intercalation may also have been part of the theoretical exercise to draw up a new calendar. Hence, Saulnier's lengthy overview of texts does not positively endorse Jaubert's theory – as he also admits in his conclusions – but it does demonstrate that a straightforward rejection of it should take into account the sophisticated nature of the calendrical discussions in Second Temple Judaism. This volume may thus indeed pave the way for a critical reappraisal of Jaubert's theory, which still deserves serious consideration and should not be dismissed too easily. Moreover, on a more general plane Saulnier's monograph provides a clear overview of the various biblical and extra-biblical data with respect to the festive year. As such, it is a most welcome addition to biblical scholarship, both in the field of the study of the Old Testament as for New Testament scholars who want to investigate anew the old problem of the chronology of the passion.

H. DEBEL


The present collection of essays offers a fine introduction to postcolonial studies and its application to various aspects of Pauline literature. This is a welcome focus as previous studies from this perspective have primarily focussed on the Gospels and on Revelation.

The volume opens with a Foreword by Puerto Rican scholar Efraín Agosto (xiii-xvi) which offers a fine introduction to the approach and reports of own research from this perspective on issues in his own context and own experiences. Agosto argues that postcolonial theory:

[... ] can allow the biblical critic to explore both the imperial and the anti-imperial implications of ancient texts. Many scholars have noted that the apostle Paul was both a subject of the Roman imperial order and an anti-imperial agent creating assemblies that were dedicated to a “lord” other than the emperor, Jesus the Christ. The postcolonial critic, however, does not limit scholarly investigation to the first century; two additional hermeneutical moves are required. In the first place, the postcolonial critic labours to ensure that the interpretive methods that were developed under the shadow of Western imperialism do not continue to dominate the way we read religious texts today but remain subject to critique and reversal. In the second place, the postcolonial critic insists that the voices of those who have been colonized (together with their contemporary descendants) must be taken seriously in the analysis of these texts and the creation of appropriate, empowering reading strategies (xv).

In the Introduction (3-7), the editor, Christopher D. Stanley, places postcolonial criticism in the recent hermeneutical debate, traces its origin and development and surveys the various forms into which it has developed. Stanley also briefly explains the structure of the collection and introduces the essays. On the nature of this perspective, Stanley writes:

At the heart of postcolonial criticism lies a concern to identify and combat the negative social, economic, political, and psychological effects of colonialism in all of its forms,
including the various types of “neo-colonialism” that have replaced formal, political domination as contemporary systems of social control. More specifically, postcolonial analysis seeks to expose the various social and ideological mechanisms that colonial powers use to maintain hegemony over the minds and bodies of colonized peoples and to explain how both colonizers and colonized are moulded by their participation in such a system (4).

Under the heading, What Is Postcolonial Studies? part one offers an introduction (“a historical and critical overview of postcolonial studies”, 5) and discusses matters of method. It consists of the following essays: Stephen D. Moore, Paul after Empire (9-23, tracing the beginnings of postcolonial studies and of postcolonial biblical criticism in particular, discussion of the claim and validity of the term “postcolonial” in the concept of postcolonial biblical criticism); Susan B. Abraham, Critical Perspectives on Postcolonial Theory (24-33, focusing on the feminist and pedagogical frame) and Neil Elliott, Marxism and the Postcolonial Study of Paul (35-50; on the uneasy relationship between postcolonial studies and Marxism, the discussion includes elements of Marxist interpretation, Marxist interpretation of Early Christianity, Marxism and postcolonial criticism, Marxist challenges for the postcolonial interpretation of Paul; Elliott also raises the issue whether there is a future and what kind of future for Marxist criticism).

