelik in die verhaal, naamlik om leermeester en eksor-sis te wees' (Botha 1989:84). (What it implies to be the Anointed becomes clear from the narrative namely to be teacher and exorcist [translated] Botha 1989:84.) And: 'God se Seun is die een wat reg leer en wat deur God aanbeveel word as luisterenswaardig.' (The Son of God is the one who teaches that which is right, and who is recommended by God as being worthy to be listened to [translated]...
Botha 1989:84.)

Although the studies discussed above, which regard the Greco-Roman biography as comparative material for the Gospels and utilise this insight in the detection of Mark's Christology, arrive at the conclusion that Mark's Jesus should primarily be regarded as a teacher, this view does not necessarily follow from the view of the Gospels as a kind of ancient biography. What, in fact, follows necessarily from the view of the Gospels as ancient biographies (Burridge 1992: prefers the term bioi) is that Jesus, and not some other subject such as the kingdom of God or the salvation of God in history, is the primary concern of the Gospels (Burridge 1992:256). 'This emphasis on the centrality of the person of Jesus is a hermeneutical consequence of the Gospels being bioi' (Burridge 1992:257).

5 MARK'S JESUS AS THE SON OF GOD

Although this article is concerned with views of Mark's Jesus and these do not necessarily cohere with Christological titles and their supposed meaning, some of these views are so closely bound up with Christological titles that they have to be discussed in connection with them. This especially holds good for Son of God. Owing to its occurrence at strategic positions in the Gospel (Mk 1:1, 11; 9:7; 14:61 and 15:9), it is commonly regarded as an important title, and even as the key to Mark's Christology. As such it has played an important role throughout the research on Mark's Christology.

Christ and Son of man have also received a good deal of attention in the research on Mark's Christology (cf Jacobs 1991:56-86; 121-159). For various reasons, however, they are not discussed here in detail. In the history of research on Mark's Christology, Christ was not as commonly regarded as the key to Mark's Christology as Son of God (cf however e.g Juel 1992). When it was, indeed, utilised to illuminate Mark's Christology, no new insights came to the fore which had not already resulted from research on the title Son of God. Mostly either supernatural (e.g Wrede 1969:74-77; Bultmann 1979:333) or royal connotations (Juel 1977:72-83; De Jonge 1989) were attached to Christ, or, like Son of God, it was filled with content acquired from Son of man and the accompanying sayings (Horstmann 1969:15-20, 28, 137; Perrin 1974a:109-111, 114; Müller 1973:164-165, 172; Boring 1985:132). Although a massive amount of research on Son of man was done during the twentieth century, the greatest part of this research dealt with matters such as the origin of Son of man, the relationship between the different kinds of Son of man sayings and the authenticity of these, whereas a much smaller part of the research is of direct relevance to Mark's Christology (cf Jacobs 1991:121-159). The research on Son of man which is indeed relevant to Mark's Christology, namely that in which Son of man is regarded as Mark's way of interpreting or correcting Son of God and
Christ, has already been referred to briefly in the section on the ὄνημος Christology.

5.1 Mark's Son of God as supernatural being
In discussing Wrede's view and that of his successors and followers, attention was paid to the view that Son of God in Mark refers to a supernatural being. This view was, of course, not restricted to members of the history of religions school, but was also held by other New Testament scholars throughout the century, although not necessarily for the same reasons as the Religionsgeschichtler (cf e.g Kingsbury 1983:47ff). While, during the first decades of the century, a Hellenistic background for Son of God was often presupposed, since the seventies New Testament scholars have to a greater extent turned to Old Testament-Jewish models in order to elucidate Son of God in Mark’s Gospel: the Messiah-king of Jewish expectation, the servant of the Lord, the suffering righteous one and the eschatological prophet.

5.2 Mark's Son of God as Messiah-king
In his well-known article of 1965, Vielhauer argued that Mark intended to emphasise Jesus’ kingship by means of the title Son of God. In his view, Son of God in Mark has both ὄνημος and royal connotations. In the former sense it is found in the miracle narratives, while in the latter sense it underlies the baptism narrative (Mk 1:9-11), Jesus’ transfiguration (Mk 9:2-8), the high priest’s question concerning Jesus’ identity (Mk 14:61-62) and the Roman officer’s 'confession' (Mk 15:39). Since Son of God in the sense of king appears at such strategic places in the Gospel (beginning, middle and end), it must be regarded as the dominant notion (Vielhauer 1965:206-209). On the one hand Vielhauer tries to prove his view from the Gospel itself by arguing that the contexts in which Son of God occurs at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the Gospel suggest that Jesus is depicted as a king. Apart from supposed support for this view from Mark's Gospel itself, Vielhauer's view that Mark's Gospel is based on an ancient Egyptian enthronisation ceremony plays a decisive role in his view of Son of God in Mark (Vielhauer 1965:213).

