Teaching Mark through a postcolonial optic

This contribution explores the potential value of a postcolonial approach for teaching Mark’s gospel. Investigating a number of texts from the gospel, it asks to what extent a postcolonial optic implies a different approach to the gospel, what it adds and where challenges exist. Teaching with a postcolonial optic entails framing the gospel in its 1st-century imperial context and focusing on the ambivalence and ambiguity of imperial rule, investigating texts with attention to hybridity and mimicry in particular. Teaching the Gospel of Mark through a postcolonial optic opens up new possibilities for interpretation and contextualisation, but at the same time poses certain challenges, pedagogically and otherwise.

Introduction

Biblical scholarship over the last decade or two has shown increasing interest in empire and postcolonialism. Notwithstanding a rather slow uptake of postcolonialism in the two-thirds or majority world biblical scholarship (Punt 2006), publications – some of which are referred to below – increasingly appear which deal with imperial concerns and engage in postcolonial discourse. At the best of times, postcolonial work is in close concert with concerns about empire. But empire (or anti-empire) studies and postcolonial studies are not one and the same. Postcolonial work’s uneasy relationship in various ways to matters imperial, in theoretical as well as pragmatic impulses, provides both perspective and challenges. The arguably different and wider reach of postcolonial work which includes the whole web of unequal power relations through but also beyond empire – thus, also ‘meta-empire’ – provides a first challenge to teaching through a postcolonial optic. A focus on the ambivalence and ambiguity of situations of imperial rule, investigating texts with attention to hybridity and mimicry in particular (cf. also Moore 2006:193–205), further complicates postcolonial pedagogics.

This contribution considers the teaching of the Gospel according to Mark from a postcolonial perspective, acknowledging the empire-postcolonial studies tension and focusing important facets in a postcolonial approach. While it has gained some ground in the last decade or so, the question rises as to how a postcolonial optic can be incorporated pedagogically. Can a postcolonial approach be part of teaching undergraduate students, and what would a postcolonial pedagogics look like? These and related questions are explored through indicating intersections and differences between empire and postcolonial studies in their approaches to Mark, but with special attention to postcolonialism’s contributions and challenges.

Teaching Mark postcolonially: Socially engaged pedagogics

A primary question probably is: Why teach Mark with a postcolonial optic? Increasing pressure is building on the academy in general and theology/biblical studies in particular to become cognisant of and interact with its contemporary context, in South Africa but also elsewhere. Notwithstanding resistance, the scholarly tide seems to be turning from detached, aloof scholarship to socially engaged academic work. This shift offers a threshold for dealing more effectively, responsibly and accountably with contextuality, while checking remaining attempts to move away from contextuality – in all of which postcolonial biblical criticism is helpful.

Postcolonial work does not eschew attention for historical and linguistic detail in traditional exegesis, but continues the work by investigating the texts and their interpretation within ancient and modern colonised and colonising contexts. In the case of Mark, postcolonial studies want to honour the study of historical narrative that is often identified in a threefold way: (1) the writing of history as always more and less than the past; (2) historiography accounting for the present to which the past has led, and thus a powerful instrument of community legitimation, identity formation and instruction; and, (3) that in history/writing events acquire narrative form...
Accounting for the imperial in Mark as pedagogical point of departure

Teaching that uses a postcolonial approach begins with the recognition of empire’s impact in the 1st century and the assertion that a New Testament text like Mark cannot be understood without accounting for the power relations in which its author (and sanctioning community) was implicated. The contrast between mainstream biblical scholarship being ‘restricted to theological, spiritual, and historical aspects of these narratives’ while postcolonial scholarship focuses on ‘the often neglected dimension of empire and the politics of imperialism’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:46) may be too simple and needs further distinction. The difference may rather be in the perception of those very theological, historical and imperial elements and how they are factored into scholarly discourse. However, teaching Mark with attention to the religious elements of the text only and to the exclusion of the interrelationship between the Roman Empire and gospel, excludes a most central aspect of Mark’s socio-political framework. In short, teaching Mark postcolonially starts with a consideration of empire vis-à-vis this gospel.

