

Individuated Identity vs. Collective (*Minjung*) Identity

Towards a Postcolonial Reading of the Body Metaphor in 1 Corinthians

Sang Soo Hyun, PhD Candidate, Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

Introduction

R. S. Sugirtharajah claims that the “future of postcolonial biblical criticism depends on its ability to reinvent itself and enlarge its scope. It should continue to expose the power-knowledge axis but at the same time move beyond abstract theorization and get involved in the day-to-day messy activities which affect people’s lives” (2009a, 465). If so, a fundamental question is whether postcolonial discussion of identity of the oppressed really helps them to change or overcome their suffering context.

Postcolonial discussion of identity has been heavily influenced by poststructuralism. As Michel Foucault rejected the Enlightenment goal of objective truths because of its oppressive regime, Edward Said (1978) also criticized categorization of identity because of its dominating power. In recent postcolonial discussions of Asian and Latino identity, Namsoon Kang (2004) and Michelle Gonzalez (2004) strongly reject the search for essentialized group identity but promote diversified and individuated Asian and Latino identity. However, individuation seems too fractured to mobilize solid change. The reason is that, as *Minjung* theology has made clear, it is not isolated individuals but a collective *Minjung* who shares similar experiences and thus has a collective identity that can resist dominating powers. Therefore, I contend that postcolonial criticism, instead of only focusing on deconstruction of group identity fearing its dominating power under the influences of poststructuralism, must seek positive construction of a collective identity of the oppressed that is capable of resisting power.

In this paper, I will first examine the two interrelated reasons that some postcolonial critics have repudiated constructing a collective identity of the oppressed: first, that a categorized identity has been used as an oppressive power in history, and secondly, that the identity of the oppressed is ambiguous, complex, and hybrid. I will then examine the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians from a postcolonial perspective. After investigating that the underlying problem in the Corinthian church is not *schisma* itself but power struggles among the believers, I will argue that the body metaphor that is employed to resolve this problem is a rhetorical strategy that not only emphasizes diversity but also imposes a new alternative but collective identity on the believers.

Postcolonial Discussion of Identity of the Oppressed

An Objective of Postcolonial Criticism

The term “postcolonialism” first appeared in 1959 in a British newspaper to refer to what had happened in India, which obtained its independence in 1947 (Sugirtharajah 2002, 2). Although it is possible to say that postcolonial criticism emerged from the 1950s in the commonwealth literature that reflects the histories of Western colonization, most scholars understand that postcolonial criticism materialized in the 1970s as a critical study of literature that had been influenced by Western colonialism. Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) is generally regarded as the beginning of postcolonial criticism.¹

Postcolonial criticism is difficult to define because it does not refer to one single method but to a perspective or an interpretative frame which can be employed together with several methodological approaches. According to Tat-siong Benny Liew, postcolonial criticism does not provide “a number of mechanical steps that one can simply follow;” rather, it offers “a set of conceptual resources and a specific objective to interrogate and oppose imperialism” (2008, 221). His observation seems correct. In their introductions to postcolonial criticism, Lois Tyson (2006, 417-49), Uriah Y. Kim (2007, 161-82), Gale Yee (2010), and R. S. Sugirtharajah (2001) do not provide methodological steps to follow; rather, they broadly suggest hermeneutical questions that postcolonial critics must pose on the text.

However, the objective of postcolonial criticism is very straightforward. It unearths and challenges colonization and the negative effects that still exist in today’s world as a result of colonial oppression. According to Robert C. Young, postcolonial criticism “focuses on forces of oppression and coercive domination that operate in the contemporary world: the politics of anti-colonialism and neocolonialism, race, gender, nationalism, class, and ethnicities define its terrain” (2001, 11). Fernando F. Segovia contends that postcolonial criticism should draw attention to the “unequal relationship of domination and subordination at work” (2005, 75-6).

Postcolonial criticism could be understood as a resistant reading, as Uriah Kim suggests, that refuses to “accept the reading of the text by the West as the norm, as the only reading” (2007, 166). The effects of dismantling Eurocentrism have resulted in the growth of the voices of non-Westerners who have been colonized. However, such understanding neither overcomes the binary distinction between the West and the Rest nor reflects diverse and complex forms of current colonialism or neocolonialism. It seems more appropriate to understand postcolonial criticism a little broadly as “an oppositional reading practice that challenges colonial culture and control in terms both material and discursive” (Liew 2008, 216). In this paper, I will thus understand postcolonial criticism as an

¹ David Joy’s analysis of the origin of postcolonial criticism seems useful. According to him, postcolonial criticism “has emerged as an intellectual response to Western imperialism since the 1970s, and it emerged with the publication of Edward Said’s 1978 book *Orientalism*” (2008, 54; see also Sugirtharajah 2009b, 175; Liew 2008, 213).

interpretative framework that focuses on unequal power relations and the effects of colonialism or imperialism.²

Postcolonial Discussion of the Identity of the Oppressed

Some postcolonial critics have rejected constructing a collective identity of the oppressed for two reasons that are closely interrelated: categorized identity has been used as an oppressive power in history, and the identity of the oppressed is ambiguous, complex, and hybrid.

First, postcolonial critics have rejected the construction of a collective identity of the oppressed because such construction has functioned as an oppressive power in history. From the beginning of postcolonialism, postcolonial scholars have foregrounded the oppressive power of a categorized group identity. Said noted the unequal relationship between the West and the Orient. He pointed out that Western colonization had been practiced more through discourse rather than through violence. According to Said, the Orient was colonized not by the West's physical oppression but by the West's construction of the Orient. The Orient was defined and constructed as a homogenous entity according to the West's norms. The Orient as a whole was depicted as morally, intellectually and culturally inferior to the West. Said questioned whether indeed there could be a true representation of anything and regarded all representations as the representer's political construction of the other (1978, 202). As Michel Foucault, a poststructuralist, repudiated the Enlightenment goal of an absolute knowledge of objective truths in order to overturn oppressive regimes of thought (King 1999, 84), Said also criticized categorization of identity because of its dominating power.³ Postcolonial critics have largely destabilized all claims to absolute meaning and reevaluated all categorizes of thought. They have thus rejected constructing a homogenous identity based on essentialism and Eurocentrism that played a great role in the West's construction of the Orient; on the contrary, they have promoted construction of a local and diversified identity of the oppressed.