The view that Son of God in Mark has royal connotations has also been substantiated from Mark's passion narrative. Juel, for example, is of the opinion that the occurrence of Son of God together with king in Mk 14 and 15 stamps it as a royal title (Mk 14:61-62; 15:1-26; Juel 1977:72-83). Donahue (1976:71-72) supposes that the Son of man saying in Mk 14:62 specifically fills Son of God in Mk 14:61 with royal content.

In line with the tendency to ascribe to the redactor Mark an ever greater, more creative role, also in Mark's passion narrative (cf e.g Kelber 1976), Matera (1982, 1986) specifically uses Mark's passion narrative as a key to the de-
tection of Mark's Christology. According to Matera it is striking that Jesus' kingship is very prominent in Mk 15. Mk 15, is, in fact, structured around the theme of kingship. The title King of the Jews/Israel ascribed to Jesus is six times in this chapter (Mk 15:2, 9, 12, 18, 26, 32). Mark, moreover, uses the mocking scenes to ironically emphasise Jesus' kingship (Matera 1982:60-63). It is also striking that Jesus' kingship is prominent in the chapter in which the Gospel reaches its culmination in the Roman officer's confession of Jesus as Son of God. In view of the fact that Son of God and king are closely bound up with one another in chapter 15, it seems as if Mark intended Son of God to be a royal title (Matera 1982:62). That Son of God is concerned with Jesus' kingship can also be inferred from the fact that Jesus dies with a Messianic outcry (Matera 1982:137).

The question is how this kingship has to be understood. The fact that Mark only calls Jesus King of the Jews (King of Israel) in the context of his suffering and crucifixion and not earlier in the Gospel, implies, in Matera's view, that Mark defines kingship in terms of suffering and death on the cross: 'Jesus is the expected Messiah in the most unexpected manner' (Matera 1982:145). To this kind of kingship Mark gives expression by means of Son of God. This explains why in Mark's Gospel the Roman officer is the first human being to call Jesus Son of God (Matera 1986:59).

For the sake of completeness it must be added that although Mark's Gospel itself, and especially the passion narrative, serves as Matera's starting-point and plays an important role in his conclusion as to Mark's Jesus, the supposed background of Son of God contributes to his view of Mark's Jesus. For Matera Ps 2 forms the primary background to Mark's depiction of both Jesus' baptism and transfiguration, whereas Ps 118, a supposed royal psalm, is quoted in Mk 12:10-11 (Matera 1982:78, 82-83; 1986:53).

In his Der leidende Sohn Gottes Steichele attempts to elucidate Mark's Christology by inquiring into motifs from the Old Testament which play a part in Mark's Gospel, especially those which underlie Mk 1:1-8, 9-11; 9:2-8, 9-13 and 15:20b-41. (These sections are chosen because they appear at the beginning, in the middle and at the end where the redactor's stamp is supposed to be most evident.) Steichele is of the opinion that Ps 2 (especially verse 7) underlies both Jesus' baptism (Mk 1:9-11) and transfiguration (9:2-8) in Mark (Steichele 1980:147, 153-156, 187). In the crucifixion narrative he detects the influence of especially Ps 22, which, in his view, forms part of the more comprehensive motive of the suffering righteous one (1980:248). As will become clear below, quite a number of New Testament scholars are of the opinion that the motive of the suffering righteous one plays an important part in Mark's passion narrative and even in the Christology of the Gospel as a whole. Although Steichele is of the opinion that Jesus' fate in the passion narrative has to be understood in terms
of that of the suffering righteous one, in his view this concept does not cover Jesus' full identity as presented in Mark's passion narrative. It would, in Steichele's view, be an attenuation of the meaning Son of God has in Mark to relate it solely to Jesus' suffering. It is, in fact, the Messianic king who here suffers as a righteous one (Steichele 1980:258). Son of God in Mk 15:39 should, according to Steichele, not be directly understood from, for example, Wisdom of Solomon 2:18: ‘Der Zusammenhang, in dem Mk 15:39 steht, ist, was die Titulatur betrifft, nicht von dem Titel “der Gerechte”, sondern von dem Titel “König der Juden” (Mk 15:26; vgl. a. Mk 15,2.9.12.18) bzw “der Christus, der König Israels” (Mk 15, 32a) geprägt’ (Steichele 1980:272). Son of God in Mk 15:39, as also in Mk 1:11 and 9:7, is meant as a title for the royal Messiah (Steichele 1980:272): ‘Jesus ist selbst im Augenblick seiner tiefsten Not und seines Sterbens der messianische König. Er zeigt sich selbst in dem der “passio iusti” entsprechenden Leiden als der alles erfüllende Sohn Gottes’ (Steichele 1980:273).