The specific interest of postcolonial pedagogics is to explore the intricate power plays behind the text, which is further compounded as they have to be approached through the power plays within the text. The empire and biblical text-interface is oblique, contingent and thus contentious, largely due to the nature of 1st-century Roman rule and the nature of the texts such as Mark’s. The interface between text and empire is not necessarily built on (literary) dependence, whether conceptual (i.e., that Mark borrowed from imperial ‘texts’) or reactionary (i.e., that Mark’s gospel primarily constitutes a response to empire in some way). The tendency to treat ‘Judaism’ and ‘Christianity’ as if they were self-contained and autonomous entities, whose interaction with a commensurate ‘pagan’ imperial culture was defined by conflict, is misleading. For students to note the implausibility that the imperial context did not in some way affect the author or authoring community is as important as introducing them to research and debates on the matter. Accounting for Mark’s emergence from a context infused by empire, and not from some neutral time and space, is part of the thrust of a postcolonial optic; the focus is therefore not on an exhaustive exegetical analysis of the chosen texts.

How Mark is positioned with regard to empire is no simple question, eliciting answers that range from Mark as in direct and open opposition to empire (e.g., Horsley 2006:157) to apprehension of a direct counter-imperial line in Mark (e.g., Kelber 2006:98–101; Moore 2006). With regard to the latter, Mark may allude to an alternative to Roman imperial machinations, but in a circumspect way. ‘[T]he kingdom’s mission in Mark to revalorize society is at most by implication opposed to Rome and careful to disguise any pronounced opposition to Roman imperial power’ (Kelber 2006:98). Anti-empire readings not only see the texts standing in an adverse relationship to empire – at times directly, at times subliminally, at times a few theological steps removed, but, typically, also see the relationship between empire and texts as one-sided, with empire unilaterally imposing upon the subjugated.

Various texts in Mark lend themselves to teaching on the relationship between Mark and empire. Selecting three texts, the escalation in imperial presence and narrative tension can be demonstrated. Mark’s incipit provides an interesting possible intertext with imperial inscriptions and the Priene Calendar in particular, suggesting an imperial presence in Mark 1:1. As one scholar put it, ‘Mark appears deliberately to highlight parallels between Jesus’ behavior and his treatment at the hands of the Romans, on the one hand, and Roman traditions and practices concerning the Ruler Cult, on the other’ (Evans 2000:69). Interesting parallels include references to ἐοικεῖκαι (notwithstanding difference

1. A particular strong position is advocated by Richard Horsley (2006:157) (quote at length): ‘Mark is simply opposed both to alien imperial oppression, with which his collaborators among the local “colonial” aristocracy ... Mark exerts an indigenous people’s movement of resistance to the imperial order to embody an alternative social order ... In contrast with Luke-Ac's ... Mark calls hearers/readers in the movement back to villages of Galilee (presumably to continue the project inaugurated in Jesus’ ministry; 14:23; 16:7), and his movement take an active and uncompromising stance against the temple-state in Jerusalem.’ Broadbent (2012:78) describes Horsley’s approach as ‘a First World type of liberation theology in its early stages’, bent upon rescuing the Bible and especially Jesus and Paul from ‘right-wing fundamentalists’. 2. It bears reminding that counter-imperial readings go beyond a rallying call for revolt or armed response, especially in a context where such actions were unrealistic (whether strategic-operational or goal-end result) options. The few instances of 1st-century insurrection, locally focussed, only underlined the futility of conventional attempts aimed at a violent overthrow of the regime. 3. For example, Broadbent (2012:78) defends Mark’s representation of Jesus and God’s kingdom as such that it studiously evades any direct confrontational engagement with Rome. ‘It is not clear why Jesus’ inversion of power has the effect of disarming any perceived threat to Roman power’, only, and not at the same time also generating an alternative, potentially discontent discourse? 4. An anti-empire reading does not depend on either the nature (censure/resistance; questioning/submissive; posing alternatives/advocating action; open/submerged or the level (harsh/subtle; pronounced/suggestive) of the perceived antipathy, subversion or resistance against empire. 5. 7.50, for example, about Paul, Horsley (2004:23) argues that ‘Paul was primarily “in but not of” the Roman imperial order’, in the sense that ‘he borrowed key terms and standard discourse from the dominant culture’ and so ‘perpetuates certain imperial images and patterns of social relations’ but that he used ‘imperial terms for Jesus in opposition to the imperial Roman lord and savior’. 8. The Priene Calendar inscription was made circa 9 BCE in honour of Emperor Augustus. Bömer, Berger and Colpe (1995:169) are of the opinion that the use of εἰσεγένθην in old Greek became a general term for any message, and that the Old Testament cannot serve to explain its meaning. Following Jesus started to use the term soon after the time of Augustus, where it carried a profound propaganda message of the beginning of a new era. For the inscription, see Dittenberger (1905:48–60); and http://www.arcts.wustl.edu/~riffin/Priene%20Inscription.html.
in number), to the beginning (as ἀρχῇ in Mark, and verb ἀρχέων in the inscription), and to the messenger of the good news (Ἰησοῦς Βασιλεύς [Ἰησοῦς θεοῦ] in Mark’s case, and Augustus as στράτηγος and θεὸς in the inscription). Following the incipit, Jesus starts his ministry with reference to η ἔπτωσις τοῦ θεοῦ ( Mk 1:15). The kingdom of God is an important – pivotal, according to Kelber (2006:98) – metaphor in Mark, and that it also has a socio-political dimension is difficult to deny. The stage which is set in Mark’s narrative evidently includes the Roman imperial context.

