

COMMUNICATION, PEDAGOGY,
AND THE GOSPEL OF MARK

SBL Press

RESOURCES FOR BIBLICAL STUDY

Editor

Tom Thatcher, New Testament

Number 83

SBL Press



COMMUNICATION, PEDAGOGY,
AND THE GOSPEL OF MARK

Edited by

Elizabeth E. Shively and Geert Van Oyen

SBL Press



SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2016 by SBL Press

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Shively, Elizabeth E., 1969– editor.

Title: Communication, pedagogy, and the gospel of Mark / edited by Elizabeth E. Shively and Geert Van Oyen.

Description: Atlanta : SBL Press, 2016. | Series: Resources for biblical study ; Number 83 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015048410 (print) | LCCN 2015050112 (ebook) | ISBN 9780884141143 (pbk. : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780884141167 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780884141150 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Mark—Study and teaching.

Classification: LCC BS2586 .C66 2016 (print) | LCC BS2586 (ebook) | DDC 226.30071—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015048410>

Printed on acid-free paper.



For our teachers who wed their research with their teaching.

“There are two things on which all interpretation of scripture depends: the process of discovering what we need to learn, and the process of presenting what we have learnt.”

Augustine, *On Christian Teaching* 1.1

SBL Press

SBL Press

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	ix
---------------------	----

Introduction: Recovering the Relationship between Research and Teaching Elizabeth E. Shively	1
--	---

Part 1. Processes: Relationships between Researching and Teaching Mark

Mark in the Frame of Ancient History Writing: The Quest for Heuristics Eve-Marie Becker	13
---	----

Teaching Mark's Narrative in a Markan Narrative Way Elizabeth Struthers Malbon	29
---	----

Teaching Mark as Collective Memory Sandra Huebenthal.....	45
--	----

Part 2. Test Cases: Orality and Performance in Researching and Teaching Mark

Teaching Mark as Performance Literature: Early Literate and Postliterate Pedagogies Thomas E. Boomershine	73
---	----

How to Hear and Teach Textual and Contextual Echoes in Mark 10:42–45 Alberto de Mingo Kaminouchi	95
--	----

No Performance Criticism without Narrative Criticism: Performance as a Test of Interpretation Geert Van Oyen.....	107
Teaching the Most Difficult Text in the Gospel of Mark: Mark 9:42–50 Francis J. Moloney, SDB, AM, FAHA	129
Hiding in Plain Sight: Performance, Pedagogy, and Mark 15 Richard W. Swanson	151
Part 3. Strategies: The Second Orality for Researching and Teaching Mark	
Mark in a Digital Age: The Internet and the Teaching of Mark's Gospel Mark Goodacre.....	175
Bibliography.....	193
Contributors.....	215
Index of Ancient Sources.....	219
Index of Modern Authors.....	222
Subject Index.....	225

SBL Press

ABBREVIATIONS

ASNU	Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis
AYB	Anchor Yale Bible
BDAG	W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BEH	Bibliothèque de l'Évolution de l'Humanité
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovanien- sium
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BPC	Biblical Performance Criticism Series
BSNA	Biblical Scholarship in North America
BSR	<i>Bulletin for the Study of Religion</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wis- senschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Text Commentaries
EBib	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testa- ment
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GPBS	Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentaries
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>

<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JNSTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement series
<i>JTI</i>	<i>Journal for Theological Interpretation</i>
NA ²⁸	E. Nestle, K. Aland, et al. <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NV</i>	<i>Nova et Vetera</i>
<i>RBL</i>	<i>Review of Biblical Literature</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Studies
RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> . Edited by K. Galling. 3rd ed. 7 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957–1965.
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire de religions</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
<i>ScrB</i>	<i>Scripture Bulletin</i>
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSU.A	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, Series A
SP	Sacra Pagina
<i>STK</i>	<i>Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift</i>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