In addition to Steichele's comprehensive argumentation in favour of Son of God as a royal title in Mark's Gospel, he is especially interested in Mark's own aim with his insertion of Son of God at crucial positions in the Gospel (Mk 1:11; 9:7; 15:39). The distinct position of these Son of God utterances in Mark's Gospel implies for Steichele (cf also Vielhauer) that an ‘innerer Bedeutungszusammenhang’ exists between them. He views this as a way which leads from the highest glory into the deepest distress (Steichele 1980:296).

5.3 Mark's Son of God as the suffering righteous one

In discussing Steichele's view of Son of God in Mark, I pointed out that quite a number of New Testament scholars are of the opinion that the motif of the suffering righteous one is alluded to in Mark's passion narrative. According to Steichele and also Schenke (1974:72-75), Jesus is not specifically portrayed in the passion narrative as the suffering righteous one. He is in actual fact portrayed as the Messiah, while the motif of the suffering righteous one is used to make the death of the Messiah understandable and acceptable (Schenke 1974:75). According to this view, Son of God must be regarded as a royal title (Steichele 1980:272-273). Other New Testament scholars are of the opinion that in Mark's Gospel Jesus is specifically portrayed as the suffering righteous one. Even Son of God (Mk 15:39) has to be understood against the background of this motif (cf Berger 1973; Lührmann 1981; 1987). Before turning to the relevant contributions, the motif itself must receive come attention.

In his book Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern (1962) Schweizer already pointed to the use of the motif of the suffering righteous one in Mark's Gospel, especially in the passion narrative where allusions to the Psalms about the suffering righteous one (e.g Ps 22) abound (Schweizer...
1962:22-23, 55-57). Ruppert investigated the motif in depth. He identified various Old Testament sections, as well as a number of deuto-canonical writings where this motif occurs (Ruppert 1972:182-189). According to him, it spans about thousand years, during which time it underwent big changes (Ruppert 1972:182, 188-189). For our purpose it is important that, according to Ruppert, the fully developed motif of the suffering righteous one already occurred in the pre-Christian Wisdom of Solomon (2:12-20; 5:1-7). This implies that this motif was available to the early Christians for use in their portrayal of Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection (Ruppert 1972:70-105).

Nickelsburg went even further. His study of the Joseph narratives, the book of Esther, Daniel 3 and 6, Wisdom of Solomon etc led him to assume that a specific genre existed in the mould of which Mark casted his passion narrative. The basic theme of this genre or narrative is the persecution and vindication of the righteous one (Nickelsburg 1980:153-156; cf also Mack 1988:278-287).

Of interest for our subject is whether the title Son of God must also be understood from the motif of the suffering righteous one. Lührmann is of the opinion that this motif underlies all the key sections of the Gospel in which Son of God occurs (Mk 1:11, 9:7 and 15:39). Mark's Christology should, in fact, be understood against the background of this motif (Lührmann 1987:43-44).

