

A Comparison of the Characteristic Traits of Learning
Theories in the Three Synoptic Gospels by Thematic
Narrative Analysis

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of
Chester for the degree of Master of Philosophy by Gordon James
Thackray.

March 2018

Signed:

Date:

Table of Contents

A COMPARISON OF THE CHARACTERISTIC TRAITS OF LEARNING	
THEORIES IN THE THREE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS BY THEMATIC NARRATIVE ANALYSIS.....	
	1
DECLARATION	5
ABSTRACT	6
CHAPTER 1.....	7
INTRODUCTION	7
THE RESEARCH QUESTION	8
THE MOTIVATION FOR THE RESEARCH.....	10
THE SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION	10
STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS.....	11
CHAPTER 2.....	13
BACKGROUND LITERATURE.....	13
CONTEMPORARY VIEWS OF MIND AND THEORIES OF LEARNING.....	13
<i>Behaviourism</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Cognitive Constructivism.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Social Constructivism</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Humanistic Learning Theory.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Strongly Situated Learning Theory.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Learning Theories as Analysis Themes.....</i>	<i>23</i>
PEDAGOGY IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	25
<i>Rewards and Punishments in Matthew.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Repetition in Matthew</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>A Community of Jesus-following Practice.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>The Disciples' Learning Failure in Mark.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Insiders and Outsiders in the Synoptic Gospels.....</i>	<i>32</i>
CONCLUSION OF THE REVIEW	35
CHAPTER 3.....	36
METHODOLOGY: THEMATIC NARRATIVE ANALYSIS.....	36
BIBLICAL LITERARY CRITICISM	36
THEMATIC NARRATIVE ANALYSIS.....	38
THE KEY ISSUES OF THE NARRATIVE	42
THE AUTHOR.....	50

THE READER	52
THE RESEARCH PROCESS.....	54
<i>An Illustration of the Method</i>	55
CONCLUSION OF THE METHODOLOGY DISCUSSION.....	60
CHAPTER 4.....	61
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	61
THE MARKAN MATERIAL	61
<i>Formation of the Disciples</i>	61
<i>Controversies with Others</i>	63
<i>Learning in Parable</i>	70
<i>Hard Words on Learning the Kingdom Secrets</i>	76
<i>Learning in Practice</i>	81
<i>Learning in Miracle</i>	85
<i>Continuing Learning</i>	88
<i>Further Examples</i>	94
THE 'Q' MATERIAL.....	100
<i>The Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain</i>	100
<i>Introduction to the Sermons</i>	101
<i>On Teaching</i>	101
<i>The Beatitudes</i>	102
<i>On Reconciliation</i>	103
<i>On Divorce and Remarriage</i>	107
<i>On Loving Enemies</i>	108
<i>The Lord's Prayer</i>	109
<i>On Transmitting Light</i>	113
<i>On Not being Anxious</i>	114
<i>On Not Judging</i>	115
<i>Parable of the Speck and the Log</i>	116
<i>On Entering by the Narrow Gate</i>	117
<i>The Test of Goodness</i>	119
<i>Hearers and Doers of the Word</i>	120
<i>End of the Sermon</i>	122
<i>The Parable of the Leaven</i>	122
<i>Blind Guides</i>	125
<i>Parable of the Lost Sheep</i>	127

<i>The Parable of the Feast</i>	129
<i>The Parable of the Talents or Minas</i>	132
LUKE'S SPECIAL 'L' MATERIAL	135
<i>The Nativity Story</i>	135
<i>The Parable of the Good Samaritan</i>	137
<i>The Parable of the Lost Son</i>	139
<i>The Parable of the Unjust Steward</i>	141
<i>The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus</i>	144
<i>Further Lukan Material</i>	145
<i>The Post-Resurrection Narrative</i>	148
CHAPTER 5	151
CONCLUDING DISCUSSION	151
DISCUSSION	151
<i>The Gospel of Mark</i>	151
<i>The Gospel of Matthew</i>	153
<i>The Gospel of Luke</i>	156
CONCLUSION.....	158
REFERENCES	160

Declaration

The material being presented for examination is my own work and has not been submitted for an award of this or another HEI except in minor particulars which are explicitly noted in the body of the thesis. Where research pertaining to the thesis was undertaken collaboratively, the nature and extent of my individual contribution has been made explicit.

Abstract

Title: A Comparison of the Characteristic Traits of Learning Theories in the Three Synoptic Gospels by Thematic Narrative Analysis

Author: Gordon James Thackray

Many writers have discussed aspects of pedagogy in connection with the books of the New Testament but few have related pedagogical elements observable in the Gospels to current theories of how people learn and the consequent teaching methods. I perform, here, a thematic narrative analysis of the synoptic gospel texts, with the focus of contemporary approaches to learning and teaching.

The project aims to identify traits of pedagogic themes throughout these gospels, with a view to establishing if it is appropriate to describe any of them as characterised by one or other of the commonly recognised theories of learning. While such a characterisation is not expected to be perfect across any one Synoptic, it could prove possible to demonstrate sufficient correlation with some theoretical learning model to argue that the gospel is typified by that pedagogy. This thesis also compares and contrasts the three synoptic gospels, in respect of their emphasis on those themes.

The thesis outlines the salient features of the currently prominent learning and teaching approaches and considers the applicability of each model to this investigation. The three approaches found most useful for the analysis are: that referred to as behaviourism in teaching; a cognitive, constructivist pedagogic model; and the strongly situated learning theory. The synoptic gospels are examined for aspects of those themes, where possible, as a series of parallel passages, each regarded as a bounded text segment. Special Lukan material is also considered, separately. Any reader's interpretation of such a narrative is constructed from within their own pre-existing framework for understanding it. My reading of the Gospels here is, therefore, a personal response to the text, which has arisen from my experience working in adult education and training.

The conclusion of this work is that all three synoptic gospels exhibit textual features corresponding to a specific teaching and learning model sufficiently consistently to regard them as substantially informed by it. Furthermore, the Synoptics each exemplify a different pedagogical approach. Matthew's gospel portrays a predominantly behaviourist pedagogy, the Gospel of Mark a generally cognitivist, constructivist approach to learning and teaching and Luke the characteristics of a strongly situative learning theory. It is anticipated that the comparison presented here will provide a new contribution to the discussion of the differences between the otherwise parallel accounts evident within the first three gospels.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Many scholars have discussed aspects of pedagogy in relation to the synoptic gospels. Chapter 2 illustrates this with various such publications relevant to the present thesis. Some of these authors focus on the teaching ministry of Jesus or consider the learning experiences of the first disciples (e.g. Csinos, 2010; Robbins, 2009). Others, such as Esler (1987) and Byrskog (1994) have focussed on the transmission of Jesus' teaching and tradition among the early communities of his subsequent followers. Other commentators still have treated features of learning and teaching in some gospel narrative as having a literary purpose (e.g. Best, 1986) or a theological function (e.g. Weeden, 1968). Few writers, however, have specifically related the pedagogical elements they detect in the gospels to contemporary theories of how people learn.

Moreover, theories of intellectual development and cognition have evolved significantly over the last twenty-five years and it, therefore, seems appropriate to reconsider the role that pedagogy might have played in the writing of the gospel narratives. Csinos (2010) has gone some way toward this, by applying a community of practice approach (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to the activities of Jesus and his first apostles and disciples – as recorded in the Synoptics – and has suggested how this paradigm could reflect, especially in Matthew and Mark, the situated learning taking place within that embryonic community.

Charette (2015, pp. 11-12) has also, very recently, reappraised the operation, within Matthew's gospel, of rewards and punishments, as incentives to correct behaviour in the teaching of Jesus, and found it to be prominent. Csinos' inferences are, to a large extent, however, inconsistent with this thematic analysis of Matthew, from a pedagogical perspective, since the behaviourist strategy of promising rewards and

threatening punishments in encouraging learning, has no place within, in fact is incompatible with, a strongly situated learning theory.

Sweat (2013, pp. 49-50) has, again quite recently, briefly reviewed the importance of a range of teaching and learning aspects in Mark's gospel, including the role of the teacher, individual learner-teacher dialogue and the personal engagement and response of the learner. The presence of these essentially pedagogic concerns in the gospel, once more, decidedly does not suggest a situative model of learning. Thus, Csinos' choice of Matthew and Mark to illustrate a Community of Practice view of the gospel narrative is unconvincing. Nevertheless, his observations regarding Mark's gospel do demonstrate that the dominant framework of cognition and the approach to teaching apparent within it is far from fully established.

By contrast, Wendel (2011, pp. 167-168) discusses the Lukan concept of both the group of Jesus' first followers and, in the Acts of the Apostles, the early community of Christ-believers, including issues very redolent of the situated learning discourse. She does so with regard to their domain knowledge, their practice and their identity formation, and in respect of the boundary objects and the learning processes (Wenger, 2000, pp. 232-233) possible at the intersection of the Christ-believing and non-believing Jewish communities (Wendel, 2011, pp. 183-186). Csinos' work, on the other hand, makes very little reference to Luke's account in applying a situativity theory to the Synoptics. Such variance of viewpoints, then, suggests there may be a need for a new, more comprehensive and consistent examination of the gospel narratives, with a focus on the pedagogic traits apparent within them.

The Research Question

This thesis proposes that the synoptic gospels can be profitably examined with a focus on current principles of learning and teaching apparent in

their texts. I show, here, that each of the synoptic gospel narratives can be seen as evidencing many features of a specific pedagogical approach when viewed through a lens of contemporary learning theories. So I am asking how the synoptic gospels compare, in respect of their allusions to learning and teaching, from the perspective of current learning theories and approaches to pedagogy.

The present project, thus, comprises an investigation of Matthew, Mark and Luke, with a view to identifying in each gospel narrative, textual expressions that can be recognised within one or other of the contemporary theoretical models of learning and teaching. This thesis presents the results of that analysis, and compares and contrasts the distinctive pedagogical emphases that it seems to indicate.

It is argued, here, that these characteristics of learning theories, in terms of their depiction of the mind and its cognitive processes, though the correspondence is in no case perfect, are substantially consistent throughout any one Synoptic and vary, markedly, between the gospel narratives considered; I show that Mark is characterized by a more cognitive approach to pedagogy, Matthew by a rather behaviouristic style and Luke by an essentially situative learning model.

The evidence for both Luke and Matthew is strong and extensive. In the case of Mark, there is somewhat less available, however, and the argument is not quite so compelling, although, I suggest, it is still persuasive. It is anticipated that these conclusions could constitute an additional contribution to the conversation surrounding the inescapable differences evident between the parallel accounts of the three synoptic gospels.

The Motivation for the Research

The present work inevitably represents, to a certain extent, a reader-response critical approach to the texts. As a professional teacher in further and higher education, and a consultant in continuing education for various academic and professional institutions, I find it natural to inspect the gospel narratives through a lens of educational theory. Consequently, in reading the synoptic gospels, I see numerous clear-cut learning and teaching episodes in the text but also many instances of events, which, though less noticeably didactic, nonetheless admit of a pedagogic reading. The present research was prompted by these observations from my own exploration of the text over many years.

Nevertheless, I adopt, here, a systematic, analytical procedure for the investigation, in keeping with my background and training in the mathematical and physical sciences, considering, initially at least, the parallel and common material of the gospels, to provide as representative as possible a comparison between them. Subsequently, it proves possible to extend this analysis, for example to address the specifically Lukan material.

The Scope of the Investigation

I move on, now, to define the boundaries of this research project. Firstly, the present research is confined to the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. The gospel of John is not examined from its pedagogical emphasis here because both John's frequently discursive nature and its distinctive content make it difficult to reliably compare it with the other books. By contrast, the strong similarities among the Synoptics make their comparison often much more straightforward and the residual differences between them then pose particularly interesting issues within the Synoptic Problem.

Secondly, the analytical method applied here is constrained to the narrative's content and does not seek to place it in any cultural or social context. It regards each gospel as a final, integrated textual unit, which can be searched for references to characteristic elements of an existing framework or theory of learning within its production. These pedagogical aspects of the material, however, may have no deliberately persuasive role in the narrative argument and may only emerge from a close reading of the text through the chosen theoretical lens. Although centred on the narrative of the gospels, then, the current approach does not attempt any socio-rhetorical or redactional criticism of their texts. Also, while I do not preclude inclusion of some structural analysis of the narratives, the chosen methodology is not primarily concerned with identifying, in fine detail, its literary construction, either.

The intention of the investigation is, therefore, not to hypothesize about any author's theological ideologies or the effect their gospel was intended to bring about amongst their audience. Neither does the study attempt to establish exactly how the text came to exhibit any views on teaching and learning that seem to be prevalent within the gospel narrative, although possible contemporaneous sources of such pedagogic perspectives will be, briefly, discussed. Rather, the research aims to examine each of the synoptic accounts thematically, focussing on the pedagogical features that characterise them, and to demonstrate how this analysis frequently throws the distinctions between these three narratives into sharp relief.

Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 2 constitutes a review of published literature relevant to this project. It includes the background to each of the five main theories of teaching and learning current today. These approaches range from the form of behaviourism that has traditionally been adopted in schools since the early part of the last century, and which still has advocates in some sections of the state education sector, through the different strands of

the currently prevailing paradigm of pedagogical constructivism, to the radically sociocultural perspective of the strongly socially situated learning theory. That chapter then concludes with a discussion of the relevant work of recent authors that has a particular bearing on the study of pedagogy in the synoptic gospels.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the methodology of thematic narrative analysis – its key features and how it differs from other narratological methods. This chapter then goes on to consider the synoptic gospels as narrative and to examine existing applications of such analytical techniques to these accounts. Chapter 3 concludes with an illustration of applying the present analysis method to one of the most important parables in the first three gospel narratives – the Parable of the Four Soils – in order to demonstrate its diagnostic potential.

Chapter 4 is the results chapter and presents the conclusions of the analysis in a staged manner. The first comparison reported is of the parallel passages shared across all three of the Synoptics. These sections are often presumed to be originally Markan material, subsequently redacted by Matthew and Luke for their theological purposes. The second stage comprises the text only common to the gospels of Matthew and Luke, which, under the two-source hypothesis, is attributed to the missing 'Q' material (though the argument presented is not, in any way, dependent on the actual existence or composition of 'Q'). Finally, the remaining, specifically Lukan component is examined. These results are further discussed and drawn to a conclusion in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2

Background Literature

In this Chapter, I review the published literature relevant to the present research. Firstly, I discuss the characteristic features of the common theories of learning and views of mind that might be significant in a Thematic Narrative Analysis of the synoptic gospels with that focus of analysis. I shall examine the five most common, contemporary learning models, which I shall refer to as the: 'behaviourist', 'cognitive constructivist', 'social constructivist', 'humanistic', and 'strongly situated' approaches. It should be remembered, however, that all these terms are somewhat imprecise and overlapping, even within education, and each can have a considerable variation of meaning. My understanding of each of them will, therefore, emerge from the review presented in this section of the thesis, itself.

I then present a literature review of material forming the backdrop to an exploration of the synoptic gospels from a pedagogical standpoint. That discussion is ordered thematically, addressing each gospel as appropriate, and makes some initial suggestions as to which learning theories might have promise as a focus of analysis in each case.

Contemporary Views of Mind and Theories of Learning

Behaviourism

I begin with the model sometimes called genetic behaviourism, often referred to by teachers as simply behaviourism. Early views of intelligence (for example, Galton, 1869; Pearson & Barrington, 1909) maintained that it was substantially genetically inherited, leading to inborn mental abilities which developed during childhood. This conviction was associated with attempts to measure human intelligence (Spearman,

1904), assuming it to obey some Gaussian distribution in the population as a whole. Burt (1921) later applied this principle to examine the academic performance of children in schools.

The assumption of inherited intelligence led to a view that the capability to learn was more or less fixed from birth, and that intellect exhibited a certain limited capacity for learning. The role of the mind in acquiring knowledge became disregarded and the learning process itself was conceived of as merely the brain receiving information transmitted by others. It also spawned the idea of testing learners' mental potential, and, because of the belief in a biological ceiling to an individual's ability, such tests became thought of as predictive of ultimate personal performance. They were, therefore, pursued with a view to focussing educational resources on those most able to take advantage of them (Broadfoot, 1996) and on developing an exclusive meritocracy who could form a political leadership to stimulate economic growth and improve social conditions (Torrance, 1989, p. 95).

Furthermore, in the early 20th century, Pavlov and Anrep (1927) showed how animals respond to an applied stimulus and, subsequently, Skinner (1938) developed a stimulus/response theory of human learning based on learners' responses to environmental stimuli. Thus the approach considered the learning process as merely a matter of inputs and outputs and, again, discounted any mental processing that might have happened in-between.

Skinner (1938) went on to demonstrate the role of rewards in positive reinforcement of a learner's desired behaviour and of punishment as a deterrent to, and eventually, an eliminator of undesirable behaviours – a practice he referred to as 'operant conditioning'. Such a behaviour change is what evidences learning in this model; and this 'scientific', objectivist view of the learning process in the behaviourist paradigm

implies that reality itself is objective and exists independently of human perception, and so permits the reification of knowledge.

The brain thereby becomes envisaged as a finite receptacle to receive transmitted information and the mind is discounted as a separately distinguishable entity (Greenfield, 2004). It constitutes nothing other than the working encephalon. Behaviourism is, thus, often said to entail a physicalistic or materialistic monistic philosophy (Uttal, 2000, p. 28). The role of the teacher in learning is now to be the source of all valued knowledge and the purpose of teaching is to supply this to the learner, in such a way that it can be readily assimilated; the learner's place is simply to absorb the facts provided and to modify their behaviour to produce the correct responses to questioning about it.

This principle of transmission and passive reception of knowledge makes the teacher both the incontestable authority on the subject taught, and the absolute controller of the teaching and learning process. Moreover, since, ostensibly, no thought mediates this stimulus/response activity, the same pedagogical approach should be equally effective with every student, up to his or her level of capability to learn. Thus, if a stimulus is effectual for some, the identical one can be utilised with all the learners. Those students that are able to learn then will do; those who do not learn, it is presumed, have an intrinsic inability to do so.

Learners' intellectual abilities, then, are predetermined from birth but their potential is attained by application of effort. The teacher must drill the student to reach their capacity to learn. Repetition, revisiting and revising are, thus, emphasized as a means to achieving mastery – as demonstrated, for example, in Robins' recent discussion of behaviourism in action within the classroom (Robins, 2012, p. 28). In its extreme form, then, this teaching approach becomes the one of practise and memorise that leads to the practice of rote learning.

Furthermore, learning is seen in this theory as an essentially individual matter, with little, if any, consideration for emotional or social influences. As Boghossian (2006, p. 718) explains it, there is practically no opportunity for interaction between the students and the teacher within the behaviourist context, since the learner has, effectively, no valued knowledge to contribute.

Cognitive Constructivism

Over the last generation or so, this model has been challenged by the constructivist approach, which has roots in the ideas of Piaget (1970) and, later, Bruner (1996). This presupposes a more active involvement of the mind in the learning process. Knowledge is constructed through the thought processes of the learners themselves, which will, probably, be different for each person. New information often causes some cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) with the learner's existing mental schema for understanding it and demands a, sometimes quite lengthy, period of reappraisal. This leads, either to their rejection of the inconsistent idea as incoherent, or to a reconstruction of their knowledge framework in a form that accommodates the discrepancy.

In fact, such a model of learning has received considerable additional support in recent years from neurobiology (e.g. Pascual-Leon, Amedi, Fregni, & Merabet, 2005), which has highlighted the plasticity of the brain and its ability to continue developing neural pathways throughout life. However, deriving from a tradition of cultural or developmental psychology, constructivism naturally tends to espouse a picture of cognition in terms of internal, mental states. It, typically, eschews a materialist, physicalistic view of mind-brain and presupposes a Cartesian dualist philosophy of the mind, in which it is non-physical and substantially distinguished from the body (e.g. Chalmers, 1996).

In what is often termed the cognitive variant of constructivism, most extremely that of von Glasersfeld (1995), a learner works on their own,

to appraise the ideas of their peers – so that cognition is essentially in the learner’s own head. Nonetheless, an agentic, purposeful mind, actively processing new knowledge, encourages a more learner-centred style of teaching, focussing on involving the learners in their self-directed and personal, intellectual progression. The teaching objective becomes to minimise superficial learning and to bring about a deeper learning experience (e.g. Usher, Bryant, & Johnston, 1997, p. 93).

Some of the pedagogic strategies that are often attributed to a constructivist conception of learning therefore include: instructional modelling, where the teacher first demonstrates the activity to be learnt and the learners are expected to understand, and then reproduce, the learnt action themselves; educational scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976), in which learners can be supported by the teacher-facilitator, or by each other, through the learning process until independent working is possible; and problem-solving activities, which anticipate an active and motivated involvement of the learner. The production of an external and enduring outcome from a teaching episode – what Bruner (1996, pp. 22-29) has called ‘externalization’ – is also believed to contribute to a sense of achievement, and authentic practical tasks, set in relevant, real world contexts, are, again, favoured (e.g. Hodson, 1998, p. 43).

The use of metaphor is another very common teaching method, especially where an agentic view of mind obtains. Indeed, many teachers today would regard analogy as the primary means of teaching anything – it deliberately draws the learner from phenomena already familiar to them into further learning. One of the most fundamental general principles of a constructivist pedagogy, in fact, is that of building on the learner’s prior knowledge corpus. A further, very important, component of a constructivist’s arsenal is that of metacognitive reflection (Hodson, 1998, pp. 41-43), in which students consolidate new knowledge by reviewing the process of constructing it that they have recently undertaken.

Before moving on, it has to be remarked that the post-modernist paradigm has, over the last few decades, extended the subjectivistic, constructivist concept of 'knowing' to the point of arguing that nothing is absolutely true (Grenz, 1996, p. 8). Consequently, while the behaviourist, generally, has a manifestly objectivist view of reality, constructivism has seemed to be more ambiguous on this matter. However, constructivistic epistemology maintains only that one's knowledge about the world is humanly constructed; there is, notwithstanding, a real, objective universe to which that knowledge framework relates (Hardy & Taylor, 1997, pp. 136-137). Indeed, to constitute a practical educational theory, this assumption is essential, for otherwise we should know how, but never what, to teach. Thus, it should be emphasised, this model of learning does not actually assert that truth is purely relativistic and hence is not at variance with classical theology on that point.

Social Constructivism

The view within constructivism that a major element of knowledge acquisition is socially mediated is usually traced back to the seminal work of Vygotsky (1978, p. 87). This developmental psychologist held that mind has a social foundation, learning occurring, essentially, between a novice and a more proficient person. According to this theory, such an interaction leads the learner on, from their current level of capability, to an understanding slightly beyond this but inside, what he labelled, their 'Zone of Proximal Development' (ZPD) (see, Cole, 1985, p. 155). The ZPD then represents the potential increase in a learner's performance as a result of their involvement with the more competent companion.

In a contemporary social constructivist conception, following Driver et al. (2004, pp. 70-71), learning occurs as a two stage progression. It begins with a dialogue involving the teacher and the learner, which generates a mutual understanding between them on the new knowledge to be learnt. Learners, subsequently, appropriate this meaning for themselves, in a

conventional constructivist manner. Thus the developmental process comprises both a social and an internal cognitive component, in that order.

Hence, in a social constructivist pedagogy, discourse and discussion become important aspects of the teaching approach. Scaffolding by the teacher comes to the fore during the period of shared meaning making, as does the bridging to, and building on, learners' prior knowledge. In addition, other pedagogical implications of a constructivist approach to learning are still also appropriate. Authentic tasks and relevant learning contexts are again given prominence; and, as another example, the use of metaphor is seen to reflect the Vygotskian notion of the technically more competent partner leading the learner, from their existing level of achievement, into their zone of proximal development.

Lastly, the teacher's position is central to the learning and teaching process in a constructivist pedagogical approach, and it becomes even more so in social constructivism, in view of the mediatory role teachers play between the subject knowledge and the learner (Driver et al., 2004, pp. 70-71). This responsibility entails forming an assessment of the learners' prior knowledge and their developing understanding, in order to enable their advancement beyond it.

Often a practical technique of nominated, directed questioning is employed to determine a learner's existing knowledge frameworks and to guide their development. Furthermore, such probing may be methodically structured along the lines of Socratic maieutics (e.g. Mulholland & Turnock, 2007, p. 16), albeit that the teacher might have epistemologically distinct perspectives from those of a strictly Socratic practitioner (Boghossian, 2006, p. 718).

Humanistic Learning Theory

During the latter half of the last century, a second strand of pedagogical thinking arose in reaction to the apparent weaknesses of the behaviourist perspective, and acquired the title of humanistic learning theory. It looked to the 'hierarchy of needs', of the psychologist, Maslow (1954), and to Kolb's experiential model of adult learning (Kolb, 1984), for its theoretical foundations, and stressed both cognitive and affective aspects of personal growth. Hence, the approach aimed to facilitate a process of self-directed human development, based on experimentation and conceptualization, and to enable the learner to achieve self-esteem and self-actualization.

However, despite their name, unlike previous such paradigms, humanistic theories do not begin to conceptualize the learning process from a specific view of mind, but adopt a holistic approach to the person of the learner. Rather than formulating a theory of how learning occurs, then, this approach regards it as a naturally emerging consequence of the human being's intrinsic inclination to explore what he or she finds interesting – or meaningful, as Rogers (1969, pp. 164-166) has put it. It, therefore, concentrates on specifying pragmatic pedagogic practices and a conducive academic environment, in line with its concern for the wellbeing of the individual, in the belief that this will permit them to attain to their inherent personal potential through their own, natural curiosity and self-motivation.

Humanistic pedagogic methods therefore focus on co-operative, non-competitive, group work learning tasks, which are student centred and learner controlled, the teacher ceding much authority to the learners in the teaching process. Activities tend to be authentic but open ended, and to concentrate on developing the learners' individual self-awareness and mutual understanding (Johnson, 2014). Educational experiences, in this model, should, then, involve the entire person, not just their intellect but also their emotions, opinions, personal values and everyday problems.

Strongly Situated Learning Theory

The final contemporary approach to learning I consider here, is that of the strongly situated theory. This paradigm rests on the sociocultural concept of a Community of Practice (CoP) – what Wenger (2000, p. 229) has described as a participatory, socially interacting group with a common agenda. The situative learning model was first proposed, from within the discipline of social anthropology, by Lave and Wenger (1991, pp. 27-30), at the end of the last century. There, they characterised a CoP as a master/apprentices type of community, comprising one or more masters or 'old hands' and a number of relative 'newcomers', who take part in its practices to differing extents. A community's legitimate members tend to start to participate in it peripherally, and, with experience, become increasingly more deeply involved.

Learning, in this model, consists, only, in the (at least peripheral) participation in the community's characteristic practices; and working together on these activities constitutes for its novices, a 'learning curriculum' of how to use, to best advantage, its specialised resources – that is, its documentation, tools and technologies. The emphasis in this paradigm, therefore, departs from didactic teaching and pedagogical approaches, and resides in becoming a knowledgeable, legitimate participant in that particular CoP (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 92-95). Thus, there is a sharp shift in perception of the master or teacher, here, from the person constituting the centre of authority for the learner, to someone with particular expertise who is one part of the organisation of the community.

One central component of this participation in the community's activities is the 'talk' that takes place within the practice – for example, participants relating stories about it, one to another. Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 109) stress that such 'talking in the practice' – which should be clearly distinguished from a purely pedagogic talking about the CoP's

practices – serves the important function of strengthening the community members' reflective thinking and enhancing their collective recall of its domain knowledge.

Other aspects of the learning environment, stressed as desirable by the situated learning community (e.g. Herrington & Oliver, 1995, pp. 253-262), include: modelling of processes by an expert; learning in undertaking of authentic, real-life tasks; the designing in of problem solving activities; the availability of scaffolding to ensure progression to competence; and collaborative working and knowledge construction.

Furthermore, in a strongly situated learning theory, all knowledge exists in, and is distributed across, the relevant CoP; and, as Arnold, Smith and Trayner, amongst others, have recently discussed (Arnold, Smith, & Trayner, 2012, p. 126; Wenger, 2009) the community membership, its practice and its knowledge domain are all mutually constitutive – they define each other and develop together.

Moreover, such a CoP may exist within, or overlap with others to form a wider, social learning system (Wenger, 2000). Overlapping communities share their resources and members with each other at the common boundary between them. Learning then occurs both inside these different CoPs and, most significantly, at their shared boundaries, where the knowledge and culture of the two meet.

In their earlier work, Lave and Wenger also discussed the social reproduction of communities of practice, as newcomers learn to be knowledgeable practitioners and become masters, themselves (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 114-116). As they do so, participants maintain the continuity of the community. However, at the same time, they also challenge the existing organisation of the community's practices, as they attempt to stamp their own mark upon them. The authors suggested this tension between stability and change, and the development and

maintenance of participants' identities through it, is fundamental to all learning. Hence, the traditional transmission and passive reception model of the physicalist, behaviourist paradigm can never adequately represent the implicit learning process of the situative perspective.

Indeed, as with a humanist learning theory, a situated model does not necessarily presume any one view of mind. Its focus in learning, on the learners' corporeal interaction with the community and their environment, makes a dualistic separation of mind and body unsatisfactory, while its commitment to learners being mentally active in their participation within the community's practice, militates against materialistic monism. Rather, the concept of 'situative learning' feeds into emerging ideas around body and mind as separately identifiable objects which act together, in concert, as an integrated whole – a conception which characterises current theories of embedded or embodied cognition (Valera, Thompson, & Rosch, 1993, pp. 172-173).

Learning Theories as Analysis Themes

In conclusion, there is a variety of approaches currently employed in learning and teaching, each of which might provide a productive focus for a thematic analysis of the synoptic gospels. A behaviourist learning model, for example, which corresponds, to a large extent, with the praxis of traditional pedagogy, would seem a promising candidate to look for signs of in an ancient writing environment. Also, in view of the emphasis of the early church on developing a community of Christ-based practice, a situative learning theory might seem a probable contender, too.

The present chapter will continue, in the next section, with a review of existing literature on the subject of teaching and learning in the synoptic gospels, in order to place the current study in the context of other, published work; and that examination will provide additional impetus for adopting both the behaviourist approach and the situative model as possible themes for the following analysis.

By contrast, while it might reflect something of the content of the teaching in the gospels, the humanistic view, focussing as it does on the peak of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, would appear, on the face of it, less likely to be of major significance in exploring text from a much more static and hierarchical era of human social organization. It might be profitable, though, to examine the synoptic gospels also, for evidence in the text of a more cognitive perspective on the process of intellectual development, especially given the influence of Greek philosophical thinking on first century society.

As described here, it must be said, these learning models are categorical and quite strictly defined. In practice, educational practitioners will often adopt approaches and strategies that seem to be effective for their students, albeit that they may draw on more than one such theory. Indeed, it is recognised by many educationalists that, to some extent, the boundaries delineating the models should be less rigid, even between those that seem to be effectively incompatible.

In particular, during the mid 20th century the neobehaviourist, Benjamin Bloom (Bloom et al. 1956) devised a taxonomy for learning, comprising three distinct domains: Psychomotor, Affective and Cognitive – the latter of which aimed to promote higher order thinking skills in teaching and learning – thereby introducing into it aspects of both humanism and cognition. Lorin Anderson later (Anderson et al. 2001) developed Bloom's cognitive domain table further, introducing more-active thinking processes into his learning framework.

Gilda Gold (Wandersman et al. 1976) described a practical integration of behaviourism and humanism, which she termed 'affective behaviorism' to teach self-control to children suffering from behavioural problems, while other authors have taken issue with the assumed mutually exclusive nature of behaviourism and constructivism. Marcee Steele (2005), for

example, showed that elements of both can profitably be employed together, especially in the challenging task of teaching learners with learning disabilities.

Teachers are continually adapting and combining approaches to pedagogy, then, to make learning as effective as possible, and as learning theories mature they naturally become more general and more nuanced. I, however, have chosen to focus here on a well-defined characterisation of the different pedagogical models, incorporating a classical definition of behaviourism and a pure cognitive constructivism. This ensures that there is a clear set of themes available pertaining to each theory, for which to search the synoptic Gospel texts. The remainder of this thesis, including the conclusions in Chapter 4, therefore relates, essentially, to the classification presented above.