INTRODUCTION:
RECOVERING THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN RESEARCH AND TEACHING

Elizabeth E. Shively

The idea for this book grew out of a conversation at the meeting of the 2013 International Society of Biblical Literature in St. Andrews, Scotland. Geert Van Oyen and I had just launched a new Gospel of Mark unit at this meeting, and we were pleasantly surprised by the overwhelming attendance for the session we held on Mark and pedagogy. The connection between research on Mark and the teaching of it is important to us, and we planned an invited session for which we had asked a group of seasoned scholars to explain how they work out their approaches to the Markan text in their classrooms. The result was a master class that gave us a view into the intersection of research and teaching that we rarely have the opportunity to see at academic conferences. Afterward we started brainstorming over lunch about how we could expand this into a project by planning another session on pedagogy for the next year's international meeting, and that led to our contemplation about a book of essays based on these presentations.

It is not the first book on pedagogy and the biblical text in recent years, however, or even the first time that essays have been collected from Society of Biblical Literature meetings on the subject to form a volume. Two books come to mind. Both critique the dominance of historical criticism for its exclusionary stance toward non-Western and female interpreters, among others. First, Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert edited a collection of essays, *Teaching the Bible: The Discourses and Politics of Biblical Pedagogy*,¹ which draw out the significance of a variety of

1. Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, eds., *Teaching the Bible: The Discourses and Politics of Biblical Pedagogy* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1998).

social locations for interpretation and their implications for pedagogy. As a point of departure, Segovia provides an introduction in which he examines the pedagogical implications of rhetorical criticism, literary criticism, and cultural criticism, respectively, and concludes that each of these methods promulgates a pedagogical model that is

highly pyramidal, patriarchal, and authoritative; a model where the teacher/critic, as the voice of the informed, universal, and self-enlightened reader, captures the sociocultural mysteries of the text and mediates it to student/readers; a model where teacher/critics rise above social location and ideology through self-knowledge to arrive at the meaning of the text.²

Although I question whether these approaches must necessarily result in the kind of pedagogical model Segovia suggests, I accept his fundamental principle that hermeneutical approaches inform pedagogical models.

Second, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Kent Harold Richards edited a collection of essays that emerged from seminars at Society of Biblical Literature national and international meetings from 2003 through 2007, *Transforming Graduate Biblical Education: Ethos and Discipline*.³ The book is concerned specifically with the transformation of doctoral education in biblical studies from a Western into a global discipline.⁴ Schüssler Fiorenza envisions this transformation particularly at the level of *research* that shifts away from a “scientist-positivist” approach to focus “on the constructive ideological functions of biblical and other ancient texts in their past and present historical and literary contexts, as well as on the ideological justifications presented by their ever more technically refined interpretations.”⁵ This volume is valuable for seating interpreters from various social locations and academic contexts around the disciplinary table who might not have been given a chair before now.

2. Ibid., 12.

3. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Kent Harold Richards, eds., *Transforming Graduate Biblical Education: Ethos and Discipline*, GPBS 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010).

4. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, “Introduction: Transforming Graduate Biblical Studies: Ethos and Discipline,” in Schüssler Fiorenza and Richards, *Transforming Graduate Biblical Education*, 2, 16.

5. Ibid., 2; see also 15.

Both of these books expose issues and break barriers that have excluded groups of readers from biblical studies because of long-held assumptions and practices of hermeneutics, pedagogy, and research. In this introduction to the present collection of essays, I wish to touch on a different issue: a fracture between research and teaching. These essays look at what academic staff *actually do in the classroom* to integrate their research and methodologies with their teaching, giving a glimpse of how their approach to the biblical text informs their pedagogy.