The challenges to essentialism and Eurocentrism are also found in postcolonial biblical scholarship. Segovia, understanding the development of biblical criticism as a process of liberation and decolonization, points out that the long-dominant construct of the scientific, universal, objective, impartial,

² There are certainly other interpretational frameworks that have a similar focus on unequal power relations such as feminist, liberation, minority, gay and lesbian, empire, and diaspora studies. Gale Yee put these criticisms, including postcolonial criticism, under the rubric of ideological criticism that studies the inequities of power in various relations. According to Yee, postcolonial criticism specifically focuses on "the power relations and disparities between empire and colony, between center and periphery" as feminist criticism focuses on gender disparities, liberation criticism on economic and class differentials, minority criticism on racial and ethnic discrimination (2010, 205); however, since colonial influence is embedded in various relations, it seems naïve to isolate postcolonial criticism from other ideological criticisms. I also think that postcolonial criticism, as Segovia claims, must "affect and be affected" by such studies (2005, 75-76).

³ In spite of its enormous influence, Said's work has been criticized. According to Yee's judgement, Said failed to recognize "the various historical expressions of political and cultural resistance colonized against colonization" within the Orient and "the advocates of anticolonial resistance within the West." Yee concludes that "by overlooking agency among the colonized, Said inadvertently privileges and empowers the Orientalism that he tries to dismantle" (2010, 197; see also Moore-Gilbert 1997, 34-73; McLeod 2000, 46-50).

decontextualized, and non-ideological reader has been changed to the construct of the local, perspectival, contextualized, ideological reader. According to him, such efforts to dismantle essentialized and Euro-centralized unequal power structures resulted in the growth of the voices of women and non-Westerners in the discipline that had been long dominated by male and European/Euro-American voices (2005, 23-79). Sugirtharajah challenges western theologies that justified the Empire and westernized Indian theologies that failed to overcome Christian triumphalism (2004, 38).⁴ He argues that one of the merits of postcolonial criticism is its challenge to universalistic, Eurocentric and patriarchal tendencies of western theologies and its recognition of the place given to the voice of the oppressed (2000, 58-60). In order to resist the colonial spirit and to hear this voice, postcolonial critics reject any attempts to construct a homogenous group identity of the oppressed but rather, promote a diversified and individuated identity of the oppressed (2001, 11; also Segovia 2005, 23-79).

The tendency to repudiate construction of a collective identity of the oppressed is also found in recent postcolonial discussions of Latino and Asian identity. Michelle Gonzalez opposes categorizing Hispanic as a monolithic race because of the diversity of Latinos in terms of race, culture and biology (2004, 58-78). Namsoon Kang, rejecting a generalized and unified identity of Asian people, argues that there is no essential core of *Asianness* (2004, 100-17). Looking at Kang's argument in more detail, she claims that Asian theologians developed Asian identity to emphasize its uniqueness and essential difference in the process of postcolonialism to overcome Orientalists' perspective of Asia. The group identity of Asia as a whole was once necessary to deny the claim for universal validity or superiority of Western culture and knowledge. However, she warns that a homogenous Asian identity can function as another form of oppressive power within the communities of Asians.

Secondly, postcolonial critics have rejected constructing a collective identity of the oppressed because of the ambiguity and complexity of such an identity. Continuing Kang's argument, this act of construction is possible only when there is a clear binary distinction between the colonizer and the colonized. However, it is not possible to maintain such binary distinctions because there have always been the colonized who act as the colonizer while dominating other colonized people because of these people's gender and class. Kang thus rejects not only the ethnic configuration of Asians but also the gender configuration of Korean women, some of whom have oppressed *other* Korean women within Korea's patriarchal society. She argues that "postcolonial theological anthropology must reject the search for the unchanging, culturally essential core of Asian/Asianness" (2004, 116). She regards a collective identity—for example, Asians, Asian feminist theologians and Korean women—as an imaginative and political construction. Refusing a totalized and categorized identity for oppressed groups, she insists that postcolonial critics must seek instead to construct a hybrid and individuated identity of the oppressed.

The tendency to repudiate the construction of a collective identity of the oppressed is understandable in the sense that power relations between the

⁴ Anna Runesson claims that the purpose of postcolonial biblical criticism is deconstruction of "epistemological and methodological positions that prevent non-western biblical exegesis from developing in its own right in local contexts" (2011, 67).

oppressor and the oppressed are highly ambiguous and complex. There is neither the pure oppressor nor the pure oppressed. For example, we cannot simply define the Roman Empire as the oppressor as a whole. Within the Roman Empire, male was the oppressor and female was the oppressed. Although Israel was the oppressed in its relation to the Roman Empire, Israelite male was the oppressor in relation to Israelite women. It is therefore not easy to decide whether the female Roman citizen was the oppressor or the oppressed. Unequal power relations have been practiced, not only by ethnic discrimination but also by virtue of differences in gender, class, age, job, social status, economic status, education, physical outlook, kinship, regionalism, and so forth. Since postcolonial criticism pays attention to both explicit power relations and implicit power relations, construction of a collective identity of the oppressed is inevitably difficult.

However, in spite of the potentially oppressive power of a collective identity and the complex and ambiguous power relations between the oppressor and the oppressed, the construction of a collective identity of the oppressed must not be abandoned if we consider the ultimate goal of postcolonial criticism. Segovia claims that this goal must move beyond analysis towards transformation. Sugirtharajah argues that “the task of postcolonialism is ensuring that the needs and aspirations of the exploited are catered to, rather than being merely an interesting and engaging avenue of inquiry” (2001, 275). If their assertions are true, construction and elevation of individuated and isolated identity of the oppressed does not change the day-to-day realities of their suffering. The reasons are simple. As *Minjung* theology has made clear, it is not isolated individuals but a collective *Minjung*⁵ that shares similar experiences and thus has a unified group identity that can resist dominating powers. Mary Douglas says that “individuals have no agency to change the world or to challenge existing boundaries” (2002, 114-15). The voices of the oppressed cannot be heard unless they become a collective. Isolated individuals easily become victims of colonizing power. In order to resist colonial powers, the oppressed then must *consciously* and *voluntarily* identify themselves as a collective that resists definition by the oppressor’s epistemology and ideology.

Therefore, I contend that, instead of focusing only on critiquing and deconstructing collective identity, postcolonial criticism must seek to construct a new collective identity of the oppressed that is capable of resisting oppressive powers.