Pedagogy in the Synoptic Gospels

I move on, now, to a consideration of the literature surrounding the exploration of approaches to understanding, learning and teaching in the New Testament, especially in the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. Ehrensperger (2009, pp. 134-135) has discussed the authority and superiority asserted by the Apostle Paul, in his undisputed letters to the early churches, through his adoption of a discourse of pedagogy, despite the fact that he did not expressly refer to himself as a teacher. She notes (Ehrensperger, 2009, p. 134) that 'along with this claim of superior knowledge goes a claim of power over the communities', which suggests the epistles exhibit elements of a rather behaviouristic approach to learning rather than that of a geographically distributed Community of Practice.

Other scholars have examined the writing of the synoptic gospel authors through the lens of pedagogical and learning theories. Robbins (2009, pp. xx-xxi) wrote of Mark's Gospel as depicting Jesus' disciples progressing,

logically and qualitatively, through a teacher-learner development process, analogous to the personal maturation of the adult human being. This process is envisaged to entail a strong relationship between the learner and the teacher, including during an initial acceptance of their respective roles, a period of continuing interaction and an end phase in which teacher scaffolding is removed and independence enabled.

Shortly after, Esler (1987, pp. 16-17) found the writings in Luke-Acts, to be motivated by the objective of providing an explanation and rationalisation, to the early Christian community, of its faith claims and practices. Luke is thought here to have been writing for a diverse, first century CE audience, under pressure from a range of external opposition. He wished to assure the community's members of the validity of their faith and to encourage them to persevere with community membership. Later, Byrskog (1994, pp. 14, 329), discussed the didactic authority of Jesus, and how the transmitters of the Jesus tradition manifested this in the activities of the Matthean community, within the context of a conception of 'Jesus as the only teacher'.

Each of these literary sources will be considered further, later in this thesis, but they begin, here, to suggest various approaches to teaching and learning which might prove separately useful in considering an examination of the first three gospel narratives.

Rewards and Punishments in Matthew

Furthermore, the perception of teaching and learning in the Gospel of Matthew has undergone a curious history. It has long been customary to insist that warning of impending punishments and the proffering of rewards play no role in the protrepsis of the gospels, including Matthew's. Indeed, compliance with a preferred behaviour through desire for recompense has traditionally been regarded as hedonistic, in a Kantian manner. For instance, de Ru (1966, p. 220) remarked, categorically, that 'Service for reward is decisively rejected by Jesus'. As another example,

Bornkamm, in his often cited paper (Bornkamm, 1963, p. 80), has, also, comprehensively dismissed reward and punishment in inducing acquiescence, as a feature of the gospels' pedagogy.

However, this perspective has, subsequently, been persuasively contested, in respect of Matthew's gospel in particular. Albright and Mann (1971, p. 13) commented, some time ago, 'on the undeniable prominence in Matthew of..."rewards and punishments"', some of which reward 'seems to be an incentive to [covert good] works', although these commentators could not completely escape the contrary conventional wisdom on the subject.

Charette (2015, p. 12), however, goes further: 'in [Matthew's Gospel] Jesus...is not at all reluctant to use promises of reward, and especially threats of punishment, to motivate proper behaviour'; and, slightly earlier, Eubank (2013, pp. 84-85) also discussed recompense in Matthew's Gospel and wrote, 'the Sermon on the Mount is filled with Jesus' pronouncements on how to acquire heavenly treasure and avoid debts and punishments' and '...it is preposterous to claim that the promise of heavenly treasure is not a vital part of the paraenesis'. Thus more recent commentators have stressed the evident role, in sections of teaching associated with the gospel of Matthew, of a degree of inducement close to the reinforcement that is a notable feature of a behaviouristic pedagogy.

Repetition in Matthew

Additionally, the fondness for repetition in the Matthean gospel is well attested, although the reason for it remains undecided. Anderson (1994) has provided a helpful review of the possibilities that have been considered. She explains that Lohr provided, what I suggest is a very credible explanation, around the tendency of early writers to retain narrative elements carried over from the structure of existing oral traditions (Anderson, 1994, p. 17).

Lohr (1961) based his supposition, in part, on the much earlier work of von Dobschütz (1928), who proposed that Matthew's repetitive narrative style arose from the similar teaching practices of rabbis and catechists. If this is the case, it might well encourage searching the first gospel for evidence of a distinctive pedagogical approach – one that would, in present day thinking, be associated with behaviourist methods of teaching and learning.

A Community of Jesus-following Practice

Csinos (2010) has recently provided an introduction to the conceptualization of Jesus and his disciples as an embryonic community of practice, which he equates with the 'reign of God' (Csinos, p. 46). While he draws examples from across the synoptic gospels, a majority of his illustrations are taken from Matthew or Mark. Discipleship, here, becomes membership and legitimate participation in Jesus' incipient CoP. Jesus is the community's 'old timer' and his followers are called into the position of peripheral participants with him.

As the gospel narratives progress, these novice community members become increasingly deeply involved in the Kingdom CoP's practices, and Jesus designates some of them as 'apostles', in a process of social reproduction of the organisation. The article then goes on to cast several more aspects of the disciples' activity, from the various accounts of it in the gospels, into this situated learning paradigm.

In principle, this model of learning is one of the possible approaches that the present thesis explores in more detail. Indeed, such a contemporary sociocultural analysis seems, in many ways, to provide a rather good fit to the inchoate community of Jesus-followers, as seen in the gospels. However, the situative approach does not emerge, from the work of Csinos in this article, as a very convincing contender for any one gospel's

pedagogic paradigm, which is the focus of the present thesis. I, therefore, discuss this further, here.

The call of the first four disciples is the initial case considered by Csinos. The account in Mt. 4:18-22, (Csinos, 2010, p. 53), however, has no obvious community-related context, at all. Furthermore, the unquestioning acceptance of the fishermen in Matthew's variant reflects very much a passive-receptive response to Jesus' summons. Mark's parallel version (Mk. 1:16-20) presents the men in a slightly more thoughtful light, for instance regarding their prior concern for the welfare of Zebedee, but their interaction with Jesus is still devoid of any shared activity with him.

Many other examples from the paper constitute, or are associated with, an, often extensive, direct teaching session, which is either very didactic and instructional (Mt. 8:1-4; 10:5-15) (Csinos, 2010, pp. 55, 58) or formal and separated from other forms of ministry (Mk. 6:34; 9:33-50) (Csinos, 2010, pp. 54-55, 59). The healing of the leper (in Mt. 8:1-4), in addition, immediately follows the widespread recognition, in Matthew's account, of Jesus' personal authority as a teacher. Such a focus on teaching, per se, and the supremacy of the instructor in it, is, once again, as discussed earlier, uncharacteristic of a situative learning approach.

As a final instance of Csinos' examples, the appointing of Apostles, in Mk. 3:14-15, does, admittedly, prepare these participants for a more central involvement in the community's practice. Even so, in the preceding verse, Jesus goes up a mountain, away from both the crowd and his own disciples, in order to single out from them individual people to accompany him (Csinos, 2010, pp. 55-56), rather than preserving the integrity of the whole company of his followers, as in Luke's version. The emphasis in Mark, here, then, is less on maintaining the unity of the Jesus community and substantially more on the Apostles' separation from it. Once more, this does not accord well with a CoP-based model of learning and casts

further doubt on this learning theory as helpful in representing the typical characteristics of learning in Mark's gospel.

The Disciples' Learning Failure in Mark

One other, well-recognized feature throughout the Gospel of Mark (e.g. Mk. 4:40; 8:17-21; 10:13-14), the last of which references (10:13-14) Csinos (2010, p. 57) also mentions, is the apparent criticism by Jesus, of his disciples, for their lack of comprehension and their learning failure. Witherington (2001, pp. 54-56) has a useful review of opinions about the reason for these repeated challenges in Mark, which I draw on here for the following contributions. Firstly, Weeden (1968) suggested it arose from an argument against an heretical theology of the early church, which the gospel projected onto the Apostles, in order to disprove it. Later, Best (1986, pp. 128-129) proposed, rather, that the slowness of Jesus' followers to learn was designed in, in order to permit Jesus to give them further 'positive teaching'.

Still other scholars point to a possible pastoral purpose in Mark's approach – for example, to encourage its readers to persevere in the faith, where the first believers did not. Witherington, however, favours Kingsbury's double-sided view of the disciples (Kingsbury, 1989, p. 101), in terms of which they demonstrate, in Mark, both 'incomprehension' and 'commitment'. There is much successful engagement with the process of discipleship to be seen in this gospel, as well as some notably less so, so that this more balanced view of the Markan followers may well seem to have additional merit.

For the present study, a significant factor here is that, in Mark, Jesus often appears to find the failure of his disciples to understand astonishing, irritating or exasperating – 'he said to [the disciples], "Why are you afraid? Have you still no faith?"' (Mk. 4:40); he frequently wondered, "'Do you not yet understand?"' in Mk. 8:21; and in Mk. 10:14, he was 'indignant' at the disciples' misguided actions, despite their being

well intentioned. One cannot, normally, become annoyed with another for their lack of understanding, unless one believes the other should understand. Mark, then, seems to portray that Jesus expected his followers to comprehend; their incomprehension was, therefore, not assumed to be due to any innate inability to do so.

Consequently, since the disciples were capable of understanding about Jesus, and if, as Kingsbury implies, they were engaging well in the group's activities, with more thought, they should have realised what those learning episodes conveyed. Their failing, therefore, apparently resided in that they were not thinking about what they had learnt enough to embrace the new teaching. Whatever Mark intends to achieve by its treatment of the disciples' learning, or lack of it, then, the form of Jesus' criticisms of them, in Mark's narrative style, projects an essentially cognitive approach to pedagogy.

The problem of incomprehension in Jesus' close followers is far less troubling in Matthew's version of the verses considered here (Mt. 8:26; 16:8-12; 19:14), as, for example, Murphy (2005, p. 177) outlines. The example of Mt. 16:8-12 (*cf.* Mk. 8:17-21), which Murphy also refers to, is a typical case in point. In Matthew, the disciples, apparently, end up with complete comprehension of Jesus' words. The Markan passage, however, is often cited to emphasise the disciples' failure to understand in Mark. For example, Burkett (2004, p. 244) writes, 'Clearly Mark thinks that the disciples should have understood something from the feeding miracles, and he berates their lack of understanding'. Such passages are, therefore, worth examining further.

Liesen and Manhardt (2012, p. 107), seem to get closer to the Markan model of teaching and learning when they argue that Jesus' questioning, here, is meant to enable comprehension. The teaching is dialogical and the questions remind the disciples of their prior knowledge. It appears that Jesus suspected they had developed very rigid mind-sets – their

'hearts hardened'. Consequently, he challenged their thinking with the conflicting facts of the matter, generating cognitive dissonance in a deeply constructivist manner. He then left them to think about his miraculous provision further, in a cognitivist fashion, and to, eventually, revise their understanding.

By comparison, in Matthew's parallel account (Mt. 16:8-12), the teaching is essentially instructional and the questions merely rhetorical. The reactions of the disciples demonstrated they were limited in their ability to learn – they were 'of little faith'. In such a situation the behaviourist's response is to teach it again, and Jesus repeated exactly the same direction as before but disambiguated its meaning – whereupon the disciples immediately understood. No additional cogitation was required – the instruction had been simplified until it could be passively accepted – and, finally, it sank in.

Insiders and Outsiders in the Synoptic Gospels

It is well-known that some synoptic gospel narratives, especially Matthew's, present a clear differentiation, among those whom Jesus taught, between the 'insiders', who legitimately enjoy access to the acquisition of esoteric knowledge concerning the kingdom of God, and those, 'outsiders', who are not privileged in that way. The issue of insider credentials in Matthew has been explored in the work of many scholars, including Harrington.

Harrington (1991, pp. 201-202) derives a criterion for the model insider in Matthew's gospel, from the Parable of the Soils (Mt. 13:23) – he or she is one who, simply, 'hears the word and understands'. The identity of an outsider, then, can be deduced as anyone who does not achieve this understanding. There may be various consequences of their non-comprehension, as listed in the parable's explanation (Mt. 13:19-22), but the parable identifies them, primarily, as just any hearer who 'does not understand' (from Verse 19).

As explained above, it is the behaviourist paradigm of learning that assumes a learner will either be able to understand new knowledge or not. In that approach, learners have a quantifiable level of intellect and a fixed potential for achievement. They may, therefore, be capable of acquiring understanding of given novel truths or may be incapable of it. This correlation, then, of the pedagogical model of behaviourism with the insider/outsider polarity in Matthew's gospel, again, encourages examining Matthew further against that particular learning concept.

Wendel (2011, pp. 182-183) has examined the same Parable of the Soils, and its immediately subsequent verses, in Luke's gospel (Lk. 8:11-21), to conclude the significance of 'insider' and 'outsider' to the Christ-believers in Luke. She points out that, in this version, insiders, 'hear the word of God and do it' (Verse 21), with (in Verse 15) 'moral integrity, endurance and obedience' being the hallmark of understanding. This could readily be recast within the discourse of the situated learning theorist, I suggest, as: hearing and comprehension, in the Lukan representation, is a matter of actively participating in the practice of the community of Christ-believers, persistently exercising its domain knowledge of God's word; these practices define the identity and membership of the Christ-believing CoP and participation in them constitutes 'insider' status.

Thus, learning to become a mature Christ-believer, in Luke's gospel, is, apparently, possible only to 'insiders' who remain, and participate, in the community of Jesus' followers. Outsiders who do not join it, or who leave it, are unable to grow in their knowledge corpus about the Kingdom and their understanding of God. In a situated model of learning that knowledge inheres, uniquely, within the CoP of believers.

Furthermore, based on the earlier work of Kodell (1974, pp. 505-519), Wendel (2011, p. 167) shows that, in Luke-Acts, "the word of God" functions as the creative force that causes the growth of the church' (Acts

6:7; 12:24; 19:20; etc.). This can, similarly, be expressed within a strongly situated paradigm, I conclude, as Luke portraying the conceptualization that – while they remained separately identifiable principles (Tannehill, 1989, p. 82) – community membership, its practice of belief in Jesus, and the ‘word of God’ were all mutually constitutive.

The gospel of Mark, on the other hand, is widely acknowledged to have a much less binary perspective on insiders and outsiders. Edwards (2002, p. 133) remarks that these categories are not regarded as watertight compartments in the Markan portrayal – an insider may become an outsider, and vice versa. As Sweat (2013, p. 51) has observed, the disciples could be seen, here, to occupy an intermediate position – with a foot in both camps, so to speak – while the classification of the crowd ‘seems vague at best’. In the light of this, one might wonder whether this concept is really in the narrative at all. Indeed, Via (2005, p. 181) has gone so far as to say that, the Markan ‘narrative erases the normal difference in meaning between insider and outsider’. It may, therefore, be worth examining the implication of this for the characteristic pedagogy of Mark’s gospel, in more detail.

The explication of the Parable of the Soils (Mk. 4:14-20), which is employed in considering the insider/outsider dichotomy in the other synoptic gospels, in Mark’s account is followed by Jesus’ very inclusive words, ‘There is nothing hidden, except to be disclosed’; ‘Let anyone with ears to hear listen’; and then, ‘Pay attention to what you hear’ (Verses 22-24). Thus, the emphasis in Mark seems to be different again, from the other, parallel versions and to advocate self-directed engagement, personal reflection and problem solving, in order to reach understanding. Such knowledge construction demands much thought, deliberation and perseverance, but it is attainable by anybody with the motivation to do it. I argue, then, that Mark could be said to demonstrate, here, an approach to teaching and learning rather close to a cognitive constructivist model.

Conclusion of the Review

In this section I have considered published literature that forms the background to a pedagogically focussed analysis of the synoptic gospels. I have reviewed scholarly thinking about the main areas of contention related to learning and teaching in the three gospel narratives. In this chapter I have also described the most common learning theories currently in circulation within the teaching profession, and have concluded that the behaviourist, cognitive and situative models might be promising as theoretical frameworks for the remainder of the present thesis.

The next chapter will constitute a discussion of the methodology adopted for the present research investigation, to examine the first three gospels for evidence of themes from these learning models in their respective narratives.

Chapter 3

Methodology: Thematic Narrative Analysis

Biblical Literary Criticism

The New Testament can be regarded for research purposes as a form of documentary discourse data (Wetherall, Taylor, & Yates, 2001, p. 2). Within this categorisation, the Gospels constitute narrative literature, in that they contain an ordered, sequence of events, related within a specific diegetic context, and written down independently of the researcher. More specifically they are 'story', in the sociolinguistic sense that the narrative incorporates, actually on more than one occasion, an element of disruption to the anticipated order (De Fina, 2003, p. 13). The Synoptics, therefore, represent to some extent three separate accounts of similar stories, by different storytellers. This makes analysis of the gospel texts by narratological methods particularly appropriate.

Form Criticism, in the early part of the last century, employed a type of literary analysis, in particular in attempting to determine the initial form of biblical passages, and their original social context, purely from the text. It fell somewhat out of favour as a topic for academic research, as it became clear that the task of deducing the pristine oral foundations that gave rise to the written sources was, probably, infeasible. Nevertheless, Theissen (1992), more recently, utilised its deductive, analytical approach in presenting early missionaries of Jesus as extremist itinerants who were, probably, responsible for the transmission of Jesus' sayings in the 'Q' tradition. His methodology is, however, too limiting for the present investigation, taking as its central question the single issue of the social behaviour of people involved in constructing the Scriptures.

Another kind of biblical literary criticism – so-called, Narrative Criticism – is well established in New Testament studies (e.g. Resseguie, 2005, pp.

18-19) and examines the narratives of the Bible for their attributes as pieces of literature, including their content, structure and rhetoric. Narrative critics have greatly expanded the reader's understanding of the gospels as rhetorical compositions and their conclusions are valuable here. That concern will not, however, be the main thrust of the present investigation, either. The objective of this study will be to look behind the story related in each Synoptic Gospel, to try to detect the distinctive, approaches to teaching and learning that might be discerned from modern pedagogical perspectives, rather than to scrutinise the literariness of the written works themselves.

In addition, Redaction Criticism also examines the biblical, narrative text – this time looking for the ways in which the authors have sewn their source materials together, in order to promote their particular theological position (Shillington, 2007, p. 8). Such research has the explicit perceptions of the gospel redactors in view. This intentional, persuasive emphasis of the Synoptic writers, however, is not the centre of focus for the present examination, so that the methods of this approach, too, are not among those applicable to address it.

Riessman (2008, p. 19) distinguishes three types of narrative analytical approach that could be applied to story data, which she refers to as Thematic, Structural and Dialogic Analysis. Of these, the latter indicates a methodology attuned to the 'local' interaction that occurs between the researcher and the teller, as their story is rehearsed. This method is, therefore, inappropriate for interpreting a literary narrative, where the investigator has played no role in the recording of the storytelling.

Riessman's first methodology – Thematic Analysis (TA) – however, focuses entirely on what is spoken or written in the narrative, looking, through a process of 'close reading' of the text, for key themes repeated within it. It pays, practically, no attention to the local context of the narration and is thus suitable for interrogating pre-organized, literary

data. It is, additionally, an uncomplicated and widely adopted approach to analysing text. Such a method is, therefore, a possible option for a narratological treatment of the Synoptic Gospels.

Thirdly, Structural Analysis also has its roots in examining narrative writing – although it is more frequently applied to spoken accounts – but this approach, again, attends, rather, to the manner in which the story is articulated in order to be persuasive. This may take the form of identifying its genre or an overall storyline, or of tracing its detailed construction from a coded sequence of brief, structural elements of prose or, sometimes, poetry. Some accompanying study of a document's textual structure then, can, often, enrich the evidence attainable from a principally, thematic analysis of it and, correspondingly, could be useful to enhance such an investigation of the gospel narratives.

Thematic Narrative Analysis

The approach adopted here is, therefore, essentially one of Thematic Narrative Analysis. Regarding this methodology, Riessman (2008, p. 74) further emphasises that it is often mistaken for Grounded Theory (GT) research or for Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) but, in reality, it differs markedly from both. As Smith *et al.* (2009, p. 47) put it; IPA concerns itself with the 'lived experience' of an interviewee, and thus offers nothing to a non-autobiographical, literary study, such as the present one.

Most significantly in Grounded Theory investigations, a procedure of inductive theorising is initially performed, to identify a proposition, empirically, from core categories found – 'grounded' – in the data. Thematic Analysis, on the other hand, is theory-rich from the start. It assumes an underlying theoretical framework, from within which the themes that the narrative is to be searched for are pre-determined. Such search foci might derive from social psychology, for instance or religious

belief (Riessman, 2008, p. 57), anthropology (p. 67), sociology or, conceivably, pedagogy.

The second characteristic feature of TA identified by Riessman (2008, p. 74) – and given top priority by her – is that it retains the integrity of the ‘story’. By contrast, GT handles the data in ‘segments’ (Charmaz, 2006, p. 45), which has the, well recognised, effect of ‘fracturing’ the narrative (Strauss, 1987, p. 29). Riessman also stresses that narrative analysts tend to assign importance to the time and location of the account given. Although that is less easy to establish with an historical document like a biblical book, this reminds the researcher that the physical situation of its author is, inevitably, germane to his/her writing at that time. Nevertheless, a specifically TA investigation is not at all concerned with the interaction of the narrator with their audience, as they hear the story.

Perhaps more crucially for studying the synoptic gospels is Riessman’s last point here – that GT is concerned with deducing a theory that applies ‘*across cases*’ (author’s italics). This, she asserts, is a fundamental distinction between GT and narrative analysis, which is, essentially, case-based. In an investigation where the objective is to distinguish between the gospel narratives on the basis of their recurring themes – and that is the more interesting kind in the context of manifestly similar texts – rather than to generalise concepts over them, this would confirm Thematic Analysis (and not Grounded Theory) as the appropriate research methodology to choose for it.

It should, additionally, be re-emphasised, before going any further, that in adopting TA, the analyst by no means denies the importance, in understanding the narrative, of taking into consideration the structural or dialogic aspects of it – as was the case, for example, in the formalist manner advanced in the past, by advocates of the so-called, New Criticism (Resseguie, 2005, pp. 21-22). On the contrary, a well-rounded examination of any gospel would, undoubtedly, involve all three

components of narrative analysis. The value of analysing the text thematically is, rather, that this can reveal characteristics and attributes – perhaps less expressly articulated – of the text, without necessitating such a full appreciation of its literary composition.

Although the whole narrative may be involved in such a thematic analysis, in several of Riessman's examples the passages interrogated were sampled from the entire text available. Working with written, epistolary texts, Tamboukou (2013), for instance, extracted her evidence from 'brief narrative segments in women's long letters' (Riessman, 2008, p. 63). Again, Ewick and Silbey (2003, p. 1349), in their investigation of stories about resisting authority, were told many verbal accounts, from which they selected, for examination, those that matched their own, content-based criteria. Riessman (2008, p. 41) refers to such distinct narrative sections as 'bounded' text segments, and discusses the difficulties and the importance for analytic study of judiciously defining the story's segmental boundaries, since they may well influence its substance and, hence, the conclusions of the exploration.

Burke (1931, p. 127), during the heyday of Form Criticism, said of the Gospel of Mark that its separate pericopae were, largely, discrete enough that they could be treated as self-contained episodes. This opens up the methodological possibility, then, of choosing certain narrative elements of Mark's Gospel for interrogation, provided it is borne in mind that these choices may constrain the results of the investigation. One option for the proposed thematic analysis could, therefore, be to compare and contrast parallel passages to these Markan texts, across the gospels, particularly if the objective of the study is, specifically, to examine how each gospel has represented, or re-interpreted, the same, bounded accounts.

To identify the theme for the present analysis, it is noted that Robbins (2009, p. 82) sees Mark's narrative as concerning a 'teacher/disciple cycle' and goes on to discuss the social context within which the Markan

account envisages this teaching to take place. This could raise the question of how the author might have pictured this pedagogic progression being effected. Byrskog (1994, pp. 233-234), in his study of the Matthean community, similarly draws attention to the need to consider the specific teaching methods of Jesus in order to properly appreciate the essential learning process brought about in his first followers. Resseguie (2005, pp. 81-84) also touches on the disciples' development, as evident, namely, in Lk. 24:13-35. This, then, prompts the question as to whether or not the three synoptic gospels all project the same view of mind and of how such learning could have occurred.

This investigation, therefore, takes pedagogical traits as its focal theme and considers the perspectives on learning and teaching found in the various books of the synoptic gospel writers. Resseguie (2005, pp. 180-181) illustrates such a possible teaching characteristic. He notes that, in Mark's Gospel, all people address Jesus as 'teacher', whereas in Matthew's, those who would be his followers call him 'Lord' – for example, Mt. 8:25 – where this latter appellation is, according to Bornkamm (1963, p. 55), a sign of divine majesty.

Resseguie, thus, recognises, here, one facet of a pedagogical analytical theme. Furthermore, that focus differentiates between the approaches of these two gospel narratives. He does not, however, go on to draw, what could be a reasonable inference from this observation – that, while in Mark, Jesus' role as a teacher seems to be of central importance, in Matthew, the teaching of Jesus seems to carry an additional, unquestionable authority for believers. Had he done so, these observations could have contributed to a TA analysis with the focus of contemporary pedagogy. Incidentally, in Luke's gospel (e.g. Lk. 8:24), the title typically afforded Jesus is 'Master'. By the same argument, this theme might, therefore, conceivably, tend to identify Jesus in Luke, rather, as the master/trainer of his community of followers.

The Key Issues of the Narrative

If one such pedagogical perspective is consistently found substantially to dominate in some gospel version, across most bounded segment comparisons, it would, then, be concluded that that account is typified by that theory of learning. This provides the motivation for a Thematic Analysis of the Synoptics across much of the gospel narratives. Riessman (2008, p. 54) suggests characterising such a TA study, in any instance, by reference to four key issues, namely: what 'narrative' comprises in this case; how data are represented; what focus (unit) of analysis is chosen for the investigation; and the researcher's attention to contexts. The present proposed enquiry could, accordingly, be located along these dimensions, as follows.

The 'narrative' comprises the many parallel, bounded accounts presented in each synoptic Gospel, as written and readily available in the Revised Standard Version of the Bible; in general, the text is used 'as printed', although the examination may compare these 'data' with that of the original, Greek New Testament, where clarification seems required; the 'unit of analysis', which, naturally, has wide variability across different investigations, in this particular case is the views of mind and the concepts of learning and teaching that characterise each synoptic gospel, and is drawn from contemporary learning theories and pedagogic approaches. In common with all Riessman's exemplars (Riessman, 2008, p. 75), attention to 'context' as related to society – its structures of authority and community – in this instance that of first century Israel, may be considerable, while that to 'local context' is, practically, non-existent.

The focus of analysis to be adopted, then, consists in concepts taken from present-day theories of teaching and learning, which typically derive from the fields of social anthropology and behavioural, cultural or cognitive psychology, but sought, here, in biblical texts. The technique of

coupling literary analysis with social scientific theory has a respectable pedigree in New Testament Studies, stretching from the early work of Petersen (1985) through Theissen (1992) to Witherington (1998) and (2001), and Robbins (1996) and (2009), where it has acquired the academic designation of 'socio-rhetorical criticism' (Horrell, 1999, p. 24). The approach is, thus, in this respect, an interdisciplinary one. Additionally, since pedagogy – as the theoretical basis of the present study – can only, adequately, be described by reference to many other, distinct disciplines, it is also transdisciplinary.

The process of applying contemporary theory to ancient text, however, is often an area of contention for Biblical Studies. Junior and Schipper (2013, p. 32), for example, have discussed the representation of 'disability' in the Bible – since, of course, it has no word for this conception. They point out, however, that this does not mean the notion would, necessarily, have been alien to Israelites – the Hebrew Scriptures frequently 'cluster' physical conditions together (e.g. Ex. 4:11) – and the New Testament reflects this too (e.g. Mt. 11:5). This suggests, rather, that people of the day did widely understand such disorders as particular examples of a more generic idea (such as that we call 'disability').

The conceptualities of contemporary learning theories and views of mind are, naturally, also not specifically referenced in the biblical text but some elements of an explicit approach to 'learning and teaching' have been identified in Old Testament writing. Crenshaw (1998, pp. 120-130) discusses knowledge acquisition in ancient Israel and goes on (pp. 130-138) to explore the pedagogy of Israelite instructors from the Scriptures. Features of Behaviourism are numerous in this chapter, but occasional, more cognitive facets are also in evidence. Estes (1997, pp. 126-134) has considered the teaching process in Proverbs 1-9 and claims to find teachers there occupying both the role of the authoritative (behaviourist)

transmitter of knowledge and that of the modern-day, constructivist learning facilitator or guide.¹

In addition, the gospel narratives were products of the first century Church and her teaching and learning methods. As Carr (2005, p. 284) has shown, although early Christ-followers retained some of the Hellenistic tradition of schooling the young, they privileged the conversion and enculturation of adults into a community 'led by a small minority of masters of [their] heritage' and oriented toward communal living, eating and learning. Its documentary resources were foundational in this, and consisted of the Hebrew Scriptures, Greek texts and a growing corpus of specifically Christian literature; and its 'technology' comprised, primarily, the power and authority of Jesus, alone.

As such, the early Church constituted a community of Christ-based practice, existing within a social learning system (Wenger, 2000, pp. 232-242) of overlapping communities of religious activity, which included their own, Rabbinic Judaism and Graeco-Roman society (e.g. Campbell, 2008, pp. 68-72; Carr, 2005, p. 285). Some consequence of this 'situated' nature of learning in evolving Church life, then, could be anticipated to appear somewhere in the subsequent writings about its initial formation. Furthermore, evidence of the relationship of learning episodes reported in the synoptic gospels to that modelled by a situative theory has, more recently, been discussed by Csinos (2010, pp. 50-59).

In any case, it is not essential, for this thematic analysis of the gospel narratives, to posit that their writers consciously possessed anything like a fully formed conceptualisation of some teaching and learning theory. TA researchers frequently draw attention to the poorly developed character

¹ It should also be reemphasized, here, that the term 'Constructivism' is used, throughout this discussion, in the educational manner of the epistemological position that accepts the individual mental construction of meaning, not in the ontological sense of social science, based on an assumption that social objects are socially constructed (see Bryman, 2008, p. 19).

of their participants' underlying theoretical assumptions. According to Williams (1984, p. 179), for example, his chronically ill interviewees only 'reaffirm the impression that...the self...has a *telos*' (author's italics).

In Tamboukou's study of 19th century female teachers, she was 'looking for insignificant details...discourses and practices [people]...used to make sense of themselves' (Tamboukou, 2013, p. 88). Riessman (2008, p. 67) talks about her work bringing to life these 'women's submerged subjectivities' which 'they themselves might take for granted'. Cain (1991, p. 228) also found 'thematic assumptions taken for granted by the teller/writer' (Riessman, 2008, p. 68), in her investigation of identity formation by alcoholics in Alcoholics Anonymous (AA). The present TA will, similarly, look for indications of an approach to pedagogy in each gospel narrative, perhaps unperceived or, at best, barely recognised as such, by the authors themselves.

Furthermore, the present investigation explores the evidence for allusions to some learning theory through the narratives. The emphasis, in each case, is on the repeating themes in the narrative, rather than either the narrative storyline or its narration. Hence, the analysis is independent of any attention to the local context of the storytelling or to the account's power, deliberately, to influence the intended audience. It is well accepted (e.g. Ward, 2004, p. 12) that the various evangelists sought to present the message of Jesus in a distinctive voice and to a particular public. The conclusions of the current TA, while possibly shedding further light on such interpretations, need not conflict, materially, with those identifiable, programmatic aims of the authors then, as this methodology does not directly bear on the presentation of the story.

The present study may, therefore, generate evidence for some of the narratives portraying, probably unwittingly, a characteristic view of the mind and how learning occurs. Another investigator might explore the biblical writer's apparent motivation for his book, perhaps adopting a

theoretical framework based around a different social scientific concept. Esler (1987) took the lens of 'legitimation', from Berger (1969, p. 48), and explored Luke-Acts, through a form of structural narrative analysis he termed 'Socio-Redaction Criticism' – combining Redaction Criticism with sociological theory. He found that, in those elements of Luke's writing specific to him, Luke has the conspicuous purpose of validating the Christian faith to its recent adult converts (Esler, 1987, pp. 16-17, 221-222).