The Need for Research-Led Teaching in Biblical Studies

Currently I find myself in a (UK) world in which universities are generally interested in research excellence that generates social or economic impact and secures funding and teaching excellence that generates student satisfaction; both are to increase the global standing of the universities. But the relationship between research and teaching tends not to be clearly spelled out on an institutional level.⁶ I came from a (US) world in which adjunct teaching, on the one hand, or heavy teaching loads, on the other, often preclude meaningful, ongoing research that might inform teaching. There, also, the relationship between research and teaching faces institutional complexities. A fracture between research and teaching is not unique to biblical studies but is endemic in higher education.⁷ This fracture is worth repairing, because a symbiotic relationship between research and teaching benefits both faculty and students. Such a relationship not only forces faculty to communicate their ongoing work and fosters new possibilities for their own learning as they engage with their students; but it also promotes the best kind of learning for the students themselves, that which is active, inquiry-based, involves critical thinking, and promotes investigation and discovery.⁸

6. On the institutional problems in the United Kingdom that perpetuate a rift between research and teaching, see Geoff Stoakes and Pauline Couper, "Visualizing the Research-Teaching Nexus," in *What Is Research-Led Teaching? Multi-disciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Alisa Miller, John Sharp, and Jeremy Strong (London: Crest, 2012), 11.

7. For example, the Consortium for Research Excellence Support and Training (CREST; see <http://www.crest.ac.uk>) published a writing that addresses pedagogy for research-led teaching in the United Kingdom across a number of disciplines: music, physiology, art, technology, history, health science, theater, and biological sciences; see Miller, Sharp, and Strong, *What Is Research-Led Teaching*.

8. Mick Healey discusses how inquiry-based learning builds on direct student

I remember getting a glimpse of it when I was in seminary. I took a Revelation course with Greg Beale while he was working on his New International Greek Testament commentary.⁹ He would dash into class with barely legible, handwritten handouts for us to devour and would become so animated while discussing the text that he would nearly knock over the overhead projector (smart boards had not arrived quite yet). No one cared if he kept us late. It was exciting, and we felt like we were experiencing something at the cutting edge of his research, even as we learned from his modeling in class and assignments that replicated his method how to exegete the text for ourselves and to discover our own interpretive voices. Simultaneously, my husband was taking a Greek class with Beale, which he ended up referring to as “eschatological Greek” because all of the illustrations came from Revelation!

How then might we define “research-led teaching”? Although I have not found a common definition in the literature,¹⁰ I think it happens when teachers apply and model their ongoing research in their teaching and allow student-led, research-based learning to occur (in groups, as individuals, in preparation for assessed work) so that students become learners and researchers in their own right (“first-handers” rather than “second-handers”).¹¹ The contributors to this volume carefully reflect on the ways that their ongoing research and their approach to the Gospel of Mark shape

engagement with research in “Linking Research and Teaching: Exploring Disciplinary Spaces and the Role of Inquiry-Based Learning,” in *Reshaping the University: New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. Ronald Barnett, Society for Research into Higher Education (Berkshire, UK: Open University Press, 2005), 67–78.

9. Greg Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).

10. It is important for each institution and/or department to determine for itself the relationship between research and teaching. The literature on the topic displays a range of terms, from “research-led” to “research-oriented” to “research-based” teaching, each with a different emphasis. See Healey, “Linking Research and Teaching,” 3–4. In addition, one study of a number of universities in the United Kingdom found that academic staff and students surveyed had differing ideas about what was meant by the practice of “research-led teaching and learning.” See Barbara Zamorski, “Research-Led Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: A Case,” *Teaching in Higher Education* 7 (2002): 414–15.

11. See the definitions of research-led teaching in Stoakes and Couper, “Visualizing the Research-Teaching Nexus,” 13; Di Drummond, “Research That Matters: Expanding Definitions of ‘Research-Led Teaching’ in History,” in Miller, Sharp, and Strong, *What Is Research-Led Teaching*, 67.

the way they teach and specifically what they do with their students and how they involve them in the learning process. My hope is that this short collection of essays will show various ways that links between research and teaching may be developed, using the Gospel of Mark as a case study. Also, I am confident that these essays will provide readers with models and strategies for their own teaching of Mark and other biblical texts.