⁵ *Minjung* is a Korean word composed of two Chinese characters (民衆) that generally means people. “It refers to those in the Korean population who are silence, powerless, economically exploited, and marginalized in different ways. This marginalization is taking place in both the socio-political structures in Korea and, from a global perspective, in the socio-political structures of neo-colonialism in a postcolonial world...*Minjung* refer to the suppressed groups in a global and historical context” (Suh 2003, 143). *Minjung* theology states that “Jesus’ healing power can be realized only when it is met by the will of the *Minjung*. Jesus could do no mighty work in his native town because people in his home town did not believe in him” (Ahn 1993, 169). To put it in another way, today’s suffering realities of the marginalized can be changed only when *Minjung* takes initiative. From a perspective of *Minjung* theology, *Minjung* have been victims in history; however, *Minjung* could be subjects of history when they identify not as an individual but as a collective being.

Towards a Postcolonial Reading of the Body Metaphor in 1 Corinthians

By contending that the underlying problem in the Corinthian church is not *schisma* itself but power struggles or unequal power relations among the believers, I will hypothesize that the body metaphor employed to resolve this problem is a rhetoric that not only emphasizes diversity in unity but also imposes a new collective and alternative identity on the believers.

Before analyzing the body metaphor from a postcolonial perspective, it seems necessary to explain what questions I will pose about the text. Postcolonial criticism suggests some hermeneutical questions that postcolonial critics must ask of the text, its reception history and its “flesh and blood” readers. First, it questions how different imperial contexts affected the production of the biblical texts and their ideologies. Secondly, it examines how the texts have been interpreted in the context of Western colonization. Thirdly, it scrutinizes how contemporary readers’ global contexts, particular standpoints, or social locations influence their readings of the biblical texts (Yee 2010, 204-209; Segovia 1998, 156-63). Thus, I will ask the following questions in my postcolonial reading: How does the text represent various aspects of colonial oppression or unequal power relations? What does the text reveal about the postcolonial identity of the oppressed? Does the text support or oppose imperial ideology? Does the text provide space or means for resistance? What concerns arise from contemporary readers’ contexts when they interpret the text?

An Example Reflecting Postcolonial Tendency

The term σῶμα in 1 Corinthians refers to various things; it is also used as a metaphor for the church.⁶ Scholars have understood the body metaphor as rhetoric to address *schisma* in the Corinthian Church and have long interpreted the body metaphor as either a call for unity against factionalism or as a call for diversity against uniformity.⁷ Recent scholarship, reflecting the postcolonial tendency to

⁶ The term σῶμα occurs 47 times in 1 Corinthians and refers to various objects: (i) the human body (1 Cor. 5:3; 6:13ab, 15, 16, 18ab, 19, 20; 7:4ab, 34; 9:27; 12:12abc, 14, 15ab, 16ab, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25; 13:3; 15: 40ab, 44ab). (ii) The body of a plant (1 Cor. 15: 37, 38ab), with σῶμα used as a metaphor to explain the resurrection of the body. (iii) The body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16; 11:24, 27). It does not directly designate Christ’s earthly body here, but his body in the Eucharist. (iv) A metaphor for the church (1 Cor. 10:17; 11:29; 12:13, 27). The *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Bauer et al. 1979, 1749) includes 1 Cor. 11:29 in the third category (as the body of Christ); however, when Paul underscores the importance of “discerning the body,” he rebukes the Corinthians’ unworthy behaviour in the community meal (1 Cor. 11:27) and urges the privileged members to “wait for” the disadvantaged members (1 Cor. 11:33). Since “the discernment of the body” means caring for church members, it is legitimate to interpret the body in 1 Cor. 11:29 as referring to the church. In this essay, I will focus on the fourth case: σῶμα as a metaphor for the church.

⁷ Yung Suk Kim aptly points out three scholarly understandings of the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians: the body as an ecclesiological organism, a symbol of corporate solidarity, and as having christological significance. Scholars who see the body metaphor as an ecclesiological organism, though their arguments are different at some points, include Margaret Mitchell (1992), C.K. Barrett (1968), Michelle V. Lee (2006), Richard A. Horsley (1998), Gerd Theissen (1982), Dale Martin (1995), Jerome Neyrey (1990), and Robert Gundry (1976). Kim opposes this view that emphasizes the importance of unity over diversity because it (1) functions as a boundary

repudiate constructing a collective identity, seems to prefer to regard the body metaphor as a call for diversity rather than a call for unity.

For example, Yung Suk Kim points out three problems of interpreting the body metaphor as an ecclesiological organism that emphasizes unity: (i) it functions “as a mark of an exclusive boundary that silences the voice of marginality in the community and society,” (ii) it supports “a narrow, rigid, and closed conception of the community,” (iii) it prevents “the possibility of an ethical interpretation of the body of Christ in the community and in the larger context of society” (2008, 1). Noting the history in which unity has been used as a rhetoric of power that demands sacrifice of diversity, he claims that “from the perspective of the powerless or the marginalized, unity is not the solution to their predicaments, because it too often serves a rhetoric of power that sacrifices diversity” (3). He thus argues that the focus of the body metaphor is diversity rather than unity. He also claims that being in one body of Christ is “not a matter of simply belonging to a single ecclesiological body, but is rather a matter of having a mind and purpose framed by the same gospel” (2). Concerning his interpretation of the meaning of being in the body of Christ, I agree with him. However, his reduced emphasis on unity seems problematic. The reason why he shifts the focus of the body metaphor from unity to diversity is that, as I mentioned earlier in my analysis of postcolonial tendency to repudiate constructing a collective identity, a collective identity has been used as an oppressive power. However, he fails to see the positive power of a collective identity that is capable of resisting oppressive powers.

Power Struggles in the Corinthian Church

To read the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians from a postcolonial perspective is attractive because it allows interpreters to see not only the problem of *schisma* in the Corinthian Church but also its underlying cause—power struggles among the believers.

In 1 Corinthians, Paul provides extensive instruction on the problems within the Corinthian Church—that is, sexual immorality (1 Cor. 5:1-8; 6:12-20), legal disputes (1 Cor. 6:1-11), marriage (1 Corinthians 7), eating meat that had been offered to idols (1 Cor. 8:1-11:1), abuses of the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:17-34), spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 12:1-14:40), and controversies about the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. 15:1-58). However, one of his underlying concerns is *schisma* within the Corinthian Church.