Lührmann substantiates this view of Mark's Son of God in his discussion of Mk 1:9-11 (the baptism narrative). As background to the portrayal of Jesus in Mk 1:9-11 one has, in his view, to choose between the Davidic Messiah and the Servant of the Lord. He himself decides on Isaiah 42:1 as mediated by Wisdom of Solomon. In this writing the righteous one is called Son of God (2:18). That the righteous one in Wisdom of Solomon is related to the servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah is to be deduced from the fact that παίς θεοῦ (Wisdom 2:13) and υἱὸς θεοῦ (Wisdom 2:18) occur in the same context. One should therefore regard the motif of the servant of the Lord, which some New Testament scholars consider to underlie Son of God in Mark (e.g. Maurer 1953), as part of the more comprehensive motif of the righteous one. The acceptance of Wisdom of Solomon as the background to Mk 1:11 would imply that Jesus is here declared righteous by God (Lührmann 1987:38). In Lührmann's view the same concept underlies Mk 9:7 and 15:39 (Lührmann 1987:154-156, 264). In fact, the depiction of Jesus in Mark's Gospel corresponds to such a degree with the portrayal of the righteous suffering one in Wisdom 2:12-20 that, in Lührmann's view, one can accept that Mark moulded the Jesus traditions available to him into a biography about the righteous one (Lührmann 1987:43-44).

5.4 Mark's Son of God as the eschatological messenger

Another proposal made as to Son of God in Mark is that Jesus is thereby portrayed as the eschatological messenger who came after the prophets and sur-
passed them. Although the Gospel of John in particular is famous for its portrayal of Jesus as the one sent by God (cf e.g Beasley-Murray 1992), this idea is also found in Mark, although in a somewhat different form. The view that Mark wanted to depict Jesus as the one sent by God, was especially inferred from the parable of the farmers and the vineyard (Mk 12:1-12). Although this view does not have as many adherents as the others discussed here, it is nevertheless worth mentioning, especially since the eschatological prophet is one of the roles nowadays considered to typify the 'historical Jesus' (Vorster 1991). Blank, whose article is briefly discussed here, made a valuable contribution in this regard (cf also Ernst 1981:42; Breytenbach 1984:253-263).

Blank's essay is, like the other proposals discussed in this section, an attempt to understand Mark's Jesus against an Old Testament Jewish background. At the same time he attempts to draw a connection between the earthly Jesus and the early Christians' confession of him as the Son of God—an aspect of his investigation which is not of direct relevance here.

According to Blank, the Old Testament motif of the successive sending of the prophets (Jer 7:1-28) determines the way in which Jesus is portrayed in Mk 12. This implies that he is depicted here as the last eschatological messenger of God before the judgement (Blank 1981:131). That Jesus, who is portrayed as eschatological prophet, is called Son of God must, according to Blank, be attributed to a fusion of eschatological prophet and Son (Blank 1981:145-146). Such a fusion can be deduced from Mk 9:2-8. It is the heavenly Son of man (cf his white clothes), also portrayed as eschatological prophet (cf the presence of Moses and Elijah) who is here called 'my beloved Son' by God (Blank 1981:147-148). As to the more specific connotation of 'beloved Son' in Mk 12:6, Blank supposes it to be influenced by Genesis 22:2. He therefore relates Son of God to Jesus' death: 'Beloved son', according to him, points to the crucified Jesus. This possibility must in his view be seriously considered since Paul was also familiar with the interpretation of Jesus' death according to the model of Isaac as a sacrifice (Blank 1981:149). In Mk 12:6-8 the relationship between 'beloved son' and the crucified Jesus is clear. As to Mk 9:2-8, the wider context confirms this view. That 'my beloved son' points to the crucified Jesus is also in accordance with the confession of the Roman officer immediately after Jesus' death (Mk 15:39). If one assumes that Mark's earliest use of 'beloved son' is to be found in Mk 12 from where he transferred it to other places in the Gospel, it is possible to deduce that he intended it to have the same meaning everywhere (also in Mk 1:11; Blank 1981:149)

6 THE JESUS OF MARK'S NARRATIVE

The increasing emphasis in Gospel research on the Gospels as narratives since the seventies is history now. It is also well-known that this insight caused New Testament scholars to employ the tools of contemporary literary criticism
in the interpretation of the Gospels. What concerns us here, is to determine the implications of this for the study of Mark's Jesus.

Although knowledge of the various methods used in Gospel research during the twentieth century is presupposed here, and the discussion of methods therefore strictly speaking falls outside the limits of this article, it is nevertheless necessary to make a few remarks about the narrative approach, especially those aspects of it which have a bearing on our subject. It will also be illuminating to put the method into perspective, especially with regard to redaction criticism which has dominated the scene of Gospel research since the fifties and in respect of which the narrative approach shows discontinuity, but also a certain continuity.