Research-Led Teaching Applied

The contributors to the volume write from different institutional contexts and different social locations and employ different methodologies. These differences inform their hermeneutics, which, in turn, informs their pedagogy. The volume is divided into three parts. The essays in part 1 (“Processes”) address the symbiotic relationship between research and teaching by discussing the specific pedagogical approaches that grow directly out of the research and interpretive methods of the contributors. The essays in part 2 (“Test Cases”) also discuss strategies and pedagogical approaches, but they focus specifically on the extent to which performance criticism—a relatively recent development in the trajectory of the study of oral tradition—may be integrated into interpretive and pedagogical approaches. That is, the contributors display their ongoing research in a particular area and then work it out pedagogically. When we originally invited the contributors to present papers at Society of Biblical Literature meetings on how their research or approach to Mark informs their pedagogy, we did not specify performance criticism; but this is what each of them chose as a current area of research that impinges upon their present research and teaching. Thus the essays in part 2 form a sort of conversation about an ongoing issue in Markan research and teaching. Mark Goodacre offers the single essay in part 3 (“Strategies”) on the use of the Internet in research and teaching, an area that has become a particular research interest and pedagogical tool for him.

Eve-Marie Becker’s essay (ch. 1) serves well as the first of part 1 and the introductory essay to the book, because she makes a clear argument for research-led teaching. She challenges those who teach in an academic context to provide “reflective insight in [their] concepts of and approaches to textual interpretation” and then to connect this with their teaching. She argues for a model of research-led teaching that necessitates heuristics. Using herself and her own approach of researching Mark in the frame of ancient history writing, Becker then suggests a model of

autobiographical reflection for understanding how teaching and pedagogics contribute to the development of heuristics. All the other authors then take up her challenge in various ways, some more explicitly than others: they show how their respective pedagogical approaches emerge from and are in dialogue with their (past and present) research and methodologies, serving to demonstrate the necessity and effectiveness of research-led teaching. Although differing in their respective approaches, the essays take seriously that Mark's Gospel was composed and/or performed in a particular ancient historical, social, and/or oral context and bring this to bear on their pedagogy for today's classroom.

Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (ch. 2) illustrates the way that hermeneutics and pedagogy, and research and teaching, are, respectively, mutually informative. She describes a pedagogical approach that marries form and content, in which what is central to the text shapes strategies for teaching and learning. First, Malbon identifies what she sees as critical aspects of narrative criticism and of the Markan narrative and then what she considers a critical aspect of the narrative of Markan scholarship and the narrative of teaching and learning. By this, she indicates how her research, approach to Mark, and teaching intersect. Then she applies the categories of narrative analysis to her recent experience of teaching the Gospel of Mark.

Sandra Huebenthal (ch. 3) reads Mark through the hermeneutical lens of social memory theory and regards it as an artifact of collective memory. She argues that, on the one hand, Mark is about the (accurate) understanding of the character Jesus; on the other hand, the text is about the constitution and organization of an adequate community of followers. In the course of the discussion, Huebenthal demonstrates how she leads students through the Gospel according to the kind of social memory approach she has come to develop in her own research and gives specific examples of ways she constructs a syllabus and assignments she uses in class.

The essays in part 2 articulate and apply research on orality and performance criticism in various ways. Thomas E. Boomershine (ch. 4) argues that there is a direct correlation between presuppositions about ancient communication culture and contemporary pedagogies in the teaching of Mark. He observes that current pedagogical practices tend to assume that Mark was a text originally read silently by readers. He challenges this assumption with the claim that study of first-century communication culture has revealed that Mark was performance literature that was composed to be heard (rather than read in silence) and memorized.

Boomershine aims to teach Mark in light of its original historical context by developing pedagogical methods that invite students to hear the sounds of Mark's story and to perform it by heart. He discusses ancient and modern pedagogical practices for teaching Mark as performance literature using specific Markan texts as test cases for suggesting ways of employing these practices.