A few chapters later, it is possible to let students see through the Mark 5:1–9 narrative something of an engagement with the Roman Empire through Legion. Jesus’ encounter with the Gerasene demoniac who lived between the graves attracted much empire-focused attention in the past. More than the single word, λεγείν ( Mk 5:9), the setting of the gospel and the passage suggests a substantial awareness of Roman imperial influence and probably also of their military occupation (e.g., Crossan 1991:314–318; Horsley 1989: 140–141, 147; Horsley 2003:100; Myers 1988:190–194; Waetjen 1989:115–118). Scholars have subsequently read the narrative in almost allegorical fashion as expressing colonising themes of land, invasion, occupation, and liberation. The exorcist account is (re)read amidst echoes of shattered bonds of a people’s resistance, bordering on self-annihilation, against the demonising force of imperial occupation, finally driven as unclean swine into the sea (cf. Moore 2006:193–205).

In an escalation from presence to engagement, a third passage on the question about taxes allows for the demonstration of a possible confrontational stance towards empire. The Pharisees and Herodians’ entrapping question, ἐξεστιν δὸνι κήσουν Καίσαράς ἢ οὖ ( Mk 12:14), is primarily directed at exposing Jesus by forcing him into making an impossible choice. At the same time, however, their question not only makes empire explicit in the narrative – in fact, it assumes the evident nature of imperial influence in daily life – but it also shows a challenging attitude towards the Romans. Mark 12 is somewhat of a climax to a gradual emergence of the emperor in Mark, particularly in its last part. In Mark 11:27–33 where the issue of authority is debated, Jesus repudiates the temple officials and reminds them of John the Baptist’s execution by Herod ( Mk 6:14–29). In the next chapter they understand as an accusation against them the parable of the tenants which anticipates that Jesus will share the same fate as John ( Mk 12:12). Thus far the imperium with its power of the sword and as responsible for the (anticipated) executions of both John and Jesus has remained in the background. But in Mark 12 through the emperor’s image on a coin, the empire is clear for all to see. Equally clear in this scene are the collaborative efforts of empire and emperor, imperial representatives and local rulers.

Identifying further elements of empire in these and other texts are of course possible. But is teaching on the Roman Empire sufficient in a postcolonial approach? If ‘[t]he primary aim of postcolonial biblical criticism is to situate empire and imperial concerns at the centre of the Bible and biblical studies’ ( Sugirtharajah 2012:46), is a focus on empire adequate? Talk of empire studies as a segment or variation of postcolonial studies (Broadbent 2012:78, 81) illustrates lurking tensions. On the one hand, the link between empire and postcolonial is evident and important, given the involvement of texts and their discursive potential in relation to power relations past and present. But on the other hand, it is how empire and imperial concerns are understood that determines the understanding of the particular nature and role of empire in postcolonial work. In addition to teaching students on the relationship between empire and text, the nature of that relationship is a vital focus for teaching with a postcolonial optic.