Although redaction criticism belongs to the historical-critical methods, its emphasis on the Evangelists as authors and not mere collectors, each with his own theological intention, in a sense assisted in the birth of the narrative approach to the Gospels. In addition to the growing emphasis on the Evangelists' role in the origination of the Gospels, the Gospels as a whole were increasingly taken more seriously. In 1976, for example, Perrin wrote: 'What is needed now, is a critical method which does justice to an Evangelist's literary activity and yet moves beyond concern for authorial intention and theology to include a concern for the text of the Gospel as a totality' (Perrin 1976:121). In the same article he wrote: 'Redaction criticism can shade over into literary criticism in such a way that no hard and fast distinctions are possible' (Perrin 1976:121). In practice, however, most studies still distinguished between tradition and redaction, that is, the stamp which the Evangelist left on the tradition (cf e.g Vorster 1980a:48-55). Regarding Mark's Jesus, this implied that scholars mostly focused on supposed redactional sections in order to determine Mark's view of Jesus (cf e.g the role of Mk 1:11, 9:2-8 and 15:39 in the quest for Mark's Christology). In contrast to this, a basic premise of the narrative approach is that all the material a writing consists of, including the traditions which the author may have used, is filtered through the narrator (Petersen 1978:105). His stamp or, in narrative terms, point of view, saturates a writing in its totality.

As to the quest for Mark's Jesus, the view of the Gospel as a narrative implied that all the information in the Gospel (incidents, role players and their functions, Jesus' names) was now utilised in the detection of Mark's view of Jesus. The plot, that is the 'thread' which holds the Gospel together, was also taken seriously, which means that the Gospel was read from beginning to end in order to determine Mark's portrayal of Jesus. Since the text itself, and not that which lies behind it, is the focus of attention here, investigations of this kind mostly did not endeavour to locate the Gospel within a reconstructed historical framework (cf however, Kelber 1979; Vorster 1991a), which meant that it was mostly read in an ahistorical manner.
Although quite a number of narrative investigations into Mark's Gospel specifically focus on Mark's Jesus, these differ greatly as to aim and approach. While Rhoads and Michie (1982) arrive at the identity of Mark's protagonist, Jesus, mainly by means of a character analysis, Boring (1985) intends to demonstrate the suitability of the narrative genre to accommodate the paradoxes inherent in all Christology (e.g., divinity/humanity, eschatology/history). The most well-known narrative investigations into Mark's Christology are those by Tannehill (1979) and Kingsbury (1983). They are briefly discussed here, while Vorster's contribution (1991a), in which other factors are brought into play, will also receive attention.

In Tannehill's view, Mark's plot is determined by the commission which Jesus received from God at his baptism, a commission he fulfills in the course of the Gospel. Jesus' identity is closely bound up with his commission. From Jesus' conduct it can be deduced what his commission comprises and who Jesus is in Mark's view: He is the one who brings salvation by exorcising demons, healing, preaching and teaching. But Jesus' commission comprises even more than this. In what Tannehill calls the reformulation of Jesus' commission in Mk 8:31-33, it is extended to include his suffering, death and resurrection. The latter aspects are emphasized by the fact that they came as a surprise, by the conflict which Peter's reaction created and by the fact that they are repeated twice (Mk 9:31; 10:33-34; Tannehill 1979:73).

Except for Jesus' commission and the expansion thereof to include his suffering, death and resurrection, in the passion narrative, the climax of his Gospel, Mark utilizes various literary techniques to focus on Jesus' identity. The mockery scenes are, for example, ironical in nature. What is intended as mockery (Mk 15:3) is in fact a telling summary of Mark's story of Jesus. The truth, emphasized by means of irony, is that Jesus fulfills the roles of prophet, king and savior while he suffers (Tannehill 1979:79-80).

From Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin it likewise becomes evident that Jesus' identity in Mark coheres closely with his death. This scene is of great significance for Mark's Christology. By appropriating, on this occasion, the titles Son of God, Son of man and Christ in answer to the high priest's question, Jesus for the first time openly acknowledges who he is. When used in connection with the suffering Christ, these titles are appropriate so that secrecy is no longer necessary (Tannehill 1979:87-88).