That conclusion, would, thus, not negate the findings of the present work about the same account. In fact, it might reasonably be thought to be consistent with, even corroborative of, that writer embracing those constructs of learning that were readily drawn from observation of the enculturation of new recruits into the embryonic community of Christ-followers. The convert learnt, at least partly, by (peripheral) participation in its cultural practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 95), which were justified, in part, as shared with traditional Judaism (*cf.* Esler, 1999, p. 146), in the overlapping social learning system of the day.

As suggested previously, then, Luke's Gospel might well be expected to echo this experience of situated learning. Some confirmation of this is found in Resseguie's analysis of the first resurrection appearances (Resseguie, 2005, p. 85), with his acknowledgement of the consequent co-construction of new knowledge about Jesus within the community of apostolic and discipular practice (Lk. 24: 32-35), alongside the principal narrative threads he detected, such as that of 'seeing'.

Indeed, thematic analysis makes no claim to discover the definitive and unique meaning behind any narrative. It recognises that multiple, diverse inferences may be capable of abstraction from it, concurrently (Riessman, 2008, p. 72). What is found, in any particular thematic investigation, will depend on the theoretical framework hypothesised by the analyst – if it proves valid – and no single interpretation of the text precludes another

(unless two appear completely to contradict each other). Robbins (2009, p. xv) even envisages inspecting sections of Mark's gospel for combinations of themes or topics – such as wisdom, miracle, or apocalyptic or prophetic discourses – 'blended' together, following the language of cognitive science on conceptual blending (e.g. Fauconnier & Turner, 2002).

About the same time as Esler's work, Malina and Neyrey (Horrell, 1999, p. 30), taking as their focus the 'group-grid', two-way classification of Cultural Theory, were able to identify, by thematic analysis, some of the cultural features of the Christian community from which the 'Q' tradition text of Matthew's gospel – as distinct from that presumed sourced from Mark, under a two-source hypothesis ('2SH') (Streeter, 1924, p. 223) – ostensibly arose. Their conclusions did not deal with the community's views on learning and teaching as such, either, but found it to have valued societal order and members occupying clearly delineated roles. Its ability to maintain the stability of this social structure was, furthermore, felt to be under threat. Consequently, it regulated its members' behaviour and controlled its boundaries, restricting who might belong, and enforcing what should be believed, 'inside' their group (Malina & Neyrey, 1999, pp. 39-40).

It might be supposed that, since this 'Q' source narrative content is adopted, largely unmodified, into Matthew's gospel, it embraces that programme, too, if only partially. Such a worldview, moreover, would seem to be compatible with a perspective on learning deriving from, what today might be called, a Behaviourist, or passive-transmissive, pedagogical position – incorporating: instructor-control of the taught material; discounting of self-directed study or critical learning approaches; and an assumption of the learners' potential in life as being hereditarily pre-determined from birth.

In contrast, Scroggs (1975) carried out a thematic narrative analysis of the synoptic gospels, as a whole, adopting the focus of 'sectarianism'. The principal aspects of a sectarian organisation he identified (Scroggs, 1999, pp. 83-88) from sociological theory, to comprise: the sect rejects views of reality asserted by the religious or secular establishment (pp. 83-84); it is egalitarian (pp. 85-86); it provides a caring and fulfilling community (pp. 87-88); it is voluntary, requiring self-motivation (p. 88); and it demands total commitment from its members (p. 88). The last of these he referenced mainly from Matthew and this seems to correlate broadly with the results of the previous investigation. Much of the remaining characterisation is, however, supported by Mark, or can be inferred from Mark's account, and so might be expected to emerge in such an examination of his views.

Those first four typifying characteristics of a sect are substantially reflected in the representative attributes of a constructivist, cognitive approach to pedagogy (see, for example, Hrynychak & Batty, 2012, p. 797). The central principle of Constructivism is that individuals' worldviews are formed through their own mental processing. Reality is, thus, not imposed by any established authority – the theory is non-authoritarian; secondly, to enable knowledge construction, learning and teaching must be dialogic, transactional and egalitarian; development of learner motivation and engaging in the challenging of existing personal constructs also demands the existence of a sensitive, supportive and co-operative learning environment; and, finally, these developmental processes can only occur if self-directed by the learner.

These facets of pedagogical Constructivism also substantially accord with the conclusions of Robbins' 'socio-rhetorical' analysis (Robbins, 2009, p. 210) – that in Mark's Gospel the disciples learned within an alternative culture, which was critical of establishment leadership – they were 'ordinary people', who, nonetheless, formed a select band of healing and serving missionaries, through their freewill response to the personal call of

Jesus, the Teacher. Robbins, furthermore, stresses that Mark regarded performing such a function as only possible following extensive interaction with the more expert, teacher – a position typical of a Vygotskian constructivist model, locating learning within the learner's 'zone of proximal development' (Vygotsky, 1978).

Robbins (2009, pp. 136-168) also pursues, in his rhetorically oriented interpretation of Mark, a comparison of it with Graeco-Roman literature, especially that based on the teaching of Socrates. Although the Socratic Learning Method (SLM) relies on a teacher-directed, objectivist, elenctic process (Boghossian, 2006, p. 716), whereas a gospel is 'story' and may incorporate many kinds of teaching and learning activity, there is, again, some commonality between it and features of a constructivist pedagogy, as might be apparent in Mark's Gospel. Both assume a cognitive view of mind, as a basic requirement, and value directed, learner questioning in aiming for an eventual revision of the student's understanding.

Clearly, this does not cover all the many consequences of a constructivist approach to learning and teaching, though. Neither was any of the other narrative themes discussed earlier a comprehensive substitute for interrogating the text from a specifically pedagogical perspective. Nor would any focus, including the present one, be expected to exhibit a perfect fit across the entire narrative data examined. There are likely to be some discrepancies in even the most convincing thematic analysis. Levine (1985, p. 14) emphasises the inevitable, inherent ambiguities in both 'human realities' and the social scientific methods adopted to try to portray them, and Riessman (2008, p. 13) acknowledges the differences of opinion amongst narrative academics that typically result.

I move on, now, to consider, in more detail, issues surrounding the author and the reader in the present methodology.

The Author

Edwards (1997, p. 10), in his discussion of the disciples in Matthew's gospel, has pointed out the entirely text-connoted (T-C) nature of the implied reader in a purely narrative-critical analysis, as distinct from the frequent meaning of 'implied' in, say, redaction-critical methods. The T-C reader is a conceptual agent who knows, at any one time, only what has been so far presented in the world of the narrative being considered. It is not a real audience, who might be assumed to have additional, extra-narrative information available with which to fill in gaps the author had left in the interpretation of the story. Nothing can be assumed about this reader's understanding of the text, then, beyond what is written in it.

Earlier Edwards (1997, p. 3) also suggested a similar distinction should be made about the perspective of the author inferred from the account, vis-à-vis the real originator of it. The composer, then, in a narrative-critical method, is, similarly, only accessible from the narrative world. This agent is the one who informs the implied reader through the text and is, thus, also a hypothetical concept. Unlike in redaction criticism, again, no consideration should be given, in a narratological analysis, to the socio-historical context of the true writer in order to determine their intention in the narrative. In view of this, it could be argued that an examination of the synoptic gospels from a strictly narrative-analytical standpoint may not reveal the inherent qualities of the actual evangelist who wrote it but only the authorial manner in which they wrote.

One example of this might be if one or more of the gospel writers, in constructing their book, adopted the theological framework of the audience they wished to appeal to, perhaps in order to ingratiate themselves, or to identify with them, when this point of view did not substantially correspond to their own. Using only the world of the narrative to deduce the author's perspective on some issue would then identify the position of the implied, T-C author (the T-C A) rather than

that of the real writer. Such a situation, of course, contrasts sharply with the fundamental assumption of the redaction critic – that the actual compiler has edited their material precisely with the intent of promoting their own perception of theology.

While a narrative cannot normally guarantee to uncover the attributes of its actual author, some scholars have recently argued for a reasonably close agreement of the TCA with the real writer, in the case of a gospel narrative, on the grounds that a gospel constitutes, by its very nature, a personal testimony of its original, real-world composer (though this remains a minority view). Witherington (2001, p. 56) has made the case for this equivalence of the T-C and real-life authors, albeit specifically in respect of the originator of Mark; and Bauckham (2006, p. 6) has highlighted this conception of the gospels more generally, in writing that they 'embody the testimony of eyewitnesses...in a way that is substantially faithful to how the eyewitnesses themselves told it'.

This conceptualization would suggest that each synoptic gospel's presentation fairly authentically reflects the individual perspective of the original source of the text. In that case, that would, probably, be the person, or people, whose pedagogical opinions can be seen in it, too. Nevertheless, the present work does not build on the results of the narrative analysis to infer any gospel writer's pedagogical presuppositions or, indeed, to draw any conclusions as to the reason for a gospel displaying a preference for one learning and teaching approach over another. Although the real authors may have been, to some extent, influential in these emphases, the thesis makes no presumptions that this can be deduced from the text.

Again, in employing a thematic narrative analytical methodology here, I do not adopt the redaction critics' principle assumption – that the authors have deliberately manipulated their source material for their own purposes – in respect of the themes of this analysis. I consider both Luke

and Matthew as redactions of their sources, under the '2SH', which enabled each to relate especially to a particular audience or to reflect a different theological position but I do not assume that the redactors extended this editing of the narrative to emphasise their views on teaching and learning, as the specific focus of the present study. That may be the case, but I do not pursue that possibility in this investigation.

I shall, therefore, essentially restrict this analysis to the content of the narrative and not look for extensive background material about the author's pedagogic position, at any one point in the gospel, from the outside world. There may be corroborating information available from other sources which is valuable to examine in connection with some text segments, but these details will not be substantive to the argument and will be used merely to provide supporting evidence.

The Reader

It has been mentioned above that narrative criticism is, strictly, concerned with the 'text-connoted reader' (the T-C R) – as Edwards (1997, pp. 9-10) explains it, with how the T-C R is guided to understand the content of the narrative. To this extent the method adopted in this work does not pursue the effect of the text on the reader, at all. Edwards also discusses, there, the response to the narrative of some 'first reader', a conceivably real, historical recipient, who heard the account recounted for the first time, during the period of the author's lifetime. Such a hearer could use information from the social context of the author to assist with interpretation of the story narrated, as a redaction critical analysis might assume.

A thematic analytical approach, though, frequently examines the text without considering how it affected the original audience. Furthermore, even were it to prove possible, in the case of an ancient script like a gospel, to confidently construct such a 'first reader', the present

examination will not touch on this either. Nevertheless, as Shillington (2007, p. 70) remarks in his narrativ study of Luke-Acts, the activity of reading the narrative is a most important one in narrative analysis, and the researcher cannot investigate a gospel account without becoming, themselves, a real reader of it.

Since Rosenblatt (1978, pp. 4-5) raised the profile of the real reader in 'aesthetic' reading, it has been clear that the significant meaning of a text is substantially created in the personal response of the one reading it. She wrote that the reading process is an experience embedded in 'the personality and world of the individual reader' (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 69), a principle now enshrined in the theory of reader-response-oriented criticism (e.g. Tyson, 2006, p. 169). Thus, any researcher's interpretation of a gospel narrative is constructed from within their particular underlying character, and their own existing knowledge framework and schema for understanding it.

In my case, as explained earlier, I am a retired professional mathematician and software engineer and a consultant in continuing education. Hence, I approach a text from a background in logical thinking and educational theory. When I examine a gospel narrative, I, therefore, find many direct examples of pedagogically rich incidents in it and many more, perhaps less obvious, allusions to aspects of learning and teaching and implicit views of mind. As such, the present work can be seen as a reader-response critical study, which reflects my own literary experience as I read the synoptic gospel texts. It is necessary to remember, then, that different researchers will, inevitably, interrogate the same gospel material from diverse standpoints and may draw a range of differing conclusions from it.

The Research Process

The present research thus first arose from my interest in the evidence of learning and teaching apparent to me in reading the New Testament. A small number of well-known and pivotal passages, with parallel versions in each synoptic gospel – including the Parable of the Soils (Mk. 4:1-20; Mt. 13:1-23; Lk. 8:4-15), the Missions of the Disciples (Mk. 6:6-13, 30-32; Mt. 10:5-15; Lk. 9:1-6, 10, 10:1-20) and the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:33-44; Mt. 14:13-21; Lk. 9:11-17) – were then examined against a range of contemporary learning theories, to establish, which theory, if any, showed potential for a thematic analysis of these gospels with the focus of pedagogic point of view. Thus, this sample of the narrative data, while of limited size, covered the main facets of Jesus' ministry in the gospel accounts, namely those of: parabolic teaching, missionary activity and miraculous provision.

This preliminary examination suggested that particular theories of learning might be, separately, especially relevant to the gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke, namely: the cognitive constructivist model, the behaviourist approach and situated learning theory, respectively, and that these distinct analysis themes might, thus, also provide a differentiation between the gospel accounts. Those three learning models formed the basis for the thematic focus of each subsequent narrative analysis, respectively. Adopting the '2SH', and following Burke (1931, p. 127), the analytical process began by investigating the passages from the Markan account, which have parallels – normally redactions – in each of the other Synoptics (e.g. Throckmorton, 1979).

Once this initial stage had demonstrated the probable value of these analytic foci, and since the bounded text segmentation approach had proved suitable for the other gospels, the comparison was continued to examining the 'Q' source material, with parallels in Matthew's and Luke's accounts, only. Finally, the method was also extended to a consideration

of the remaining, special 'L' material, specific to the Lukan gospel. The results of these analyses are reported in Chapter 4, the Analysis chapter of this thesis.

A thematic biblical narrative analysis of the synoptic Gospels, adopting the focus of pedagogical point of view, then, has its undoubted limitations, especially if it is restricted to bounded segments of the text. It also has to be remembered that, should some correlation – however compelling – be found in the investigation, for any gospel narrative, with one or other contemporary learning theory, it could never be regarded as any proof that the evangelist actually held that schema. Furthermore, this exploration represents a personal response to the synoptic texts and other readers may have divergent experiences of it. Nevertheless, this appears to remain a feasible and desirable theological enquiry, which might help explicate some of the well-known differences in emphasis between the separate gospel narratives.

An Illustration of the Method

In Chapter 2, I discussed aspects of the Parable of the Four Soils – which is a New Testament parable of, in many ways, primary significance – in connection with the insider-outsider dichotomy in the synoptic gospels, as currently addressed in the published literature. I shall use the same text now to illustrate the narrative analytical method that I will subsequently adopt in examining the Synoptics more fully from the perspective of teaching and learning. As remarked above, there is a parallel passage to this text segment in each such gospel narrative, and, moreover, the subject of this teaching episode is a disciple's learning process, so that these varying accounts provide a useful comparison of the particular pedagogical emphases in the three books considered.

The parable itself is essentially similar across the three gospel versions but the comparison between them is brought out in their subsequent interpretations (Mk. 4:10-20; Mt. 13:10-23; Lk. 8:9-15). Firstly, in Mark

(4:10), Jesus was alone with his close followers when their request for his explanation was made and in Matthew there is a fairly long interval of didactic teaching after his address to the 'great crowds' of Verse 2 (Mt. 13:10-17); but in Luke (8:9-11), Jesus continues, immediately after speaking to the crowd, to answer the disciples' question.

The disciples' learning here, in Luke, then, to the extent that it occurs at all, appears to be part of the on-going activity of Jesus' new community – which involves preaching (Lk. 8:1), healing the sick (2) and addressing the general public – and is assisted by their talking within that practice, while performing it. Moreover, by comparison with Matthew's, Luke's prelude to the parable's explanation (9, 10) is minimal. This approach to knowledge acquisition, eschewing directive teaching and focussing on participation in community practices, is characteristic of a strongly situated learning theory, and, indeed, under such a model that is the only way it could happen.

In Matthew alone, the disciples do not seek any clarification of the parable's meaning – they only ask, 'Why do you speak to them in parables?' Nor, apparently, do they need one. From (13:16) they seem to have grasped it, straightaway – 'blessed are...your ears, for they hear. Furthermore, when the explanation of the Parable of the Soils comes, it is preceded by the didactic instruction: 'Hear then the parable of the sower' (Mt. 13:18). The teaching following is, thus, to be heard and known (11), in a passive-transmissive manner, reminiscent of a behaviourist teaching approach.

Mark (4:13), however, introduces the clarification with a reference to the disciples' comprehension. This parable is about how to learn and, in Mark's interpretation, if they do not 'understand' it they will have difficulty comprehending 'all the parables' that are to come. Here, then, the disciples are expected to apprehend the parable's meaning but, unlike in Matthew, they have not yet done so. An emphasis on ensuring

the learners' understanding of what is taught, in the achievement of learning, while recognizing that this can take some time to formulate, is a feature of a cognitive or constructivist pedagogy.

In Mark, then, as in Luke (8:9), the explication is given so that the disciples would understand, whereas in Matthew it is because they already do (e.g. Mt. 13:16). The assumption in the latter version is rather, it appears, that some individuals are able to understand what is being taught while some are quite unable to. Some will 'never understand' (14). This is, again, indicative of an underlying educational behaviourism in Matthew's account. People, it is apparently presumed, have a certain cognitive ability, which means some will comprehend and others will simply not do.

Mark then begins (in 4:14), 'The sower sows the word'. Mark's parable focus, then, is on 'teaching', with a somewhat cognitive slant – the teacher introducing, to those attending, the information they need to learn. Luke (8:11), however, opens with 'The seed is the word of God'. Here, no suggestion of pedagogy occurs. Rather, the parable emphasises, in a situative manner, the 'knowledge' to be learnt. Matthew (13:18), by sharp contrast again, declares, 'Hear then the parable of the sower.' Now the story is about the instructor. Such a view – that the teacher's position is paramount in learning – is peculiar to behaviourism.

This impression of a behaviourist approach within Matthew's account continues when the explanation is read. In Matthew (13:19), some people hear the word and just do not understand it. Its meaning is forever denied to these hearers; while at the same time, it is 'he who hears the word and understands it' who 'bears fruit' (23). Once more then, in this version, while one 'does not understand' the word (19) another, effortlessly, does (23), highlighting their supposedly different levels of innate capability.

In Mark and Luke, on the other hand, there is no such cognitive binary in the exposition. Mark's, presumably prior, expression of the crux of the parable seems, rather, to concern the hearers' attitude toward Jesus' teaching. Fruitful apostles would 'accept [the word]' (Mk. 4:20), although this would not constitute any inert, purely receptive acquisition of knowledge – to just 'hear' it. The learners should embrace the teaching they are exposed to and (in Verse 15) engage with it, construct a sound underlying framework – a 'root' structure – for its deep, solid comprehension (in Verse 17) and pursue their development with persistence (18 to 19). Effective learning thereby typically demands effort and takes time and, in Verse 13, the disciples need to appreciate this if they are to discern the truths from Jesus' metaphorical teaching approach.

Luke, furthermore, elaborates that it is those who, when they have heard the message, in 'an honest and good heart', 'hold...fast', and showing 'patience', 'bring forth fruit' (Lk. 8:15). This, therefore, emphasizes many of those human qualities that build up social relationships – honesty, goodness, patience and commitment – and these also represent more of the practices of the emerging CoP of Jesus and his followers.

In particular, Luke stresses here, that it is important for hearers to 'hold...fast', perhaps in the face of the possibility that a hearer might easily 'fall away' (Lk. 8:13) and withdraw themselves from the fellowship, or 'go on their way...choked by the cares and riches and pleasures of life' (14). This, again, I propose, embodies the situative notion that to learn the knowledge of a community of practice – 'the secrets of the kingdom of God' (10), or the 'word of God' (11), in this case – it is necessary to remain an active participant in the practices of that CoP.

At the end of Jesus' explanation, he is reported to remark that there would be a rich harvest from the seed sown in the 'good soil'. In Mark (4:20), a gradation of potential yield is described – 'thirtyfold and

sixtyfold and a hundredfold'. A successful disciple's learning outcome, then, would lie somewhere on this open-ended scale. This suggests a view of achievement as personal, reflecting a concept of learners as individuals, each attaining some degree of successful development.

This is in contrast to Luke's conclusion (Lk. 8:15) – that the seed 'in the good soil' 'are those who...bring forth fruit...', which is a qualitative, generic statement, referring to the productive followers as an undifferentiated group. Luke, then, seems to exhibit a further redaction of the Markan account, here, to display more concern for the overall performance of the faithful community as a whole, than for that of any individual member.

Furthermore, this concluding sentence, 'that in the good soil, they are those who, hearing the word...in an honest and good heart...bring forth fruit with patience', suggests that, in Luke, as the domain knowledge of 'the word' of God is consolidated, and the more the social practices of the community of Jesus' followers – such as honesty, goodness and patience – are exercised, the more that community's membership thrives and produces new 'fruit'. This mutual growth relationship between the knowledge domain of the CoP, the CoP's practice and its participants is therefore, very redolent of some of the more recent developments in the contemporary theory of learning within the strongly situated learning paradigm.

Finally, Matthew (13:23) enumerates the specific achievement measures of 'what was sown' into 'good soil', across the possible spectrum. Each such person 'bears fruit...in one case a hundredfold, in another sixty, and in another thirty.' It seems then that, in this rendition of the interpretation, people all have their expected capacity for productivity. In addition, Matthew's variant re-arranges this sequence of yields into descending order, from a maximum value, as if presuming there is an upper bound to a human being's feasible achievement. Such a view of

personal development is more akin to a behaviourist model of learning, presupposing an identifiable, inherent ability for attainment of the learning objectives, in any individual, which then needs to become realized through instructional teaching (for example as ensues in 13:18 *ff.*)

I suggest, then, that the text in Mark, at this point, seems to reveal elements of what would, today, be classified as a cognitive, constructivist approach to teaching and learning, whereas that of Matthew often adopts a more behaviourist pedagogical position. Luke's version appears consistent with a third learning model, which broadly corresponds to a strongly situated theory. Were each of the gospels found, generally, to exhibit these respective approaches, this parable explanation could be seen as a representative pericope of those narratives. In Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis, I shall demonstrate that this can, reasonably, be argued to be the case.

Conclusion of the Methodology Discussion

This chapter has discussed Thematic Narrative Analysis as an appropriate methodology for investigating the synoptic gospels, with a view to detecting the different traits of pedagogical approach evident in them. The analytical process that will be followed in the remainder of this thesis has been described in detail and illustrated with an example that contains some clear pedagogical relevance. This section has also considered the gospels as narrative, in order to establish the extent of applicability of the investigation's conclusions. The next chapter will present the results of carrying out this study, and the following one will discuss the deductions that could be drawn from that analysis.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Results

In the following discussion, the synoptic gospels will be reviewed, beginning with those passages that have parallel variants in all three books. The common assumption of the primacy of Mark will be made and, where possible, Mark's Gospel will be followed, each bounded segment being compared with that of the parallel versions in Luke and Matthew. Later, material commonly attributed to the 'Q' source is considered. This will assume the prior nature of Matthew and will be considered in the order of that book. Luke's special material will also be examined.

The Markan material

Formation of the Disciples

The invitation to Simon Peter and his brother Andrew is presented very similarly in Matthew 4 to the account of Mark 1. In both cases their call is accompanied by an offer to be made into 'fishers of men' – a nice comparison with fishing that certainly should have spoken to them of what Jesus had planned for them (Cole, 1961, p. 60; Martin, 1983, p. 108). In Mark (1:17), however, Jesus invites them to 'become fishers of men' – 'become' here implying, rather as Grassmick (1983, p. 108) suggests, that there is a preparatory transition to undergo in order to develop the required abilities to be fishers of people.

In Matthew (4:19), however, the proposition is rendered straightforwardly, 'Follow me and I will make you fishers of men'. Matthew's account, therefore omits any such formation process – they will be made into what is needed – and the brothers' immediate response here implies a much less thinking, more direct and passive acquisition of the skills for the role. It also demonstrates an unquestioning acceptance

of the authority of the teacher calling them. These are expected outcomes of a basically behaviourist pedagogy.

When Jesus moves on to call the other couple of fishermen, James and John, those themes are again present in Matthew. These brothers are initially with their father Zebedee, in their boat but, following their calling, they immediately abandon both ship and parent (Mt. 4:22). There is no thought given, in obeying their new teacher, to their departure or to the consequences for their father who is, apparently, left alone. Commentators (e.g. Barbieri, 1983, pp. 27-28; France, 1994, 4:18-22 The first disciples are called) typically relate this to the absolute commitment that discipleship places on the novice follower – that is, that both family and livelihood may have to be forgone in dedicating oneself to it; and in this respect the Matthean and Markan versions concur.

However, that traditional inference does not consider the various pedagogical traits in the two texts. Mark's account is somewhat more nuanced in this respect. The whereabouts of the siblings' parent, unlike in Matthew, are not originally apparent. James and John are also not said to depart instantly (1:20) but, first, consciously ensure that their father is left 'in the ship with the hired servants', so making provision for the well-being of both. Full commitment to their new master is still demanded, then, but the disciples' cognitive faculties of thinking and judgement are now not disregarded in the process.

Luke's version of events (Lk. 5:1-11) is distinctly different, however. In fact, some authorities (e. g. D. Brown, 1871, Luke 5:1-11; Morris, 1961, p. 114) argue it describes a separate, third 'call' of the fishermen – the first being in John (1:35-42). However, if the men 'immediately' 'left' and 'followed [Jesus]' (as in Mk. 1:18, 20) after the second call, it becomes difficult to understand why they would be back on the water again, for yet another.

It is suggested, here, that the differences seen in the Lukan account may arise from this gospel's concern being less to define the incident's precise chronological order than to set it in its natural social context. The call, then, takes place within Jesus' normal, missionary practice (Lk. 5:1, 3) that he was prosecuting amongst the Galilean community of which he was, peripherally, a member. He was in the boat, on the lake, with the men he had chosen. Furthermore, he took part in their fishing expedition (in Verses 4-7). When Jesus then advanced the idea that, 'henceforth, you will be catching men', their learning and understanding was situated within the practices of their native community.

Again, the fishermen subsequently 'left everything and followed him' (Lk. 5:11), though how long it took them to reconcile themselves to this profound mental and physical transformation Luke does not say. Furthermore, Jesus' new followers moved from their family homes into, as Tannehill (1996, p. 100) puts it, 'a "surrogate family", the community of [Jesus and his] disciples' (cf. 8:19-21). Indeed, from a situated learning perspective, learning about him could only continue within that community.

During this early formation of Jesus' band of disciples, various other events are recorded in Mark (Chapter 2 and following), also with direct parallels in both Luke and Matthew. Echoes of views of learning and teaching are apparent in several of these, especially where traditional religious authorities were challenging the behaviour of the inchoate community.

Controversies with Others

In the call of Matthew-Levi, for example, though the calling itself is intensionally undifferentiated, the subsequent meal pericope is treated differently in each gospel. In Matthew (9:11), the Pharisees asked the disciples why their teacher associated with tax collectors – "Why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and sinners?" His learners appear

unable to give a reason but Jesus, himself, replied with some choice, but quite didactic teaching, demanding, at one point, for example, "Go and learn what this means", plainly countering the accusation of the questioners (Verse 13).

For Mark (2:16), the challenge is similar. In his reply here (Verse 17), though, Jesus is gentler on his hearers and omits the targeted, instructional commands. He could well be teaching his followers as much as his detractors – 'he said to them, "Those who are well have no need of a physician". In this case, the passage apparently becomes a straightforward use of metaphor to teach anyone listening, including his own learners.

Within Luke (5:30), however, the Pharisees' question concerns the disciples themselves, as a unit – "Why do you eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?" Although Jesus replied, the query was addressed specifically to his followers. Several commentators note this (Martin, 1983, p. 218; Morris, 1961, p. 120) but without offering any reason for it. It is suggested here, that the challenge amounted to disapproval of the practices of this new community, in which they were all participating.

Jesus' reply was practically the same as in Mark but was definitely directed toward the scribes of the Pharisees. Moreover, it was an answer to their query (Verse 31) – that he had 'come to call...sinners to repentance' – explaining the practice in which he and his learners were engaged, as much, perhaps, as a counter-criticism of the scribes' implicit, self-righteousness.

The incident at the tax collectors' meal is immediately followed, in all the Synoptics, by a discussion about Jesus' disciples' lack of any regular fasting. In Luke (5:33) the initial remark apparently came from the scribes of the Pharisees, whereas Matthew (9:14) attributes the query to John the Baptizer's disciples. Mark (2:18), however, clearly implies they

were neither John's followers nor adherents of the Pharisees but some other people who had noticed that both those parties were currently observing a fast. Jesus first replies in a very similar way in each case (Mt. 9:15; Mk. 2:19-20; Luke 5:34-35).

He then continues to explain his activities, in all three gospels, with the same triplet of metaphors, thus, again, building effectively on the existing knowledge of his hearers, whoever they were. The analogies Jesus used included: one cannot fast and celebrate a wedding simultaneously; no one attaches non-pre-shrunk cloth to an old garment, because the new material will shrink and tear it; and no one puts new wine into old wineskins because the increased pressure will burst them. The interpretations of these 'parables', in the various gospels, are, on the other hand, rather different.

What the parables originally meant is uncertain (e.g., Davies & Allison, 1991, pp. 114-115). Some commentators (Harvey, 1972, p. 123) stress, in this regard, the inability of existing traditions to contain Jesus' radical truths of righteousness and forgiveness. However, if Jesus' new system 'superseded all older observances', as Harvey puts it, it is difficult to understand how, later, fasting 'would be resumed' (in Mk. 2:20) – 'then they will fast'. In this respect, the commentator (Harvey, 1972, p. 124), merely concludes, 'The verse remains mysterious'.

Rather, it is proposed here, that it was not the practices themselves that are in the Markan spotlight but how they were being conceptualised. It was the Pharisees' understanding of rigid, ritual observance that could not withstand the dissonance of Jesus' ideas about religious practice. France (1994, 9:9-17) makes a similar point – albeit in connection with Matthew's version, which it is suggested here, does not exemplify the fact nearly so fully – '[Jesus] was challenging...their outmoded understanding of the will of God'.

Mark (2:21-22), from this viewpoint, presents as mostly concerned with the unsustainability of such a novel perspective within an incompatible, existing conceptual schema – it separates from it, ‘the new from the old’ (Verse 21) – and the pre-existent repository ‘will burst’ (Verse 22). The old knowledge structure – that whole edifice – disintegrates. This is reflected in an essentially constructivist model of learning, which implies that new information may require the learner to dismantle and reconstruct their framework of comprehension to accommodate it – ‘new wine is put into fresh skins’ (Verse 22b). In this case, Jesus’ radical perspective on faith demands that they all develop a renewed understanding of conventional customs such as fasting.

Mark’s repetition, in Mk. 2:19 – ‘Jesus said to them...As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast’ – similarly seems to emphasise that the presence of the newlywed makes maintaining a traditional fast inadmissible (Keener, 1993, p. 134). The Pharisees’ conception of fasting as ritualised practice is comprehensively irreconcilable with Jesus’ novel thinking on the subject; a revision of their schemata is required that can accommodate his new ideas, without necessarily discarding their religious practices, as such – rather including them in a consistent, appropriate way, namely to fast when mourning is indicated.

Mark anticipates the old dispensation to be still applicable, although only in special circumstances – for example, ‘on that day’ specifically ‘when the bridegroom is taken away’ (Mk. 2:20). The new approach of Jesus, though, must be the norm, it seems. By contrast, Matthew’s emphasis is, seemingly, the conservation of one’s pre-existing knowledge corpus during the acquisition of additional information. ‘No one’ adds new material so that the old is made ‘worse’ (Mt. 9:16) – ‘so both are preserved’ (Mt. 9:17). Harvey (1972, p. 46) notices this latter, Matthean addendum, too, and concludes that, ‘for Matthew...[Christianity] by no means superseded the Jewish Law’; but he offers no proposal as to how,

when 'Matthew runs very close to Mark' here, this exact opposite of the Markan conclusion – that 'the new...superseded all older observances' (Harvey, 1972, p. 123) – could derive from the parallel parables in Matthew.

It seems that Matthew's version, once more, follows the receptive model of learning typically associated with the philosophy of the educational Behaviourist. It corresponds with an assumption of the brain as a receptacle gradually being filled up with transmitted, and not necessarily connected, knowledge. Jesus had introduced a new aspect to fasting then, but the practice had, by no means, been done away with – 'The days will come, when...they will fast', he said (Mt. 9:15). Davies and Allison (1991, p. 112) express this as, 'For Matthew Judaism is...a continuing presence within [Christianity]'.