Scholarly opinions vary about the underlying causes of division (1 Cor. 1:10; 11:18), dissension (1 Cor. 12:25), quarreling (1 Cor. 1:11; 3:3), and jealousy (1 Cor. 3:3) in this church. F. C. Baur argues that it was due mainly to tension and disagreement between the Petrine-Jewish group and the Pauline-Gentile group. Rather than seeing four different parties in the church as 1 Cor. 1:12 suggests, Baur

marker; (2) does not challenge hierarchy or unity promoted at the price of diversity in society. Scholars who understand the body metaphor as denoting corporate solidarity include Wheeler Robinson (1980), W.D. Davies (1980), and Eduard Schweizer (1964). Kim evaluates this view positively because it has a broader conception of community. Scholars who take christological approaches, that see “in the body of Christ” as union with Christ or participation in the messianic kingdom of God, include Ernst Kasemann (1971) and Albert Schweitzer (1931). Kim seems to support this view. He understands “being in Christ” not as “belonging to a party” but as “association with the cross of Christ” (2008, 1-31).

suggests that there were only two parties. While those who claimed adherence to Paul and Apollos represented the Pauline party, those who claimed devotion to Peter and Christ constituted the Petrine party (1831, 61-206). Nils Dahl, however, interprets the situation differently, suggesting that the slogans “I belong to Apollos,” “I belong to Cephas,” and “I belong to Christ” in 1 Cor. 1:12 do not represent different factions, but are expressions of dissatisfaction or opposition to Paul (1967, 313-35). Although the positions of Baur and Dahl have been influential, they require modification because they have not examined closely the internal social dynamics within the Corinthian Church. The real problem was not *schisma* itself but unequal power relations or power struggles among the believers. *Schisma* was a mere expression or result of these power struggles.

Unequal power relations are found at different levels within the Corinthian Church. First, there was a power struggle at the socioeconomic level. The members of the Corinthian Church represented a spectrum of different social and economic classes ranging from prosperous household heads to slaves. Wayne A. Meeks claims that “a Pauline congregation generally reflected a fair cross-section of urban society” (1983, 73).⁸ Paul says that not many of the members in the Corinthian Church were “wise,” “powerful,” or “of noble birth” (1 Cor. 1:26-28; 7:21-23; 11:22). This indicates that although most members of the community belonged to the lower social class, some were wealthy and well-born. Crispus was a household head and a synagogue officer (Acts 18:8; 1 Cor. 1:14); Gaius had a house large enough to host Paul and the whole church (Rom. 16:23; 1 Cor. 1:14); Erastus was the city treasurer of Corinth (Acts 19:22; Rom. 16:23; 2 Tim. 4:20). The rich members’ disregard for the poor members at the Lord’s Supper could be a clear example of such a power struggle in this church (1 Cor. 11:17-22). Some who had a house and enough food to eat were humiliating “those who have nothing” (1 Cor. 11:21-22). The *haves* seem to arrive well before any laborers who owed their days to their employers and masters. They began the community meal, were being filled, and even drunk while the *have-nots* were “going hungry” (1 Cor. 11:21). Witherington argues that at Christian fellowship meals, the hosts may well have followed normal customs and served wealthy merchants in one room with one kind of food and the poor and slaves elsewhere, probably the *atrium*, with the leftovers (1995, 29).

Secondly, there was a power struggle at an ethnic and religious level. The issue of eating meat sacrificed to idols (1 Corinthians 8) and the disagreement over participation in meals at temples (1 Corinthians 10) are perhaps examples of such power struggles among believers who had different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Although the Corinthian Church was mainly Gentile, there were also a few Jewish members. Eating meals sacrificed to idols could be a serious problem for Jewish Christians, but not for Gentile Christians. These differences in viewpoint may be due to socio-economic diversity as well as ethnic and religious differences. Only the relatively well-off were likely to have been regularly confronted with invitations to such meals (Witherington 1995, 28).

Thirdly, there was another power struggle at the spiritual level. The Corinthians’ hierarchical understanding of spiritual gifts caused dissension (1 Cor.

⁸ However, there are scholars that challenge Meek’s conclusion that Pauline congregations were of mixed classes and examine class diversity in detail (Friesen 2004, 323-61; Longenecker 2009b, 36-59).

12:1-14:40). Members in the Corinthian Church understood spiritual gifts hierarchically. Some were so awed by their new knowledge, freedom and capacities for ecstatic speech that they considered themselves fully mature and perfect (1 Cor. 2:6-3:4). They tended to judge each other and even their mentors (1 Cor. 4:1-5), while at the same time neglecting the moral demands of their calling (1 Cor. 5:1-6:20). They valued the gift of “tongues” and were eager for this gift. They even thought that those who had the gift of tongues were superior to those who did not. The charismatic manifestation of the Spirit in the form of spiritual gifts was regarded as the sign of their own spiritual power (Wenham 1995, 208). This spiritual elitism led to factionalism (Johnson 1999, 297).⁹

Fourthly, there was a power struggle at the level of the house-church. Some Corinthians said “I am of Paul,” or “I am of Apollos,” while others said “I am of Peter,” or “I am of Christ”¹⁰ (1 Cor. 1:12). It does not seem possible to assign a distinct ideological program to each of these factions. They were perhaps created more by personal allegiance to particular leaders than by clearly defined theological differences. Political groups were often designated by the name of the persons whose political interests they served (Hays 1997, 22; Collins 1999, 75). The Corinthian Church met in private houses (cf. 1 Cor. 16:19; Rom 16:5). If the whole church was an assembly of the various cells, or house churches (cf. 1 Cor. 14:23; 16:19), this division may also be interpreted as a power struggle among these cells or house churches in Corinth (Talbert 1987, xxii). In the Greco-Roman world, the common quest for honour and praise was one of the main forces that bound society together (Moxnes 1988, 207-18). Almost every public activity was a competition for praise and honour, because honour was seen as a “limited good.” In this sense it is easy to see why there were rivalries among Corinthians (Witherington 1995, 155).¹¹

In these power struggles, the privileged were often boastful and proud while despising the marginalized. The relations between them were governed by the imperial ideology or imperial cultural values that naturalize the *haves'* domination over the *have-nots*.¹² From the fear of loss or downward mobility that was so common (Rohrbaugh 1987, 543), some wealthier and more privileged members among the Corinthians “sought to integrate their new faith in Christ into a well-rounded lifestyle of civic responsibility, piety, and prestige in the ordinary rhythms

⁹ This internal division can also be attributed partly to socio-economic differences within the church (Wenham 1995, 12).

¹⁰ The fourth slogan seems stranger than the other three. This claim seems to be what every Christians should confess. Some Corinthians seem to claim Christ as their leader in an exclusive way with a boastful presentation to have direct spiritual access to Christ apart from any humanly mediated tradition (Hays 1997, 23). Some scholars interpret the Christ party as a group of Judaizers or anti-Pauline Christian Jews, while others identify a group of pneumatic Gnostics who opted for the Spirit over and against tradition (Collins 1999, 72).