Dealing with Mark amidst the vicissitudes of power

A postcolonial optic further explores the intricate webs of power relations, particularly as they connect with (or, are
The question as to where a postcolonial pedagogics is appropriate cannot be indirect, in overt and subtle ways, on all aspects of the lives of centre and margins, where centre is often symbolised as such (and in the process re-victimise them), but to try and understand what was involved in how people engaged and negotiated webs of power. Such webs of power are always messy and engagements with them are characterised by both the attraction (allure) as well as the repulsion of empire – and requires rethinking the nature of empire.

The Roman Empire existed as material and structural reality, comprised of and operating in terms of an important binary of centre and margins, where centre is often symbolised by a city and margins are that which are subordinated to the centre – at a political, economic or cultural level. But secondly, structurally empire was not a uniform phenomenon in temporal or spatial sense but was differentiated in composition and deployment regardless of many remaining similarities. Thirdly, the reach and power of empire was of such an extent that it influenced and impacted in direct and indirect, in overt and subtle ways, on all aspects of the lives of the powerful as well as the subalterns. These and other areas of concern are sufficiently covered in empire studies.

Teaching from a postcolonial perspective takes empire’s unrelenting, diverse material presence and ideological influence in all dimensions of 1st-century life across a wide geographical area further. Postcolonial work stresses two additional dimensions of empire. One is that empire was primarily a conceptual entity to which its material form(s) attests – even though admitting mutuality between structure and idea does not reverse the conceptual primacy. Additionally, and contrary to restrictive, essentialist understandings of empire, it can be theorised as dynamic and primarily a process, in its conceptualising as well as its constant fabrication: a negotiated concept. Positions towards empire were dynamic and not static ‘for’ or ‘against’ positions, as people’s interactions with empire were infinitely more complex and hybrid than merely support or opposition. First-century empire was a complex, intricate constellation of interrelations between the powerful and marginalised, characterised by uneven power relations and kept intact by constant social negotiations, aimed at the submission also of those on the periphery or in distant settings, by controlling land and resources. Neither monolithic nor simply imposed on passive subalterns, who had equally composite and complex profiles, empire was principally the distillation of sustained interaction between rulers and subjects, imperial forces and indigenous foreigners, with or without intermediaries (see Punt 2012a).

These engagements and negotiations postcolonial biblical studies explore as will be shown in three passages where the negotiation of power is overtly at issue. In teaching, such tensions are pointed out, teasing out various configurations in terms of agency (e.g., ‘who calls the shots’, who think they do and who does; on what level?) and axes in terms of dimensions and levels, e.g., subalterns; gender; cultural identity; social memory; to name a few) of power. It implies questioning all too easy deductions, often playing ‘devil’s advocate’ with the students’ interpretation (and their use of the scholarship or the reception history). In essence a...
postcolonial approach moves beyond assuming a narrowly conceived empire position.

Teaching hybrid identities in Mark 7:24–30 (The Syro-Phoenician woman)

A postcolonial exploration encourages students to read Mark in a setting informed socio-politically by the Roman Empire in its various forms and formats, rather than myopically interpreting Mark as timeless theological treatise or religious tractate disconnected from 1st-century political reality. Such readings are not only ideologically biased but also historically poorer for it. A postcolonial pedagogics insists on the importance of Roman rule for understanding Mark, and the nature of Roman rule as consisting of a ‘web of legitimating practices entangling Roman subjects within an imperial ideology’ (Perkins 2009:1–15). But Roman rule was complicated. The elaboration of imperial ideology was done very much in the interest of a particular group in the Empire, the elite. This does not mean, however, that the Empire was an elite-driven enterprise in the simplistic sense of the word, although the elite’s vital role in the Empire and in shaping ideology was always evident. In a ‘unity of self-interest’ the coalition of elites used imperial ideology to further their own interests. Perkins identifies in addition to the elite coalition another significant group, but on the other side of the power spectrum, namely the ‘early Christians’ (Perkins 2009:40). However, were the early followers of Jesus so alienated from the Roman Empire as Perkins argues, especially if their number included members of the elite? Teaching Mark postcolonially acknowledges such tensions within and ambivalence towards empire and the hybrid identities created, also in Mark’s narrative. In addition, the effects of centuries of reception history require a discerning approach.