Jesus' novel teaching was not to be merged with prior learning then in Matthew but added to the existing knowledgebase, in a separate slot, as it were – 'new wine is put into fresh wineskins...' (Verse 17b) while the old skins continue to retain, perfectly well, the maturer, vintage knowledge – 'and so both are preserved'. Again, where Mark emphasises the detachment of 'the new' cloth 'from the old', Matthew is, evidently, principally concerned not to damage the valued, original 'garment', repeating this item in Verse 16, instead.

The Matthean redaction of Mark's reference to the wedding celebrations, furthermore, relates to an indefinite time in the future, 'the days' after the groom has departed. The guests will then resume the practice of fasting (Davies & Allison, 1991, p. 167). The knowledge of the value of fasting has not been lost, then, but additional information has been acquired about whether or not to 'mourn', which applies 'as long as the bridegroom is with them' (Mt. 9:15a). The new teaching then is specifically for the exceptional situation of the presence of the bridegroom and normal, mourning behaviour will obtain otherwise.

Luke is the most focussed of the three on the new entity – the unshrunk material is ‘from a new garment’ – and maintaining its cohesive unity: ‘if he does’ ‘he will tear the new’ (Lk. 5:36), ‘the new wine...will be spilled’ (Verse 37). He also incorporates an additional logion, apparently concerning the reluctance people express to novel practice – ‘no one after drinking old wine desires new;’ (Verse 39). The allusion appears to be, plainly, to his incipient community and its activities, about which the questioners were, currently, enquiring.

Thus Jesus would not curtail the unorthodox practices of his followers. Tannehill (1996, p. 109) writes, ‘Jesus, in Luke, is insisting that his community be allowed to adopt new ways of acting that fit their new situation’. Nor would he impose them on other, more established groups, because they would not be conformant with their own – ‘the piece from the new will not match the old’ (Verse 36). That is, apparently, why the various associations of disciples (in Verse 33) remained intact and distinctive. Martin (1983, p. 218) partly makes this point, too.

Moreover, I suggest, Luke demonstrates here a concern for retaining the entirety of the new fellowship of Jesus. Tearing the newly acquired garment and spilling some of the fermenting wine speak of its fracture and division, if it were constrained to the confines of Pharisaic legalism. As the CoP of Jesus and his followers, the group’s practices, knowledge domain and membership were mutually constitutive. The consequent loss of members from it would be serious, if one believes that learning and development in its beliefs can only occur through participation within that particular community of religious practice – which suggestion, appears to epitomise some of this gospel.

Luke’s redaction (in Lk. 5:33-35) of Mark’s parable on fasting in the presence of the bridegroom, similarly, appears to shift the significance of Jesus’ words, from the legal prohibition of it to the community’s

prerogative to choose – ‘You cannot make the wedding guests fast’ (Lk. 5:34). Participants will do so or not as they see fit. The statement then seems to become another clear metaphor for Jesus and his new learners. While their Master, who is a cause for great celebration, is with them, the disciples cannot be compelled, by human rules and regulations, to exhibit sadness. Observance of the fast has, hence, become, once again not obsolete but, this time, optional; however, there will come occasions when it will be appropriate to fast, specifically during ‘those days’ (Verse 35) following Jesus’ physical withdrawal from his community.

A further controversy arises later, in Luke (6:1), where Jesus’ learners picked corn while walking through a field. The Pharisees asked them why they were infringing the Sabbath law, “‘Why are you doing what is not lawful to do on the Sabbath?’” (Verse 2), again objecting to the conduct of their developing band. As in the debate about eating with tax collectors, the disciples did not venture an answer; but Jesus regarded this behaviour as perfectly acceptable, under appropriate conditions, and answered the question by relating it to the Scriptures.

Furthermore, the one argument or scriptural example, unlike Matthew or Mark, that Luke chooses in order to illustrate this reasoning (1Sam. 21:1-9), refers to the sustaining of a company of men, and its leader, by unlawful food, with its consequent comparison to Jesus’ community of disciples, as Bock (1994, p. 114) seems to imply. Thus, here, Jesus, once more, defended the unorthodox practices of the community he was in the process of forming (Keener, 1993, p. 194), by means of an apposite, scriptural precedent.

David’s right to break the law, in 1 Samuel, was, apparently, extended to cover his companions (Lk. 6:4b). Jesus’ answer to the Pharisees’ question, then, seems clearly to imply that the master can confer his own legitimacy onto his community’s participants. Luke’s account ends with a simple assertion that, ‘The Son of man is lord of the Sabbath’ (Verse 5).

The inference, therefore, appears to be that He, also, has exempted his disciples from the Law, in this instance – that of Sabbath observance.

In Mark's variant (in Mk. 2:24), the Pharisees questioned Jesus, directly. They appear to blame him for the inadmissible actions of his errant disciples. There follows a learning package, consisting of several teaching points expressed in a manner that undoubtedly bridged to the questioners' prior knowledge and, in which, through generating a series of cognitive disequilibria, the hearers are led progressively from the Pharisees' view of the law, through the same passage of Scripture as before, to Jesus as 'lord of the Sabbath' (Verse 28) (Grassmick, 1983, pp. 114-115). The session started by answering the original inquirers, but by the end of the section could, once again, be interpreted as general, group-wide teaching.

Matthew's version, lastly, is introduced by an explicit complaint against the Teacher (Mt. 12:2), rather than any enquiry, and he replied with three justifications from the Scriptures, one of which was repeated from the call of Levi (in 9:13). Matthew, however, does not derive the 'lord of the Sabbath' claim (in Verse 8) as the conclusion of the preceding verses, as Mark's account (Mk. 2:28) does (Grassmick, 1983, pp. 114-115) – 'so the Son of Man is...' Rather, he states it as an axiom – 'For the Son of Man is...' (Barbieri, 1983, p. 45) – a fact to be assumed true and taken as the basis on which proof of the disciples' innocence rested.

Characteristically, the Matthean account has redacted Mark to make this important learning point simply an accepted truth. Additionally, the instruction in Verses 6-8, viz. 'I tell you, something greater than the temple is here' evokes a sharply directive teaching style.

Learning in Parable

Jesus did, sometimes, deliver didactic teaching, but he most famously taught in parables. The parable adds to the metaphor's andragogic qualities, since its meaning is not immediately clear. It demands some

problem solving on the part of the hearer to reveal its true significance for them (Thatcher, 2006, p. 8). As Dodd (1936, p. 16) famously put it, it will 'tease [the mind] into active thought'. It enforces an active, self-directed or learner-centred involvement with the content, which is widely acknowledged to bring about a deeper learning experience (Usher, Bryant, & Johnston, 1997, p. 93).

Moving on through the Galilean section of the gospels, one of the few major parabolic narratives that occur in all three synoptic gospels, there, is the Parable of the Soils. The story is, actually, reflexive, in that it refers to its own teaching – the words of Jesus, that is the Good News which he (the Sower) was, even as he spoke, broadcasting over the varied 'soil' (each Verse 8) of the 'great crowd' (Lk. 8:4) that had amassed before him.

The parable seems to conclude that those who embrace the Gospel, who patiently persist with it and who cultivate a deep form of appreciation of it, develop mature Christian characters and become prolific ambassadors of the Kingdom of God themselves. It is no coincidence, therefore, that these are exactly the attributes needed to properly decipher the parable itself. Consequently, anyone who does take such pains to appreciate its allusions, the narrative teaches, has the qualities to become a follower of Jesus.

The telling of the parable is reproduced faithfully across all the gospels considered here. However, the various gospels interpret it from within differing conceptual frameworks, I propose. In Luke (8:9-10), for example, the disciples asked Jesus 'what this parable meant' and he replied that 'for [the] others' the secrets of the Kingdom of God are 'in parables', so that although they are 'hearing' them, they may not 'understand' their implication. Understanding would not come automatically, simply by receiving teaching but, as concluded in Chapter 3 of this thesis, would demand serious, practical and mental application

(Marshall, 1994, 8:9-15 The meaning of the parable; Morris, 1961, pp. 150, 152).

It was also shown in Chapter 3 that Mark (4:10-12) expresses much the same view of the way parables can be effective in discouraging surface learning and enforcing reflective problem solving and personal meaning making. Keener (1993, p. 137) also points out this need, expressed in Mark's Gospel, to 'listen most astutely' to the parable, and Cole (1994, 4:1-34) writes on these verses, 'if [listeners] are thoughtful, [this teaching method] will lead them to see the spiritual truth. Otherwise, they will just enjoy the story...and forget it'.

Matthew (13:10-15), on the other hand, states simply that 'to them it has not been given' to know these secrets. He quotes Isaiah's prophecy in full, "'You shall...never understand'" (13:14). Furthermore, toward the end of the passage, in Verse 23, the one who is fruitful is, in direct contrast to Verse 13, 'he who hears the word and understands it'. One either can comprehend the word or one cannot. France (1994, 13:10-17) similarly says, of parables in the theology of Matthew's gospel, 'not everyone has the ability to penetrate their meaning'. (Although he goes on to suggest that discipleship enables this understanding, how that state could be achieved does not readily emerge from this pericope.) Such a perceived categorical limit to intellectual capacity is, as remarked previously, a defining feature of a behaviourist theory of learning.

Furthermore Mark (4:13), alone among the gospel versions, apparently stresses the foundational nature of this specific teaching sequence – that it is about how to learn – and, when the disciples had clearly not comprehended it, Jesus remarked, 'How then will you understand all the parables?' It was, therefore, necessary to explain it to the Twelve, privately (in Verse 10). Matthew, in contrast, is, evidently, unconcerned with any general application of this learning principle and merely has

Jesus utter an instruction to listen to the parable being explicated –
“Hear then the parable of the sower” (Mt. 13:18).

In Luke (8:11), Jesus just replied to the question the disciples originally posed (in Verse 9). There is no suggestion here that they were ‘alone’ (as in Mk. 4:10), the teaching episode having come to an end. Rather this discussion seems to have taken place in the midst of the activities of the new community and by reference to the crowd – the ‘others’ – spread out on the land before them; and by Verse 16 the focus appears to have returned to the wider audience (e.g. Marshall, 1994, 8:16-18). Such ‘talking within the practice’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 107), between experts and novices, is an important component of the situated learning paradigm – thought to be vital for the participants within any community in learning to perform that community’s practices.

When we look at the different interpretations of the Parable of the Soils, we see yet more distinctions between them. All three agree, firstly, that what was sown – the seed – was the word (of the Kingdom or of God) (Mt. 13:19; Mk. 4:14; Lk. 8:11). Then, according to Mark, ‘when the ones along the path...hear’ this teaching, ‘*satan*’ – ‘the opposer’ (e.g. Moberly, 2013, p. 247), ‘immediately comes and takes away the word’ (Mk. 4:15). These individuals, therefore, apparently give precedence to conflicting, challenging arguments and reject the Gospel without further thought. This suggests, it is proposed here, an outright lack of motivation to engage with the cognitive dissonance of the Kingdom message.

In Matthew (13:19), however, ‘When anyone hears the word of the Kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches (it) away’. Here, then, some of the audience are just incapable of comprehending the message of the Gospel. For these people, ‘*poneros*’ – perhaps suggesting the ‘bringer of toils’ (Thayer, 1889, p. 530) – who makes understanding too painfully laborious for them – takes the meaning of the words away from the less able. Hence, what in Mark

derives from a lack of cognitive engagement, in Matthew, could signify, once more, limited intellectual ability.

To some extent, Luke concurs with Mark – these people ‘along the path’ have heard the words – but then ‘the slanderer’ ‘comes and takes away the word from their hearts, that they may not believe’ (Lk. 8:12).

Detailed examination of the use of ‘*diabolos*’ by later Jewish authors was recently presented by Zurawski (2012, pp. 383-384) where it seems it could imply a, quite possibly human, agent who falsely accuses victims – in the present case, potential believers. That being so, it would not be a matter of their inability to understand but of their permitting some false criticism of themselves to creep in and deny them confident belief. Luke, therefore, like Mark, does not imply here that any person’s capacity to learn is intrinsically predetermined.

Moreover, Luke’s variation is, in fact, considerably different from both Matthew’s perspective and that of Mark. In Mark (4:15) ‘the word is sown’ ‘along the path’ (*cf.* Mk. 4:4) but for Luke (8:12) ‘The ones along the path’ (*cf.* Lk. 8:5) ‘are those who have heard’, albeit in vain. Similarly, ‘The ones on the rock’ (*cf.* Lk. 8:6) ‘believe for a while’; and ‘what fell among the thorns’, ‘they are those who hear, but...are choked’ (8:14). The seed, that is the word of God, has, thus, become the people who hear it (*cf.* Robertson, 1960). Finally, Luke writes, ‘that in the good soil...they are those that bring forth fruit’ (8:15) – that is, more seed, so more hearers of the Gospel (Thackray, 2012).

If we accept that the Acts of the Apostles is the sequel to the gospel of Luke, we see what may be the outcome of this conception of ‘the word (of God)’, in its characterisation of the subsequent early Church. Frequently in Acts (e.g. Act. 6:7; 12:24; 19:20), the ‘word of God’ ‘grew’ and ‘was strong’, when, clearly, it was, actually, the believers in that gospel message who increased in number (Meeks, 2003, pp. 155-156).

In Luke-Acts, then, 'word of God' seems to be an epistemic signifier for the new community of Jesus' followers. This idiosyncratic concept is surprisingly strongly evocative of contemporary, socio-cultural learning theory. In the situated-learning discourse, all knowledge exists in, and is distributed across, some community of practice, and any such community and its knowledge domain are mutually constitutive (Arnold, Smith, & Trayner, 2012, p. 126) – that is, they evolve together. As the early Church of Jesus – the ontologically signified – developed, therefore, so did its knowledge of God in him, and vice versa. In the Parable of the Four Soils, then, I conclude, Luke prefigures some of the most recent thinking in current theories of socially mediated learning.

Finally, in Luke, 'those who...bring forth fruit' (Lk. 8:15) are not differentiated. The verse is a statement about the productiveness of the communal activities of the company of believers. It, again, reflects a concept of Jesus' followers as an identifiable community of practice, whose practices comprise: maintaining the faith, expanding the membership, and displaying honesty, goodness and patience (8:15).

Mark, on the contrary, states that they 'bear fruit, thirtyfold, sixtyfold and a hundredfold' (Mk. 4:20), indicating a scale of productivity against which the achievement of any individual disciple might be measured. This, the present paper proposes, is suggestive of an individualistic view of learning that largely privileges the personal construction of knowledge over any socially distributed model. Matthew, moreover, stresses this differentiation of learning outcome even more with 'he...yields, in one case a hundredfold, in another sixty, and in another thirty' (Mt. 13:23). This could be seen as consistent with an implicit assumption of a level of capability predefined for each learner, which would correspond with the characteristics of the Matthean pedagogy identified previously, including throughout Matthew's interpretation of the present parable.

Hard Words on Learning the Kingdom Secrets

One of the questions that remain outstanding in the Synoptic Gospels surrounds Jesus' apparently 'hard' sayings concerning the secrets of the Kingdom of Heaven, which occur in Mark Chapter 4, Matthew 13 and Luke 8, and which often seem to introduce a discriminatory 'insider/outsider' divide into his view of discipleship. Gundry (1981, p. 138), for example, supposes parables were deliberately used to hide the facts from resistant, non-believers. I discuss these issues here in the context of learning and meaning making in the New Testament. The conclusions will need to be referenced in the later textual analysis of the shared material of Luke and Matthew arising from the 'Q' tradition source.

Only one logion is present in Mark and within both the collection in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain of Luke. It is reproduced as, 'the measure you give will be the measure you get (back)' (Mk. 4:24b; Mt. 7:2b; Lk. 6:38b). In Matthew and in Luke's Gospel, it is associated with the well-known verse about not judging others, so that you are not judged yourself.

In Mark's Gospel, there is no such didactic 'Sermon', however. As Osborne (2007, *The Secret of the Kingdom of God (4:10-12)*) says, 'Mark never presents his audience with a sermon'. The saying occurs in 4:24, where it follows the explanation of the Parable of the Soils, which, in this version includes that outsiders would, curiously, 'indeed hear but not understand' the secret of the Kingdom of God (4:11-12). Here the phrase in Verse 24b seems to be used to clarify that statement. Jesus has just made the point, rhetorically, that you do not bring a lamp in to extinguish it under a bed but to position it somewhere conspicuous. His words are, it seems, intended to be illuminating – they are not obfuscatory. Everything that is obscured is so in order to be elucidated (Mk. 4:21-22) (Cole, 1961, p. 93).

Anyone can comprehend this Kingdom secret, then, if they have the will to uncover it (Mk. 4:21-24a) – ‘if any[one] has ears to hear’. Cole (1961, p. 91) similarly makes this point. So does Osborne (2007, Parables About Parables (4:21-25)). ‘Consider what you hear’, Jesus reportedly urged in Verse 24a of Mark. Deep learning, in Mark’s version, thereby occurs through involvement with and reflecting upon what you are told. Hence, to put 24b into the same context: the extent to which you engage determines the depth of understanding you will attain – ‘the law of proportionate returns’ (i.e., the more you put in the more you’ll get back).

In Mark, then, Jesus intends that his audience shall not be satisfied with a merely shallow understanding of his words – ‘not (passively) understand’ (4:11-12). However, although outsiders will, apparently, not simply hear and immediately comprehend Jesus’ words, Mark clarifies that, with enough application, anybody can come to grasp the meaning of his parables – an assertion very much in accordance with a cognitive view of individual learning potential, I suggest.

In Luke (8:18), the corresponding exhortation is redacted to, ‘Consider then, how you hear’. There, it is, thus, a call, not so much to active learning, as to examine how to learn successfully. From a strongly situated learning position, learning about some knowledge domain is not generally possible but can only occur through participation within the community that possesses that knowledge. Matthew, moreover, makes no further comment on the crowd not understanding Jesus nor any reference to the value of reflecting on one’s learning. Thinking about teaching does not appear to be a top priority in Matthew.

Additionally, all three gospel accounts of the parable feature Jesus’ ‘hard’ words (in Mk. 4:25; Mt. 13:12; Lk. 8:18) about knowing the secrets of the Kingdom (Mk. 4:11; Mt. 13:11; Lk. 8:10) – ‘for to him who has will [it] be given [...] and from him who has not...taken away’. This general

observation on knowledge impermanency could be summed up, it may be argued, in the modern-day English aphorism, 'use it or lose it' and, although this is true in any learning model, it is a fundamental tenet of a behaviourist pedagogic approach, with its emphasis on practised responses.

Matthew's Gospel, alone, places this text centrally in the narrative surrounding the Parable of the Soils, immediately following the, very binary, 'to you it has been given to know...but to them it has not been given' (13:11) statement. In Matthew, then, this saying seems to mean, 'for to him who has the facility, will knowledge of the secrets of the Kingdom be given'. Keener (1997, p. 239) expresses it, 'The disciples' eyes and ears were blessed...The rest of the hearers' were 'unable to fathom his message'. This interpretation, therefore, continues Matthew's black and white characterisation of knowledge acquisition – one either does or does not have the necessary capability, so correspondingly, one can or cannot learn. Nothing in this Matthean passage evidently mitigates this situation.

The very controversial saying of Jesus, 'hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand', a parallel one to Mk. 4:11b, then follows directly in the next verse, Mt. 13:13. Consequently in Matthew, it apparently sums up Jesus' justification of using parables. Those who have not been given the ability to do so will fail to understand them. Evidently, the 'hard' fact is that some people simply cannot comprehend the secrets of the Kingdom, reflecting a pedagogical assumption of people having differing, fixed levels of intellectual capacity.

Mark and Luke, by contrast, both interpose, before the challenging words 'even what...he has will be taken away', the explanation that secrets are meant to 'come to light' (Mk. 4:22; Lk. 8:17). Mark's version, only, goes on, quite inclusively, 'if any man has ears to hear, let him hear' (23) and then states the present saying – 'for to him who has will [it] be given...'

Thus, it could be understood to intend, 'for to him who has ears to hear, will any secret thing (of the Kingdom) be given'. Once again then, to the gospel of Mark, the hidden meanings of the parables are, it would seem, attainable by anyone who takes the trouble to listen to them attentively.

In the Lukan redaction (Lk. 8:18b), Mark's generalisation in Verse 24 of Chapter 4, is omitted, however, and after 'Consider then, how you hear', it proceeds directly to the 'hard' saying, rendered in the RSV 'for to him who has will [it] be given...' Whilst what the person will be given is presumably still some secret of the Kingdom veiled within the parables, it is not easy, now, to see what precise prerequisite it is that the would-be receiver should first possess.

It would be most important to identify this requirement though, since the passage ends, in the RSV, 'from him who has not, even what he thinks he has will be taken away' (Lk. 8:18b). Nevertheless, what it is that the deficient person does not 'have' is, again, not specified. It might be 'engagement' – as with Mark – or Matthew's intrinsic 'ability', or some other human attribute. Indeed, there is no object of the verb, 'has', in this sentence, at all.

The meaning could possibly be found through the immediately preceding and carefully redacted, 'Consider then, how you hear'. This, probably, relates, back a couple of verses, to Verse 15 of Chapter 8, at the end of the Parable of the Soils (Tannehill, 1996, p. 143), then, where Luke, uniquely, concludes that the productive hearers are, 'those who, hearing the word, hold fast. It might make much more sense then, to render the succeeding saying as, 'for to him who holds fast, will [any secret thing of the Kingdom] be given'. This is, thus, exactly the implication of Luke's version of the parable and provides a rationale for the introductory redaction.

This reading would make remaining firmly established in the faith the essential ingredient of spiritual learning success. Luke then immediately continues (Lk. 8:19-21) to relate an incident, which occurs before the Parable of the Soils in the other Synoptics, in which Jesus, when his own nuclear family wished to draw him away, rather, asserted his commitment to the community of 'those who hear the word of God and do it.' Tannehill (1996, p. 144) makes a very similar point.

Furthermore, it implies that, in Luke, effective learners 'hold fast', following 'hearing the word' 'in an honest and good heart' (Lk. 8:15) – this order of the phrases being recommended by Morris (1961, p. 152). Learning happens then, essentially, in right social relationship, within the body of believers, whereas, as remarked in Chapter 4 of the thesis, it is gravely disrupted for those who withdraw (Verse 13) or 'go...their way' (Verse 14) from it. Moreover, Luke is concerned here, I infer, to build up this communal body, exhorting them to 'hold fast' 'in patience', displaying honesty and goodness, one to another. Only then will the secret things of the Kingdom become clear to each one.

Wendel (2011, pp. 182-183) expresses this idea, too. In Luke, the insiders in the faith, which defines the identity of the community of Christ-believers, are those 'hearing, understanding and obeying "the word of God"'. That is to say, Jesus' CoP comprises those learning and practising the specialist knowledge of God that constitutes it. This then, I conclude, represents an essentially situative learning view of insiders and outsiders. Those who do not persevere in the communal faith – the outsiders – will no longer learn the secrets of the kingdom and will, in fact, lose the knowledge of it they once thought they held.

Finally, to return to the apparently harsh statement which parallels Mk. 4:12 in Luke (8:10) – 'hearing, they may not understand' – much the same can be said of it as for Mark's variant. There is nothing secret that will not become clear (Lk. 8:17) so that meaningful comprehension of the

mysteries of God's kingdom is, notwithstanding 8:10, completely accessible to all. Teaching will not be totally transparent, though, presumably since that could result in mere observation and passive listening, which would lead to only superficial understanding.

However, as noted before, Mark's law of proportionate returns is not reproduced in Luke, so that it does not seem so plausible that a deep personal engagement with Jesus' words is the route to understanding here. Instead, in Luke's version alone (8:16), it is 'those who enter' the illuminated room who 'may see the light' of the conspicuously positioned lamp. Following the previous inference from the Parable of the Soils itself then, it is only through entering and participating, albeit peripherally, in the community of believers that true knowledge of the Kingdom secrets can be perceived. This is also the assumption under a strongly situated learning paradigm, where, in fact, genuine learning could not take place in any other way. Hence, in a gospel generally displaying that pedagogical approach the hard words of Lk. 8:10b would not be entirely inappropriate.

Learning in Practice

As a further example of teaching and learning in the gospels we can look at the sending out of the disciples (Thackray, 2012), first the Twelve and also the seventy others. Plainly, these missionary assignments were authentic learning experiences for the close followers of Jesus, entailing real preaching and healing tasks carried out among the local community. In each of the synoptic gospels, Jesus had just been travelling about the countryside with his learners, performing exactly these activities himself, effectively modelling the programme's learning objectives to them (Mt. 9:35; Mk. 6:6; Lk. 8:1).

Then Jesus commissioned his apostles – the Twelve – supplied the resources they would need for the mission (Mt. 10:1; Mk. 6:7; Lk. 9:1) and 'sent them out'. In Mark (6:7), they went 'two by two' – a

pedagogical strategy known in the constructivist community as 'instructional scaffolding', in which learners, working in pairs, can support one another, each benefitting from the greater skill strengths in the other. As Grassmick (1983, 6:12-13) points out, this learning amounted, in part, to developing a realisation that they had Jesus' power, even though he was not physically present with them.

Matthew (10:5-6), although it has Jesus limiting the exercise geographically, does not comment on how the task was organised practically. Indeed, it does not appear, necessarily, to recognise this episode as learning at all. When the disciples were prohibited from taking any form of physical support with them, Matthew explains it as because 'the labourer deserves his food' (Verse 9). Keener (1997, pp. 201-202) similarly expresses the mission in Matthew, very much in terms of the exercise and demonstration of Jesus' delegated authority, rather than as any form of training exercise.

The other gospels evidently suggest the reason the disciples were not permitted to take their own sustenance was self-evident – presumably as Bock (1994, p. 163) emphasises in respect of Luke's account, to teach them to rely entirely on the authority of God bestowed upon them by Jesus – though incidentally, Mark says they were allowed sandals and a staff 'for their journey'.

Luke 9:1-2 states that Jesus 'called the Twelve together and...sent them out'. While it is not explicit, then, there is cause to suppose that Luke regards them as working in a team – undergoing a group exercise in collaboration; and 'on their return' – which again sounds to have been collective – they gave Jesus a, presumably joint, report of their activities (Lk. 9:10).

Matthew provides no further information about this missionary programme. That account does not appear to presuppose any benefits

arising from it for the disciples' development. Mark, on the other hand, records that the mission was very successful. Many ordinary people were engaged and physically healed (Mk. 6:12-13). Luke (in Lk. 9:6) concurs. Mark notes that there was a concrete outcome in terms of a renewed and enlivened local community (Mk. 6:33), which, within a constructivist perception of learning, would constitute an externalised, co-operative product from the exercise – what Bruner (1996, pp. 22-29) has termed an *oeuvre*. Such an enduring work is generally acknowledged to have a powerful effect on group unity and sense of achievement.

When the learning task was completed, the disciples assembled around Jesus and 'told him all that they had done' (Mk. 6:30) and similarly (Lk. 9:10a); and, in these accounts, Jesus then took them on a short retreat, to recuperate and prepare for the ensuing popular response (Mk. 6:31-32; Lk. 9:10b). This, especially as described in Mark, would have provided an opportunity for metacognitive reflection on the new knowledge obtained during the activity – a learning process about their learning, commonly considered, in constructivism, as crucial in reinforcing it (A. Brown, 1987, pp. 65-116). Quite likely, then, the value of such reflection-on-practice was recognised in both Luke and Mark.

A little later (Lk. 10:1), Luke only, relates that Jesus enlisted seventy 'others', distributed them between smaller groups and, as before, 'sent them on ahead of him'. Harvey (1972, pp. 251-252) remarks that the purpose of this larger company is essentially unexplained in the gospel and that he can merely conjecture about Luke's possible objectives in recounting the event. Although this venture was, apparently, again, first and foremost, mission activity (Tannehill, 1996, p. 173), from its close comparison with Jesus' training of the Twelve, in Mark Chapter 6, the existence of a learning curriculum could well be inferred – and this is recognised by many writers (e.g., Gould, 1998, Luke 10).

According to Bock (1994, p. 185) Jesus was in the process, here, of creating a 'new community', one which would, eventually, extend to the whole of humankind; and though the main focus of attention in Lk. 10:1-22 is on its latest recruits, it is apparent from Luke's dialogue at the Last Supper (22:35) that the original twelve 'apostles' (9:10) were among Jesus' subsequent, expanded ministry team, too (Bock, 1994, p. 186).

Thus, the Lukan conception of this enlarged missionary workforce has all the hallmarks of a community of practice – a participatory, socially interacting group with the common agenda of proclaiming Jesus' message and living out his teaching (Lk. 10:9). There was a 'master' within that community – Jesus, the Master – but in these verses he encouraged his disciples to take considerable responsibility for the shared work themselves (10:1, 9, 17-19), much as in the master-apprentices sense of a CoP, as originally described by Lave and Wenger (1991, pp. 91-94).

The Twelve now became the experienced 'old-hands', assigned to work alongside the newcomers (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 95) in this further endeavour. Hence, we can relate the involvement of the disciples in these activities to the situated learning concept of 'legitimate peripheral participation' in this incipient community. The designation of 'apostle', then, could have represented, not so much a hierarchical progression from 'disciple', as a 'centripetal' movement (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 34-36) inward from less, toward full, integration in the life and mission of Jesus (Csinos, 2010, p. 55).

Within a strongly situated theory of cognition, furthermore, knowledge is regarded as socially mediated and distributed across the community, and learning is deemed an integral part of (peripheral) participation in its practice. In joining with Jesus and one another to 'heal the sick' and announce that 'the Kingdom of God has come near' (Lk. 10:9), then – by sharing with their colleagues and, especially, by observing the behaviour

of the 'old hands' – but with no obvious external support (10:4), the wider disciples learnt how to express the coming of the Kingdom of God in actions and words, depending entirely on the enabling power of Jesus' Name (10:17).

Here, therefore, we find the newly appointed disciples discovering how to 'talk within the practice' – using the discourse of the community to convey the truths of God's Kingdom (Lk. 10:5-11). After the mission, the participants also, again, discussed their experiences with the Master (10:17-20) and no doubt, with one another, telling their own stories and learning, additionally, from those of others.

Stories comprise one of the most common resources of a community of practice (Wenger, 2000, p. 232). Others include: documentation, tools and technologies, each specialised as appropriate to the needs of that particular praxis. Working together on the activities of the community constitutes a 'learning curriculum' (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 93-97) of how to use these items and of developing a deep understanding of their use. In the community of Jesus' followers, there was to be only one 'technology' – the powerful authority of Jesus (Lk. 10:17, 19). In this passage, the disciples can thus be seen learning to depend on this power alone.

Learning in Miracle

Immediately after the return of the Twelve, in both Mark and Luke, is positioned the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand plus people. Jesus was in 'a lonely place' (Mk. 6:31). In Mark (6:35) and Luke (9:12) his disciples were with him, but in Matthew (14:13) he was on his own at first and they joined him there later (14:19). He was addressing a very large crowd. According to Matthew (14:14) his focus was on 'curing the sick', although in Mark (6:34), his primary concern seems to have been 'to teach them' – a much more cognitive issue which Matthew has neglected. Tasker (1961, p. 143) notices this Matthean divergence, too,

but chooses to blur the distinction rather than clarify it. Luke (9:11) avoids any suspicion of didactic teaching, without, however, overlooking their learning, and settles for 'speaking to them about the Kingdom'.

When evening began to fall his learners wanted to dismiss the people to buy food for themselves but Jesus told them, 'you give them something to eat' (Mk. 6:37; Mt. 14:16; Lk. 9:13). It was another opportunity for their legitimate participation in the practice of his new community or, at least, for their authentic teaching and learning. As Barbieri (1983) puts it, Jesus was modelling, to his disciples, the active role they would later have in nurturing his people – 'he would supply [their provisions], but the feeding would be done by them', i.e. by the disciples (Barbieri, 1983, p. 54). In Mark, the process of involving the disciples begins straightaway. Jesus 'said to them, "How many loaves have you? Go and see.'" and they 'found out' (Mk. 6:38).

Then, according to Matthew (14:19), once the extent of their resources had been established, Jesus took control and ordered all the people to sit down and the disciples to serve the food. In Luke's version (and probably in Mark's too, see e.g. NRSV, contra the RSV), in sharp contradistinction, the disciples were participants in the whole activity of supernatural dispensation. It was they who organised the crowd (Lk. 9:14-15), dividing them into manageable groups and getting them sat down, as well as distributing the bread and fish to them. The disciples' involvement seems, therefore, to be illustrated much more clearly in Luke, which is consistent with a gospel that inherently recognises the crucial importance of participating to the learning process.

