

Following Sack, M. understands territoriality to be not simply a place but a flux of influences coming from three realms of experience: the natural, the social, and the traditional (i.e., stories and traditions), all of which intersect at the place of the self (p. 182). Thus, Paul can be understood as a Greek, a Roman, and a Jew, all at the same time—and therefore elements that have often been set in juxtaposition about him can instead be viewed as complementary from a geographical perspective. As M. states, “Paul can be a Roman citizen and a Jewish rabbi at the same time” (p. 182). Her assessment of Paul is therefore that one has to take seriously the Roman world as Paul’s place (since the major places to which he traveled were in that realm) and not propose Jerusalem as Paul’s geographical center just because his theology reflects so many Jewish elements.

But this does not result, for M., in a vision of Paul as one thrilled with everything Roman. She concludes that it means rather that the place with which Paul was in dialogue—affirmatively or confrontationally—was the Roman world. She theorizes that Paul’s decision to evangelize toward the west may have developed precisely from that sense of Roman territoriality. This would contrast sharply with other Jews whom she guesses were probably carrying on missionary activity in the east of the empire, following what she suspects would have been a natural tendency to be directed by what she calls “old geographical loyalties” (p. 182) to look in that direction (due to some six centuries of influence from the east in the form of exile or Hellenistic rule). As M. herself notes, her study has been a rediscovery to some extent of Paul the Roman or Hellenist à la William M. Ramsay and others, but her careful and very readable application of Sack’s spatial theory to Paul and Romans in particular offers a clear treatment of Paul as both Jewish and Greco-Roman, which, in the light of such considerations dealing with the social construction of space, presents a relatively integrated portrayal of him.

Magda concludes this work with an appendix appealing for the translation of most instances of *ethnē* in Romans as “nations” rather than as “gentiles.” Her discussion argues that Paul uses *ethnē* mostly in a neutral sense (thus inclusive of the Jews) “unless he modifies it or uses it in juxtaposition to the Jews where it is clear he means a special case” (pp. 191-92). M.’s point deserves serious consideration since, as she notes, the old translation favoring “gentiles” has supported centuries of hatred between Jews and gentiles in the understanding of Paul’s mission.

Florence Morgan Gillman, University of San Diego, San Diego, CA 92110

JOSEPH A. MARCHAL, *The Politics of Heaven: Women, Gender, and Empire in the Study of Paul* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008). Pp. xiv + 213. \$29.

This provocative study of Paul’s letter to the Philippians from a feminist, postcolonial perspective voices a strong plea for an inter- and transdisciplinarity in biblical studies that pays attention to multiple, intersecting structures of domination and injustice in both the ancient and contemporary worlds. Pointing to the pioneering role of feminist theology, in particular Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza’s concept of *kyriarchy*, Marchal argues for the long-overdue integration of empire-critical and postcolonial approaches, on the one hand, and feminist criticism, on the other hand. His interpretation strongly draws on the feminist, post-colonial work of Musa Dube and Kwok Pui-lan, as well as on extrabiblical scholars such

as Rey Chow, Inderpal Grewal, Anne McClintock, Sara Mills, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, and Meyda Yeğenoğlu. In five chapters M. critically charts recent developments in Pauline studies that are relevant to the topics of empire and colonialism, most notably around “Paul and politics” and “people’s history” (chap. 1), discusses the Christ-hymn and heavenly *politeuma* in Phil 2:6-11 and 3:18-21 through the lens of Musa Dube (chap. 2), explores Paul’s imitation rhetoric against the background of postcolonial studies on mimicry and hybridity beyond Homi Bhabha (chap. 3), and finally turns to Philippi itself as an ancient colonial “contact zone” (Mary Louise Pratt) where the role of the two women missionaries Euodia and Syntyche is examined in an effort to “decenter” Paul (chap. 4). Chapter 5 is a concluding summary.

As an introduction to feminist and postcolonial theories in their general relevance for Pauline studies, and as a methodological challenge not to be ignored, the book is, without a doubt, helpful and stimulating. The exegetical part, however, is disappointing. Whereas M. in his introduction situates himself with all his ambiguities as a privileged, American, “pale male” feminist interpreter in the complex field of present anti-imperial struggles, not much of this nuanced and contextualized resistance discourse is left when he gets to Paul and Philippians. Although Paul writes the letter as a prisoner of Rome, his clear-cut image as a proponent and propagator of empire hardly ever gets blurred: his obedience and authority claims follow the imperial pattern. His discourse with regard to Euodia and Syntyche displays an “imperial gendered mindset” (p. 53) that appeals to the ultimate authority of the divine to enforce subordination and domination. Imitating Paul means nothing but compliance. While he may contest the Roman Empire and its false gods, he at the same time reinscribes the imperial and patriarchal hierarchy—and his own power—in the name of Christ. In his “gentile mission,” therefore, Paul is colonizing, “positioning himself as a provincial governor and colonial administrator for the divine *imperator*” (p. 50).