Part two is devoted to Paul and ancient forms of colonialism. It seeks “to examine various ways in which postcolonial studies might enhance our understanding of the historical Paul and his letters. The length of this section reflects both the diversity of interests of the individual contributors and the judgement that insufficient work had been done in this area until fairly recently” (5s.). The first three essays are devoted to Paul and Roman colonial rule: Jeremy Punt, Pauline Agency in Postcolonial Perspective. Subverter of or Agent for Empire? (53-61, Punt first accounts for the ambivalent relation between Paul and empire, then presents a postcolonial optic on Paul and Empire consisting of power and agency, examines and describes Paul, power, and agency in his relationship with the Corinthian Christian community, discusses Paul’s discourse on weakness and foolishness as a potential challenge to the Empire and finally turns to Paul’s assertions of power and strength); Gordon Zerbe, The Politics of Paul: His Supposed Social Conservatism and the Impact of Postcolonial Readings (62-73, the underlying millenarian script, Paul’s use of politically loaded terms, Paul’s own experiences at the hands of Roman and civic authorities, Romans 13 as the monumental contradiction in Paul’s stance vis-à-vis empire) and Davina C. Lopez, Visualizing Significant Otherness: Reimagining Paul(ine Studies) through Hybrid Lenses (74-94, asking for the origins of postcolonial Paul(ine studies), discussing “hybridity” as a complex, contestable signifier in postcolonial Paul(ine studies), resourcing visual representation for potentially hybrid postcolonial re-imaginations of Paul(ine Studies), Trajan’s column: visualizing Romans and Paul as unstable, hybrid figures, visualizing hybridity and honesty: reimagining relationships then and now). According to Stanley, these three essays focus:

[...] on the political dimension of Paul’s writings, with special attention to the ways in which his thought patterns and rhetoric might have been affected by his social location as a colonized citizen (?) of the Roman Empire. All three articles grapple in different ways with the question of whether Paul should be viewed as resisting, rejecting, or reinscribing the ideology, values, and practices of Roman imperial/colonial rule. Their sophisticated and nuanced treatment of these issues and the conclusions that they draw
pose challenges for much of the work that has been done in recent years under the “Paul and Politics” rubric (6).

The following three contributions focus on Paul, colonialism and ethnicity employing a postcolonial lens to analyse Paul’s assertions on personal and ethnic identity: L. Ann Jervis, *Reading Romans 7 in Conversation with Postcolonial Theory* (95-109, Paul’s struggle toward a Christian identity of hybridity, identity in postcolonial theory, hybridity, analogical relationships between Romans 7 and postcolonial theory, the identity of the speaker in Romans 7, concluding that a hybrid identity is being described in Romans 7). In *Paul the Ethnic Hybrid? Postcolonial Perspectives on Paul’s Ethnic Categorizations* (110-126), Stanley cautions in concluding:

[... ] this study also shows the importance of maintaining a critical attitude toward the theories and models that we derive from postcolonial studies. Like most of the other methods and approaches that have been applied over the years to the letters of Paul, postcolonial theory offers many valuable insights that can help us better to understand Paul and his world. But it is not a magical key that opens every door. We must therefore be judicious in the way we use postcolonial theory and resist the colonial impulse to wrestle it into subjection to Western critical models. Postcolonial criticism, if it is to remain true to its origins, must always sit uneasily with the dominant discourses of Western culture, including those of contemporary biblical criticism (126).

Tat-siong Benny Liew writes on *Redressing Bodies at Corinth: Racial/Ethnic Politics and Religious Difference in the Context of Empire* (127-145, discussion includes the embodying of Corinthian rhetoric and politics, Paul’s rejected body, “body building” over Jesus’ dead [Jewish] body, [other] bodies feminized and sexualized; exploring “the tensions that would have existed between Paul and his Gentile audiences [specifically, the Corinthians] as a result of the Jewish physical identity of both the apostle and the Messiah whom he preached”, 6).