How do Christological titles, which often play a central part in Christological investigations, function in Tannehill's approach? At the outset he maintains that he is not primarily interested in Christological titles. In so far as they play a role in the development of the narrative he will, however, pay attention to them (Tannehill 1979:58). In due course it becomes clear that Son of God actually plays a central role in his investigation. In Tannehill's view, the identity of
Mark's Jesus becomes evident from his commission and his fulfilment thereof. And his commission is closely bound up with the title Son of God. It is, as it were, embedded in this title (Tannehill 1979:61-62, 74-75). That Mark's Jesus is, in Tannehill's view, indeed the Son of God becomes clear from the comprehensive content with which he fills this title: 'It...encompasses Jesus' conquest of demons, healing of supplicants, call to the disciples, death in Jerusalem, etc.' (Tannehill 1979:75). Since, according to Tannehill, Son of God in Mark includes everything which Jesus said, did and experienced, it can be maintained that Jesus is, in his view, portrayed as the Son of God in Mark's Gospel.

Kingsbury's *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* is also an attempt to detect Mark's Christology by reading the Gospel as a narrative. This can be deduced from the fact that he decides on Son of God as the bearer of Mark's Christology on literary-critical grounds (position in the narrative, the fact that Son of God, in his view, represents God's point of view). It, moreover, becomes clear from the way in which he views and deals with the Messianic secret, as well as from the fact that he intends to study the Christological titles, especially Son of God, in the context of Mark's plot.

In Kingsbury's book the Messianic secret, which had begun to disintegrate since the sixties (Kingsbury 1983:4-21) and which was no longer unanimously regarded as such a crucial motif in Mark's Gospel, was restored as the key to Mark's Christology. His Messianic secret, which he calls the Son of God secret (Kingsbury 1983:21), is not as comprehensive as the one Wrede identified in the Gospel. As a literary motif it nevertheless, in Kingsbury's view, plays such a prominent role in Mark's narrative that the plot of the Gospel should be read on the basis thereof (Kingsbury 1983:ix-xi). For our subject it is important that Mark, according to Kingsbury, uses the Messianic secret to demonstrate what he means by Son of God (Kingsbury 1983:xi). Since Son of God is closely bound up with the Messianic secret in Mark, its full meaning only becomes evident when the Messianic secret is dissolved at the end of the Gospel.

According to Kingsbury, the question who Jesus is, is of crucial importance throughout the Gospel. In fact, the very reason for the detailed description of Jesus' action and fame is that it leads to questions about his identity (cf Mk 1:27; 2:7; 4:41; 6:3, 14-16; 8:27-29). People's questions, as well as their answers (cf Mk 6:14-16), reveal their initial lack of knowledge as to Jesus' identity. Over against this, the demons right from the beginning know who Jesus is and the function of their exclamations (Mk 1:24, 34; 3:11; 5:7) in the Gospel is to repeatedly remind the reader thereof (Kingsbury 1983:80-89).

In contrast to the first part of the Gospel (Mk 1:14-8:26), people from Mk 8:27 onwards begin to show insight into Jesus' identity. By means of various attempts at identification, Jesus' identity is now gradually revealed to the reader, although the Messianic secret initially remains intact. Peter 'confesses' him as
the Christ (Mk 8:29) and Bartimeus addresses him as Son of David (Mk 10:47-48). In both cases Jesus is identified correctly, though inadequately, since his suffering and his Sonship of God is not included in these identifications (Kingsbury 1983:92, 95, 101-102). The secret is only dissolved with the Roman officer's 'confession' after Jesus' death. Here for the first time in the Gospel a human being consents to Jesus being Son of God (over against Mk 12 and 14:61; Kingsbury 1983:102-114; 117-121; 150-151). Thereby the Messianic secret has fulfilled its function, namely to demonstrate how a human being came to view Jesus in the same way God views him, as Son of God (cf Mk 1:11). In order to share God's view of Jesus, one has to regard him as preacher, teacher, healer and exorcist (Mk 1:14-8:26, 29). Above all, one must regard him as the one who died obediently and will be raised again. The disciples will therefore only know who Jesus is at the reunion which is held in prospect (Mk 14:27-28; 16:6-7; Kingsbury 1983:140-155).

From the above survey of Tannehill's and Kingsbury's contributions, it is clear that, although their reading of Mark's Gospel is guided by different motifs, they end up with more or less the same view of Mark's Jesus: According to both, Mark's Jesus is the Son of God who preaches, teaches, heals and excorcises demons and whose identity is especially bound up with his suffering and death.