¹¹ House churches would not be meeting in space provided by patronage (like *domus*), but rather in rented or shared space (like *insulae* or tenement buildings) provided by the members themselves. In this case, the influence of house church leaders would not be significant (Longenecker 2009b, 36-59; Adams 2009, 60-78). However, no matter where house churches meet, the idea of the competition for honour among house churches is not reduced. Even in today's house church movement, the competition for honour among house churches is vividly observed.

¹² “The *haves*” does not simply refer to the rich but includes those who subjugate others with certain ideologies, whether protognostic (ascetic) or libertine (licentious) (Kim 2008, 62; Fiorenza 1987, 386-403).

of a Roman colony” (Elliott 2008, 108).¹³ The *haves* among the believers mimicked, to borrow the term from Homi K. Bhabha, the attitudes of imperial Rome in their relationships with the *have-nots*. The *haves*’ mimicry broke apart or split up the Corinthian church and threatened the life of the church as one community.

Bhabha argues that mimicry is “one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge” (1994, 85). The call for imitation is based on a difference between the colonizer and the colonized that cannot be overcome. The colonized are usually described as savage, uncivilized, and inferior, while the colonizer is described as masterful, civilized, and superior. The attitudes of the colonized towards the colonizer and the ways they identify themselves are changeable and ambiguous. The colonized may imitate or mimic the colonizer, because they want to be like the colonizer. But they soon realize that they cannot truly be a colonizer, because they recognize the existence of an uncrossable boundary lying between them and the colonizer. Their failed attempt to become like the colonizer leads to disappointment and anger, often slipping into mockery and creating the feeling of unhomeliness among the colonized—they feel they have no place to which they can truly and permanently belong, neither at the centre (the space of the colonizer) nor the periphery (the location of the colonized). In spite of this failed destiny of mimicry, the attitudes of the colonized or the oppressed are heavily governed by the principle of mimicry since, as Yee observes, it “functions among the colonized primarily at the level of the unconscious” (2010, 201).

Though Bhabha uses the concept of mimicry to explain ambivalent attitudes of the oppressed towards the Empire, I think we need to examine the functions of mimicry not only in the (external) relationship between the colonizer and the colonized but also in the (internal) relationship among the oppressed. In the external relationship, mimicry explains the double attitudes of the oppressed towards the colonizer, that is, affection and resistance (mimicry later turns into mockery). Thus the identity of the oppressed is very ambiguous and complex. In the internal relationship, mimicry of the *haves* among the oppressed creates internal conflicts among the oppressed. The *have-nots* within the oppressed experience double oppression: from the Empire on the one hand and from the *haves* within their own community on the other. The oppression from the *haves* can be more cruel and harsh. In the colonization of Japan, for example, Koreans often suffered more severely from their brothers (the *haves*) who mimicked the imperial ideology of Japan. Thus, Bhabha’s conception of mimicry should be expanded in order to examine internal conflicts caused by mimicry.

This is my hypothesis. If the problem of the Corinthian church is neglect of diversity among the believers, the body metaphor might be used as rhetoric to draw people’s attention to the importance of diversity. Kim argues that the real problem in the community was lack of diversity. He says that “the divisiveness of the Corinthian community results not from a lack of unity but from a failure on the part of its members to acknowledge and respect the diversity present in the community” (2008, 4, 56, 97). Thus he reads diversity as Paul’s proposed solution

¹³ We may say that the *haves* sided with social conservatism that supported the ideal of hierarchical unity (Kim 2008, 55).

to the Corinthian problems (71). However, the real problem in the church is unequal power struggles among the believers and the *haves'* mimicry of the imperial cultural norms. Although Kim questions whether unity is “the solution to the problem in the Corinthian community and society” (25), I want to ask whether diversity is the solution to the Corinthian problems. Construction of diversified and individuated identity cannot be the answer to the problem of the Corinthian church because it does not resolve unequal power struggles among the believers. In order to resolve the problem of unequal power relations and mimicry, the Corinthian church needs to resist imperial ideology. The body metaphor thus constructs a collective identity of the believers, creates a sense of belonging to an alternative body, and encourages transformed power relations among the believers that do not imitate the imperial ideology.¹⁴

The Body Metaphor in 1 Corinthians

Paul's main concern in 1 Corinthians is not simply to edify individual believers, but to nurture and build up the community (Hays 1997, 11). He constantly urges the Corinthians to understand their new identity as one body of Christ. Although the body metaphor was a typical Greco-Roman socio-political term used to appeal for social concord against factionalism, Paul seems to transform this usage. The body metaphor in a Greco-Roman context is used by the upper class ruling ideology to confirm the hierarchical structure of the society and domination over the marginalized;¹⁵ however, Paul transforms its cultural conception of hierarchical unity by reversing the imperial ideology of honour.

¹⁴ Although I disagree with Kim in the respect that the focus of the body metaphor is diversity, I think he is right when he describes “Paul's new imagination of the body of Christ as a collective participation in Christ crucified. In that community, the image of Christ crucified deconstructs the conception of the community based on powers of wealth, status, and identity and reconstructs the community based on sacrificial love and solidarity with those who are broken in society” (2008, 21).

¹⁵ Although the term “body” in the Greco-Roman world referred in a literal sense to various things (e.g., a “corpse,” a “living human,” an “animal body,” and a “slave”), it was often used as a metaphor for human societies (Martin, 1991, 3-37). In this metaphorical sense, the term “body” was used by Greco-Roman authors as a socio-political term; namely, as a ruling ideology for the upper-class. The comparison between the body and human societies was rhetorically commonplace, particularly in speeches calling for social concord (Mitchell 1992, 157-64). The body metaphor seems to have two functions: (i) to support the hierarchical unity of society; and (ii) to emphasize members' interdependent relationship in a community (Collins 1999, 458; Horsley 1998, 171; Malherbe 1986, 88). First, Greco-Roman authors used the body metaphor to appeal to the unity of society. Plato used it to speak of the unity of the city against any evil that would tear it into many parts (Grube 1974, 123). Dio Chrysostom (*Discourse* 34.20) depicted a city as a “body” to appeal to his fellow citizens. He urged those who were divided by different ideals to have the same mind (cf. 1 Cor. 1:10; Phil. 2.5). Aelius Aristides also depicted the *polis* as a “body” to encourage citizen solidarity. The unity which Greco-Roman writers sought through the body metaphor was not an egalitarian unity, but a hierarchical and unequal unity. This unity was based on a hierarchical framework that advanced the rights or privileges of the ruling class, while demanding the unqualified obedience of the lower classes. Politicians used the body metaphor to urge members of the subordinate classes to stay in their places in the hierarchical social order and not to upset the natural equilibrium of the body by rebelling against their superiors (Hays 1997, 213). The classic example of this use of the metaphor is Menenius Agrippa's fable, “*The Belly and the Limbs*.” Agrippa used the body metaphor when he tried to persuade revolutionary plebs, who opposed the oppressive government dominated by patricians. In this fable Agrippa said that though only the hands, mouth, and teeth – which represented the lower class—seemed to work hard, it was the

Paul rejects unequal power relations in one body of Christ based on the diversity of the believers' racial, social, and economic standings. He argues that there is no hierarchical distinction between Jews and Greeks (1 Cor. 1:24), circumcized and uncircumcized (1 Cor. 7:18-19), and slaves and free (1 Cor. 7:21-22). The cultural hierarchical Jew-Greek and slave-free power relations have been broken down in one body (1 Cor. 12:13). Paul claims that the old markers of identity should no longer divide the community (cf. Gal 3:27-28). Paul's body metaphor then does not function as a boundary marker like the Greco-Roman stoic body metaphor does.