In Mark's account, however, their learning was not completed at this point (Mk. 6:52) – the disciples had not yet apprehended that Jesus was able to meet all their needs. Mark often does not exemplify a simplistic view of comprehension as natural and mechanical up to a given potential. Here it is understood that it could take time, sometimes a very long time,

for learners to reorganise their mental frameworks to incorporate such new and dissonant knowledge. Nor, in this gospel, is this possible only in shared activity – people might need a period of privacy (Mk. 6:31, 32) in which to make complex adjustments to their personal thinking. Thus, in Mark, the lesson of Jesus' inexhaustible provision proved too difficult for Jesus' followers to grasp immediately.

A second example of miracle as a learning resource can be taken from Jesus' healing ministry. Jesus came upon a crowd of people (in Mt. 17:14; Mk. 9:14; Lk. 9:37) and a man begged him to look favourably on his son, who suffered from fitting (Mt. 17:15; Mk. 9:18; Lk. 9:39). In Matthew (Verses 16), the father 'brought [his boy] to [the] disciples' but they could not heal him. Similarly, Mark (Verse 18) writes that he 'asked' them to relieve the lad and Luke (Verse 40) says 'begged' them. Evidently, this did not demonstrate effective belief on his part because, in each case, Jesus berated the whole generation for their lack of faith (so, Osborne, 2007, IV C).

Then, according to Matthew (Verse 18), Jesus 'rebuked' the boy, who was cured directly. The incident is a straightforward miraculous healing. In Mark (9:20-27), though, he engaged the man, first, in a challenging discussion about his level of conviction, so that the father became involved in his own learning, in a constructivist manner, resulting in him crying out, "'help my unbelief!'" (in Verse 24). The Teacher then commanded the affliction to leave the young man.

Following the healing miracle, in both Matthew (17:19) and Mark (9:28), his disciples queried Jesus, in private, as to why they could not cure the condition themselves. In the former gospel, he replied with some didactic teaching – 'Truly, I say to you' – about their own degree of faith. This answer is, then, again, consistent with the epistemological position exhibited across Matthew's gospel so far.

In Mark (9:29), however, Jesus immediately gave a somewhat enigmatic reply, “This kind cannot be driven out by anything but prayer.” This answer is rather puzzling, both because he did not manifestly pray about the cure himself – it seems to have been effected just by his authoritative command – and, also, the thrust of the teaching in Mark referred, rather, to exercising a sufficiency of faith. Perhaps, then, it was the father’s prayer – “help my unbelief!” – that was needed, as, again, Osborne (2007, IV C) discusses. In any case, this teaching point could not be unthinkingly accepted by the learner, in Mark’s account, and appreciating it demanded the disciples’ personal construction of meaning.

In Luke’s variant there was no pedagogy employed at all. The ‘majesty of God’ (Lk. 9:43) was manifested to all present but no specific teaching was carried out and any distinction between the learners and their Master is assiduously avoided. It is as if the apprentices had run into a situation they were not familiar with and the master stepped in to complete the task. The disciples’ learning occurred then, to the extent that it did, in a very situative fashion, simply through their experience of the Master’s contribution to the shared healing practice.

Continuing Learning

Immediately following this healing event, Jesus broached the matter of his impending death. For Luke, this happened during the ‘astonished’ reactions of the crowd to the miracle (Lk. 9:43) – ‘while they were all marvelling’. It was part of the talk within the activities of the community, again; and he urged his disciples to take in what people were saying (the listening demanded here is of more active nature in the Greek than the RSV’s passive-receptive sounding ‘let...sink into’ might suggest), ‘for the Son of Man is to be delivered into the hands of men’ (9:44) – the current response of the observers had to be reconciled with their imminent violent antagonism toward him (Martin, 1983, p. 231). In Mark’s rendition (Mk. 9:30-31), Jesus taught his disciples this same, unpalatable

truth, but very confidentially – ‘he would not have anyone know’ he was doing so.

In both these narratives, however, the disciples ‘did not understand’ what he was saying and ‘they were afraid to ask him’ about it, yet again appreciating that such a cognitively discordant piece of information would be particularly difficult to accommodate to. Morris (1961, p. 175) makes this point, too. Bock (1994, p. 177) also recognises that new schema construction was involved, in that ‘some expectations need revision’. These two gospels also seem to suggest that the disciples were meant to ask Jesus to explain it more fully but they were too nervous to do so, which compounded their incomprehension.

In Matthew (17:22-23), this was a clear-cut learning point, delivered in a teacher-directed manner. The disciples understood its significance well enough (Harvey, 1972, p. 70), at least the first two parts of the saying – that he would be handed over and killed – ‘and they were greatly distressed’. It was one more fact to be added to their knowledge of him, albeit a most disturbing one. Obviously, they overlooked the implication of the last assertion here – that Jesus would ‘be raised on the third day’, or they would not have been so distraught, but Matthew does not acknowledge any lack of understanding of this.

In both Mark and Luke, the narrative continues directly with the question about which of Jesus’ followers was the most important. In Luke (9:46), it was an argument amongst the disciples, which again took place within the activities of that community, about ‘which of them was the greatest’. As such, it constituted ‘talk within the practice’. Not all practice dialogue is helpful – Wenger (2000, p. 230) points out that CoP’s cannot be idealised in that way. Jesus, as part of the group, ‘perceived the thoughts of their hearts’ (Verse 47).

Matthew's parallel relates that the query was, merely, an innocent enquiry, raised by the disciples, seeking factual information from their Teacher – "Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?" (Matt. 18:1). It expected a categorical ruling from Jesus – further information for each of them, to be added to their individual body of knowledge about his imminent spiritual reign.

Mark (9:33), however, describes it as a discussion the disciples had engaged in 'on the way'. Later, in a private house, Jesus challenged them about that conversation. Apparently, he singled out some individuals, here, because, subsequently, he 'called the Twelve' (Verse 35). This was, then, a characteristically, much more cognitive constructivist approach, probing these learners' personal motivations and inducing them to reconsider their self-centred assumptions. He waited for their answer for some time, Mark implies, because 'they were silent' (9:34). Permitting the learner a 'wait' time, to process a question, is another consequence of adopting pedagogical constructivism.

This comparison is somewhat supported by Walvoord and Zuck (eds.) (1983). Of the following part of Mark's version of events, Grassmick (1983, p. 146) describes Jesus' words as 'teaching' – 'he taught [the Twelve] the essence of true greatness'. Barbieri (1983, p. 61), on the other hand, writes of Matthew's much more transmissive account, 'he told the disciples a change in their thinking was necessary' – it was, effectively, 'instruction'. Lastly, Martin (1983, p. 231) says that, in Luke's variant, Jesus simply 'set forth the principle' of the Markan material, no learner-teacher interaction over it being related at all.

Finally, Jesus explained the principle of greatness in the Kingdom, in each case very similarly (Mt. 18:3-4; Mk. 9:36; Lk. 9:47-48). He stood a small child in front of the assembled learners, as a visual aid – an authentic exemplification of powerlessness – and referred to the youngster in his

explanation. It was, obviously, a quite emotive and memorable teaching and learning experience for his disciples.

The Jerusalem based section of Jesus' ministry begins with his triumphal entry into the city on the colt of a donkey. The sending of a couple of disciples to the village to collect the young male animal is similar, in intention, in each synoptic Gospel (in Mark 11, Matthew 21 and Luke 19), except that Matthew (21:2) has them bring the dam, too.

All three gospels appear to recognise the subsequent event as a major learning outcome for his followers (Cole, 1961, p. 173) – a dramatic portrayal of, at once, Jesus' kingliness and his humility, although his disciples did not yet 'fully understand' his Messiahship (Barbieri, 1983, p. 155). In Mark (11:4), the disciples 'went away, and found a colt'. They were quickly engaged in the process of their own learning. This involvement continued as they 'brought the colt to Jesus, and threw their garments on it' (Verse 7).

Matthew (21:4-5), however, invokes the authority of the prophet Zechariah (9:9) first, presumably to justify and explicate the teaching point being made (Mt. 21:4-5). As France (1994, 21:1-11) remarks, the triumphant response of the crowds in Verse 9 endorsed the appropriateness of this comparison. Furthermore, the disciples were not so much taking part in this 'live' demonstration, as carrying out their Teacher's instructions – 'as Jesus had directed them' (Verse 6). Their learning was essentially teacher-led.

Whereas Matthew exhibits a directive teaching and learning approach, then, both Luke and Mark do not interpret the spiritual symbolism here but allow the learners (whether the disciples or the reader) to do so for themselves. In Luke's rendering, moreover, the whole activity is communal. As Morris (1961, p. 278) also notes, the disciples not only fetched and dressed the colt but 'they set Jesus upon it' (Lk. 19:35).

They then laid their clothes before him and, as Tannehill (1996, p. 283) similarly observes, they shouted his praises (Verses 36-37) as he rode – while in Matthew it was the, unspecified, ‘crowd(s)’ who did those things (Mt. 21:8-9).

Lastly, Luke’s account of the procession ends with the Pharisees, once more, attempting to curb the practices of Jesus’ followers, this time in respect of their public worship of him. “Teacher, rebuke your disciples”, they urged him (Lk. 19:39), but He, again, declined to do so. He would not inhibit their expression, within the community, of ‘all the mighty works that they had seen’ (Verse 37).

As another illustration we can look at Jesus’ identification of the great commandment. A legal expert, who, in Matthew and Mark, had just observed Jesus disputing with the Sadducees, quizzed him, “Which commandment is the first of all?” (Mk. 12:28). In Matthew (22:34), the Pharisees ‘came together’ and this man seems to represent the group, whereas in Mark he is an individual scribe (12:28). Jesus combined two textually unconnected laws, one from Dt. 6:4-5 – ‘you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart...’ – and Lev. 19:18b – ‘and your neighbour as yourself.’ – and answered him.

It has to be said, there was some didacticism in Jesus’ reply, here; although, Jesus appears to have amended the Hebrew, Deuteronomic Shema (Dt. 6:5) a little to add, ‘and with all your mind’. In Matthew’s (22:37-40) adaptation, these instructions were baldly delivered, in an authoritative manner, and no one made any further comment about them. It was more transmitted information for assimilating.

Continuing with Mark, though, the scribe, who inevitably noticed how Jesus had inserted a fourth phrase into the Scripture, expressed his unqualified agreement with the answer, “You have truly said...to love him...with all the understanding” (Mk. 12:32-33) he concurred, and he

went on, that this “is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices”. To recognise the value of understanding, like this, as against simply accepting truth, is the characteristic of a cognitive approach to learning. Brown (1871, Mk. 12:30) picks this up by stressing the importance of putting ‘intelligence into...affection’, as opposed to exercising ‘blind devotion’.

Furthermore, the questioner took the Teacher’s words to heart himself then and employed his own intellectual faculties in the service of his personal faith. Cole (1961, p. 193) says he ‘weighed and appraised’ Jesus’ reply. He made a cognitive reappraisal – to reverse the orthodox teaching of his profession – and put loving God and neighbour above traditional, ritual practices. Jesus commented that he was, “not far from the Kingdom of God” (Verse 34). Thus Mark demonstrates, again, a much more constructivist model of the human mind.

Luke describes the incident very differently. It occurred (in Chapter 10), not during an episode of disputation with the religious authorities, but shortly after the return of the seventy missionaries. Jesus was still reviewing the outcome of this activity with his disciples (in Verse 24), talking in the practice of his community, at the time.

The lawyer who interrogated him was only a peripheral participant in that CoP, albeit a legitimate one (in the sense of Lave and Wenger (1991)). Nevertheless, he must have been listening closely to this conversation, because, unlike in Matthew and Mark he did not have to approach Jesus, he just ‘stood up’ (Lk. 10:25). The question the man posed was, “what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” (Lk. 10:25) Maybe this query was triggered in the man by Jesus’ remark, a few verses earlier, that his disciples’ names were now ‘written in Heaven’ (Verse 20).

Jesus offered him no teaching on the Law but, instead, asked him, “how do you read” it?; and it was the lawyer, himself, who attached the

textural modification (in Verse 27), in advance of any remark from the Master. This unscriptural reference to a fourth constituent of the person seems to have been a striking amendment for a guardian of the Law to make and was possibly meant as a challenge to Jesus, to see what he would say. In this case, the exchange was typical Socratic dialogue (Boghossian, 2006, pp. 716-719) and, in the event, Jesus just confirmed the man's own conclusions.

Unlike in Mark's narrative, the interchange here did not result in any record of new meaning construction by the interrogator. The lawyer still had not understood (Bock, 1994, p. 197; Morris, 1961, p. 188) – “and who is my neighbour?” (Lk. 10:29), he continued. Although not uniquely so, this is not inconsistent with a situated learning theory, in which learning takes place only within participation in the activities of a community of practice and not, substantially, through any individual's independent mental processing.

It may be that the lawyer's synthesis of Dt. 6:5, here, with Lev. 19:18b – ‘your neighbour as yourself’ – was composed in order to challenge Jesus further, on this very matter of what a ‘neighbour’ is. The Master had taken many people from their families and local neighbourhoods and sent them to widespread villages and towns, stretching nearly into Samaria; but the Hebrew in Leviticus, it could be argued, referred to loving your very close fellow Jews. Luke may have included this passage, then, because it constituted yet another criticism of the activities of Jesus' new community, which Jesus then defended.

Further Examples

Continuing with Luke, Jesus countered this test from the lawyer by telling a story about a Samaritan who saved the life of a local Jew in the middle of nowhere (Lk. 10:30-37). The man had to agree this was the loving thing to do, irrespective of location or religious affiliation. Here, Luke illustrates, then, the capacity of even Pharisees and Lawyers to learn the

culture of Jesus' CoP given sufficient peripheral participation in its practices.

A further example can be taken from the prediction of the Parousia. Whilst the prophecies, themselves, do not, significantly, differentiate the gospels in pedagogical terms, their instigation does. In Mark (13:1), one particular, though unnamed, disciple drew Jesus' attention to the 'wonderful stones' around them. Jesus asked him, "Do you see these great buildings?" It was a directed question, inviting the hearer to move on, cognitively, from what he already knew – a sound, constructivist approach to some difficult learning ahead.

Although the actual learning point – that there would not be one stone left standing on another – is practically identical in all three gospels, in Matthew (24:1-2), 'his disciples' – referred to generically – 'came' to Jesus (they were not with him, beforehand) and pointed the buildings out. Jesus' question to them was undirected and rhetorical, "You see all these, do you not?" It expected no reply and was followed by some didactic teaching, introduced with "Truly, I say to you". This teaching method is, thus, once more, much less learner-centred than that described in Mark. In particular, it followed a behaviourist approach of delivering the required, authoritative knowledge to all learners in the same way.

Luke, distinctively, has this learning emerging within the practice of Jesus' followers. At the end of Chapter 20, the Master had been talking with his disciples in a public place. The group was still together, talking amongst themselves, when (in Lk. 21:5) 'some spoke of the Temple', with its 'noble stones'. The current warning arose as a natural next step in this conversation – "As for these things which you see", he began. The dialogue then continues with their query "when will this be...?" (Verse 7) Although there would be no definitive answer to that, Jesus

responded (Verse 8, etc.), yet again, within the verbal exchanges of his community.

Brown (1999, Mk. 13:1-37) remarks on the narrative differences here between the Synoptics, in respect of the number of disciples involved – one, all or several – and reasons that Mark most likely singles out the spokesperson for the others concerned. While this is what, in all probability, did happen, it does not explain why both Matthew and Luke redacted Mark's 'doubtless' (D. Brown, 1999, Mk. 13:1-37, §1) reliable description, making their own versions 'less definite' and more problematic. Seen within the context of the distinct approaches to teaching and learning evident elsewhere in each gospel, however, these dissimilarities seem reasonably understandable.

In both Mark's and Matthew's gospel, the location now shifts to the Mount of Olives. According to Matthew, 'the disciples came to him privately' (Mt. 24:3) there, once more, and sought additional information. 'And Jesus answered them' (Mt. 24:4-44). The teaching that ensued was delivered to them all, once more, quite transmissively, as Jesus imparted, albeit at length, the knowledge they required.

Mark relates, by contrast, that it was, once again, only specific persons who, confidentially, asked the follow-on question – namely, Simon Peter, Andrew, James and John. Jesus' response was thus, initially at least, addressed to them, personally – 'And Jesus began to say to them' (Mk. 13:5). However, in Mark's formulation, he did not conclusively answer their query (so, Cole, 1961, pp. 198-199); he only 'began to say' when it would happen. From the Gospel of Matthew's perspective, then, the Teacher is the unassailable authority on his subject; while, under the, apparently more constructivist, learning model of Mark, it is not essential for the teacher-facilitator to always provide the full, indisputable answer to learners' questions.

Finally, we can examine the women's visit to the empty tomb, as an example of learning from the end of the gospels. In Matthew Chapter 28, when the Marys went to the tomb, a supernatural 'angel' had descended (Verse 2), with great dramatic effect, and dealt with the stone at its mouth. This messenger of God instilled terror into everyone present (Verses 4, 5) and delivered his instructions in a didactic manner, for example, ending with (Verse 7), 'Lo, I have told you'.

That account contrasts strikingly with the material of Mark (16:5-7), in which a young man – not a Matthean 'angel', *pace* Morris (1961, p. 333) – speaks his truth in a normal voice, sitting calmly in the tomb. In Mark's representation of this message it is, 'as he told you'. Linking new information to prior learning this way, once more, evokes a, to some degree, constructivist approach to teaching. Matthew, on the other hand, introduces into the proceedings, here, in the form of that awe-inspiring, 'bearer of God's specific commands' (Douglas, Hillyer, & Wood, 1962, ANGEL), an air of personal and positional authority, in order to transmit the knowledge of Jesus effectively.

Luke's narrative at the tomb (in Chapter 24) is more faithful to the Markan report than Matthew's, in that it also does not, explicitly, invoke supernatural powers. Despite Morris' view (Morris, 1961, p. 333), again, that Luke's two characters in the sepulchre 'are evidently to be understood as angels' – it was the women who interpreted them as such (in Verse 23) – as Marshall (1994, Lk. 24:1-12 The empty tomb) emphasises, the Lukan messengers were, once more, ordinary people, only wearing bright clothes.

Although two men are claimed to have been present (in Lk. 24:4), in practice they spoke with one voice (Verses 5-7). They offered the visitors the same explanation of Jesus' absence (Verse 6) as Mark's 'young man', also by reference to his followers' existing knowledge; however, Luke's messengers gave the women no direct instructions, unlike those in the

other two accounts (Mk. 16:7; Mt. 28:7). Luke, therefore, seems, yet again, to avoid instructional teaching elements.

Nevertheless, in Luke (24:9), the women returned and shared this information with all Jesus' disciples – an event which is absent from both Matthew and Mark (omitting the disputed 'endings') – suggesting that the unity of the community of believers is still strong, as this gospel draws to a close. Indeed, while Matthew (Mt. 28:1) mentions just the two Marys visiting the tomb, and Mark adds only Salome (Mk. 16:1), there was a whole group of women involved in Luke's account (Lk. 24:10).

Tannehill (1996, pp. 350-351) remarks on this further change of number, though he does not seem to consider why this amendment from Mark's account was introduced. In Luke, then, the women's understanding of the Resurrection occurred during their group activities, whereas within the other synoptic gospels, to the extent it happened at all, it was a much less communal process. Once again, learning occurs in the Gospel of Luke, essentially through participation in the practices of the community concerned.

Nonetheless, in Matthew's gospel the Marys immediately 'ran to tell his disciples' what they had learnt (Mt. 28:8). They did not question its validity. Barbieri (1983, p. 92) says, similarly, 'they obeyed the angel's instructions'. Furthermore, the disciples apparently accepted its truth unquestioningly too, for all eleven made the journey to Galilee, exactly as directed (Verse 16). Matthew, evidently, regards this knowledge, then, simply as factual information to be assimilated, given the authority of the ones who delivered it.

In Mark 16, however, the women were stunned by the presence of the young man (in Verse 5) and left the tomb in a perturbed state of mind (Verse 8). It is unclear how much they had understood. Such a staggering revelation was by no means easily grasped – Cole (1961, p.

257) expresses the same idea – nor convincingly directly transmissible to others. From a cognitive view of learning, this is readily appreciated. They ‘fled from the tomb, trembling and bewildered, saying nothing to anyone’ (Verse 8), for an indefinite length of time. Grassmick (1983, p. 193), in the same commentary series (Walvoord & Zuck, 1983) as Barbieri, also recognises that, in contrast to Matthew, at least ‘for a time’, they were, according to Mark, ‘reduced to silence’.

This dichotomy in the gospel texts is, thus, often not considered significant by commentators, although the response of the disciples to these prioritised, expressed wishes of the risen Jesus could have had major consequences for their subsequent faith and ministry. While the women must, eventually, have told the menfolk something of their story, so that it becomes possible to harmonise this part of the various versions, this does not explain why Matthew’s account differs from the Markan original, so radically, in respect of their initial reactions on leaving the tomb.

I suggest this is best understood within the context of Matthew’s different general approach, from Mark, to knowledge acquisition. In the present case, teaching and learning is taking place between the messenger and the recipients of the message. In an, effectively constructivist, conception, such as that which I believe is seen across much of Mark’s gospel, a great deal of mental reorganisation would be required, and it would be expected that such cognitively difficult, novel information would cause the women a, perhaps prolonged, period of disequilibrium. On the other hand, from a much more passive, receptive position on pedagogy, which I propose can be identified throughout the rest of Matthew’s gospel, acceptance of new knowledge, from so authoritative a source, should be immediate and unreserved.

In the Lukan account (Chapter 24), the women followers did convey their experiences ‘to all the rest’ (Verse 9), but, although this group included

some of Jesus' closest female believers, the apostles dismissed their verbal report as 'an idle tale' (Verse 11). Even when, subsequently, 'Jesus himself stood among them' (Verse 36) 'they still disbelieved' (Verse 41), at any rate, partially. It was not until Jesus lived with these men (24:43) and talked to them within their practice as his witnesses (48-49), and they participated in his departure (Verse 51), that they became thoroughly confident of his Resurrection (52-53).

Hence, Luke's variation on the events is also understandable, I submit, in the light of that gospel's approach to learning, on this occasion one of a substantially situated view of its nature. Thus, what the women said to the disciples would have made no sense to them at the time, since they had not, themselves, taken part in that group's activity.

The 'Q' Material

The Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain

I am beginning this textual analytical comparison of Lukan and Matthean parallel material, where these can be regarded as both redactions of the putative 'Q' source tradition, with the Sermons on the Mount and on the Plain. I start with an introductory examination of the context of each sermon.

Various passages in the Sermon on the Mount, within Matthew 5:21 - 7:49, relating to Jesus' strict revision of the law, are also reproduced in Luke. In Matthew's gospel, many such learning objectives begin with the didactic formula, 'it was said...But I say to you' (e.g. 5:21-22, 27-28, 38-41). Once again then, Matthew reports Jesus, in all these case, replacing some existing injunction with another, more demanding one.

Furthermore, Albright and Mann (1971, p. 48) have remarked, with only a little reservation, on this 'undeniable prominence' in Matthew's gospel of the role of 'rewards and punishments'.

Again, in the light of earlier widespread scholarly opinion (e.g., de Ru, 1966) that the heavenly rewards promised in Matthew's gospel are not intended to induce desirable behaviour, Eubank (2013, pp. 84-85) recently concluded: 'the Sermon on the Mount is filled with Jesus' pronouncements on how to acquire heavenly treasure and avoid debts and punishments...it is preposterous to claim the promise of heavenly treasure is not a vital part of the paraenesis.' The characteristic of a behaviourist teaching and learning approach to favour such methods of persuasion has been noted and discussed previously. Thus, throughout most of the following passages from his instructional Sermon, it is concluded that Matthew exhibits a view of teaching representative of pedagogical behaviourism in this respect.

Introduction to the Sermons

Matthew's 'Sermon' compilation begins (Mt. 5:1) with Jesus curtailing his healing activity and withdrawing from the crowds up the mountainside. He sat down, reminiscent of a Jewish preacher in the synagogue preparing to deliver an instructional sermon (Tasker, 1961, p. 59) – presumably emphasising the authority of his teaching – and his disciples (so far we have only heard of the four fishermen) joined him, to absorb his words.

The, much shorter, Sermon on the Plain (in Lk. 6:20-49), starts (17), in contradistinction, by Jesus descending from the hills, with the Twelve, to stand (not sit) amongst the crowd and his many followers, healing and speaking to them (6:17-19). He then addressed his disciples, in the midst of this community activity (20) – talking within the practice of his community.

On Teaching

Luke, alone, goes on to discuss guiding and teaching in the early community of Christ followers. Learners do not have the expertise of

their teachers but, when their learning is completed, they 'will be like' them (6:40), it states. So Jesus is portrayed, here, as presenting the uncomfortable principles of the evolution and reproduction of a CoP – which Lave and Wenger refer to as the continuity-displacement conflict, dividing apprentices from their masters, but 'which is surely part of all learning' (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 114).

The Beatitudes

After the scene setting in Matthew 5:1-2 and Luke 6:17-20a, there follow the Beatitudes, in both gospels. In Matthew (3-10) each such 'Blessing' seems to be a recompense – or a promise of one – offered to people in return for demonstrating some desired attitude or behaviour (Harvey, 1972, p. 241). So that, for example, 'the poor in spirit' attain the kingdom of heaven and 'peacemakers' 'shall be called sons of God'. These first eight statements are delivered to the four listening disciples in a quite non-interactive and impersonal style, in the third person plural and structured in a formatted list.

Not only is Matthew's narrative approach didactic, here, however, but its Beatitudes, together, define a system of positive rewards, which are potentially understandable as incentives to develop exactly those preferred characteristics referred to (Eubank, 2013, pp. 84-85), in an, almost, behavioural manner (e.g. Merrett & Wheldall, 2012, p. 25). Those who 'shall inherit the earth', for instance, are 'the meek' and it is 'the merciful' who, themselves, 'shall obtain mercy', so encouraging and rewarding development of the personal qualities of meekness and compassion.

While Matthew itemises nine Beatitudes altogether, Luke identifies only four. Furthermore, Luke's redaction of the 'Blessed' sayings (in Lk. 6:20-23) contrasts markedly with the Matthean version. Firstly, as was remarked previously, it is directed at the wider community of disciples and delivered within its activities. It is, also, about them, expressed in

the second person plural and dealing with serious social concerns that may well have troubled many of its members (Martin, 1983, p. 220) – literal poverty (20), hunger and sorrow (21), and discrimination (22). It addresses those who are hungry or who weep 'now' – it does not contain any exhortation to make oneself hungry or distraught.

Consequently, I suggest, these statements do not relate, specifically, to how people behave or their characters. The three initial pledges that the Lukan Beatitudes make – that 'the kingdom of God' belongs to the 'poor' among 'you', (Lk. 6:20) and that, in it, 'you who hunger now' 'shall be satisfied' and 'you that weep now' 'shall laugh' (21) – are, apparently, straightforward promises of happiness and deliverance in the coming society of God. This is confirmed in Verses 24-26, with a parallel series of four, converse 'woe' propositions, such as, 'you that laugh now', 'shall mourn'. Evidently, then, there were also some pretty well off people peripherally taking part in this exercise. To these a series of serious warnings are given but there is no apparent attempt at behaviour change involved. The focus in Luke is, rather, on Jesus' forthcoming community of practice.

On Reconciliation

In Verses 21-26 of Matthew Chapter 5, Jesus, seemingly, warns of potentially dire penalties for expressing an antagonistic attitude toward a fellow believer; but even being angry with them renders one 'liable to judgment' (22). Thus, developing undesirable behaviour – in this case the break down of amiable relationships (France, 1994, 5:17-48 Jesus and the law: Notes.) – is discouraged within the group by warnings of severe punishment. Moreover, Verse 23 seems to make the hearer also responsible for reconciliation if their 'brother' has any issue with *them*, and, ultimately, they must even be friendly to an opponent (25).

This latter requirement is illustrated with the passage (Mt. 5:25-26), paralleled in Luke's gospel, about failing to make peace swiftly with your

accuser possibly resulting in the imposition of a lengthy prison sentence, handed down by the authorities. For Matthew, then, the example continues the theme of the serious consequences of persistent, fraternal discord. In Luke (12:58-59), however, Jesus was addressing the crowd (Verse 54), rather than his closest followers, and there is no other reference present to being punished or to forming or preserving friendship. The Lukan context and, hence, its meaning, appear quite different from Matthew's.

In Luke, Jesus had been berating the general populace for their lack of discernment (Lk. 12:56). They did not understand 'the present time' – apparently the presence of Jesus and what he was currently saying to them, his parables and his teaching, presumably including this rebuke itself. That lack of perception was astonishing, though; they had the ability to comprehend, if they wished to. They could predict the weather from the smallest of indicators (54-55), for example.

From Luke then, their problem was not any behaviouristic limit to their mental capacity (Tannehill, 1996, p. 215) but their level of involvement – 'they did not want to see it', as Morris (1961, p. 220, quoting Arndt) puts it. They, similarly, lacked the will to determine from amongst themselves what the right decision was in the current circumstances (Lk. 12:57). The present passage (58-59) therefore urges people to negotiate with one another to reach an equitable, compromise solution to a dispute, in order to avoid having recourse to human, judicial bodies, who may make inappropriate, impersonal and inflexible decisions. A social, or intersubjective, participation in developing a joint knowledge domain thus seems to exemplify Luke's conceptualisation of the shared ownership of knowledge, here.

It seems then that, in Matthew, Jesus sought, with this section of teaching, to develop friendliness, specifically in his followers, one to another, by, once again, stressing the negative consequences of their

neglecting to do so; whereas, in Luke, the same saying is used to encourage the people to a common understanding of the truth, in the light of Jesus – friendship, per se, was not necessary – and to escape the heartless law-enforcement of those in positions of authority. The above analysis is consistent with, on the one hand, Luke's characterisation of learning as the practice of a community, requiring no authority figure, and, on the other, Matthew's implicit assent to the positional power of the teacher and the threat of retribution as effective instruments in the teaching and learning process.

Matthew's Sermon goes on (Mt. 5:27-28), following the last parable, to repeat that very transmissive formula, 'it was said...But I say to you', with respect to the law on adultery and then that on divorce (31-32). Luke's gospel also continues in the same setting as before but introduces two, real-life, fatal incidents (Lk. 13:2; 4), which allow the crowd, collectively, to put into practice Jesus' challenge to them to come to their own social and theological conclusions (Tannehill, 1996, p. 216).

Moreover, Luke precedes this section with Jesus' teaching on division. According to Matthew (10:34-36), Jesus would be the cause of disunity within the home – 'a man against his father...a daughter against her mother', and so on (35). Luke also recognises the potential that the lifestyle change – when a person chose to become a follower – had, to fracture their family relationships, however much this idea jarred with a model of ideal community. It was a regrettable, but unavoidable, fact of the faith (Martin, 1983, p. 239). By leading from this saying into the next (54-59), Luke appears to use it to justify the schism that was opening up between those who would 'judge...what is right' and follow the way of Jesus, and the others, who would rely on the existing Jewish institutions – and suffer for it.

Finally, the Gospel of Luke concatenates these passages with a sentence also found in Matthew 16:3, namely, 'You know how to interpret the

appearance of the sky' – presumably, in Matthew's case, a humorous, literal response to the Pharisees' and Sadducees' request for 'a sign from the heaven' (1) (Tasker, 1961, p. 155) – 'but you cannot interpret the signs of the times'. Luke, however, avoids Matthew's implication that the hearers do not have sufficient intelligence for such discrimination, by structuring the text as a rhetorical question (Lk. 12:56). As Bock (1994, p. 235) implies, in Luke's version the people in the crowd were simply not paying enough attention.

Morris (1961, p. 220), can find 'no obvious connection' between the later Lukan passages (Lk. 12:54-59) here, regarding reconciliation, and those, on social disintegration (49-53), before them. It seems to me, however, that, given that this gospel often exhibits a community of practice, situative approach to learning, it is understandable that it recognizes the enormous historical significance of that moment in Verse 56. It was the disturbing, turning point at which traditional, kinship-based Jewish communities (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1992, p. 244) would begin to break down (52-53), as different members of them took opposing positions on the person and teaching of Jesus.