Vorster's essay 'Om te vertel dat Jesus die lydende Seun van God is' (In order to tell that Jesus is the suffering Son of God) is in various respects important for our subject. Like the above New Testament scholars, he emphasises the fact that Mark narrates his material (Vorster 1991a:34-35). Unlike other investigations of a narrative kind, which are usually ahistorical in nature, the presupposed historical context of the Gospel is back into the picture (cf however Vorster 1980b). According to Vorster, Mark did not merely intend to pass on the story about Jesus. His intention was, furthermore, not to write history or to proclaim Jesus: 'Markus het die verhaal oor Jesus se lewe en werke geskryf om mense wat in 'n konkrete situasie was op 'n bepaalde manier te laat optree.' (Mark wrote the narrative concerning Jesus' life and works in order to make people, who found themselves in a concrete situation, act in a specific manner [translated] Vorster 1991a:35.) Since Mark's narrative has a strong pragmatic function, it is necessary to attempt a reconstruction of the situation for which it was intended (Vorster 1991a:36).

Vorster's proposals as to the historical context of Mark's Gospel need not be discussed in full here. In his view, two proposals fit in with the Gospel's expectation of the second coming of Christ in the near future. The first is that the Gospel was written by John Mark and was addressed to Christians from heathendom in Rome following the murder of Nero and Galba. This hypothesis could well explain the persecution which is foreseen in the Gospel (Mk 8:34-35
and 13; Vorster 1991a:37; cf also Hengel 1984 on whose view Vorster relies). The other hypothesis Vorster discusses, is that Mark’s Gospel presupposes the situation in Galilee before the destruction of the temple. This was a time of tension in which Mk 8:34 and 13 would also fit well (Vorster 1991a:37). In favour of the latter view is that the author of Mark’s Gospel as well as his intended readers are seemingly familiar with the Old Testament (cf e.g Mk 1:2-3).

Vorster’s reading of Mark’s Gospel is determined by various symbols which he discerns in the narrated world of Mark’s narrative: the narrated time (that between the time of the Old Testament and the coming of the Son of man), the narrated space (inter alia Galilee, Jerusalem and its surroundings, the supernatural space where God is and whence the Son of man will come), the two narrator’s perspectives according to which things are viewed either from God’s or from man’s perspective (Mk 8:33), the many names ascribed to Jesus and the first (Mk 1:1) and last (Mk 16:8) sentences of the Gospel. According to Vorster these symbols, which must be viewed together, form the context of Mark’s narrative about Jesus. Within this context various theological perspectives (Christology, eschatology, following of Jesus) play a role.

From various aspects of the Gospel’s content (especially Mk 13, Mark’s depiction of the kingdom of God and the expectation of Jesus’ second coming in the near future) Vorster deduces that Mark’s theology is determined by an apocalyptic-eschatological perspective, that in Mark’s Gospel the future, and what it is expected to hold in store, determines the present (Vorster 1991a:50). This implies that the other important theological motifs in Mark’s Gospel—Christology and following of Jesus—cannot be detached from Mark’s view of the future. When Mark, for example, depicts Jesus as the suffering Son of God, this depiction is only understandable from the expectation of Jesus’ second coming in the near future (Vorster 1991a:55). The narrated Jesus’ appeal to follow him should likewise be viewed in relation to the expectation of Jesus’ second coming in the near future (Vorster 1991a:54-58).

In his contribution Vorster takes seriously both the narrative nature of Mark’s Gospel and the fact that it is an ‘ancient’ narrative. In his dealing with the Gospel he takes into account material (e.g Mk 13) which does not function in the other narrative studies. Whereas the other investigations treat Mark’s Gospel as if it is solely concerned with Christology, according to Vorster, Mark’s Gospel also contains other important theological perspectives with which its Christology is interwoven. Although Vorster arrives at more or less the same depiction of Jesus, according to him, this portrayal of Jesus, and the narrative in which it is embedded, only make sense in the historical context of that time. This implies that, in Vorster’s view, Mark’s Gospel should not function as a timeless narrative. In order to make sense today, Mark’s story of Jesus should be told in another way (Vorster 1991a:56-58).
From the discussion of these few narrative studies some inferences can be made as to their contribution to the identification of Mark’s Jesus.