A biblical text is not a reservoir of theological or moral meaning, but rather ‘a system of codes which interpreters must disentangle in order to reveal the hidden power relations and ideologies lurking in supposedly innocent narratives’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:185). The imperial-infused web of power relations, also between subalterns vying for power, is often characterised by ambivalence, seen in how Jesus relates to women, one of whom is presented in terms of hybridity. In the reception history of Jesus’ encounter with ἡ δὲ γυνὴ Ἑλληνίς Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει (7:26), the imperial interpretive heritage is surreptitiously reproduced and normalised when biblical commentaries as a rule refer to the Syro-Phoenician woman as a Gentle and her land as pagan. Keeping our focus on the text, however, this is a narrative where the importance of a gender perspective is particularly important. Much energy has gone into discussing the (not unimportant) breadcrumbs and dogs-metaphor, but the agency that the woman assumes and the ambivalence that characterises Jesus’ position is remarkable.

Patriarchy is an enduring aspect of Mark’s gospel, too, with women only becoming active participants in the narrative within the enclosed space of the domestic sphere, ‘subjected to the men and the needs of the family’ (Liew 2007:128). The Syro-Phoenician woman, however, as foreigner in her own territory approached Jesus with a clear sense of urgency, her own agency, but both are subalterns amidst bigger power plays. But her agency is remarkable in a gospel where human beings lack agency, objects upon whom others act and who do not become subjects in the full sense – the only true active agents in Mark being God and Satan (Liew 2007:123). In Mark, women ‘are either passive channels of male bonding or active culprits of male discord’ (Liew 2007:130). Yet in Mark 7 the Syro-Phoenician woman, in however limited a way, transgresses social conventions and steps outside Mark’s narrative patterning, and acts assertively towards Jesus. In this way she becomes a hybrid figure in the narrative – hybrid in the sense of aspiring to move beyond binary thinking by allowing the inscription of agency on the subaltern, with a restructuring and destabilising of power. In a complex web of cultural interaction, forged by creatively redeploying local and imported elements, the Syro-Phoenician woman’s...
identity and agency is re-inscribed as hyphenated, fractured and multiple.31

Teaching ambivalence in Mark 8:34–9:1 (Taking up one’s cross)

Biblical scholarship, maybe not unlike other areas in the academy, is fond of invoking and treasuring its canons of research and learning, insisting on so-called core materials, scholarly consensus and basic starting points. A postcolonial angle does not deny the existence or potential value of such resources, but, in fact, acknowledges its importance for the current form and function of biblical scholarship. However, a postcolonial approach has questions and misgivings as to whether the conventional or even consensus positions either account sufficiently for their own posturing and ideological embeddedness or adequately reflect the wider berth of scholarship, particularly in the two-thirds world. Students are introduced both to a postcolonial canon of postcolonialism’s own making, complete with privileged texts and sanctioned authors (Sugirtharajah 2012:26), but also encouraged to reflect critically about ‘the attempt to explore the often one-sided, exploitative, and collusive nature of academic scholarship’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:13).32

Teaching Mark by means of a postcolonial approach shifts canonical boundaries and takes into account that “[…] is a function and expression of power, specifically imperial power” (Berquist 1996:28). Moving outside the restrictions set by religious and academic canons rest on the conviction that ‘truth is not confined to the text and is not singular, but can take many forms; non-Christian texts are as important as Christian texts; the biblical text is not unique or the sole bearer of truth; the voices of the marginalized are to be heard and recovered’ (Broadbent 2012:61).33 However, the decision of which texts to include and on what basis introduces a range of complex issues: Are all subaltern texts or hidden manuscripts (Scott) necessarily worthy of inclusion, as if they have some pure, unadulterated form, untouched by imperial influences? Or are the texts of the marginalised always liberating, when issues of gender and class often complicate the other texts/voices? When does one man’s emancipatory text become another woman’s oppressive text?

Although only chapters away from Jesus’ execution, the use of cross as metaphor in Mark 8 comes as a surprise. Crucifixion was used by the Romans equally as an apparatus of war and a means for securing their version of peace, whether eroding resistance of besieged cities, humiliating the conquered or intimidating seditious soldiers or restless provinces (Frankemölle 1992:217; Schottroff 1992:156–163). The well-known call ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ (Mk 8:34) resonated differently in the 1st-century world than in later Christendom, and stands in worrying contrast to Mark 13: 14–20, all of which may already signal the imperial destruction that accompanied the Jewish War. Using the image of taking up one’s cross, Mark’s Jesus issues a call for loyalty to him and by implication to share in the community of Jesus-followers complete with its social systems and configurations of power.34 In what amounts to catachresis, when subalterns take up the terminology of the powerful and adjust it for their own purposes, Mark turns the ultimate deterrent of the Empire into a symbol of a different kind of power.35