Paul also opposes spiritual hierarchy or elitism in the Corinthian Church. The Corinthians tend to think of "inspired utterance" or "ecstatic" experiences as a mark of being truly "spiritual." The Corinthians seem to have considered themselves to be already like the angels, thus truly "spiritual," needing neither sex in the present (1 Cor. 7:1-7) nor a body in the future (1 Cor. 15:1-58). Speaking angelic dialects by the Spirit was evidence enough for them of their participation in the new spirituality, hence their enthusiasm for speaking in tongues (Witherington 1995, 258; Fee 1987, 572-3). However, Paul insists that their spiritual gifts are not achievements but gifts (1 Cor. 12: 7-8, 11). Believers do not choose their gifts. The Spirit "gives" and "distributes" gifts and ministries "to each" as he wills (1 Cor.

belly, namely, the ruling class, that provided the nutritious energy for the body to function (Livy, *The History of Rome* 2.32). This parable attempted to illustrate by means of a concrete image why the working class needed the seemingly idle nobility. The stomach, Agrippa pointed out, needed to digest the food in order to supply energy to the hands and feet to work. Therefore if the plebs rebelled, they would eventually run out of energy and die. In this way Agrippa tried to calm the political hostilities that the working class felt against the ruling class. In the meantime he justified the social hierarchy (Collins 1999, 459). Another example of the usage of the body metaphor to support social hierarchy comes from Galen (129 AD – 200 or 216 AD). He claimed, from his knowledge of the human body, that there were strong and weak parts in the body; thus the superior parts must rule and the inferior must submit. According to him, stronger parts can refuse to receive assistance from weaker parts. But weaker parts cannot refuse to receive assistance from stronger parts. Therefore, the weaker parts' existence highly depends on the stronger parts' aid (Galen, *Hygiene* 6.13). He supported the hierarchical social order by likening the collapse of the hierarchical social order to a bodily disease (Martin 1991, 31).

Second, the body metaphor was used to emphasize the interdependent relationship of members in a community. To achieve the unity of society—even though it was a hierarchical unity—each member must realize mutual interdependence. For instance, Maximus used the body metaphor to argue for active participation in civic responsibility, emphasizing the joint contribution of all members to the functioning of the whole (Maximus of Tyre, *Oration* 15.4-5). Greco-Roman writers often used the body metaphor to emphasize the interdependency and union both in brothers' and husband-wife relationships (Plutarch, *Advice to Bride and Groom* 142E-143A, 144CD, 144F-145D). Hierocles, using an extended body image, spoke of the importance of *brotherly love* in a community (Hierocles, *On Duties. On Fraternal Love* 4.27.20=.660, 15-664, 18 Hence). He depicted brothers in this way: "brothers far more than parts of the body are adapted by nature to help each other...we should consider that in a certain way a person's brothers are parts of him just as my eyes are of me, and similarly my hands, and the rest." He asked brothers to think that "they would not be able to perform their own functions without the presence of the other members" and to treat their brothers in the same way they would expect their brothers to treat them. According to Hierocles, brotherly love was not self-love. Hierocles, through his body metaphor, emphasized interdependent relationships, while opposing the attitudes of separatism and individualism (Hierocles, *On Duties. How to Conduct Oneself Toward One's Fatherland* 3:39.34-36=3.730, 17-734, 10 Hence).

From these examples we can see that, although the body metaphor in the Greco-Roman world was used to emphasize members' interdependent relationship in a society, it was also often used as a ruling ideology to support the hierarchical social order.

12: 11). “As he wills” suggests that gifts have the character of free grace and are ultimately the expression of the Spirit’s own sovereign action in the life of the believer and the community as a whole (Fee 1987, 599). It is God who chooses and arranges the members in one body (1 Cor. 12:18) and appoints each member’s gifts and services in the church (1 Cor. 12:28). Because each member’s gifts and roles within the church are determined by the will of God (1 Cor. 2:12), Paul argues that there is no sense of superiority in one body of Christ.

Paul moreover claims that believers must treat the less honorable and respectable members with greater honour and respect (1 Cor. 12:23-24). It is precisely those members who render the less spectacular services who should be accorded the greatest respect. It is plain that in Corinth there are strong people who exalt themselves over the weak. The “strong” impose a feeling of inferiority on those who have less ostensible gifts and regard them as non-spiritual. The most outwardly attractive or dramatic ministries are not necessarily the most fundamental. Other gifts may be less striking in character, exercised in a less ostentatious, more private manner, and yet contribute more substantially to the community’s well-being and growth (Banks 1980, 64). Paul’s point seems to be that such seeming weakness has no relationship to the real value of either the gifts or those who possess them, nor to their necessity to the body. Paul thus challenges the imperial cultural values that set up an honour roll favoring the more socially elite, presentable and dignified Christians, or those with the more outwardly showy or dramatic gifts (Witherington 1995, 263).

Paul’s primary rhetorical strategy in 1 Corinthians is to identify in part with the high-status members of the congregation in order to get them to change their behaviour and attitudes toward the lower-status Christians in the community (Martin 1991, 563-9). He urges the strong to give more honour and respect to the weak, and so cease their mimicry of imperial ideology. It is the “more respectable members” to whom the argument in 1 Cor. 12:21-24 is directed, since it is they who might be tempted to say to the weak “I have no need of you” (Witherington 1995, 254). Paul uses the body metaphor not to support a social or spiritual hierarchy but to challenge the imperial spirit by imposing new identity of one body of Christ on believers.

