

A Third Way: Explicating the Post in Post-Christian Feminism

Frances Gray([Biography](#)) and *Kathleen McPhillips*([Biography](#))

Much feminist debate in religion concerns the place of text in religious discourses, the weight and authority that should be given to those texts and the relationship between text and lived experience (Merleau Ponty 1962). The question of whose lived experience is represented in the debates and in the texts has recently become the focus of womanist/feminist theorising in Australian religious feminist circles. Both Anne Pattel-Gray and Elaine Wainwright have insisted that a valorising politics of difference must inform feminist theory in the theological/religious domain, specifically in relation to hegemonic religious texts. They have argued that biblical readings can be exclusivist by either hiding multiple subjectivities or silencing the very possibility of giving voice to the oppressed. This paper considers this problematic—associated with textual interpretation and lived experience, beginning with the work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza.

Schüssler Fiorenza (1997) has identified two responses to the bible as sacred text: either to abandon it entirely as hopelessly androcentric and irrelevant to the lived experience of women today (see Hampson 1996); or to retrieve it in an apologetic gesture which seeks to acknowledge and preserve it as a container of eternal verities which, although socially and historically situated, are still relevant for women today (Lee 1997). In “Struggle is a Name for Hope”, an essay published in the Australian theological journal *Pacifica* in

1997, she offered an alternative to what she saw as either the exodist or apologist positions—a third way of reading Biblical texts which mediates these views.

The Third Way, considered as an Hegelian tracing, is a movement from thesis to antithesis to synthesis and marks a significant moment in feminist thinking in religion.

The contention that the bible is a liberatory text for women is certainly not new. What is new is that the text is seen as text in process, much as are the lives of women historically and in terms of their current lived, embodied, experience. On Schüssler Fiorenza's reading, the bible is not simply an historical document. Rather it is both a proto-typical text and a living, processive text which has been formed through the experiences of women and men and which continues to function in this way.

The bible is but one text that has been constitutive, either explicitly or implicitly, of the lived experience of women who have been inscribed by Eurocentric and Christian values. If we take the Foucauldian story of the inscription of docile bodies at all seriously, and we think we should, then the role of text in the construction of subjectivity and agency is central to an elucidation of women's or anyone's lived experience. Bodies are inscribed by text, by discursive and non-discursive practices (spatio-temporal features like architecture and civic organisation). Bodies must also be inscribed by geographical and historical locatedness. Inscribed human bodies are conscious, experiencing bodies, the site of subjectivity which emerges as an effect of discursive and non-discursive factors. On this story, there is no pre-social self.

If it is the case that there is no pre-social self, that subjectivity is constituted through text, textuality and context, if it is the case that experience and subjectivity are effects of discursive practice, then lived experience emerges from text. The boundaries between subjectivity, lived experience and discursive and non-discursive practice are theoretically interesting, but ontologically blurry. In her paper, “Seeking and Sucking”, Catherine Keller (1998) remarks that “(f)eminist theology ... does not benefit from boxing itself into the false binary opposition of either psychoanalytic individuals or liberation collectives.” The point is well taken here in the case of potentially rendering oppositional, text, subjectivity and experience. Put bluntly, what we are asserting is that text writes us and we write text. Text, discursive practice, narrative, produce subjectivity and lived experience and power relations. To delineate, indeed to oppose text and experience is to court a form of dualistic structuring that is equally as inappropriate to feminist theorising as any other invocation of dualistic categories or forms.¹

But discursive practice is neither isolated nor individualistic. Discursive practice, text, is situated always already within and is constitutive of social practice. Text is, therefore, necessarily politically situated, whether it is the text of the media, legislation, poetry, music or art.

Further, because a multiplicity of texts is constitutive of subjectivity and women’s lived experience, it is arguable that women are constituted by specific historico-social moments, which bear traces of the past and mark the future. Such an account of experience invokes the idea of multiple textual voices, politically and socially situated in a web of power relations, which will also be stylistically various.

In this paper, we will explore the textual politics of feminist biblical interpretation with regard to post-Christian feminism with specific attention to the metaphorical and symbolic ordering of “post” as a marker of excess—of a third way. It is a moment of excavation and reflection which suggests that any form of “post” analysis in an Australian context needs to take specific account of the multiple her/stories and voices that “post”-Christian feminism is constituted by, and the ways in which excess and by implication, containment are positioned. We will begin by examining some of the socio-cultural conditions in which feminist theological discourse is produced and the politics which are in turn produced by two texts, which aim to recover hidden voices. We hope to suggest something of a condition of post-Christianity and the possibilities that such a discourse offers.