With the exception of Varro (Sat. Men. fr. 24), who cuts a lone voice in protesting against the barbarism of crucifixion, the general sentiment of the time was apparently that this form of execution was a necessary deterrent to employ against the lower classes and especially slaves, in order to discourage serious crimes (O’Collins 1992:1209; cf. Punt 2009:446–462).36 In a dense passage (Mk 8:34–9:1) which appears to foreshadow Jesus’ death but also appeals to his followers to adapt a certain perspective, lifestyle, or communal practice, Mark does not re-inscribe the cross as much as retell it. In resourceful appropriation (catachresis) he turns the rhetorical instrument of imperial power against it. It becomes a device of subversive adaptation which redirects intrusions of imperial discourse and creates a parody of the empire through strategic misrepresentation. Mark takes up the cross and retells it for his own purposes, as is confirmed by the glory-filled parousia of Jesus (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, 8:38) which is placed in close proximity to the reference to the cross.37 However,


32. Some biblical scholars argue that it is the contravention of the traditional syllogi, and through the inclusion of what lies beyond ‘the neatly defined religious and textual exclusivity of traditional exegetics’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:171) that styles postcolonial exegesis as such. Postcolonial work on texts accepts a broader hermeneutical base and deliberately includes other ancient and contemporary texts, also from other religious traditions. Recently Kim (2010) connected three strands in her work, tying together feminist, postcolonial and her own Korean contexts. She constructs a Salim hermeneutics (a strategy of ‘making things alive’) for each of the narratives through a dialogue between the biblical story and the reader’s use of her or his own imagination. In contrast to historical criticism’s emphasis on a single, correct meaning in the biblical text, Kim’s interpretative goal is making things alive, a mending of broken things, so as to open up meaning.

33. It means not to opt for rescuing the biblical text which will effectively ‘reinscribe authority to one single text and exclude … non-biblical scriptures and writings’ (Broadbent 2012:81). As Moore (2006:197) argues: ‘A defining feature of “postcolonial” biblical exegesis, indeed, is the will to press a biblical text at precisely those points at which its ideology falls prey to ambivalence, incomherence, and self-subversion – not least where its message of emancipation subtly mutates into oppression.’

34. The nature of the Markan community deserves more attention, but suffice it to mention here that unlike Samuel (2007:4–5, 158), Moore (2006) and others who tend to regard Mark as the product of an already existing community, Leander (2013) reads Mark as a collective representation that interpellates the Christ-followers as a group.

35. In her discussion of the subaltern, Gayatri Spivak (1995:94–98) introduced catachresis as a concept for use in postcolonial thought, suggesting that it can describe how the colonised can recycle or redeploy parts of colonial and imperial culture and propaganda for their own purposes (and in conflict with their first, or more ‘proper’ uses). Cf. also Leander (2013) on Mark 8 as catachresis.

36. As a rule the crucified man [sic] was regarded as a criminal who was receiving just and necessary punishment” (Hengel 1977:87). Notwithstanding the frequency of crucifixion in Roman times, sophisticated writers sometimes opted to avoid the topic like Tacitus who did not mention the innumerable Roman crucifixions in Palestine (Josephus, Hist. 5.8–13; cf O’Collins 1992:1209).

37. Leander (2013) argues that the apocalyptic undertones of Mark 8 (drawing on Dan 7 and 1 Enoch 46–48; cf. Wis 1:6 and 4 Ezra 13) issues a challenge to empire. He criticises Liew’s emphasis on apocalyptic as ‘protest against colonialism’ (Liew 1999:57) to the neglect of the imperial dreams of domination over other peoples and nations (e.g., Dan 2:44; 7:14, 27; 4Q467 2:1–8) found in such anti-imperial protests. Although apocalyptic literature’s revolution tends to stay imaginary, it is a powerful form of resistance in situations of social powerlessness (Collins 1998:283), and reminds of Scott’s ‘hidden transcripts.’ Cf. Liew (2007:106) for the widespread apocalyptic emphasis in Mark and the connections between apocalyptic time and colonial politics (e.g., 1:3–5, 15; 3:23–27 plundering Satan’s household; 9:1, 10:29–30, 14:62 imminent kingdom; 13 little apocalypse).
Mark's Jesus is implicated in the imperial power game. Teaching the ambivalence of the cross—which appears not to be lost on the narrator as at least the unfolding events of the show of military force and blatant mockery with political overtones in Mark 15:15–20 seem to indicate—is a challenge for which a postcolonial approach has both the discernment and an adequate vocabulary and grammar.