Alberto de Mingo Kaminouchi (ch. 5) brings together the Jesuit context in which he teaches with his research on orality studies to bear upon his pedagogy. He approaches the text of Mark with the assumption that Mark retains features of oral literature, among them the use of modulated repetitions that give coherence to the narrative. His goal, however, is to go beyond literary criticism of these "textual echoes" to study the "contextual echoes" that resonate with the reader's social experience. He brings his approach to the Markan text into the classroom by demonstrating how students can deepen their reading of Mark by "listening" to how a text resonates with other passages in Scripture and with tradition, using Mark 10:42–45 as a test case. His goal is for students to see that Mark's contextual echoes resonate with practices of the church as an alternative polis that challenges the powers of the world.

Geert Van Oyen (ch. 6) takes a different approach than Boomershine (and Kaminouchi), arguing that performance criticism is a helpful pedagogical tool for opening up pathways of communication and interpretive nuances but that it should be employed today on the basis of its current interpretive and pedagogical payoff, rather than on the basis of supposed oral practices of the first century. He argues that in order to perform Mark's Gospel well, one first has to perform narrative criticism of the text. This becomes especially apparent with regard to those passages where a "sub-text" cannot be found at first glance or where the interpretation depends on the understanding of the whole Gospel. After discussing the relationship between narrative criticism and performance criticism, Van Oyen looks at a number of texts that may give rise to plural interpretation and shows how he has led students to examine the possibilities for performance and, on the flip side, to ask questions of the validity of different performances of the same texts and thereby put into practice "performance as a test of interpretation" (David Rhoads).

Francis J. Moloney (ch. 7) takes an eclectic approach to exegesis, arguing that no single approach can claim to communicate everything that needs to be known about a text. He sees performance criticism as an approach that must work together with historical and literary approaches

and as a necessary way for bringing the past world of the narrative to the present of the audience. As a test case, he uses what he considers to be one of the most puzzling texts in Mark (9:42–50) and demonstrates how a teacher might lead students through an eclectic approach that begins with questions about the origins of the text and follows through to its contemporary appropriation and reception. The essay culminates with some suggestions concerning the features of a student oral performance shaped by prior historical and literary analyses of the text.

Richard W. Swanson (ch. 8) explores ways that embodied ensemble performance can function in teaching undergraduate students to interpret the Gospel of Mark, using Mark 15:40–42. He discusses the difference between an interpretation based on silent reading, which is generally not too surprised by the sudden appearance of women in this account, and one based on performance, which is more likely to surprise students when the storyteller points to women, many of them, who are standing nearby and watching. Swanson explains how embodied performance by an ensemble, because of its unique demands and difficulties, creates the most promising and productive situation for interpreters, teachers, and students: the women must be discovered and must be discovered to have been present all along, always and from the very beginning in Galilee. He demonstrates how this mode of analyzing the text draws students into the surprise that makes this story work.

Lastly, Mark Goodacre (ch. 9) considers the challenges and opportunities of teaching Mark's Gospel in the Internet age and discusses how his research on Mark intersects with his ongoing interest in and use of the Internet for research and teaching. He discusses ways that the Internet encourages instructors to rethink their approach to Mark and how the use of blog posts, podcasts, and websites can open up new avenues for both instructors and their students.

Finally, Geert and I want to thank those who have made this project possible. Our editor, Tom Thatcher, embraced the idea for the book immediately and eagerly and provided expert guidance for its shape. Also, Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Steve Holmes gave helpful advice at different points about the conception of the book. Toward the end of the process, Kai Akagi provided crucial, meticulous editorial help. When we first embarked on this project, each of the presenters responded with enthusiasm to our invitation to expand their papers into contributions for a book. We are grateful for this outstanding group of international contributors who have persevered with commitment and professional-

ism through a long process until we could see it to completion. They have exhibited passion for the Gospel of Mark and its teaching and expertise in communicating their subject matter, making this an altogether satisfying project. We owe a debt of gratitude to our families for their love, support, and encouragement. Especially our spouses, Todd and Mia, have made countless sacrifices that have made it possible for us to follow a career in biblical studies in which it often seems like the work of teaching preparation, research, and writing never ends. Without their help and support, we would not have completed this project.

SBL Press