What I found disturbing in this overall image is not just the lack of a more complex textual and contextual reading that would engage the letter as a whole rather than giving lists of negative proof-texts. The disinterest in exegesis, however, is rooted in a presupposition that marks the non-negotiable truth claim at the center of this book. Though M. consistently lists “Paul” and “Pauline interpretation” as two separate terms, he from the outset treats them as de facto identical. Paul himself, not Emperor Constantine or anybody else, is the original culprit of a gender-biased, imperial, and colonial Christianity, with all its well-known consequences for women, Jews, pagans, savages, slaves, and other Others.

Because of the almost “creedal” status of this assumption, eventually Paul, much more than empire, appears as the “chief enemy” to be confronted. And the main hermeneutical problem to be addressed in this book is not the wide range of past and current individualistic, triumphalistic, anti-Jewish, misogynist, and homophobic interpretations that all feed into the colonizing, gendered logic of empire. Instead, and with a somewhat bewildering rigor, the representatives of an empire-critical approach to Paul—the likes of Richard A. Horsley, N. T. Wright, Richard J. Cassidy, Efrain Agosto, Peter Oakes, and Erik M. Heen—are singled out as “malestream” and scolded for their uncritical naïveté in making Paul a contestant of empire rather than its missionary-in-disguise.

This is not how an encounter of feminist, empire-critical, and postcolonial approaches must end, as, for example, Davina C. Lopez’s *Apostle to the Conquered: Reimagining Paul’s Mission* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008) in this same series has

shown. But here, in this case, it is paradoxically and distressingly the conservative interpretations that ultimately win the day—in their abstract negation they are simultaneously confirmed and reinscribed as “genuinely Pauline.” M.’s own final and halfhearted effort to envision a counter-reading of Pauline texts in terms of a *catachresis* leaves the reader somewhat incredulous: Why still bother with Paul?

And another “nagging question” stays, eloquently raised by the author himself as the question of not only “what this means” but “what this does” (p. 112)—the question of relevance, of forging alliances, of mobilizing forces and resources for resistance and transformation. Indeed: *Cui bono*—who is benefiting?

Brigitte Kahl, Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY 10027

MARVIN MEYER, *Judas: The Definitive Collection of Gospels and Legends about the Infamous Apostle of Jesus* (New York: HarperOne, 2007). Pp. viii +181. \$22.95.

“Judas studies” as a field has expanded dramatically since the long-awaited publication of the Coptic *Gospel of Judas* in 2006. One of many publications on the apostle and the Gospel bearing his name since that publication, this book, by one of the *Gospel’s* editors, offers access for nonspecialists to the debate over whether a positive or negative image of Judas emerges from the *Gospel*, and a useful contextualization of Judas within and beyond the Christian tradition. Seeking to “reconsider the figure of Judas as presented in ancient texts and traditions” (p. 1), Meyer places the Judas of the *Gospel of Judas* in the context of other Christian understandings—canonical and otherwise—of the apostle and contextualizes Judas within a narrative of other betrayers from pre-Christian antiquity and medieval views of Judas. Each chapter provides a discussion of a group of relevant texts, followed by the texts themselves in translations.

In the introduction, M. surveys the major texts to be discussed before sketching the diversity of the early Christian tradition of which the *Gospel of Judas* is one facet and arguing for a “reexamination of Judas Iscariot in the New Testament . . . with a fuller recognition of his positive character” (p. 18). William Klassen’s *Judas: Betrayer or Friend of Jesus?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) is cited several times in support.

In chap. 1, “Judas in the New Testament,” M. surveys Pauline references to the “handing over” of Jesus (1 Cor 11:23-24; Gal 2:19-20; cf. Rom 8:31-32) to the death scenes in Matt 27:3-10 and Acts 1:3-26. He suggests on the basis of the friendship between Judas and Jesus in the Gospels (citing Klassen), that traces of “the more positive image of Judas” that he sees in the *Gospel of Judas* “may already be hinted at in the accounts of Jesus in the New Testament gospels” (p. 31).

Meyer sets forth his own reading of the *Gospel of Judas* in chap. 2, where he summarizes the reactions of scholars such as April D. DeConick, John D. Turner, and Louis Painchaud, which are now set forth in monographs (e.g., DeConick, *The Thirteenth Apostle: What the Gospel of Judas Really Says* [London/New York: Continuum, 2007]) or in the proceedings of conferences devoted to the *Gospel* (*Codex Judas Papers: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex Held at Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13–16, 2008* [ed. April D. DeConick; Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 71;



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.