**Teaching mimicry in Mark 10:32–45**

The question by the sons of Zebedee

Personal orientations to teaching develop as lecturers ‘shuffle their goals and access to resources’, but they always ‘enter the classroom with an array of resources. They have knowledge of their subject… but they also have procedural knowledge about how things work and conceptual knowledge of how things fit together into larger systems’ (Schoenfeld in Rhem 2013, my emphasis). Teaching Mark with a postcolonial optic illuminates and potentially destabilises the persisting orientalising urge in biblical scholarship. ‘Like the Oriental discourse, biblical Orientalism has constituted itself as an object to be studied and structured and has distanced itself from the concerns of the region… has paid little attention to what the indigenous people in the Mediterranean thought about its knowledge production’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:99), leaving no room for any sense of hybridity or prevailing ambivalence.

Leaving aside that teaching already is characterised by a fair amount of ambivalence, Mark’s narrative, which is cloaked in hybridity, ambivalence, and also mimicry, poses a pedagogical challenge. Homi Bhabha’s (1994:92) claim that the Bible bears ‘both the standard of the cross and the standard of empire’, accentuates the nature of the challenge. The postcolonial optic cautions against narrowing the notion of empire to protest and resistance, but retains the focus on unequal power relations in ‘uneven cultural equation and distorted representation’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:24). Not unlike other colonial-imperial settings, Mark’s narrative did not adopt a stance of unambiguous resistance towards empire.

The ambivalence inherent to contexts infused by empire is expressed well by Moore (2006:204): ‘In the end, then, Mark’s gospel refuses to relinquish its dreams of empire, even while deftly deconstructing the models of economic exchange that enable empires, even eschatological ones, to function.’ In postcolonial analysis the role ascribed to Jesus in Mark is often described as mimicry, which wants to focus on the ambivalent mixture of deference and disobedience, and that amounts to a counter-strategy brought into play by the colonised or the subalterns: subversive subservience, subversion cloaked

---

38. By promising the utter destruction of both Jewish and Roman authorities upon Jesus’ eschatological return, the Markan parousia is ‘in the final analysis no different from a “might-is-right” ideology’ (Liew 1999:107); rather, it ‘duplicates the authoritarian, exclusionary, and coercive politics of his colonizers’ (Liew 1999:149).

39. Far from exposing the brutality of the Roman punishment of crucifixion, the reversal of power constellations renders the crucifixion a source of strength and turns the Romans into unwitting executors of redemption’ (Kelber 2006:101). In postcolonial fashion, Moore points out that ‘the Markan cross … is merely a bold entrepreneurial wager that yields an eschatological effect’ (Moore 2006:203).

40. In Edward Said’s ground-breaking work on the topic, he describes how the West invented the idea of the Orient and its people with the purpose both to describe and also mimicry, poses a pedagogical challenge. Homi Bhabha’s (1994:92) claim that the Bible bears ‘both the standard of the cross and the standard of empire’, accentuates the nature of the challenge. The postcolonial optic cautions against narrowing the notion of empire to protest and resistance, but retains the focus on unequal power relations in ‘uneven cultural equation and distorted representation’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:24). Not unlike other colonial-imperial settings, Mark’s narrative did not adopt a stance of unambiguous resistance towards empire.

41. In the words of Sugirtharajah, ‘the Bible is not merely a simple spiritual text but has the capacity to foster both spiritual and territorial conquest’. And, ‘(t)he Christian Bible, for all its sophisticated theological ideas like tolerance and compassion, contains equally repressive and predatory elements which provide textual ammunition for spiritual and physical conquest’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:31–31). Or even stronger, in an earlier work: ‘the Bible itself is part of the conundrum rather than a panacea for all the ills of the postmodern/postcolonial world… (it) is an unsafe and a problematic text’ (Sugirtharajah 2002:100).