Jesus was, emphatically, anxious to get this incendiary process started (Lk. 12:49), Luke tells us, and appears frustrated that the great majority of the crowd were not engaging more enthusiastically with it (56). However, it did not end there. Whilst past allegiances were to be severed, others would be formed, as members of different families made the choice to join together in Jesus' new fellowship. Old family rivalries and antagonisms between them would then have to be resolved, if learning about the faith could only continue, for each, when they remained actively involved within that developing community of his followers.

Moreover, if any such disagreement were taken before the legal authorities, one of the contenders might well suffer, catastrophically. I suggest, then, that many of the new community participants would have

urgently needed to arrive at novel, mutual understandings, between themselves (Lk. 12:58-59). This could be successfully achieved, with some application, but Jesus' audience were, currently, showing little inclination to make the necessary effort (57).

On Divorce and Remarriage

In Matthew, the section of the Sermon on the Mount relating to divorce (5:31-32) sits between that on adultery and that concerning swearing an oath. Both of those are highly prescriptive passages, so that it seems reasonable to regard this one as an implicit instruction, too. It compares Jesus' directive teaching on the subject with that in current practice.

Luke's version of his words on divorce and remarriage (16:18), by contrast, is again descriptive and is placed in the midst of the activities of Jesus and his community – teaching the disciples (16:1), telling parables (19) and disputing with the Pharisees (14-15). Actually, only Verse 18b of Luke Chapter 16 appears to come from the same source as Matthew's Sermon (Mt. 5:32b); 18a seems to reflect Mark's variant (Mk. 10:11) more closely.

While Matthew's passage is unremarkable, then, Luke's setting is described by Tannehill (1996, pp. 250-251) as 'puzzling'. He suggests it may imply that the Pharisees' false teaching, permitting men quick and easy divorce, promoted adultery. However, this does not appear to be Luke's main concern, as it has no parallel section to that of Matthew (5:27-30) specifically condemning adulterous behaviour. It seems, rather, to be included as a prime example of a much more general complaint against them – that they 'justify [them]selves before men' (Lk. 16:15) (Bock, 1994, p. 268), sanitising, and making appear socially acceptable, actions that aim to evade or circumvent God's law, in order to enhance their own respectability.

The Pharisees, Jesus appears to argue, were among those who were 'forcing their way into [the kingdom]' (16:16b) that he was declaring, by trying to adjust its entry requirements to their own preferred standards. The present passage illustrated this: if a man or woman desired to take a different marriage partner, the Pharisees' lax divorce laws made it perfectly legal and proper to do so, although, he maintained, it remained adultery in God's eyes (Martin, 1983, p. 247).

Seen this way, Luke uses what is a stricture on divorce in Matthew to record Jesus launching a verbal assault on incompetent, self-promoting teachers. This Lukan suspicion of directive teaching would fit with the situative view of learning, which discounts didactic teaching approaches, insisting that knowledge acquisition can only occur by participation in the CoP possessing that knowledge. In delivering his criticism here, Luke links the current passage to one from the Sermon on the Mount warning against the love of money (Mt. 6:24), another trait which the Pharisees were accused of exhibiting (Lk. 16:13-14).

On Loving Enemies

Following on in Luke (6:27-36), the Sermon continues with further moral teaching. The thrust of it seems plain enough. It is an appeal to go beyond the principle of reciprocity (e.g. Moum, Schaefer, & Collett, 2007, pp. 199-217) in social relations and to adopt an altruistic disposition. However, Matthew starts, each time, with a well-known commandment, such as 'a tooth for a tooth', and replaces it with another, namely – 'Do not resist (the) one who is evil'.

Thus, while he persists with his theme of evil forces (Mt. 5:41), Matthew compiles a new set of rules for believers' behaviour – albeit one which 'passes beyond behaviour specifically punished by law to the kind of heart that generates [it]' (Keener, 1997, p. 114). This characteristic of a behaviourist methodology was supposedly spoken, by Jesus, to the four disciples, in the directive format, 'But I say to you...' (e.g. 5:38).

Luke, on the other hand, has Jesus address 'you that hear' – his teaching is not instruction for the inner group of initiates, then, but for anyone joining in, who wishes to learn about his approach to life (Tannehill, 1996, p. 116). Luke's emphasis, here, tends to be on those who have been despised, insulted (Lk. 6:27-28) or robbed (29-30) – once again, offences against the person – rather than on forces of evil or oppression.

Both versions express the novel law of loving enemies (Mt. 5:44; Lk. 6:27). Matthew, however, appears to invoke Premack's principle (Premack, 1959, pp. 219-233) of positive reinforcement, to effect this change of behaviour– 'Love your enemies...so *that* you may become sons of your Father in heaven' (44-45) (my emphases). Luke does recognise the 'great', intrinsic reward of becoming 'the sons of the Most High' but this, he stresses, demands doing good 'expecting nothing' (35) back – to reiterate the main import of both the two previous verses.

In Luke's account, then, Jesus dwells on the valued practices of his emergent community – showing love, doing good and lending to one another. Tannehill (1996, pp. 119-120), again, also relates Jesus' practical love of all, even enemies, to the probable everyday experiences of the, often very varied, Lukan Christian communities. Lastly, where Matthew ends this section with the, rather over-optimistic, 'You, therefore, must be perfect' (Mt. 5:48), Luke seems to accept the obvious impracticability of that aim and redacts it to the more realistic, unity building objective, 'Be merciful' (Lk. 6:36).

The Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer also falls into this category of 'Q' tradition sayings. In Luke, it is found in Chapter 11, following the return of the seventy missionaries and the Parable of the Good Samaritan, and succeeded by the casting out of the dumb demon in Verse 14. It lies here, therefore, in the heart of the practice of the community of Jesus and his followers.

Jesus was 'praying in a certain place' (11:1) and the disciples – presumably that larger trainee group – were with him, which both identifies praying as a characteristic activity of the group and induces one of them to ask him to teach them what to pray. This communal nature of Luke's version of the prayer is, similarly, pointed up by Bock (1994, pp. 202-206).

In Matthew, the Prayer occurs in the middle of the Sermon on the Mount – in the midst of a series of didactic instructions on behaviour, rewards (France, 1994, 6:1-18 Religion and its rewards.) and punishments – addressed, most probably, to a select few of Jesus' followers, in a section devoted to the proper practice of praying. It precedes related passages on forgiveness and on fasting. Matthew has Jesus introduce the model prayer, then, under the unsurprisingly terse rubric, 'Pray then like this' (6:9). It was, therefore, I assume, another directive on discipular conduct.

In Luke's account, Jesus said, rather, 'When you pray, say' (6:2) – not stating a command to pray at any particular time, therefore, more giving a description of what praying, when it is undertaken, should comprise. The Lukan model is short and quite simple, with little new in it. It seems to be merely the bare bones of a prayer.

Jesus addressed the 'Father', as he normally did (e.g. 10:21) and gave him honour in exactly the words from Matthew, although it is not clear that the two accounts emphasize the same connotations of that title – Tannehill (1996, p. 188) points out it signified both love and authority in the home. He then prayed, 'Thy kingdom come.' The coming of the kingdom of God was precisely the theme of the mission of the seventy and the essence of Jesus' preaching (10:9) (Martin, 1983, p. 235). For Luke, this sentence needed no further elaboration.

Matthew, however, rarely refers to the 'kingdom of God', preferring 'kingdom of heaven', and in this version it therefore becomes necessary, it seems, to explain what was meant by it (Tasker, 1961, p. 72). It expressed, God's will 'done, on earth as it is in heaven' (6:10). Apparently, then, it was his heavenly kingdom – his divine sovereignty – becoming accepted on the earth. Once again, while Luke is concerned with the building of the society of God, I propose, Matthew is focused on the acceptance of his authority.

Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer continues with the words, 'Give us this day our daily bread' (6:11). By asking for food only on that specific day, then, this prayer was very tightly time-bound – bread had to be consumed quickly or it would go stale or mouldy. So, within days, the request would have to be made again – 'Give us *this* day our daily bread' – for the next day or two. The emphasis is in the original text (Keener, 1997, p. 143). Matthew intends the model to be repeated, on a frequent and regular basis, it appears then. This gospel envisages it being prayed routinely. Behaviourists favour routine repetition of desired activity – it develops positive and beneficial habits. The structure of this version of the petition would encourage just such an outcome.

Luke renders the same verse, 'Give us each day our...bread...' (11:3) – in the continuous present tense (Morris, 1961, p. 194), that is, 'Keep giving us each day...'. In this case, the occasional use of the prayer model would suffice – in fact repeating it often would be excessive. This is a redaction that would reflect a group who prayed without requiring any great incentive to do so. They were, presumably, envisioned as readily carrying out Jesus' teaching on lifestyle and behaviour. The next section (11:4) corroborates this. Luke's version asks for forgiveness of sins, 'for we ourselves forgive every one...' They were, quite generally, a forgiving community, it apparently assumes, so that they could confidently request to be forgiven themselves.

This contrasts with Matthew's prayer pattern, which seeks pardon, 'as we also have forgiven our debtors' (Mt. 6:12) (Barbieri, 1983, p. 32). Such a statement demands a reviewing of those once indebted to you, immediately before the prayer is spoken, so that it can honestly be asserted that you have, indeed, forgiven them – and if it is found otherwise, the supplicant would have to do some serious pardoning before proceeding. This review of forgiving needs to be done continually, before each recitation of the Lord's Prayer, which, itself, should be reiterated practically daily. This means more repeating of valued behaviour – this time to forgive the offences of other people – thus fostering more habitual, good practice.

Both versions then plead not to be led into temptation – or the time of trial; but Matthew's, only, ends with, 'but deliver us from [the] evil [oppressor]' – returning once more to his particular anxiety about this force of persecution in the world. The 'evil oppressor' is the one who, in the Parable of the Soils (Mt. 13:19), denies spiritual understanding to less able learners. In this case, the disciple seeks salvation from trials and difficulties for which this 'evil one', despite God's guidance, seems to be responsible. By contrast to Tasker (1961, p. 72), who regards this last clause as a supplementary clarification of the previous one, however, I suggest it is a primary component of that compound sentence.

By not including that last line, Luke (in 11:4b) shifts the emphasis of the whole verse. It now seems to read, following Tannehill (1996, p. 188), that a testing time, perhaps brought about by God, is a real possibility for the disciple, and should be fervently prayed about. In Luke alone, Jesus has already discussed, again within the Parable of the Soils (Lk. 8:13), that to 'fall away', or withdraw, I have suggested from the group of believers, in the face of a 'time of trial', is one of the most prevalent dangers threatening a follower's spiritual development. If learning is inherent in the practice of the community, as a situative view presupposes, then to drop out of it would be catastrophic for the learning

process and, thus, the learner should take all measures possible to avoid this happening.

Finally, Matthew is at pains to explain further the prerequisite for forgiveness and does so in two parallel statements – one positive and rewarding, the other negative and punishing – in Verses 14 and 15. These propositions express, in very behaviouristic ‘if...then’ contingencies, that the Father will pardon the petitioner, if and only if, they also forgive others.

There is no need, nor any place it seems, in the Gospel of Luke’s conceptual framework, for these, behaviourist pedagogic methods, however. People learnt to pray and to forgive others by living within a praying, giving and forgiving community, I infer. Luke concludes with two parables about neighbourhood and family communities that, as a matter of course, excuse and respond to their members, and where learning to ask, and to expect to receive, takes place naturally – ‘For everyone who asks receives’ (11:10) in such relationships, it records Jesus as saying. The second of these illustrations is practically a direct replication of the text (Mt. 7:7-11) in Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount, where, however, it is non-contextualized.

On Transmitting Light

In Chapter 11 (33-36), Luke includes two further pieces from Matthew’s Sermon. The second of these, from 6:22-23, refers to the eye as the source of light to the body. In Matthew, this idea comes at a point where Jesus is instructing the disciples on seeking heavenly riches. The perception – represented here, as Tannehill (1996, p. 196) concludes, by the ‘eye’ – is either distinct, in which case reception of God’s kingdom truths (Keener, 1997, p. 149) will readily occur through it, or seriously hindered, when what floods in is dark incomprehension; and ‘How dark is that?’ he comments.

Such a, literally, black or white view of cognitive ability, while consistent with a behaviouristic approach to cognition, would not sit well within a situative model of learning. Luke, however, appends the saying to one taken from early in Matthew's Sermon (Mt. 5:15), which suggested there that the disciples should act as beacons of good practice to others (14-15).

This rather pedagogic idea is not made use of in Luke, either, but that saying was similar to one used following Luke's Parable of the Soils, where it seemed to imply that Jesus' words were shedding illumination on the secrets of the kingdom. In that interpretation, it was *Jesus* – not any of his apostles – who stood like a 'lamp' 'on a stand' (Lk. 11:33), so that 'those who enter may see the light' (8:16), and so it appears to be here – Lk. 11:30 relating the passage to 'the Son of Man'; thus anyone who entered his social sphere could receive enlightenment from his teaching. So, also, concludes Bock (1994, p. 214).

Luke also emphasises, much more positively than Matthew, in the subsequent parable, the spiritual brilliance, as from such a lamp, that is, generally, possible (Lk. 11:36) to a learner. This gospel also replaces the Matthean reference to the terrible depth of absolute uncomprehending darkness (Mt. 6:23b), which serves to heighten the binary nature of the passage, with a warning to guard against what seems to be light but is, in fact, dark, and, I argue, this emerges, in part at least, as the real point of the comparison (Lk. 11:35). Matthew's non-understanding has become, in Luke's version, the less absolute *misunderstanding*. The passage leads into an encounter with a Pharisee, which permits Jesus, once again, to illustrate mistaking such false learning for truth.

On Not being Anxious

The teaching on not being anxious, found in the Sermon on the Mount account in Matthew 6:25-34, is reproduced in Luke at 12:22-31. It instructs those in need of the necessities of life to seek, rather, spiritual

possessions. The earlier passage, in Mt. 6:19-21, which treats those who could amass 'treasures on earth', advises them, instead, to accrue heavenly riches. Luke may, however, imply that the former group deserves more support than Matthew's version of Jesus' words seemed to offer and that the latter required further encouragement.

Luke's answer to the implicit question of how seeking the kingdom *could* meet physical needs, then – *how* 'these things shall be yours as well' (12:31) – seems to be, that those who could afford to, would not store up a worldly fortune but would release it for the poor, and so 'provide [them]selves with...a treasure in the heavens' (12:33). It has the passage about 'anxiety' preceding that on 'treasure' and coupled to it by only a short, transitional text, namely: 'Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell your possessions and give alms' (32-33a).

This link, therefore, seems to sum up the Lukan vision for the social principles of the believers' communal life – that the well off would donate their resources to support the poorer members, as Moxnes (1988, pp. 113-123) also argues, and thus the whole 'little flock' – the incipient community of followers of Jesus – would, simultaneously, develop in kingdom wealth and materially cater for each other. Hence, participation in the Jesus community's caring practices would constitute its members' spiritual growth – a principle very consonant with that of a situative approach to learning.

On Not Judging

The subsequent prohibition on judging in Matthew (7:1) – 'Judge not' – is immediately modified to assume justice would, indeed, be dispensed; and Matthew's application of the logion – common to Mark – 'the measure you give will be the measure you get (back)' (Mk. 4:24b; Mt. 7:2b; Lk. 6:38b), is given next as, 'with the judgement you pronounce you will be judged'. That is to say, the sentence that you exact is the standard that

will be applied to you (*cf.* 7:2b) – ‘the law of retribution’ (Harvey, 1972, p. 40) (i.e., you’ll be done by as you do – sometimes referred to as the reverse of the Golden Rule).

The proscription ‘Judge not...’ in Luke (6:37), however, is softened to ‘forgive, and you will be forgiven’ and, in the next verse, to ‘give and it will be given to you’ – in good measure (38). In Luke, then, it appears that this is the implication of that sentence (Verse 38b) shared with Mark – that the magnanimity with which you give is the degree to which you will receive back – the law of ‘reciprocity’ (Morris, 1961, p. 132) (i.e., you’ll get back what you give).

Whereas Matthew’s concern, then, seems to be with instructing, and modifying the behaviour of, those who must make decisions within the Christ based communities – to induce them to do so in an equitable fashion and from a position of mercy and humility – Luke’s focus is, apparently, once more, on building up the fellowship of believers, through development of reciprocal giving and forgiving.

Parable of the Speck and the Log

Luke then has the ‘Judge not...’ passage followed by a block of sayings on teaching. After warning about dangerous ‘blind guides’, who mislead their novices, and reminding that any learner will, eventually, attain to the knowledge and expertise of their teacher, the gospel seems to pursue this topic further with the parable of the Speck and the Log (Lk. 6:41-42). The narrative has, thus, appeared quite suspicious of teachers in 6:39-40 – verses which Harvey (1972, p. 242) finds ‘enigmatic’ and ‘mysterious’ but whose tone is, in fact, readily comprehensible, when viewed from a situative, practice-based perspective on learning, which deprecates didactic teaching. It becomes more disparaging yet, in this latest pericope.

The context of this parable is the fellowship of believers, who address each other as 'Brother' (Lk. 6:42). The kind of person Luke describes would correct the minutiae of a fellow community member's mistakes, while not seeing the much greater errors they commit themselves. It seems the 'log' of this person's own failings conceals their very existence from them.

Although Tannehill (1996, p. 122) thinks that having this unrecognised impediment pointed out might make the brother 'less likely to judge others', the Lukan text is actually disconnected from any saying concerning judging or condemning, and its stated object is to exhort the person to remove that 'log', so that they can, indeed, rectify the other's flaw, with perspicacity (42). Marshall (1994, 6:39-49), also, refers this section specifically to teaching. The Lukan passage can therefore be seen as reinforcing a critical situated learning approach to pedagogues.

In Matthew's version (Mt. 7:3-5), contrastingly, very much the same content follows directly upon the verses on judgment (1-2). There is little reason to doubt, then, that it refers, there, to one who disapproves of some small character trait or behaviour of another and wishes to set them right on it, but who exhibits far worse personality faults themselves (Tasker, 1961, p. 79). The passage would, thus, represent further behaviour management of those who find themselves in positions of authority amongst believers.

On Entering by the Narrow Gate

While some disconnected elements of the Sermon on the Mount, then, become, in Luke, occasions for Jesus to make a significant point, most appear there, together, evidently in order to explain or illustrate each other. The Parable of the Narrow Gate has a very pass or fail appearance, in Matthew 7:13-14 – 'those who find it are few' and many enter, by the wide gate, to destruction. In Luke (13:23-24), when someone asked

Jesus if only a few would be saved, He, similarly, replied, 'Seek to enter by the narrow door; for many...will not be able'.

Here, however, Luke seems to be designed not to leave the reader with the impression that this widespread inability to 'enter' was due to people being unable to find the way (so, Tasker, 1961, p. 82), attributable, perhaps, to the limited intrinsic level of their capability, as Matthew may well suggest in stressing that this 'way' was not 'easy' for many.

Luke redefines the narrow entry to be a 'door' (Lk. 13:24) and almost immediately has Jesus' narrative slide into the later passage in Matthew, on deception (Mt. 7:21-23), via a reference to the 'householder' who 'has risen up and shut the door'. The lack of ability of many people to get inside, then, was not due to being intellectually unable to find the way in, but because, when they got there, they were not recognised and the entrance was closed to them.

In Matthew, these individuals were barred because of their undisciplined manner (7:22-23). Jesus explained (following Knox, 1946; Tasker, 1961, p. 84) that, 'It is not the people who say "Lord, Lord"' to him 'who shall enter the kingdom of heaven'. These people, it seems, acted like badly behaved schoolchildren, clamouring for the teacher's attention – calling 'Sir! Sir!' – and claiming privileges for having successfully carried out the tasks set. They were condemned for engaging in lawlessness (24) – presumptuous and disorderly conduct, before the Master. They did not recognise his unique authoritativeness (Keener, 1997, p. 166).

This neglect of respect for authority is, apparently, not Luke's main consideration, however. Perhaps those who had done 'many mighty works' in Jesus' name (Mt. 7:22) should be regarded as deserving of better treatment – they had, at least, taken part in the practices of the community of followers. Luke records the words of the *personae non-gratae* as, 'You taught in our streets' (Lk. 13:26). These people, then,

knew very well *about* Jesus but had declined to be more than peripherally involved with him. They were dismissed as workers of iniquity – perpetrating acts of gross unfairness, perhaps including implying that they had participated in his kingdom activities, when, in reality, they had not but had left it all to others.

Furthermore, whereas within Matthew the gate 'leads to life' (Mt. 7:14), in Luke the door gives access to the kingdom of God (Lk. 13:28), and it was, then, to this divine society that the excludees had no right of admission. This situation permitted Jesus another opportunity to review the attendance at the forthcoming 'Great Feast' (13:30) and to remark, once again, of those who believed themselves most worthy (Marshall, 1994, 13:22-30), that 'some are first who will be last'.

The Test of Goodness

In Lk. 6:43-45, Luke seems to prosecute its assessment of contemporary teaching toward its completion. 'For...' the narrative repeats four times (43, 44a, 44b, 45), evidently conjoining this section firmly to the previous one (Lk. 6:41-42), which, it is proposed here, is on that particular topic. For instance, 'For...nor again', it records that Jesus declared, 'does a bad tree bear good fruit' (43). Marshall (1994, 6:43-45), again, comments, 'Only the person whose heart is richly stored with good will bring forth good teaching'.

Leaving aside the almost tiresome repetition of this analogy and its questionable universal applicability – brambles, for example, can be pretty vicious plants but yield delicious soft fruit – the core meaning of this section is fairly plain, I suggest. A narrow-minded, brutal and pedantic teacher will result in a poor learning experience and I regard the gospel as challenging the teaching methods of the cruel, traditional pedagogue in the words, 'for out of the [evil] abundance of the heart his mouth speaks' (Lk. 6:45).

Matthew has some similar words (in Mt. 7:16-19) but this gospel associates them with people referred to as 'false prophets' (15). Presumably, then, Matthew's issue relates to individuals who claimed to speak with divine authority but opposed the official teachings of Jesus and his Apostles. They were 'advocates of the broad way' (Barbieri, 1983, p. 34) that Jesus had just deprecated in the previous verses, or they ignored Jesus' Golden Rule of love (12) in their treatment of others. This would, naturally, conflict with behaviourism's fundamental assumption of the right of the appointed teacher to control and provide all valued knowledge.

These imposters appeared to be genuine 'sheep' when they first arrived Matthew explains, but they harbour rapacious, ulterior motives. The gospel warns that 'the bad tree bears evil fruit' (Mt. 7:17) and this is how the charlatans can be identified within the 'flock' (16) – their interventions will bring dreadful consequences. Matthew adds that such a tree is chopped down and burnt (19), threatening them with a horrible death as their punishment for persisting in their unacceptable behaviour (France, 1994, 7:13-27 True and false discipleship).

Hearers and Doers of the Word

Both chapters – Matthew 7 and Luke 6 – end with the parable of The House Built on a Rock (Mt. 7:24-27; Lk. 6:47-49). The accepted moral of the story is, again, famously well known – faith, established firmly by obeying the words of Jesus, will withstand the storms of life but that resting on superficial grounds will, comprehensively, collapse at the first onslaught. However, the reason for doing what he says (Lk. 6:45; Mt. 7:24), as opposed to just agreeing with it, is different in the two gospels.

In Matthew, whoever carries out Jesus' teaching, 'does the will of [his] Father' in heaven, and, thus, 'shall enter the kingdom of heaven' (Mt. 7:21). Moreover, those who merely invoke his name, without doing so, will, ultimately, be dismissed as 'wrongdoers' (22-23). Thus there is here

a 'division on the basis of behaviour', as France (1994, 7:13-27) again puts it, and, apparently, an evident ethos of 'reward and punishment' at work once more in justifying this principle.

Throughout the Sermon, then, Matthew has promoted the prize, for faithful obedience to the teachings of Jesus and his Apostles, as a place in the imminent kingdom of heaven, and pronounced the penalty for dissent to be permanent exclusion from it. The subsequent parable, I suggest, is 'then' or 'therefore' (Mt. 7:24) a pair of similes illustrating the same sentiment once again.

Luke, on the other hand, does not include most of Matthew's preamble, so it seems natural to assume that this passage continues to illustrate Luke's critical manner toward the contemporaneous practice of teaching and learning. The rationale for practising what has been learnt could, then, be presumed to lie purely in the story itself (Lk. 6:47). Those who do put it into practice will develop a resilient framework of understanding and belief (48) – it 'will mean being able to stand up in the trials of life' (Bock, 1994, p. 130), whereas those who listen but do not apply their new knowledge will find it fails them, catastrophically, when they need it most (49).

Dewey (e.g. Jones, 1994, p. 47) is acknowledged, pre-eminently, as having established the importance, in present-day teaching, of just such practical, vocational involvement of the learner with the subject matter – in fact, learning by, what he called, 'doing and making'. The parable of the Wise and Foolish Builders, I propose, can, therefore, be seen as the final example, in Luke's Sermon, of this gospel's unfavourable attitude toward conventional pedagogy. From a situated learning perspective, passive reception of taught information is unsatisfactory. It leads to surface knowledge and understanding that is shallow and insecure. Deep, solid and enduring learning is engendered only through active

participation within the practices of Jesus and his community of disciples and followers.

End of the Sermon

Finally, Matthew ends the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 7:28-29) with a remark about the astounding authority of Jesus as Teacher. The text hints that the general public had, also, been overhearing parts of the address and it emphasises how authoritative they regarded his teaching, in accord with behaviourist expectations. In the Sermon on the Plain, Luke (6:17) has made the reader aware from the start that 'a great multitude of people from all Judea and Jerusalem', and even further afield, were within hearing distance and this version finishes with another reminder that Jesus' 'sayings' were 'in the hearing of the people' (7:1). There is no reference at all to the audience's response, though, and the narrative moves swiftly into Jesus' next practical activity, situated within the local community (in Verse 2).

Much material thought to be part of the 'Q' tradition source (The International Q Project, 1996), such as the teaching on serving two masters and that on anxiety (Mt. 6:24-34), while placed in a different context, is reproduced in Luke essentially verbatim from Matthew's version. There are noticeable differences in others of the passages, however, which are taken here as Lukan redactions of the Matthean original. This includes a number of Jesus' parables, which will be considered next. I start with the Parable of the Leaven.

The Parable of the Leaven

The Parable of the Leaven is situated, in Matthew 13, at the end of a sequence of analogical stories apparently concerning the growth of the kingdom of heaven. Jesus got into a boat, it says (2), and addressed a great crowd; his disciples were with him, as well (12:49). According to Mt. 13:3, 'He told [the crowd] many things in parables.'

However, Matthew also informs the reader that the use of parable was, 'because seeing they do not see...nor do they understand' (13:13). This imbues the whole teaching episode with a very transmissive feel – the Teacher instructed the crowd, who, largely, did not understand what they were being told. Indeed, Jesus had to explicate most of it, privately, to his disciples, in plain language, afterwards, because of its perceived obscurity.

The address began with the Parable of the Soils, discussed earlier. There followed the, notably binary, parable of the Wheat and the Tares; then, that of the Mustard Seed and this very short one about Leaven were appended. Mustard has a tiny seed that grows into a luxuriant plant, it is explained (in Mt. 13:32), just as the kingdom, which would spread vigorously, throughout the known world and encompass a great transnational people (Tasker, 1961, pp. 137-139), was beginning with a diminutive, apparently inconsequential, band of cognoscenti.

The immediately subsequent vignette in Matthew (Chapter 13 Verse 33) seems to reflect the same conception. Barbieri (1983, p. 51) also draws attention to the fact that, once started, the permeation process could not be stopped 'till [the dough] was all leavened'. Once again, then, Matthew relates this as a parable, which Jesus 'told' the crowd and simultaneously his own disciples, in an instructional manner, about the inexorable growth of his new society, but that the great majority of those listening heard without understanding.

Luke also recognises the correlation between these latter two parables, despite the Mustard Seed story having been apparently redacted from a Markan account and the Leaven one deriving from the 'Q' tradition, and places them together, in the same configuration as Matthew. However, the context in which this gospel has them arise is very different from Matthew's, and their implication, consequently, subtly changed. In Luke's

Gospel, Chapter 13, Jesus was travelling from Galilee toward Jerusalem, with his apostles, and 'he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath' (10). It does not say that his disciples were present too, but it would have been most unusual if they had not been.

There was a woman there with a back problem and Jesus immediately healed her, in Verse 12 of Luke Chapter 13. This caused a controversy, since the ruler of the synagogue viewed healing on the Sabbath as a violation of the Law (14). These two parables were issued, in Luke's gospel, as a consequence of that opposition to this, supposedly illegal, practice of Jesus and his community, as Verse 18 makes clear.

Now (in Chapter 13 Verse 21) Luke compares the coming kingdom to leaven, which a woman has appropriated a little of – it does not need to say where from – and secreted inside her own bread mix, to start it rising – she 'took and hid' it. Evidently, she was doing something distinctly *clandestine*, then, but only 'till it was all leavened', when she could return the leaven to its rightful place. No lasting damage would be done by this covert act and the bread would be that much more enjoyable for those who ate it. The kingdom of Jesus was like this, too. Pointless and petty legalities would not be permitted to inhibit its work of love and liberation. Bock (1994, p. 244) makes a similar point in relating the yeast to the inchoate community and its earlier Sabbath day healing miracle.

Luke's application of the parable can, therefore, be seen as yet another justification by Jesus of his new community's activities – this time overruling the constricting Sabbath laws in order to perform a loving and compassionate service. Like the yeast in the leaven, Jesus' society will carry on working until even the largest of populations is thoroughly reinvigorated.

Matthew's account continues with further teaching from Jesus, specifically directed toward his disciples, in private. This ends with Jesus checking for

understanding, in Mt. 13:51. The followers reply categorically that they have understood. Barbieri (1983, p. 52) comments that this is 'surprising' because they could not yet have fully appreciated the consequences of their new learning. From a behaviouristic standpoint, however, the learners would be expected to have acquired the knowledge transmitted, if their intellectual capacity was sufficient. This does not mean, though, that it had been well integrated within their existing knowledge frameworks.

Jesus responds (in Mt. 13:52) that a trained expert in the kingdom can draw on both new learning and pre-existing knowledge. There is no suggestion here, then, that old patterns of understanding need any revision. In terms of pedagogical approaches, therefore, in Matthew, novel teaching can be accepted alongside one's prior knowledge schema, immediately and without reconstruction of cognitive frameworks, once again, in a behaviourist manner.

Blind Guides

Moving on through the 'Q' material, Verses 39-41 of Luke Chapter 6, which contain the next parallel verse, are described by Tannehill (1996, p. 121) as 'difficult to interpret'. He suggests linking them to 'judging others', in Verse 37a, but despite his recommendation to 'understand them in context' they have little narrative connection to that passage and no obvious thematic relationship with it either. As mentioned previously, Harvey (1972, p. 242) simply sidesteps Verse 39 as 'certainly enigmatic'. However, when seen through the lens of a situated learning critique of pedagogy, as is suggested here, they appear quite understandable.

Verse 39 of Chapter 6 – 'Can a blind man lead a blind man?' – seems, then, to imply that a teacher or learning facilitator, if they are going to direct the learning of others, must not be misguided in the understanding of their specialism, themselves, or they will founder on its unexpected pitfalls and, thereby, impede their learner's advancement as well – 'Will

they not both fall into a pit?’ Marshall (1994, 6:39-49) makes this point, too.

Verse 41 then seems to stress that, generally, a disciple does not understand nearly well enough to act as instructor to others. Luke’s ultimate concern, therefore, appears to be with the uninterrupted progress of the one being guided – the ‘disciple’ (40) who needs someone able to ‘see clearly to take out the speck in [their] eye’ (42b) and enable them to perceive correctly, too.

In Chapter 15 Verses 11-12 of Matthew’s gospel, Jesus issued this very public warning, ‘what goes into the mouth’ does not defile a person, ‘but what comes out’. This seems to have affronted the Pharisees, although Verses 15-16 indicate that they had not, actually, comprehended what he really meant. What outraged them may have been an assumption that Jesus was, again, denigrating their teaching of the traditions.

