citizen, and immersed in Asian theology. Her poem speaks powerfully to the universal church. Some of Kyung's paradigms, such as Jesus as shaman, speak to Koreans in a way they cannot to others. On the other hand the testimony she cites of the “factory floor” Christ speaks to factory workers everywhere.

In the first section of the book, “Jesus amid Other Asian Ways, Truths and Lights,” the essay by Michael Amaladoss stands out. He begins by rejecting the “lowest common denominator” approach—“we all have religious experience, so we all agree really.” He seeks a paradigm in between inclusivism and pluralism, which he calls “advaitic,” mediating between the one and the many, not denying either, but making them the poles of one complex reality. One thing which emerges very clearly from this book is that it is Asian theologians who must teach us about mission. Born of their struggle to be faithful both to Christ and to the experiences of their non-Christian neighbors, it is here that mission thinking is really being re-born.

Some of the other contributions, especially in this section, seem to me to beg the question of real difference. Seiichi Yagi, for instance, makes interesting parallels between the Buddha and Jesus as Saviour figures, but it is clear that the view of the human in the two religions is quite different. Can Amida-Buddha and Christ both work for the salvation of humanity if what we need to be saved from is conceived quite differently? Such problems apply a fortiori to Ovey Mohammed's comparison between the salvation offered by Krishna and that by Christ. Surely we should be clear, by now, on the difference between myth and history.

The overall perspective of the book is liberal in the sense which might be called “Western,” but is in fact global, like the market to which it is related. Nevertheless, I believe the collection to be one of the most stimulating recent contributions to the question of the meeting of the great world religions. A companion volume on history and culture would be most welcome, and might advance the argument.

T.G. Gorringe

St John's College, Oxford


The book contains a technical/personal Preface, five chapters, and an Afterward. In Chapter One Rashkow sets out her methodological considerations and premises. Psychoanalytic (especially Freudian) and literary
(especially of the relativistic, reader-response or reader-reception kinds) theories enrich our understanding of biblical texts. The processes of psychoanalysis and Bible reading are in some ways analogous — for instance, in the significance attributed to shifts of meanings and plot, the recognition that communication is multifaceted, and the exercising of identification and critical suspension. "... our reaction to these [biblical] narratives is psychological. In reading the Hebrew Bible, we try to shape the text until it is the kind of setting in which we can gratify our wishes and defeat our fears" (p. 25).

Chapter Two examines the process of reading in terms of "transference," that is, the complex of relationships between analysand and analyst. The example chosen for detailed analysis/reading is the "matriarch in danger" topos (Genesis 12, 20 and 26). After other methodologies for this cluster of stories are surveyed, the intertextuality/transference analogy yields textual assumptions of: powerful male and powerless female, "others" and "us"; and the need for a hermeneutic of suspicion.

Chapter Three explores Abimelek's dream in Genesis 20 in the light of Freudian night-dream theory, as representation of reality, and the interpretation of this dream/text. In this interpretation, v. 3 is the dream itself, complete with censorship, condensation and displacement; while vv. 4-7 represent the secondary stages of recollection and interpretation. The reader, who interprets Abimelek's interpretation of his dream, is drawn into the dream itself.

Chapter Four depicts the relationship between daughters and fathers in Genesis and beyond it, a relationship that is largely conspicuous by its non-existence. The virtual absence of daughters, as, for instance, from the incest lists of Leviticus 18 and 20, recalls Freud's rejection of his early seduction theory as "hysteria." Did Freud turn away from the father/daughter incest theory in order to "cover up" the father's role — like the biblical texts which posit daughters (Lot's, Genesis 29) or daughterly figures (Tamar, Genesis 30; Ruth) as seducing their fathers or fatherly figures? Blame and guilt are thus shifted from the one gender to the other.

In Chapter Five Rashkow relates to "some of Freud's writings which deal with female sexuality and biblical narrative with the same theme" (p. 85). Her conclusion is that, in both texts, female sexuality is subordinated by male sexuality. Feminist evaluation of Freud's and the Bible's views of feminity must perforce label both as phallocentric and logocentric: males are the universal norm; females and female sexuality are depicted in both as the sub-species and terra incognita that patriarchy, biblical and psychoanalytic, images for its own comfort.

The Afterward makes three claims: readings of biblical texts, like any other texts, are relativistic; the biblical text is a "text" and should be read as such, considerations of [pre]history notwithstanding; and psychological and cultural processes condition our readings.