Reading the Gospels as narratives rendered it possible to move away from the one-sidedness which often characterised the research on Mark’s Jesus. Redaction-critical studies mostly focused on one facet of Mark’s portrayal of Jesus, relating Mark’s view to that specific facet: Jesus as a miracle-worker, as a teacher, his suffering and death, Jesus as the Son of God, Son of man, etc. In cases where Mark’s Jesus was acknowledged to have more than one facet, the relevant facets were sometimes set off against each other (e.g. Jesus as miracle-worker and as the suffering one). The narrative approach leaves room for various facets of Mark’s portrayal of Jesus to stand alongside each other as part of a comprehensive notion of Jesus.

Without detracting from the variety in Mark’s depiction of Jesus, New Testament scholars who make use of the narrative approach regard Mark’s Jesus to be narrated from a specific perspective. According to all the above discussed narrative studies, Mark’s Jesus is ultimately the suffering Son of God. Emphasis on the aspect of suffering in Mark’s Son of God concept, however, does not imply that Son of God is restricted thereto in Mark’s Gospel. Vorster, for example, wrote: ‘Deur dit wat hy oor die Seun van God vertel, gee hy inhoud aan hierdie term. Hy is ‘n wonderdoener, ‘n leermeester, die koninklike Messias uit die geslag van Dawid en die Seun van die mens wat gesag het... wat gely het, gekruisig is en opgestaan het.’ (Through what he narrates about the Son of God, he gives content to this term. He is a worker of miracles, a teacher, the kingly Messiah from the lineage of David and the Son of man who has authority... who suffered, was crucified and resurrected [translation] Vorster 1991:49.) In this multi-dimensional picture of Mark’s Jesus (Son of God) a specific Marcan accent is ultimately detectable, that of the suffering of the Son of God (Vorster 1991a:35).

What is the reason for the favouring of Son of God in narrative studies, which implies that Son of God in these studies becomes a perspective on Jesus instead of merely a name, so that Mark’s Jesus is in reality regarded as the Son of God? The occurrence of Son of God in the first sentence of the Gospel undoubtedly plays a decisive role in this (cf Kingsbury 1983:66-68; Vorster 1991a:42). The fact that various characters at strategic positions in Mark’s narrative address Jesus in this way (the voices from heaven, supernatural beings, Jesus himself when he accepts this name in Mk 14:62, the Roman officer in Mk 15:39) also contributes towards the choice of Son of God as Mark’s perspective on Jesus. To this can be added that, according to both Tannehill and Kingsbury, the plot of Mark’s Gospel relates to Jesus as the Son of God.
7 CONCLUSION

Without detracting from the variety of views held on Mark's Jesus during the twentieth century, and at the risk of oversimplifying the matter, one can at this stage draw some broad conclusions as to the past century's research, thereby pulling together the still loose threads.

During the course of the twentieth century different aspects of Jesus' conduct, as well as different Christological titles were regarded and utilised as the key to Mark's portrayal of Jesus: Jesus' miracles, his suffering and death, his teaching, the titles Son of God, Son of man, etc. Various concepts were, moreover, regarded to underlie these titles and activities of Mark's Jesus, as has been pointed out above.

As a result of the narrative approach to Mark's Gospel, there has, since the seventies, been a tendency to combine the various facets of Mark's Jesus into a comprehensive picture. In these investigations Mark is also considered to have a specific perspective on Jesus: In narrative studies Mark's Jesus is usually viewed as the suffering Son of God.

Apart from the movement in the direction of a more comprehensive view of Mark's Jesus, still another tendency can be detected in the research on the topic. Whereas at the beginning of the century Mark's Jesus was considered to be a supernatural being (cf Wrede's 'übernatürliche Glaubensausfassung'), researchers at the end of the century tend to view Him as a more human figure. This can, for example, be deduced from the meaning which New Testament scholars nowadays ascribe to Son of God (the suffering righteous one, Messiah-king). It can also be deduced from the fact that the designation/role of teacher, which was previously regarded to be either irrelevant to Mark's Christology or as representative of only an aspect thereof, is nowadays regarded as Mark's main typification of Jesus by some New Testament scholars. This corresponds with the growing tendency to regard and read Mark's Gospel as a kind of Greco-Roman biography.

It seems indeed as if the gap between the 'historical Jesus' and Mark's Jesus which Wrede pushed to extremes at the beginning of the century has, in a sense, narrowed. At least both are nowadays—by some scholars—regarded to be teachers (cf Botha 1989; Vorster 1991b).
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