Jesus responded, therefore, that they were ‘blind guides’ (15:14). They did not, themselves, understand what they thought they were teaching others; nevertheless, they could, safely, be ignored. They should be simply left to their own devices, as it were, and they would, eventually, be eradicated (13). Then here, in Verse 14, Jesus is said to utter the present parable – ‘And if a blind man guides a blind man, both will fall into a pit’.

Whereas Luke seems to be principally concerned with the novices being steered, then, Matthew’s account is focussed on the uncomprehending guides. Those following will be misled, but they will *both* end up in deep trouble. The Pharisees would be the cause of their own downfall, because they were incapable of accepting the teaching of Jesus. In Matthew, then, with its concept of mental capacity as finite and unalterable, I suggest, such people seemed just not able to grasp the truth of Jesus’ message – as Tasker (1961, p. 149) also notes regarding this passage.

Parable of the Lost Sheep

In Matthew's version of the Parable of the Lost Sheep, the setting is where the disciples asked Jesus who the greatest in the kingdom of heaven is (18:1). Jesus was speaking to his closest followers, then. As related previously, he responded by placing a child in their midst (2). That reference leads, in this Gospel, into a block of sayings about 'little ones'; however, it soon becomes obvious that these 'small people' are not, primarily, children but those who behave 'like a child' (18:4). Initially in the passage, such a 'modest person' refers specifically to one who 'humbles himself' but it seems clear later on, that it is, more generally, any limited individual who is potentially easily led into temptation (6-7).

'Little', then, does not delineate a person's physical stature anymore but, rather, their capacity for independence of thought or action. This impression is reinforced in Verses 8-10a of Chapter 18, where Matthew argues that it is better to be permanently, physically disabled and 'enter life', than to be able-bodied and suffer eternal punishment for sin. As those with monocular vision experience reduced eyesight, then, so some people suffer from restricted insight; but it would be better, in the long run, to be 'one of these little ones, who believe' (Verse 6) than to have a greater intellectual ability that hinders belief.

Once again therefore, this gospel displays a view of individuals as constrained by a fixed ceiling to their ability and potential; and in some, this threshold is markedly lower than for others. Matthew is concerned, then, in the following parable, for these, inherently, poorly intellectually or ethically endowed people, that they should not be victimized (10b). France (1994, 18:10-14) explains, similarly, that Matthew's 'Lost Sheep' story 'was told as a model for the concern' that should be exercised toward such 'less confident or "successful" fellow-disciples'.

The context in Luke (14:25-33) is that Jesus is about the business of community building. He was accompanied by 'great multitudes' (25) as he explained the exacting criteria for discipleship to them. Tax collectors and others marginalised by society were also, peripherally, involved and listening to him (15:1), which puzzled the Pharisees and scribes (2-3) – once again the practices of Jesus and his disciples came under heavy fire; and that caused him to relate the Parable of the Lost Sheep to them.

In Luke, then, the 'lost sheep' was, apparently, an individual who had parted company with his community (Barbieri, 1983, p. 244) and He, Jesus, was working to bring that person back into the 'fold' (Bock, 1994, p. 257). The parable focused on the flock's owner, who 'has lost one' of his sheep. He leaves the others to look after themselves and 'goes after' it 'until he finds it' (14:4). The absent one *will* be found, then – it is the shepherd's responsibility to find it and return it to the ninety-nine others. His great joy is to retrieve the misplaced charge and restore it to the flock.

When the farmer succeeds in this endeavour, he celebrates within his own neighbourhood, as does the society of heaven when someone who has left it repents of their separation from God and re-joins his people (15:7). The whole parable, so far then, is seen, in this way, as about reuniting the missing person with their natural community.

Returning to the Matthean parable, the focus, here, is on the *sheep* – connaturally weak-natured creatures that follow others unthinkingly and need a firm guide – one of which 'has gone astray' (18:12). The owner disregards the remainder to 'go in search of' it. Should he happen to discover the stray – it is not a foregone conclusion that it can be found alive – he rejoices over it. The recovered animal is a greater source of joy to him than the ninety-nine who did not wander off.

Finally, Matthew confirms the parable's meaning as referring to the 'little ones' identified earlier (18:14). It is not God's intention that any one of these, less capable, people – as the wayward sheep in the story was – should become destroyed, not 'even the weakest' (Keener, 1997, p. 286). He will make every effort to rescue them and, therefore, far from disrespecting them, so should Jesus' disciples.

In Luke's application of the parable, however, the point was not that it was a 'sheep' but that its owner had 'lost' it from his number; and Luke immediately continues with a closely analogous story of a coin – one of a collection of ten – which a woman mislaid and searched the house for until she located it (15:9), and then with the Parable of the Prodigal Son, with whom a family lost close contact but who eventually returned and was 'found' again (15:32). Thus, Luke is seen to have retaining the unity of the social group at its heart here. From a situated learning viewpoint, this is considered essential, since, once outside the community of practice, acquiring the community's, specialised, shared knowledge is not possible.

The Parable of the Feast

Variants of this story appear in Matthew Chapter 22 and Luke Chapter 14. In Matthew's Gospel, the section forms part of Jesus' dispute with the Chief Priests and other religious leaders in the Temple. They approached him 'as he was teaching' and asked, 'By what authority are you doing these things and who gave you this authority?' (21:23). Such a challenge to the jurisdiction of the teacher (Barbieri, 1983, p. 69) is a notable issue within a behaviourist view of learning and teaching, since within this perspective the acknowledged instructor is considered the incontestable source of all relevant knowledge.

Although Jesus refused to justify his right to teach there, several parables ensue on the subject of authority – that of a father over his sons (21:28-31), the rights of householders over their belongings (33-41) and then

this one, starting at (22:2), of the king's rule over his subjects. All three highlight the flouting of this command hierarchy and what happens when people defy the established authority system – namely, they lose their 'most favoured people' status (France, 1994, 21:28-22:14). The last, at the wedding feast of the king's son, constituting the highest concentration of power in the country, naturally incurs the greatest penalty – utter destruction (7).

In Mt. 22:3-6, the guests were repeatedly called to the banquet, but they did not care to go. Some even murdered the king's messengers to silence them. The king was, understandably, irate and torched the whole city (7). Tasker (1961, p. 206) argues that these latter verses are 'unnecessary for the exposition of the main truth' of the parable, and therefore, a later gloss; but I suggest, albeit a little hyperbolic, they are perfectly in order, here, from a behaviourist perspective, if its principal moral is that of the consequences of unrelenting opposition to God's words from the teacher, Jesus.

In Luke's case, the context of the story is, on the face of it, a dinner party, hosted by one of the Pharisees, which Jesus attended. There transpires a series of parables around the theme of feasts and banquets, and the present one arises when one guest makes reference to enjoying the great banquet anticipated in the kingdom of God (Lk. 14:15). One can, therefore, take it, with Martin (1983, p. 243), that the parable is meant to illustrate God's coming society and who might, or might not, be present in it, in line with Luke's frequent reference to community membership.

The implication, in Luke 14:21, appears to be that those who were expecting a share in God's kingdom, as were the Pharisees, were excluding themselves from it by their parochial priorities, while the outcasts in society were entering it in their stead. Jesus' community was open to the many but some would not avail themselves of it. In

Matthew's account the king's multiple servants 'gathered' everyone they could find, so that the wedding venue was filled to capacity (Mt. 22:10). The eventual guests were 'both bad and good', reflecting Matthew's very discrete view of human calibre – even those unable to be morally upright were accepted, to make up the numbers.

The room was now full but that was not the end of the story (*contra* Tasker (1961, p. 207), again). When the king inspected it, someone had managed to get in without having a wedding garment on (22:11). This was a varied group of people but they were not the 'poor' of Luke's conception (Lk. 14:21) and, apparently, they had all been told to go home first and turn up properly dressed for the occasion. To have not done so might well be interpreted as another form of rebellion against the royal dictate.

After giving the interloper a chance to explain himself (Mt. 22:12), and discovering that he could not, his king had him, unceremoniously, ejected. While some, by constant rejection of Jesus' teaching authority, will deliberately exclude themselves from the coming kingdom, then, others, who may be anxious to be included – but only on their own terms – would find they were expelled from it.

At the end of Luke's parable, there was still spare room at the feast and the invitation was extended to anyone in evidence (14:23), and we never learn if even that exhausted it. Luke gives a summary, in Verse 24, that, nevertheless, those invited originally would not be offered another invitation – 'I tell you (*plural*)', Jesus reportedly stressed. He then simply 'turned' and we find him immediately addressing the 'great multitudes' of Verse 25, to whom he continued to speak, giving further warnings about not allowing family ties to prevent one from becoming his disciple. Martin (1983, p. 243) notes that, 'The setting then changed' because he 'intended to impress [this] on the people', though he does not discuss how this switch of physical context could have occurred.

Rather, the narrative has smoothly segued, here, from the Pharisee's dinner table to the wider public of Jesus' potential adherents, which, as Tannehill (1996, p. 237) remarks of this new scene, must have included his existing disciples, too; and it, thus, becomes apparent that the Gospel implicitly presumes that the current parable was heard and understood, at least in part, within the normal practice of the community of Jesus and his followers.

The Parable of the Talents or Minas

The Parable of the Talents (in Matthew) or of Minas (in Luke) provides further examples of the gospels' tendencies from a learning perspective. Matthew's variation forms part of the teaching that Jesus gave his disciples in response to their request for information about the culmination 'of the age' and his coming again as 'the Christ' (Mt. 24:3-5).

Before taking a round-trip journey, the man in this story divided up his, quite considerable, assets (around £2m by today's standards) between three servants – so we must assume these employees were supposed to possess some, acknowledged, financial acumen. Treggiari (1975, pp. 48-77) showed that such retainers often exercised managerial responsibilities in the imperial Roman household. The wealth was distributed in the ratio of 5:2:1, 'to each according to his ability' (Mt. 25:15).

In Matthew then, once again, it appears people have a fixed capability or power to achieve (so, Morris, 1961, p. 273). For these three, the parable implies, their capacity for business success could be quantified and standardised, in much the manner of a behavioural geneticist's psychometric measure. By the owner's reappearance, two of the servants had, through trading, it seems, faithfully realised their particular, expected potentials; but the third had not. Matthew's point seems to be then, that Jesus' followers need to be ready when he reappears, to give

an account of their reliability in his service, although their intrinsic levels of ability will be taken into consideration, too, in that final assessment process.

However, in the version from Matthew's account, the two successful traders actually earned their employer the same Return on Investment. Both agents doubled their principal and were commended by their master (in Mt. 25:21, 23) exactly equally for it (France, 1994, 25:14-30 The parable of the talents). Moreover, doubling one's outlay, over 'a long time' period (Verse 19) was not an exceptional financial achievement for the society of the day (Keener, 1993, p. 112). There is little evidence, then, that, in practice, there was a great difference between these servants' commercial abilities within the original story. The concept of the division of the master's wealth in proportion to their capabilities (Verse 15), rather than inhering in the parable, seems to be a feature of Matthew's gospel and its behaviouristic perception of fixed mental capacity.

Luke explains the inspiration for this parable, slightly differently, as the disciples' assumption of the imminent arrival of the kingdom of God (Lk. 19:11), though it also seems to bear some relation to the incident of Zacchaeus renouncing his ill-gotten monetary gains in the previous few verses. In this case, the traveller was of noble birth and left in order to 'receive kingly power' in a distant land (12). He formed a small trading company, comprising ten of his servants, to manage a limited fund (equivalent to around £5k in today's terms) between them, during his absence. It was not his whole estate, by any means, but a notional sum, with which they could all develop some valuable, commercial experience (13).

Luke's concern seems, once again, then, to be with the *learning* that takes place through participation in shared, social activity. In this story, it is by way of joint preparation for the ruler's eventual return, with his

newly acquired regal powers. When this finally comes about, it turns out that the servants had apportioned an equal share of the money to each of the ten participants and the first two had produced substantial financial returns with theirs. The different versions of the parable are distinct, then, in that in Matthew, there is the same return rate on different assets, whereas in Luke there are varied outcomes from the same initial endowment. This distinction was also noted by Brown (1871, Luke 19:11-27. Parable of the Pounds.)

There was, it is true, considerable differentiation in the productivity of Luke's first two participants – a factor of two; however, the narrative does not attribute this to a disparity between their innate capabilities but to the power, given a little work, of *money* – 'your mina' (Lk. 19:16, 18) – to multiply itself (Morris, 1961, p. 275), apparently behaving as a randomly accumulating quantity. Nevertheless, those servants had learnt well and were appointed to govern a proportionate number of the ruler's new cities (17; 19). The king's community was growing in size and in knowledge. In Matthew, by contrast, the high achieving servants were only set, rather vaguely, 'over much' (Mt. 25:21; 23).

Matthew's last servant, although he avoided making any loss, put no effort into the task of creating wealth and made no profit on the single unit of capital for which he was given responsibility. He not only incurred his master's wrath and saw the money given to the first employee, but faced eviction into the 'outer darkness' (Mt. 25:30). According to Matthew, then, there may be a heavy penalty, in terms of exclusion from the kingdom of God (Barbieri, 1983, p. 80), for not trying to attain to your known potential.

In Luke, the third servant was also unproductive, and condemned himself for it (Lk. 19:22), but he stayed part of the group – the integrity of the community continues, apparently, to be strongly evident in this gospel. The apprentice's fate is contrasted (in Verse 27) with that of the ruler's

enemies – those who did not want him as king – who were killed in front of their new monarch. In passing, we are told nothing about how well the remaining seven Lukan servants performed in the training or what became of them, though their fates can, presumably, be imagined to be no worse than that of the third one.

In Matthew, then, the narrative is about servants using their innate intellectual expertise to its maximum capacity, however great that is in each case. It endorses the idea of some retainers being given roles 'in charge of many things' (Mt. 25:21, 23) in the household, while others never could be, and promises a reward for acting productively. Such features fit well with a behaviourist approach to teaching and learning.

Within Luke, however, this is a story about untrained slaves who are given a practical, communal opportunity to develop their aptitudes and rise to exercise their abilities over many others. I suggest, therefore, that this latter version shows that anyone in the community can develop mastery of its resources and depicts, through the destruction of those who would not belong to the nobleman's new kingdom, the downfall of those who would assert their independence from it. These characteristics are thus consistent with a situative view of learning based on participation within a community of serving practice.

Luke's Special 'L' Material

The Nativity Story

Something should be said about the stories surrounding Jesus' birth, in Matthew (1:18-2:23) and Luke (1:3-2:51), although they are very diverse accounts, since some major learning experiences are said to have taken place in these segments. In particular, both the parents of Jesus are reported as coming to terms with his anticipated, supernatural conception, there. Matthew's narrative is almost entirely from the perspective of Joseph, his non-biological father. It is driven by a series of

authoritative instructions, often delivered by an 'angel of the Lord' and received by Joseph in a dream.

In Mt. 1:19, for example, when Mary's pregnancy became known, Joseph had practically decided that the kindest solution was to break off the engagement quietly but, as he slept, the dream-world angel convinced him of Jesus' divine provenance (1:20-21). When he woke up, Joseph 'did as the angel...commanded him' (1:24) and took Mary to be his wife. Evidently, the angel's astonishing information was unquestioningly assimilated, and was actually allowed to overrule Joseph's cognitive reasoning and abruptly reverse his earlier decision.

Subsequently, even the 'wise' astrologers, who visited the babe (in Mt. 2:1), accepted the guidance of the authority within the 'dream', in Matthew, and were persuaded to vary their homeward itinerary (2:12). Matthew's treatment of learning in its nativity story then seems to be consistent with that transmissive-passive receptive model of pedagogy seen through much of the subsequent gospel.

In Luke's gospel, by contrast, the birth and babyhood of Jesus is dealt with very much from the viewpoint of his mother. The narrative is set in the context of the supernatural pregnancy of her relative of advanced years, Elizabeth and Elizabeth's husband, Zechariah. This man had had a message from an angel regarding his infertile wife's impending conception. He, however, did not believe it, and argued with the divine messenger over it (Lk. 1:18), so that he was struck dumb (1:20), presumably to prevent him denying its possibility. There is, thus, a much less positive response to authoritarian teaching in this account from that in Matthew's.

When the same angel announced to Mary that she was going to have a child (Lk. 1:31-33), who would be a great, deific Ruler, she was far from accepting of the idea, too (1:34) and disputed with the messenger about

it. By the end of the meeting, Mary was resigned to whatever miracle was in store for her – ‘let it be to me according to your word’, she replied (1:38) – but there is no sign in the text of the joyfulness that would be anticipated if had she learned any of the significance of what she had just been told. It seems that, in Luke, despite the introduction of a divine agent here, learning often does not happen through directive teaching.

Mary then rushed to Zechariah’s house to visit Elizabeth (Lk. 1:39-40). It is there, in the company of those Judeans who were themselves expecting a miraculous birth, that Mary breaks out in joyful praise, clearly demonstrating her realisation of the truth of what she had heard earlier (1:47). It was in communality then, between the participants in this shared activity of supranatural childbearing, that everything made complete sense. Elizabeth, her unborn baby and Mary, possibly carrying her own embryonic son, together (1:41-42), understood the meaning of what they were jointly experiencing. This incident, I suggest, sets the tone for the much more community of practice-based model of learning that is widely evident in the Gospel of Luke.

Finally, this learning approach continues when the shepherds in Luke (2:8) were visited by a ‘multitude’ (13) of angelic beings, praising God for Mary’s newborn child. It was following their participation in this community of worship that the herdsmen made their own decision to find and give praise for the Bethlehem baby (15, 20).

The Parable of the Good Samaritan

The Parable of the Good Samaritan arises in Luke’s Gospel (10:30-37), from a question posed by a lawyer, on hearing Jesus’ reaction to the returning seventy missionaries. It occurred, then, in the course of the practice of his community, including service (17), prayer (21) and teaching (23). Jesus agreed with the man (27-28) that the two, crucial, Mosaic commandments which led to eternal life were to ‘love the Lord,

your God' with your whole being and to love 'your neighbour as yourself'. The lawyer's query, though, was 'who is my neighbour?' (29).

By making the one who 'proved neighbour to the man who fell among the robbers' (10:36-37a), a Samaritan, however, the story taught that one's neighbour could include even those, to the Jew despised, people, and, if them, then presumably, anyone. This continues the thread, in Luke's Gospel, of Jesus' acceptance of non-Jews, which included his intention to visit a Samaritan village (in 9:51-52) and his avoidance of insulting them, as threatened by Mark 7:26-27 and Matthew 7:6. Thus Luke appears to use the present parable to demonstrate further the potential breadth of membership of the new community of Jesus' followers.

The lawyer's question, though, also appears to have implied, judging from Luke 10:29, the self-justifying one of: whom, then, should he take the trouble to love? Again, it could have been just those in his immediate locality, or, it might have had to cover all Israel. The man the Samaritan saved, however, professed no particular race, creed or place of residence. The truth was, the story apparently insisted, it was anybody that one came into contact with who needed help. Hence, all the existing opinions on this were too limited and the parable implicitly identified, yet again, the dispute Jesus had with the position of almost every current teacher of the law.

Finally, Jesus' response to the man was an individualised answer (in Lk. 10:37) to his specific, follow-up, question. However, the implication of neighbourly love that the lawyer began to comprehend was not a theoretical, intellectual concept – it was a practical principle to be acted upon – 'Go and do' this, the Teacher told him. His learning, it is proposed then, occurred in Luke, within the community of Jesus and his disciples and was achieved by participating, at least peripherally, in its practice – in this case that of compassionate love towards those in need.

The Parable of the Lost Son

Following on from the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin, in Luke Chapter 15, is the fairly extensive narrative of the Loving Father and his Lost Son (15:11-32). Although this chapter begins with Jesus addressing the Pharisees and scribes (15:2-3) – ‘he told them this [first] parable’, in response to their discomfort at the presence of ‘tax collectors and sinners’ in his audience (15:1), it is less clear that these religious leaders continued to be Jesus’ main target for this third illustration, which simply begins, ‘Then he said’ (11).

Furthermore, immediately after the present story is finished, Jesus appears to have been speaking specifically to his disciples (Lk. 16:1), which prompts the suggestion that this teaching was directed, at least partially, toward them, too. In any case, the author has situated the learning episode considered here, firmly within the normal practice of the community of the Master and his learners.

From the start, the Lost Son parable focuses on the material assets of the family – the father ‘divided his living between [his sons]’ (Lk. 15:12). Wealth has been used before in Luke’s Gospel (12:21; 33), to allude to the riches of God’s kingdom, and will be again (16:11; 18:22). The Lukan followers of Jesus are given ‘the kingdom’ (12:32) and its secret knowledge (8:9-10). The accent on sharing the family’s property, here, thus suggests ‘his living’ may again refer, in Luke, to those precious, esoteric kingdom truths that the Father bestows on his people.

Many commentators, for instance Morris (1961, pp. 243-244) assert the elder brother’s ‘likeness to the Pharisees is unmistakable’ here. Bock (1994, p. 258), however, goes so far as to say he stands for anyone, not specifically a Pharisee, ‘who claims to serve God and yet is harsh toward the possibility of forgiveness for sinners.’ The impression that the elder sibling might not necessarily be a reference to the Pharisees is strengthened by the fact that his only complaint to his father is that the

other son was being disproportionately rewarded (Lk. 15:29-30) and this does not seem to be the problem with the 'sinners' that the Pharisees – who were famously confident of their eventual reward – were expressing in Verse 1 (e.g., Keener, 1993, p. 220).

Moreover, the parable has been placed within Luke in conjunction with the two previous stories – of The Lost Sheep and The Lost Coin – both of which emphasize the return of a missing individual to the group from which they came and to which they belong. Here, it is a wayward son who was returned to his nuclear family. However, this prodigal son is also a lost 'brother' (Lk. 15:27, 32) – that title being the customary mode of address within the early fellowship of Christ followers (e.g. 6:41-42). In the present case then, the father in the story could be construed as representing God (e.g., Marshall, 1994, 15:11-32) and the brothers as both members of Jesus' embryonic community of believers.

In Verse 13 of Luke Chapter 15, the younger brother took his share of the inheritance and deserted the family to live 'prodigally'. As the Parable of the Soils in Luke (8:13) apparently emphasised, withdrawing from the community of God's people is, potentially, spiritually disastrous, for that is where the knowledge of the kingdom resides. Those who 'go their way', through the attractions of the 'riches and pleasures of life', are choked by them and seriously imperil their spiritual development. Sure enough, in due course, the son's funds were exhausted and he became destitute (15:16).

The prodigal resolved to apologise and to return to his home as a humble servant (Lk. 15:19), but on his arrival at the family estate, he was greeted as a long-lost son. His loving parent ran to meet him and paid little attention to his confessions (22). The comparison seems to be that of the father in the account with God the Father, who, within Luke then, is not, in general, a symbol of patriarchal authority (Tannehill, 1996, p. 188) but much more one of unconditional love.

To extend this interpretation to its natural conclusion, then, the 'lost son' can be seen as standing for a latecomer or returner to the community of believers, after pursuing a, perhaps well publicised, undesirable lifestyle outside it. In the context of Luke's Gospel, the parable then serves as a reminder to those established in the group that God regards all community members equally, irrespective of their previous lives. The older brother was still loved and included in the family (Lk. 15:31) but the homecoming of the younger one, despite his history, was an even greater cause for celebration (32). Thus, in its original setting, the younger brother might be identified with those tax collectors and other social outcasts who were, even as Jesus spoke, 'drawing near to hear him' (15:1) (e.g., Bock, 1994, p. 258) and the elder with Jesus' earliest disciples or closest apostles, toward whom, judging by 16:1, the parable was, in part, addressed.

The father's reminder that 'all that is mine is yours' (Lk. 15:31), the unhesitating sharing of the property in Verse 12 and his serving of the fatted calf for all to join in (23), may then reflect an underlying view that the treasured knowledge of the kingdom, which derives from the Father, is distributed across the community's believers, in a situated learning fashion. The desire to maintain its membership is shown in both his welcoming back of the errant offspring and his sympathetic, subsequent, placating of the disgruntled elder brother; while the friction between the newcomer and the 'old hand', that characterises the reproduction of such a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 113-116), is well exemplified by the fractious fraternal relationship between the younger and older sons.

The Parable of the Unjust Steward

The fourth parable in this sequence is that of the unjust steward (Lk. 16:1-9). Bock (1994, p. 262) refers to this as 'probably the most difficult parable in Luke'. He notes (Bock, 1994, p. 263) the frequently debated

question of 'What exactly happens in the story?' Some commentators, for example, suggest that the steward was imagined to have deducted, from his master's debts, either an illegally added interest figure or a mark-up for his own fee (e.g. Fitzmyer, 1985, pp. 1095-1101).

Bock finds the moral of the story to be 'clear enough', and identifies it as that of exercising responsibility in the stewardship of resources, even, one might add, if these were originally acquired through ethically dubious routes – which situation might well resonate with a number of new converts to the faith in the Lukan audience. The difficulty arises, this commentator explains, in discerning exactly how the story demonstrates that principle.

Bock (1994, pp. 263-264) outlines two main contenders for this explication: either the steward, supposedly, simply discounts the bills of his master's clients to win their favour and the master commends him for this because the servant had been wise 'in relation to their generation' (Verse 8); or – and, following Derrett (1970, pp. 48-77), Bock prefers this second possibility – the initially corrupt employee learns, 'by his failure', the error of his former ways and adopts the morally commendable solution of deducting his own commission from the invoices. Bock (1994, p. 265) argues this latter action is something his employer could, more reasonably, be expected to have applauded.

Whatever way the story was, initially, intended to demonstrate its point, the objective of the steward's actions was, expressly, that, despite the indignity of being dismissed from his job, people might still 'receive [him] into their houses' (Lk. 16:4). He was anxious to escape the ignominy of hard manual labour or accepting charity, and to remain socially acceptable within his community (Verse 3), where he might, subsequently, obtain more professional employment. The parallels with the prodigal son narrative are apparent, then. Firstly, this manager also, allegedly anyway, squandered the wealth he had been made responsible

for (Verse 1) (Keener, 1993, p. 222; Martin, 1983, p. 246); but also the servant's desire to continue to belong within his society (Verse 4) reflects the son's troubled rehabilitation into his own nuclear family.

Given a situative approach in Luke, then – of participation in the practice of the relevant community, which the present dissertation proposes is also adopted there toward learning – it might be possible to suggest a choice between the alternative views on interpreting this parable.

It is concluded, here, that Luke normally eschews the concept of individual learning. It seems unlikely, then, that in the Lukan expression of this parable, the unjust manager learned, on his own, from his mistakes. He would be expected to learn only through participating within his community's corporate practices and there is nothing to infer any such communal activity at this point in the text. Hence, his subsequent actions in cancelling much of his clients' debt probably did not represent a change of heart.

The allusion, in Verse 8, to the 'dishonest manager' then remains applicable in Verses 5-7, as Martin earlier (1983, p. 246) asserted, in which case, the simplest explanation would be that, in the narrative of Lk. 16:5-7, the fictional steward defrauded his employer. This is an unacceptable behaviour in any society; but the justness of the anticipated retribution for it – of expulsion from his community – was, it seems, outweighed, in Luke, by the imperative of remaining in it. Presumably this is so since only within his CoP could a miscreant learn to become a better member of it. Hence, in astutely ensuring his continuing community membership, the corrupt manager could be commended for his actions, despite the fact that they had caused an offence toward another person.

The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus

The collection of Jesus' stories continues in Luke with that of The Rich Man and Lazarus. Keener (1993, p. 276) has described this parable as 'a negative illustration' of the principle expressed in Lk. 16:9, drawn from the previous parable. In this case, then, the very rich man neglects to provide for Lazarus, a poor invalid who lived in his gateway, and the narrative relates the dreadful consequences for him of this inhumane behaviour.

The main character's house was the communal home of six Jewish brothers, presumably with their families, and their father (Verses 27-28), so that the story concerns a domestic community, of which this neglected pauper, Lazarus, was a, literally, peripheral participant. This community-oriented nature of the story makes its inclusion – in a gospel rich in situated learning episodes – unsurprising. Tannehill (1996, p. 254), furthermore, touches on the application of this parable to the Lukan communities and the early church, generally.

After death, the fortunes of the affluent man and the indigent were sharply reversed, making the point that those who do not use their wealth to aid a community member in need, may forfeit their inheritance of the riches of heaven (Verse 25). This focus on membership of a community is heightened when it is recalled, as Ryle (1999, Notes on Luke 16:19-31) remarks, that when he died Lazarus was carried to the comforting presence of Abraham, the patriarch of the entire Jewish people – he was included in his historical family – whereas, in death, the rich man was permanently excluded from that ultimate fellowship, by 'a great chasm' (Verse 26).

From a learning perspective, moreover, it seems the wealthy brother learnt next to nothing from his experience. He still regarded Lazarus as simply a lowly servant, available to be sent on his errands (Verses 24, 27-28) and to protect his family from suffering the torment he now had

to endure – ‘send him to my father’s house...that he may warn them’ (Verse 28), he requested ‘father’ Abraham. Since the rich man was in Hades, at the time, isolated from the living, this seems, again, consistent with an underlying gospel approach to learning as situative – that is, practically impossible independent of the community constituting the knowledge to be acquired.

Abraham’s response seems to concur with this opinion. It was of no value to send Lazarus to the family. They should learn how to behave toward the poor through the normal activities of a Jewish household – reading the Scriptures, perhaps especially those mentioned by Tannehill (1996, p. 253), and observing the Law of Moses (Verse 29). If they failed to do that, they would certainly not be persuaded to change their ways by the teaching of some individual, even though he possessed the authority of having just returned from the realm of the dead (Verse 31).

Although, in common with the rest of the gospel, there is some evidence of behaviourist tendencies in Luke (e.g. Verse 29, ‘They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them.’), learning was not a matter of blindly accepting authoritative teaching but largely occurred, I infer, through participation in the practices of the relevant community.

Further Lukan Material

There follows a sizable sequence of specifically Lukan material – several parabolic sayings of Jesus (Lk.17: 1-10) and a healing story (11-19). Morris (1961, p. 255) comments that ‘connections between the various paragraphs are not obvious’ and Bock (1994, p. 278) concurs, at least as far as Verses 1-10 are concerned. However, Tannehill (1996, p. 254) holds that this section expresses the concerns of the emerging Christian community.

Furthermore, this practice-based talk at the beginning of Luke Chapter 17 is not delivered in any lecturing or sermonising manner but in hyperbolic

and rhetorical terms, set within the activities of the apostles' community. With Verse 11 it slides seamlessly into the narrative of the real world healing of the ten socially marginalised, 'lepers', although it is questionable if that order of events is accurately chronologically arranged (Morris, 1961, p. 257).

The healing miracle story (in Lk. 17:11-19) relates that all ten victims of the dreaded skin disease were healed, through the exercise of their faith in going directly to the priests and showing themselves (Lk. 17:14). As Tannehill (1996, p. 257) states, this clearly demonstrated an adequate, albeit limited, degree of trust in the Master. Nonetheless, the tenth leper – a Samaritan – showed an enhanced quality of belief, by his response to his healing. Tannehill (1996, p. 257) writes, 'his faith...has blossomed' into worship and thanksgiving towards Jesus.

The example of spiritual growth and development provided by the healed Samaritan thus, evidently, epitomises what Jesus wants the apostles to understand by increased faith (following Lk, 17:5) – not so much greater divine powers for themselves but, rather, a deeper awareness of who he is and of his ministry. This flowering of belief, in Luke, has occurred through the afflicted man's participation within the activities of his community of confirmed leprosy sufferers. At the same time, this whole learning episode of Luke seems constructed, for the apostles, to take place through their community practice as Jesus' followers – the telling and hearing of kingdom parables and acts of healing and deliverance (Lk. 17:19).

A couple of sections on Jesus' eschatology follow, with parallels in both Mark (Chapter 13) and Matthew (Chapters 24-25). These lead into two more parables and a practical illustration at the beginning of Chapter 18, mirroring those passages at the start of Chapter 17 (1-4; 5-10; and 11-19 respectively), above. The first of these (Lk. 18:1-8), Luke explains, was a learning opportunity for the disciples – on perseverance in prayer –

and the second address (18:9-14) was directed at those exhibiting an attitude of supercilious self-righteousness. The third of these later pericopae (15-17) relates Jesus welcoming the presence of small children into his community activity. It seems, then that, once again, these, not necessarily consecutive, episodes of learning are set together in Luke, once again, within a context of the practice of Jesus' community.