42. In addition, as Sugirtharajah (2012:172) also indicates, ‘Postcolonial biblical criticism questions the potential of the Bible to preserve and protect the dominant and also in the process unsettles its position as a primary source for the dominant to strengthen their grip’. The Bible remains both a contested and an ambiguous collection of texts. At times Sugirtharajah’s position seems less harsh, like when later on the same page he suggests that ‘the hope of postcolonial exegesis is that the ancient text sheds its imperial, mystifying, archaic, and repressive image and realigns itself with postmodern, postcolonial causes’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:172).

43. But the criticism can at times be harsh as much as inappropriate, for example, this claim about another gospel: ‘Luke scorns comments on the moral and social implications of the imperial rule and has nothing to say about the ethics of the origins of wealth production’ (Sugirtharajah 2012:171). It is probably both culturally insensitive and anachronistic to expect criticism against imperial political and economic hegemony, even if Luke gospel’s narrative world provides ample evidence of engaging the elite, the wealthy and the powerful.

44. The term ambivalence developed in psychoanalysis and refers to the simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action. Ambivalence disrupts ‘the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disturbs the simple relationship between coloniser and colonised’ and describes the ‘fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery which is fundamentally unsettling for the colonizer and is, therefore, an unwelcome aspect of colonial discourse’ (Ashcroft, Giffiths & Tiffin 1998:12). Both the coloniser and colonised find their positions marked by ambivalence: the coloniser is characterised by exploitation and nurturing that are simultaneously present in the relationship with the colonised; the colonised again is never simply conflict with nor resistant to the coloniser.
in apparent submission. In a recent nuanced postcolonial reading of Mark, Samuel (2007) argues that Mark negotiated a space between Roman imperial power and the comparatively dominant Jewish nationalism. Invoking Bhabha’s notions of ambivalence and mimicry, Samuel’s (2007:4–5) argument is that Mark is neither pro-colonial nor anti-colonial, but rather an ambivalent and hybrid discourse that aligns itself with but simultaneously disrupts both internal (native elite Jewish) and external (alien Roman) discourses of power.

Conclusion

Teaching with a postcolonial optic is not a strategy of arguing direct literary or historical dependence between empire and text, as empire as negotiated concept implies reciprocity or negotiation – uneven and biased and ideologically skewed as such negotiations would have been. Moving beyond the scholarly bracketing of empire and having recognised the imperial setting as the elephant in the room of 1st-century texts, one is left with the even more perilous task of attempting to understand the nature of the beast: the varied, complex web of interrelationships amongst empire, communities and people in particular social settings. Moreover, how does one teach the Gospel according to Mark in the 21st-century world marked by neo-colonialism, characterised both by armed conflicts and low-intensity warfare but also by economic imperialism and cultural chauvinism, amidst calls for ‘enlightened re-imperialism’? How does one teach postcolonial exegesis that integrates exegesis and interpretation into a single process, holding the historical and hermeneutical closely together? What knowledge, skills and attitudes would one want to communicate with and to students by means of a postcolonial optic on Mark? What does this require in terms of the expectations – regarding the teaching of Mark in content, regarding theory and approach, in terms of exegesis, and the pedagogical goals? Does this not amount to the loss of an activist angle; that an eye for complexity drives out clear challenges? As far as one answers such questions with a postcolonial optic in mind, the extent and nature to which the ubiquitous and pervasive 1st-century imperium romanum impacted on the New Testament texts will stay a topic for further debate. While empire cannot become shorthand, an all-inclusive term, for life at the time, its heuristic value for biblical scholarship is unlocked by a postcolonial optic that offers a useful approach to deal with empire in its broader sense, as negotiated concept.

In the end, teaching towards a postcolonial optic is no simple task, dealing with an approach or theory with limited consensus about its nature and operations; an approach that on top of this wants to avoid strong and exclusivist binaries and invokes ambivalence, hybridity and mimicry. Yet postcolonial theoretical perspectives can address pressing and lingering tensions without the predisposed utopian tendency to simply reverse alienation, marginalisation and disenfranchisement in postcolonial settings, which has led all too often to a mere reversal in power while leaving unevenness intact. Teaching the Gospel of Mark through a postcolonial optic opens up new possibilities for interpretation and contextualisation, but at the same time poses many challenges, pedagogically and otherwise.
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