Paul also uses the body metaphor to emphasize interdependent relationships and the necessity of diversity in the church. He asserts that to become a body, the church needs various members who have different gifts and roles (cf. 1 Cor. 12:19). There must be varieties of gifts, services, and activities in the united church (1 Cor. 12:4-6). The church which Paul speaks of is the body which consists of many members who share gifts and services with each other (cf. 1 Cor. 12:14). In the church, as in the body, one may have the gift of wisdom or knowledge, while another may have the gift of faith or healing (1 Corinthians 8-9); one may have the gift of working miracles or prophecy, while another may have the gift of discernment of spirits or various kinds of tongues (1 Cor. 12:10); one may have charismatic spiritual manifestations, while another may have humbler forms of service as manifestations of God’s presence (1 Cor. 12:4-6). All must be respected regardless of the forms of their gifts and services. No person or group of persons on the basis of their particular gifts should discount other contributions to the body or impose uniformity upon everyone else (Banks 1980, 63-64). Thus, the

church for Paul is not homogeneous, but a dynamic community where unity and diversity interact with each other (Hays 1997, 210).

When Paul uses the body metaphor, he equally values both unity and diversity. The diversity in the church does not endanger the unity of the church as people sometimes assume, because diversity is produced by the same source. Although gifts, services, and activities are various, all are produced from the same Spirit, the same Lord, and the same God (1 Cor. 12:4-6; 8-11). Another reason why the variety of gifts does not endanger the unity of the church is because all gifts exist for the common good, not for individual good (1 Cor. 12:7). The whole purpose of God's distribution of spiritual gifts is for the benefit of the community as a whole, not merely the private edification of the individuals who receive the gifts (cf. 1 Cor. 1:3-5, 12, 26; 2 Cor. 12:19; 13:10). But the Corinthians' use of the gifts was as a means of self-aggrandizement rather than as a way of building up community identity (Johnson 1999, 306). Paul asserts that all spiritual gifts must be used for the purpose of building up the church, not for self-indulgence. Paul values the gift of prophecy more than the gift of tongues because the former builds the church, while the latter mainly benefits individuals and outsiders (1 Cor. 14:4).

Paul asserts that the Corinthians must identify themselves as members of one body. One cannot function or even exist without others' help or co-existence. All members need each other: the "eye" needs "hands," and the "head" needs "feet" (1 Cor. 12:14-21). All members of the body are intimately bonded together. They share suffering and joy together (1 Cor. 12:26). Even more, one member's failure can cause the whole church to fail in its relationship with God. One member's sexual immorality can taint, weaken, and eventually destroy the whole community just as "a little leaven leavens the whole lump" (1 Cor. 5:6-8). The church is more than a group of individuals who belong to each other. They are members of one body (1 Cor. 12:27). They do not exist by themselves but as members to the body (cf. 1 Cor. 12:14-16). The temptation to seek salvation by exalting the individual against such collectives or by seeking withdrawal from the body of socio-historical existence becomes a serious problem throughout the history of the church (Robinson 1988, 8).

Conclusions

Although postcolonial criticism emerged originally to resist Western colonization in the 1970s, it is not necessary to limit postcolonial criticism to being a discourse that exposes inequities of power between the West and the Rest. In contemporary diverse and complex forms of colonization, postcolonial criticism must address unequal power relations in various relations and the effects of colonialism by employing postcolonial theories. Postcolonial critics, under the influence of poststructuralism, tend in general to dismantle a collective identity of the oppressed because this collective identity has been used as an oppressive power in history, and the identity of the oppressed is ambiguous and complex. All destructive forms of oppression rooted in categorized identity must be stopped. However, I also want to suggest that postcolonial criticism must seek to construct a collective identity of the oppressed in order to provide them with an effective means to resist oppressive powers.

The tendency to repudiate constructing a collective identity but to promote an individuated identity has been so influential that some scholars have interpreted the body metaphor as a call for diversity rather than a call for unity. However, if we consider the underlying problem of the Corinthian church is not *schisma* itself but unequal power relations among the believers and the *haves'* mimicry of imperial ideology, the body metaphor not only emphasizes diversity among the believers but also imposes a new identity among believers. Even though the body metaphor acknowledges the importance of diversity among the believers, it does not promote the construction of believers' individual identities at the cost of unity. To Paul, diversity among the believers does not compromise but rather promotes the unity of the believers as one body of Christ. Thus, diversity could be understood as relational difference among the believers that does not forsake the importance of a collective identity as one body of Christ.

Since postcolonial sensitivity tries to bring the voice of the marginalized up to the forefront, I would like to present one case study to close my paper. I believe this case study shows us what the marginalized people are really suffering in today's world. In ethnocentric Korean society, there are one million foreign laborers. This number has rapidly grown in the last decade. Although these labourers left their home with a dream of a better life, some of them experience harsh oppression and racism and become victims of globalized capitalism. In order to resist oppressive powers and make themselves seen and heard, they gather together even though they have very different backgrounds in terms of nationality, language, culture, religion, education, gender, and social status in their home country. What has brought them together is their shared experience of suffering. They voluntarily and consciously identify themselves as *Minjung* based on these shared experiences of suffering and oppression. They claim that "my blood is red like yours. Please don't think I am different. I am not different." Their protest clearly shows that they are suffering not from lack of acknowledgement of diversity but from lack of acknowledgement of unity or common humanity.

As the construction of a homogenous identity that emphasizes unity can function as an oppressive power, construction of an individuated identity that emphasizes diversity can also function as an oppressive power. Letty M. Russell notes that "difference itself has become a category of exclusion and domination in our postcolonial world" (2009, 71). She argues that "the essentializing of difference makes it possible to use differences as a structural weapon of oppression" (72). Therefore, it is not necessary to regard the body metaphor mainly as a call for diversity considering its ethical implications. As Alistair Scott May argues, the body metaphor also implies radical notion of belonging and social identity (2004, 267). Understanding "the *ekklesia* as an alternative society to the Roman imperial order" (Horsley 1998, 235), Paul invites the believers, through the body metaphor, to have a new, collective, and alternative identity that does not conform the imperial ideology.