The first of these parables is located 'in a certain city' – an urban community – in which there lived a callous judge, a helpless widow and the widow's legal adversary. The woman repeatedly demanded justice in her case but the magistrate would not listen. Eventually, he conceded. As Marshall (1994, Luke 18:1-8) remarks, this story is very similar to that of Lk. 11:5-8, which, itself, takes place within a close-knit neighbourhood environment. This suggests the community-centred setting of this parable is influential in its inclusion in Luke's gospel.

The second parable compares a Pharisee and a Tax Collector, at prayer in the Temple (Lk. 18:11-13). The first man was very self-satisfied and superior before God, while the publican confessed he was a 'sinner' and sought God's mercy. Jesus declared the humble penitent to be the righteous one. This would seem to be consistent both with the concern of Luke's gospel for the inclusion of outcasts and marginalised members of society, and with a disapproval of the self-important religious authorities of the day.

The practical contextualisation for this learning on humbleness, is then given, it seems, by the account of Jesus welcoming the infants and babies, in Verses 15-17 of Luke Chapter 18. This section is apparently Markan rather than L material, so is considered here only as the learning context for those parables. Children are not 'humble' in the sense that they relinquish their positional power, since they have none to renounce. Tannehill (1996, p. 267) makes a similar point. Rather, he points out

(Tannehill, 1996, pp. 267-268), in New Testament times, a child's humbleness arose from their absolute absence of any social standing.

The connection to the second parable then would seem to be, that it is those who strip themselves of their position and authority in the presence of God, and become powerless – 'like a child', who may receive and enter his kingdom. This again resonates with an inherent concern for an inclusive and non-authoritarian community of Christian practice.

The Post-Resurrection Narrative

Following the resurrection narrative, Luke, alone, goes on (in Chapter 24:13-50) to relate the post-Resurrection appearance experienced by the two men travelling the Emmaus Road. They were making this journey, specifically in shared company, when Jesus, anonymously, appeared, joining in their on-going conversation concerning the events surrounding his death (Verse 17). Jesus' action began with a number of questions to involve these disciples in dialogue about himself (verses 17, 19, 26). He then took them through all the places in the Scriptures that refer to him (Verse 27). This striking learning experience was, therefore, within their communal travel towards the village and can be seen as part of their talk as apprentice apostles, engaging with the Scriptures – the documentation and tools of the inchoate community of Christian practice.

Finally, it was 'When [Jesus] was at table with them' (Lk. 24:30) and he broke the bread, that 'their eyes were opened' (31) and the two followers understood the significance of everything that had been happening. They were, then, immersed in the normal group practices of the Jesus community – talking, praying and sharing food, with Jesus taking his customary position in it (Keener, 1993, p. 244). Their learning thus occurred only in community, in accordance with a situative learning approach. Once Cleopas and his travelling companion recognised him and

he disappeared from their sight, they immediately returned to the gathered followers, told their story and heard the accounts of others.

In the course of this extraordinary day, Luke (and only Luke, if the longer Markan ending is discounted) informs the reader, the disciples were 'saying, "The Lord...has appeared to Simon"' (24:34). This post-Resurrection interaction with Jesus must have been a hugely significant and meaningful event, both for Simon Peter, and for the Eleven and many of 'those who were with them' (33). Nevertheless, the report of that encounter is circumspect (people were 'saying' it had happened but the gospel does not vouch for it) and silent about any of its details – Tannehill (1996, p. 358) cursorily remarks, 'for some reason'.

This indifference toward elaborating Simon's revelation is understandable, however, if it is accepted that Luke's gospel, generally, does not presuppose the occurrence of individual, non-corporate teaching and learning experiences. Learning, in Luke, is, I am proposing, a collective, situative matter, which arises only through participation in the activities of the community of relevant practice. In this case, the idea of Simon coming to a comprehension of the risen Jesus apart from the activities of the group would be, once again, antithetical to the implicit Lukan conception of learning.

At this point, according to Luke, the Lord reappeared (24:36) and continued to reveal himself to the whole group of followers (44-48). This company included the wider gathering of 'the Eleven...and those who were with them' (33). Jesus then 'led them out as far as Bethany' (Lk. 24:50-51), in a post-Resurrection continuation of their community practice, and left them. It is within this life of the assembly of followers, then, that, within Luke, understanding appears to become possible (52-53).

In Luke's Gospel, there is no commandment to visit Galilee, despite the compelling evidence of Mark's explicit message (in Mk. 16:7) to do so and of Matthew's later report (Mt. 28:16) of that visit having taken place. It is remarkable that Luke completely reverses Jesus' instruction to go, and records, instead (in Lk. 24:49), an order to stay in Jerusalem. Marshall (1994, Luke 24:1-12 The empty tomb. Notes) explains how the absence of Lukan post-Resurrection appearances in the Galilee region obviates the need for the command to make the journey; and Tannehill (1996, pp. 348-349) attributes that lack of any appearance of Jesus there to the unique presence of this other directive in Luke.

However, this only explains the missing instruction in terms of the putative existence of another – one that is far less well substantiated in the remaining gospels than the first. Apparently then, Luke actually negates the suggestion of a Galilean excursion, although the reason why remains unexplained. However, in his account, the whole company of apostles and disciples thus remained together in Jerusalem, awaiting the coming of 'power from on high', as Jesus had, ostensibly, commanded them (Lk. 24:49). The entire party of believers thereafter returned to Jerusalem and met continually in the Temple (52). I suggest this narrative divergence is, therefore, an indication of how the underlying Lukan concern with preserving the unitedness of this new community of practice continues, unabated, to the very end of that gospel narrative.

Chapter 5

Concluding Discussion

Discussion

During the thematic analysis of the previous chapter, whenever a comparison or investigation of a gospel text segment has been made, Matthew has typically demonstrated some aspects of a behaviouristic pedagogy, Luke's version more often a strongly situated learning theory and the Gospel of Mark elements of a cognitive or constructivist pedagogical style. While the whole analysis has featured Lukan material and much of it Matthean parallel text, there is rather less specifically Markan content to work with. Overall, while the evidence for Matthew and Luke is quite robust, the argument for Mark's Gospel is not quite so strong, although it remains reasonably persuasive.

Hence, there is considerable evidence for all three Synoptics. This suggests each synoptic gospel could be seen as exhibiting, to some extent, a different contemporary philosophy of learning and teaching. The present section discusses whether any Synoptic apparently evidences sufficient breadth of features, from its particular model, that it could be regarded as essentially characterised by that educational approach.

The Gospel of Mark

As far as the use of metaphor in the gospels is concerned, of course all the Synoptics, including that of Mark, emphasise Jesus' adoption of the parable as a powerful, allegorical teaching tool. All the contemporary learning models considered here embrace this teaching strategy. However, the cognitive approach to pedagogy focuses, first and foremost, on the learner's positive mental involvement in the learning process. After the telling of the Parable of the Soils, which, itself, had emphasised that learning and development demands active listening – with

engagement, enthusiasm and endurance (Thackray, 2012) – The Gospel of Mark (Mk. 4:21-25), similarly, seems to repeatedly assert that anyone can learn the meaning of Jesus' parables, provided they pay sufficient attention to them.

Moreover, in this model, cognitive dissonance is often generated in introducing new knowledge, which can cause an, often lengthy, reappraisal of knowledge frameworks. Although the disciples may not always have reflected on Jesus' teaching well enough, and, hence, taken longer than should have been necessary to understand it (e.g. Mk. 4:40, 8:21, 10:14), Mark frequently (e.g. 6:53, 9:31-32) indicates that comprehension of his words and actions was difficult and took the learners considerable time and effort. The unresolved incomprehension of the women at the empty tomb, in Mark's gospel, (16:8) is a case in point.

Mark appears to be quite emphatic about the need, in learning, to undergo radical reconstruction of mental schema. For example, when Jesus replied to the scribe's question about the greatest law, the Markan questioner recognised the value of understanding in one's relationship with God (Mk. 12:33). Furthermore, though he was not a disciple, after evaluating Jesus' comments he overturned the traditional primacy of sacrifice in the thinking of his profession, putting loving first – in a distinctly constructivist manner.

The main pedagogical consequence of adopting a cognitive view of the learning process is the teaching principle of involving the learners in their own learning. Mark evidences this frequently, in Jesus' teaching of the disciples, including at the feeding of the five thousand (Mk. 6:38) and during the entrance into Jerusalem (11:4). Many other features of a cognitivist approach can be seen in the sending out of the Twelve in Mark's gospel (6:6b-13). Before the mission Jesus travelled about the countryside effectively demonstrating the activities his learners were to

engage in – teaching and healing – to them (6:5-6), in a substantial example of instructional modelling. Organisation of the missionary group in pairs (6:7), furthermore, reflects the strategy of educational scaffolding, familiar to constructivist practitioners as a method of peer support until independent performance is possible.

In addition, this missionary programme was, as was most of Jesus' teaching of his disciples, a real-life teaching activity, involving on-the-job training. In the language of constructivist pedagogy, it was an authentic learning experience, performing practical healing and preaching tasks in a real-world context. In Mark also, the exercise generated a very considerable, tangible work (Mk. 6:13, 33) in terms of numbers of people healed and revitalized – a beneficial process of 'externalization' of their combined learning and development.

Shortly after this, in Mark's gospel, Jesus and his disciples are faced with the challenge of feeding five thousand plus people in some remote location. In all the gospel versions Jesus tasks the apostles with solving this problem; but it is in the Markan version (6:37-38) that they become most clearly and personally involved in finding a solution. There is some evidence, then, that this gospel also employs problem solving as a means of teaching and learning. Mark (for example, in Mk. 6:31-32) also seems to demonstrate best the value in the learning process of metacognition. Hence, I suggest, there is considerable overlap between the tacit pedagogical traits detectable in the Gospel of Mark and a contemporary, cognitive constructivist model of learning.

The Gospel of Matthew

The gospel of Matthew frequently implies that learners have a fixed, limited mental capacity. For instance, Matthew reports Jesus' parable of the Talents rather than that of the Minas in Luke. In the Matthean version (Mt. 25:15) the three servants are each said to have a specific, quantifiable financial ability, even though the assertion does not tally with

the story. As another example, in Matthew's Parable of the Sound Eye (6:22-23), perception is either crystal clear or dreadfully obscured – portraying understanding as full for some and absent for others. Such a quantitative view of cognitive capability – that a person has an inherently restricted level of intellectual potential – is consistent with a behaviouristic pedagogic perspective.

Examples of the transmission and passive reception approach to teaching and learning, which has historically been associated with a behaviourist pedagogy, is ubiquitous throughout the Gospel of Matthew. Instructional teaching episodes occur in all the synoptic gospels but they abound in Matthew – not least in the Sermon on the Mount – often beginning with the directive phrase, 'I say to you' (Mt. 5:18, 22, 32; 24:3, etc.). As another example, Matthew's version of the message from the empty Tomb (28:7) has been redacted to replace its Markan reference to prior knowledge with the angel's transmissive 'I have told you'.

The women's apparently unthinking response to that Matthean message (Mt. 28:8) was to rush to convey this extraordinary information to the disciples, indicating a lack of need, in this gospel, for any intervening thought on the learner's part. Again, in Matthew, the disciples often understand immediately what Jesus meant, even when this is very difficult to imagine (e.g. 13:51; 17:22-23). Understanding seems to be a matter of acceptance rather than the result of any cognitive processing – again a feature of a behaviouristic pedagogy.

The use of rewards and punishments in encouraging right behaviour is again prevalent in Matthew, especially in the Sermon on the Mount (e.g. Mt. 5:10 and 21-26, respectively). Although the emphasis is frequently upon a future recompense rather than on an immediate positive or negative reinforcement, each threat or promise made is effective, directly following behaving in the specified manner. This strategy, therefore, seems strongly redolent of a behaviouristic approach to teaching and

learning. Moreover, there are occasional applications of Premack's principle in Matthew (5:44, for instance), which further identifies its paraenetic methods, largely, with behaviourism.

The behaviourist view of the teacher as the indisputable authority on their subject, with the pedagogic consequence of discounting all learner-teacher interaction, can also be seen frequently in the Matthean text. Both the other gospels remark on the especial authoritativeness that people in the synagogue sensed as accompanying the teaching of Jesus but Matthew extends this, at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, to even the crowds of casual bystanders (Mt. 7:28-29).

Matthew's account ends (Mt. 28:18-20) with the Great Commission, where Jesus' authority is complete and the disciples are accordingly ordained to teach, themselves, so that all peoples should observe his commands. Again, when teaching is delivered from the vacated Tomb, Matthew introduces a celestial figure of great authoritative power (28:2-4) to issue it. This angel's words were not open to question, so that the women immediately obeyed them (7-8).

Other typical pedagogical strategies from the behaviourist perspective include revision and reiteration of material, and a 'one size fits all' approach to teaching methods. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Matthew's gospel is well known for its structural and textual repetition – for example, its repeating of the notion of Jesus as the Son of God at significant points through the narrative (Mt. 2:15, 3:17; 16:16; 27:54). Matthew also appears to assume the value of repetitive practice in developing good faith habits, especially those of prayer and forgiveness, within its version of the Lord's Prayer (6:11-12).

In addition, in some cases, such as in Mt. 24:1 – where Jesus predicts future events – Matthew, in this instance somewhat unexpectedly, relates teaching of the disciples as a whole group, when the Markan source does

not indicate this was the case. This redaction, then, might represent a behaviourist pedagogic feature of this gospel – in treating all learners of the same material in a like teaching manner. The scene moves on in Mt. 24:3 but this change of approach, from Mark's small group tuition to plenary session, continues until 24:44.

The Gospel of Luke

There are a great many allusions, throughout the Gospel of Luke, to the community of Jesus first followers. This can be cast, I propose, into the sociocultural concept of a CoP (Community of Practice), on which the strongly situated learning theory rests. Learning in this model consists only in participation within that community's practice. One typical reference, which is uniquely recorded in Luke, is the sending out of the seventy plus missionaries (in Lk. 10:1-24). There were old hands present amongst these disciples, in the form of the twelve apostles, and many new apprentices, each participating in the activities of this socially cohesive group, with some degree of peripherality. Its practices were those of Jesus himself – proclaiming the coming of the Kingdom and curing sick people in his name (10:9, 17). The power of Jesus was the group's only specialised resource.

This Lukan missionary activity provided an authentic, real world context (Lk. 10:1) for learning to live out the lifestyle of Jesus. There were opportunities for modelling by the apostles, scaffolding and collaborative working (10:1) and for problem solving (10:17). There is also evidence of talking within the practice (10:9-11, 17-18), which is considered, in the situative theory of learning, to develop construction and recall of the community's domain knowledge.

However, there are many examples in Luke's narrative where Jesus and his first followers can also be seen as an identifiable group with distinct practices, representable by an inchoate community of practice – from the initial formation of the apostles (e.g. Lk. 5:30-32) to the post-

resurrection band of disciples (24:9). Furthermore, throughout, the gospel seems to reflect a concern for preserving the membership of this CoP. This is exemplified in the parables of the new garment and new wine (5:36-37), the four soils (8:13-14) and the lost sheep, coin and son (15:6, 9, 24). I suggest that retaining the individual in the community is a critical issue in Luke, as it is in a situative learning theory – since situated learning can only take place through relevant community participation.

Another aspect of a community of practice that the return of the lost son (Lk. 15:24-28) might be thought to bring out is the friction engendered in a CoP between the 'old hands', who have an investment in its established practices, and newcomers, who challenge them with novel ideas. Within a situated learning approach, this continuity-displacement dialectic is a foundational factor in any learning. Such a conflict may also be hinted at in Luke's logion about the learner and their teacher, in 6:40.

In the Prodigal Son story (Lk. 15:12b), one could also regard the central family's assets as being shared between the members of the narrative community in a manner reminiscent of the distributed nature of valued, domain knowledge across any CoP. Moreover, Luke's correspondence, in the Parable of the Soils (8:15), of the message disseminated with the people who receive it, and who then propagate it further, resonates strongly with the CoP principle of the mutual constitution of a community's membership and its knowledge domain.

Finally, we notice in the Gospel of Luke a persistent tendency to object to the directive teaching of religious leaders of the time. While an opposition to teachers of the Law is common in all the synoptic gospels, it seems particularly sustained in this one (e.g. Lk. 6:41, 10:29-37, 14:24). Again, although Luke includes the, sometimes quite instructional, words of Jesus, as the avowedly authoritative Teacher, in comparison with other Synoptics these are often broken up by episodes of community activity

(e.g. 10:1-12) or parable (e.g. 10:29-38). Also, didacticism in one gospel account is, often, replaced in the Lukan parallel with a more community-based approach to learning (e.g. at 9:43, 24:8). Thus, the situativity theory's aversion to teacher-led pedagogy, though not universally applied within Luke's narrative, appears to be clearly influential in it, too.

Conclusion

An investigation has been carried out of the three synoptic gospels, to examine and compare the traits of pedagogic theories evident in them. It constitutes a personal reading of these narratives, from my own experience, through the lens of contemporary educational models. The work takes the form of a thematic narrative analysis, with an analysis focus of current approaches to teaching and learning, and a 'narrative' of the many bounded text segments in each such gospel as printed in the RSV version of the Bible. Some justification has also been provided, in this document, for a focus of analysis taken from the present-day learning and teaching discourse to be applied to an examination of ancient texts.

The question that initiated the present research project was originally framed as, 'How do the synoptic gospels compare, in respect of their allusions to learning and teaching, from the perspective of current learning theories and approaches to pedagogy?' I conclude that each synoptic gospel can reasonably be regarded as characterised by a different view of mind and contemporary andragogic theory. Although in no case is the correspondence perfect, I propose here that Matthew's gospel predominately exhibits a behaviourist pedagogy; whilst Mark generally portrays a much more cognitivist constructivist approach to teaching and learning; and the Gospel of Luke displays many aspects of, what today would be termed, a strongly situated theory of learning.

In conclusion, it is hoped that the comparison presented in this thesis can form a contribution to the discussion of the differences between the first three New Testament books, that lie at the heart of the Synoptic Problem. Further work that remains to be done in this context includes a similar consideration of the special material of Matthew, which has been omitted from this investigation only on the grounds of the space available.

In addition, The Gospel of John has not been examined in this project at all, largely because of its more discursive character and its dissimilarities from the Synoptic gospels, but it would also be interesting to examine whether any contemporary teaching and learning approach dominates in that account, too. Finally, it could be of value to compare any pedagogical tendencies in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles with the findings here, especially those on Luke's Gospel in view of the widely accepted common authorship of these two New Testament works.

References

- Albright, W. F., & Mann, C. S. (1971). *Matthew*. NY: Doubleday & Co.
- Anderson, J. C. (1994). *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, Sheffield Academic Press.
- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York, NY: Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.
- Arnold, P., Smith, J. D., & Trayner, B. (2012). The Challenge of Introducing "One More Tool": A Community of Practice Perspective on Networked Learning. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, & D. McConnell (Eds.), *Exploring the Theory, Pedagogy and Practice of Networked Learning*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Barbieri, L. A. (1983). Matthew. In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures: New Testament* (Vol. 1). Colorado Springs, CO.: David C. Cook.
- Bauckham, R. (2006). *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Berger, P. L. (1969). *The Social Reality of Religion*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.
- Best, E. (1986). *Disciples and Discipleship: Studies in the Gospel according to Mark*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.), Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York, NY: David McKay Co Inc.
- Bock, D. L. (1994). Luke. In G. R. Osborne (Ed.), *The IVP New Testament Commentary Series*. Nottingham, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- Boghossian, P. (2006). Behaviorism, Constructivism, and Socratic Pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(6), 713-722.

- Bornkamm, G. (1963). Der Lohngedanke im Neuen Testament *Studien zu Antike und Christetum* (Vol. 2, pp. 69-92). Munich: Kaiser.
- Bornkamm, G. (1963). The Stilling of the Storm (P. Scott, Trans.). In G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, & H. J. Held (Eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. London, UK: SCM Press.
- Broadfoot, P. (1996). *Educational Assessment and Society*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Brown, A. (1987). Metacognition, executive control, self-regulation and other mysterious mechanisms'. In F. E. Weinert & R. H. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, Motivation and Understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brown, D. (1871). The New Testament *Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (Expanded Electronic Version ed.). Marion, IA: Laridian Electronic Publishers.
- Brown, D. (1999). Mark. In O. Collins (Ed.), *The Classic Bible Commentary: An Essential Collection of History's Finest Commentaries in One Volume* (Laridian Electronic Edition ed.). Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, Good News Publishers.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods* (Third edition ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, K. D. (1931). *Counter-Statement*. Berkley, CA and London, UK: University of California Press.
- Burkett, D. R. (2004). *Proto-Mark to Mark*. London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark International.
- Burt, C. L. (1921). *Mental and Scholastic Tests*. London, UK: P. S. King.
- Byrskog, S. (1994). *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Cain, C. (1991). Personal stories: Identity acquisition and self-understanding in Alcoholics Anonymous. *Ethos*, 19(2), 210-253.

- Campbell, W. S. (2008). *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark Biblical Studies.
- Carr, D. M. (2005). *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Charette, B. (2015). *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. London, UK and New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Charmaz, K. C. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Cole, M. (1985). The Zone of Proximal Development. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, R. A. (1961). *Mark*. Leicester, UK: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Cole, R. A. (1994). Mark. In D. A. Carson, R. T. France, J. A. Motyer, & G. J. Wenham (Eds.), *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition* (Laridian Electronic Edition ed.). Leicester, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- Crenshaw, J. L. (1998). *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group Inc.
- Csinos, D. M. (2010). "Come, Follow Me": Apprenticeship in Jesus' Approach to Education. *Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association*, 105(1), 45-62.
- Davies, W. W. D., & Allison, D. C. (1991). *Matthew: Volume 2: 8-18*. London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark Ltd.
- De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in Narrative: A Study of Immigrant Discourse*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- de Ru, G. (1966). The Conception of Reward in the Teaching of Jesus. *Novum Testamentum*, 8, 202-222.

- Derrett, J. D. M. (1970). *Law in the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Dodd, C. H. (1936). *The Parables of the Kingdom* (3rd Edition ed.). London, UK: James Nisbet & Co.
- Douglas, J. D., Hillyer, N., & Wood, D. R. W. (1962). *New Bible Dictionary*. Leicester, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- Driver, R., Asoko, H., Leach, J., Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (2004). Constructing scientific knowledge in the classroom. In E. Scanlon, P. Murphy, J. Thomas, & E. Whitelegg (Eds.), *Reconsidering Science Learning*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Edwards, J. R. (2002). *The Gospel According to Mark*. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, UK: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Edwards, R. A. (1997). *Matthew's narrative portrait of disciples: how the text-connoted reader is informed*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Ehrensperger, K. (2009). *Paul and the Dynamics of Power: Communication and Interaction in the Early Christ-Movement*. London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark International.
- Esler, P. F. (1987). *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Esler, P. F. (1999). The Socio-Redaction Criticism of Luke-Acts. In D. G. Horrell (Ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark Ltd.
- Estes, D. J. (1997). *Hear, my Son: Teaching and learning in Proverbs 1-9*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Eubank, N. (2013). *Wages of Cross-Bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew's Gospel*. Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. (2003). Narrating social structure: Stories of resistance to legal authority. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), 1328-1372.

- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. (1985). *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.
- France, R. T. (1994). Matthew. In D. A. Carson, R. T. France, J. A. Motyer, & G. J. Wenham (Eds.), *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition* (Laridian Electronic Edition ed.). Leicester, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary Genius*. London, UK: MacMillan.
- Gould, D. (1998). *Luke*. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group.
- Grassmick, J. D. (1983). Mark. In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures: New Testament* (Vol. 1). Colorado Springs, CO.: David C. Cook.
- Greenfield, S. (2004). The child. In E. Scanlon, P. Murphy, J. Thomas, & E. Whitelegg (Eds.), *Reconsidering Science Learning* (pp. 44). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Grenz, S. (1996). *A Primer on Postmodernism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Gundry, R. H. (1981). *A Survey of the New Testament* (Revised Edition ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Hardy, M. D., & Taylor, P. C. (1997). Von Glasersfeld's radical constructivism: A critical review. *Science and Education*, 6, 135-150.
- Harrington, D. J. (1991). *The Gospel of Matthew*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.
- Harvey, A. E. (1972). *Companion to the Gospels*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press.

- Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (1995). Critical Characteristics of Situated Learning: Implications for the Instructional Design of Multimedia. In J. Pearce & A. Ellis (Eds.), *ASCILITE95 Conference Proceedings*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.
- Hodson, D. (1998). *Teaching and Learning Science: Towards a Personalized Approach*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Horrell, D. G. (Ed.). (1999). *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark Ltd.
- Hrynchak, P., & Batty, H. (2012). The educational theory basis of team-based learning. *Medical Teacher*, 34(10), 796-801.
- Johnson, A. P. (2014). *Educational Psychology: Theories of Learning and Human Development*. El Cajon, CA: National Science Press.
- Jones, I. (1994). *The Gospel of Matthew*. London, UK: Epworth Press.
- Junior, N., & Schipper, J. (2013). Disability Studies and the Bible. In S. L. McKenzie & J. Kaltner (Eds.), *New Meanings for Ancient Texts*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Keener, C. S. (1993). *New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Keener, C. S. (1997). *Matthew*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Kingsbury, J. D. (1989). *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Publishers.
- Knox Msgr., R. A. (1946). *The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holydays: Translation and Commentary*. New York, NY: Sheed and Ward.
- Kodell, J. (1974). The Word of God Grew: The Ecclesial Tendency of the λόγος in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20. *Biblica*, 55, 505-519.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, D. N. (1985). *The Flight from Ambiguity: Essays in Social and Cultural Theory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Liesen, M. R. J., & Manhardt, L. W. (2012). *The Gospel of Mark*. Steubenville, OH: Emmaus Road Publishing.
- Lohr, C. H. (1961). Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 23, 403-435.
- Malina, B. J., & Neyrey, J. H. (1999). Jesus the Witch: Witchcraft Accusations in Matthew 12. In D. G. Horrell (Ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark Ltd.
- Malina, B. J., & Rohrbaugh, R. L. (1992). *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Marshall, I. H. (1994). Luke. In D. A. Carson, R. T. France, J. A. Motyer, & G. J. Wenham (Eds.), *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition* (Laridian Electronic Edition ed.). Leicester, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- Martin, J. A. (1983). Luke. In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures: New Testament* (Vol. 1). Colorado Springs, CO.: David C. Cook.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Meeks, W. A. (2003). Assisting the Word By Making (Up) History: Luke's Project and Ours. *Interpretation*, 2003(April), 151-161.
- Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (2012). British Teachers and the Behavioural Approach to Teaching *The Behaviourist in the Classroom* (Routledge Library Editions: Education ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Moberly, R. W. L. (2013). *Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Morris, L. (1961). *Luke*. Leicester, UK: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Moum, U. D., Schaefer, D. A., & Collett, J. L. (2007). The Value of Reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70(2), 199-217.
- Moxnes, H. (1988). *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

- Mulholland, J., & Turnock, C. (2007). *Learning in the Workplace: a toolkit for facilitating learning and assessment in health and social care settings* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Murphy, F. J. (2005). *An Introduction to Jesus and the Gospels*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Osborne, G. R. (2007). Mark. In D. S. Briscoe & H. Robinson (Eds.), *The IVP New Testament Commentary Series* (Laridian Electronic Edition ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Pascual-Leon, A., Amedi, A., Fregni, F., & Merabet, L. B. (2005). The plastic human brain cortex. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 28, 377-401.
- Pavlov, I. P., & Anrep, G. V. (1927). *Conditioned Reflexes*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pearson, K., & Barrington, A. (1909). *A First Study of the Inheritance of Vision and of the Relative Influence of Heredity and Environment on Sight*. London, UK: Dulau & Co.
- Petersen, N. (1985). *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Genetic epistemology*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Premack, D. (1959). Toward empirical behavior laws: 1. Positive reinforcement. *Psychological Reviews*, 66.
- Resseguie, J. L. (2005). *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: an Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretations*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Robbins, V. K. (2009). *Jesus the teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Robertson, A. T. (1960). *Matthew Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

- Robins, G. (2012). *Praise, Motivation and the Child*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to Learn: A View of What Education Might Become*. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of Literary Work*. Southern Illinois: Southern Illinois University.
- Ryle, J. C. (1999). Luke. In O. Collins (Ed.), *The Classic Bible Commentary: An Essential Collection of History's Finest Commentaries in One Volume* (Laridian Electronic Edition ed.). Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, Good News Publishers.
- Scroggs, R. (1975). *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part Two: Early Christianity*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- Scroggs, R. (1999). The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement. In D. G. Horrell (Ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark Ltd.
- Shillington, V. G. (2007). *An Introduction to the Study of Luke-Acts*. London, UK and New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group, T&T Clark Ltd.
- Skinner, B. F. (1938). *Behavior of Organisms*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Spearman, C. (1904). "General Intelligence", Objectively Determined and Measured. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 15(2), 201-292.
- Steele, M. M. (2005). Teaching students with Learning Disabilities: Constructivism or Behaviorism. *Current Issues in Education*, 8(10) 1-5.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis For Social Scientists*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Streeter, B. H. (1924). *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of The Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*. London, UK: MacMillan & Co., Ltd.
- Sweat, L. C. (2013). *The Theological Role of Paradox in the Gospel of Mark*. London, UK and New York, NY: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Tamboukou, M. (2013). A Foucauldian approach to narratives. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing Narrative Research*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Tannehill, R. C. (1989). *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts* (Vol. Volume 2: The Acts of the Apostles). Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press.
- Tannehill, R. C. (1996). *Luke*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Tasker, R. V. (1961). *Matthew*. Leicester, UK: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Thackray, G. J. (2012). Learning among Early Christ-followers: Special Topic in Biblical Interpretation. *Postgraduate Diploma in Theology Programme*. Lampeter, UK: University of Wales Trinity Saint David.
- Thatcher, T. (2006). *Jesus the Riddler: the power of ambiguity in the gospels*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Thayer, J. H. (1889). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Corrected Edition ed.). New York, NY: American Book Company.
- The International Q Project. (1996). *The Critical Text of Q: Society of Biblical Literature*.
- Theissen, G. (1992). *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament* (M. Kohl, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Publishers.
- Throckmorton, B. H. (Ed.). (1979). *Gospel Parallels* (New Fourth Edition ed.). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Torrance, H. (1989). The origins and development of mental testing in England. In B. Moon, P. Murphy, & J. Raynor (Eds.), *Policies for the Curriculum*. London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Treggiari, S. (1975). Jobs in the Household of Livia. *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 43, 48-77.

- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today: a User-Friendly Guide* (Second edition ed.). New York, NY/Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Usher, R., Bryant, I., & Johnston, R. (1997). Reconfiguring the 'other': Self and experience in adult learning *Adult Education and the Postmodern Challenge: Learning Beyond the Limits*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Uttal, W. R. (2000). *The War Between Mentalism and Behaviorism: on the accessibility of mental processes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Valera, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1993). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: The MIT Press.
- Via, D. O. (2005). *The Ethics of Mark's Gospel: In the Middle of Time*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- von Dobschütz, E. A. A. O. A. (1928). Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 27, 338-348.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walvoord, J. F., & Zuck, R. B. (1983). *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures: New Testament*. Colorado Springs, CO.: David C. Cook.
- Wandersman, A., Poppen, P. J., & Ricks, D. F. (1976). *Humanism and Behaviourism: Dialogue and Growth*. Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Ward, K. (2004). *What the Bible really Teaches: A Challenge for Fundamentalists*. London, UK: SPCK.
- Weeden, T. J. (1968). The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 59(3-4), 145-158.

- Wendel, S. J. (2011). *Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill.
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems. *Organization*, 7(2), 225-246.
- Wenger, E. (2009). Social learning capability: Four essays on learning and innovation in social systems *Social innovation sociedade e trabalho booklets, 12, separate supplement*. Portugal: MTSS/GEP & EQUAL.
- Wetherall, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (2001). *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd, in association with The Open University Press.
- Williams, G. (1984). The genesis of chronic illness: Narrative reconstruction. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 6(2), 175-200.
- Witherington, B. (1998). *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Witherington, B. (2001). *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology*, 17(2), 89-100.
- Zurawski, J. M. (2012). Separating the Devil from *Diabolos*: A Fresh Reading of Wisdom of Solomon 2.24. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, 21(4), 366-399.