The remaining three essays of part two concern Paul, colonialism, and gender: Joseph A. Marchal, *Imperial Intersections and Initial Inquiries: Toward a Feminist, Postcolonial Analysis of Philippians* (146-160), Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre and Laura S. Nasrallah, *Beyond the Heroic Paul: Toward a Feminist and Decolonizing Approach to the Letters of Paul* (161-174, the heroic political Paul, disrupting the heroic traveling missionary: 1 Thessalonians and Acts as test cases) and Jennifer G. Bird, *To What End?: Revisiting the Gendered Space of 1 Corinthians 11.2-16 from a Feminist Postcolonial Perspective* (175-185).

Part three deals with Paul and modern Western Colonialism (“bringing Paul into the modern [and postmodern] world, tracing some of the ways in which his letters have been or could be used either to support or to challenge the ideologies and practices of Western colonialism”, 6 – and one might add also to challenge other forms of colonialism!) and contains the following four essays: Robert Paul Seesengood, *Wrestling with the “Macedonian Call”: Paul, Pauline Scholarship, and Nineteenth-Century Colonial Missions* (189-205, examining how the academic study of Paul’s letters in the nineteenth century was influenced by popular Christian beliefs about missionary activity and slavery); Brigitte Kahl, *Galatians and the “Orientalism” of Justification by Faith* (206-222, analysing “how a number of important Pauline scholars appropriated ancient stereotypes of “the Galatians” and turned Paul into a protagonist of Roman/Christian/Occidental civilization doing combat with inferior barbarians/Orientals/Muslims/Turks”, 206); Jae
Won Lee, *Paul, Nation, and Nationalism: A Korean Postcolonial Perspective* (223-235, identifying a tension between nationalism and transnationalism in Paul’s letters) and Gordon Zerbe, *Constructions of Paul in Filipino Theology of Struggle* (236-255, examining how Paul has been read and used by contemporary Filipino scholars and church leaders in their effort to promote popular resistance to authoritarian neo-colonial rulers). The volume closes with about one hundred pages of notes to each chapter and indexes of passages and authors.

This excellent and provoking collection is a fine introduction to postcolonial studies as applied to Pauline studies. The essays indicate the strengths and weaknesses of this approach and offer a number of fresh perspectives for Pauline studies. Throughout this volume, focus is on Western colonialism as the backdrop for postcolonial approaches to situations ancient and modern. It would be interesting to see what results or other perspectives might emerge, if other geographical or ideological versions of colonialism (such as Arab or Asian colonialism), ancient and modern, would also be considered. The final words belong to the editor:

The essays included in this volume do not begin to exhaust the possible relevance of postcolonial criticism to the letters of Paul, but they do demonstrate some of the ways in which a serious postcolonial engagement with Paul might proceed. [...] Readers who wish to learn more about postcolonial criticism will find a treasure trove of helpful material in these notes, including works by both "secular" and biblical scholars. If the articles in this volume serve to encourage more Pauline scholars to read and interact with the insights of postcolonial studies, then it will have achieved its purpose. Postcolonial criticism is no passing fad, and scholars of Paul would do well to become familiar with it (7).

C. STENSCHKE


The First Epistle to the Corinthians has always had a kind of special place in the KEK series, because of the fame of its commentators (none less than H.A.W. Meyer, C.F.G. Heinrici and J. Weiss are among Zeller’s predecessors) and perhaps even more so because of the importance these commentators have given to the religion-historical background and related questions in commenting upon this text. With Dieter Zeller (24 June 1939 – 16 February 2014), the editor in chief was at the right address to continue this tradition and to find an enthusiastic disciple of these prestigious names. Zeller has done an impressive job, which is not a little achievement in an already most remarkable line of recent German commentators of the letter (Lindemann, Merklein, Schrage).

The Introduction of almost forty pages covers all the essential issues regarding the letter and thereby lays the foundations for an exhaustive commentary that provides ample from the author’s broad and thorough knowledge of the ancient non-Christian sources to explain minutaie as well as crucial issues all through the work. The Introduction gives information on the history of Corinth, the origins and constitution of the Christian community in the city and the tensions to which the letter refers, the situation of the author, the structure and genre, literary-critical questions, the earliest reception