Bibliography

Adams, Edward. 2009. "First-Century Models for Paul's Churches: Selected Scholarly Developments Since Meeks." In *After the First Urban Christians:*

- The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later*, edited by Todd D. Still and David G. Horrell, 60-78. New York: T&T Clark International.
- Ahn, Byung Mu. 1993. "Jesus and People (Minjung)." In *Asian Faces of Jesus*, edited by R. S. Sugirtharajah, 163-72. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Banks, Robert. 1980. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Barrett, C. K. 1968. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. 1979. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baur, F. C. 1831. "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4: 61-206.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Raymond F. 1999. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press.
- Dahl, Nils A. 1967. "Paul and The Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1-4." In *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, edited by W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, and R.R. Niebuhr, 313-35. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, W. D. 1980. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. 4th edn. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Dio Chrysostom. 1932-1951. *Discourse*. Translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Douglas, Mary. 2000. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Elliott, Neil. 2008. "The Apostle Paul and Empire." In *In The Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance*, edited by Richard A. Horsley, 97-116. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Fee, Gordon D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. 1987. "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 33: 386-403.
- Friesen, Steven. 2004. "Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-Called New Consensus." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26: 323-61.
- Galen. *Hygiene*. 1951. Translated by Robert Montraville Greene. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas.
- Gonzalez, Michelle A. 2004. "Who is Americana/o? Theological Anthropology, Postcoloniality, and the Spanish-Speaking America." In *Postcolonial Theologies: Divinity and Empire*, edited by Catherine Keller, Michael Nausner, and Mayra Rivera, 58-78. St. Louis: Chalice Press.
- Gundry, Robert. 1976. *Soma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology, 1-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hays, Richard B. 1997. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press.

- Hierocles. 1986. *On Duties*. Translated by Abraham J. Malherbe, in *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Library of Early Christianity; Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Horrell, David G. 2004. "Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre." *New Testament Studies* 50: 349-69.
- Horsley, Richard. 1998. *1 Corinthians*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Hurd, John Coolidge. 1983. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy and Penner Todd C. 1999. *The Writings of the New Testament*. 2nd rev. and enl. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Joy, David. 2008. *Mark and its Subalterns: A Hermeneutical Paradigm for a Postcolonial Context*. London: Equinox.
- Kang, Namsoon. 2004. "Who/What is Asian? A Postcolonial Theological Reading of Orientalism and Neo-Orientalism." In *Postcolonial Theologies: Divinity and Empire*, edited by Catherine Keller, Michael Nausner, and Mayra Rivera, 100-117. St. Louis: Chalice Press.
- Käsemann, Ernst. 1971. *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Kim, Uriah Y. 2007. "Postcolonial Criticism." In *Judges and Methods*, edited by Gale A. Lee, 161-182. 2nd Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Kim, Yung Suk. 2008. *Christ's Body in Corinth: The Politics of a Metaphor*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- King, Richard. 1999. *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India, and "the mystic East"*. New York: Routledge.
- Lee, Michelle. 2006. *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liew, Tat-siong Benny. 2008. "Postcolonial Criticism: Echoes of a Subaltern's Contribution and Exclusion." In *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*, edited by Janice Capel Anderson and Steven D. Moore, 211-31. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Livy. 1919-1951. *The History of Rome*. Translated by B. O. Foster. 14 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. 2009a. "Exposing the Economic Middle: A Revised Economy Scale for the Study of Early Urban Christianity." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31: 243-78.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. 2009b. "Socio-Economic Profiling of the First Urban Christians." In *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later*, edited by Todd D. Still and David G. Horrell, 36-59. New York: T&T Clark International.
- Martin, Dale B. 1991. "Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 59: 563-69.
- Martin, Dale B. 1995. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Maximus of Tyre. 1986. *Oration*. Translated by Abraham J. Malherbe, in *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Library of Early Christianity; Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- May, Alistair Scott. 2004. *The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5-7*. New York: T&T Clark International.

- McLeod, John. 2000. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Meeks, Wayne A. 1983. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. 1992. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: John Knox.
- Neyrey, Jerome. 1990. *Paul, in Other World: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. 1997. *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. London: Verso.
- Moxnes, H. 1988. "Honor, Shame, and the Outside World in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*, edited by J. Neusner et al., 207-18. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Plutarch. 1927-1976. *Advice to Bride and Groom*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. 15 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. 1984. "Methodological Considerations in the Debate over the Social Class Status of Early Christians." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 52: 519-46.
- Robinson, John A. T. 1952. *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*. London: SCM.
- Robinson, Wheeler. 1980. *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Runesson, Anna. 2011. *Exegesis in the Making: Postcolonialism and New Testament Studies*. Boston: Brill.
- Russell, Letty M. 2009. *Just Hospitality: God's Welcome in a World of Difference*, edited by J. Shannon Clarkson and Kate M. Ott. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Schweizer, Albert. 1931. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Schweizer, Eduardo. 1964. *The Church as the Body of Christ*. Richmond: John Knox Press.
- Segovia, Fernando F. 1998. "Biblical Criticism and Postcolonial Studies: Toward a Postcolonial Optic." In *The Postcolonial Bible*, edited by R. S. Sugirtharajah, 156-63. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Segovia, Fernando F. 2005. "Mapping the Postcolonial Optic in Biblical Criticism: Meaning and Scope." In *Postcolonial Biblical Criticism: Interdisciplinary Intersections*, edited by S.D. Moore and Fernando F. Segovia, 23-79. London: T&T Clark International.
- Sugirtharajah, R. S. 2000. "Critics, Tools and the Global Arena." In *Reading the Bible in the Global Village*, edited by K. H. Richards, 49-61. Atlanta: SBL.
- Sugirtharajah, R. S. 2001. *The Bible and the Third World: Precolonial, Colonial and Postcolonial Encounter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugirtharajah, R. S. 2002. *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sugirtharajah, R. S. 2004. "Complacencies and Cul-de-sacs." In *Postcolonial Theologies: Divinity and Empire*, edited by Catherine Keller, Michael Nausner, and Mayra Rivera, 22-38. St. Louis: Chalice Press.

- Sugirtharajah, R. S. 2009a. "Postcolonial and Biblical Interpretation: The Next Phase." In *Postcolonial Commentary on the New Testament Writings*, edited by Fernando F. Segovia and R.S. Sugirtharajah, 456-66. New York: T&T Clark International.
- Sugirtharajah, R. S. 2009b. "Postcolonial Criticism." In *Searching for Meaning: An Introduction to Interpreting the New Testament*, edited by Paula Gooder, 175-183. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Suh, David Kwang-sun. 2003. "Minjung Theology." In *Dictionary of Third World Theologies*, edited by Virginia Fabella and R.S. Sugirtharajah, 143. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Talbert, Charles H. 1987. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. New York: Crossroad.
- Theissen, Gerd. 1982. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Tyson, Lois. 2006. *Critical Theory Today*. 2nd Edn. New York: Routledge.
- Wenham, David. 1995. *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Witherington, Ben. 1995. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio- Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Yee, Gale A. 2010. "Postcolonial Biblical Criticism." In *Methods for Exodus*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, 193-233. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, Robert C. 2001. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/)