Situating Australia: Post-Colonial, Post-Christian²

...feminists in religion must create and support post-colonial spaces and autonomous organisations where women can articulate and celebrate their religious-cultural-ethnic differences and thereby overcome kyriarchal divisions and oppositions. (Schüssler Fiorenza 1996).

Although postcolonialism is an ambiguous (Sugirathajah 1999) contested term³, trading in a heterogeneity which makes it difficult to ever really define what this means beyond specific instances of expression, there are strong reasons to suggest that issues of

national identity and the arrangements of power in contemporary Australia are post-colonial. For the purposes of this paper, we will be using the work of two Australian cultural theorists, Ken Gelder and Jane Jacobs (1998), and their argument that a post-colonial Australia is observable through a series of discourses and public debates/events which demonstrate the unsettled and contradictory nature of national identity and the re-arrangement of power in ways that untie previously stable (colonial) relationships: self(white)-other(black), primitive-settler, marginal-centre, man-woman, and so on⁴. In a post-colonial, post-industrial, globalising Australia, these dualisms are fraught, intertwined sites; and the claims for national identity are multiple and conflictual⁵.

For Gelder and Jacobs a defining feature of post-colonialism can be witnessed in some strange—or uncanny—moments: moments where groups which in a colonial arrangement were clearly defined as elite and powerful (pastoralists, mining conglomerates, political parties, developers⁶) now constitute themselves as marginal and disenfranchised, arguing that Aboriginal issues and concerns are at centre stage and take up vast amounts of “the national concern” (whatever that might be). The post-colonial moment is when a white educated non-Aboriginal elite utilise the discourse of minority politics and take the position usually associated with “being Aboriginal” (Gelder & Jacobs 1998: 77).

This produces an uncanny effect which results in the destabilisation of one’s assumptions about who exactly can claim a “proper” minority status—and we have seen pastoralists, as well as mining companies and developers and “mainstream” Australia do just this, particularly in the development of the new right politics of the One Nation

Party, railing against the excess of special government funding to Aboriginal peoples. Further, if wealthy elites are claiming minority-victim status, then what effects does this have on the re-distributive and political powers of democracy? (Gelder & Jacobs 1998: 142). It could be argued that what is lost in post-coloniality is polarisation as a power strategy in the sense that new power arrangements result in the merge of contradictory categories. For example, dispossession and loss of tradition sits alongside new forms of empowerment where "...one can never totally polarise these features (the traditional and the modern, authorisation and the loss of authority etc) ...[and where] there is no need to equate dispossession so completely with disempowerment. Indeed, new forms of Aboriginal authority may come into being through the very structures of dispossession—precisely because the relations between language and place are so unbounded" (Gelder & Jacobs 1998:51).

Post-colonial politics also produce "post-colonial racisms" which emerge from resentment over the fact that Aboriginal people can command the attention of the non-Aboriginal population. It follows from a (mis)recognition that Aboriginal people now have too much: "...too much land surface...too much unverifiable belief... too much power over the nations fortunes, too much of an ability to solicit the nations attention, too much charisma" (Gelder & Jacobs 1998:65). A good example of post-colonial racism can be found in the discourse on tradition. "Tradition" involves the notion that views and/or sacred sites never change. Meaningful sacred sites are those that can be traced back thousands of years; newer sacred sites or perceived changes in tradition bring scepticism and resentment (Gelder & Jacobs 1998:73)—we might add, a not uncommon response to feminist theologians who challenge religious traditions.

If we accept that Australia displays certain post-colonial characteristics, then what can we say of the practice of feminist theology? In what ways is it situated with respect to such arrangements of power, and what of its own specific power relations with respect to racism? What might be some of the links between the destabilising possibilities of “post” and Christian feminist theological discourse? In the next section we reflect on the discursive possibilities of post.

Post: Precisely

Post: long sturdy piece of timber or metal set upright in the ground and used to support something or as a marker.

Post: after time or in order (*The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, 1998).

Post: a marker, a sign, a phallic uprightness, supporting. Supporting what? A flag, itself a marker. Marking what? The land. A marker in the ordering of time, an orderer of time and place. That which signifies order in a wild, untamed, pre-phallic land. The sign of ownership: a link between a European past/present and the grimness of distance and uncertainty in an alien country. Here the sun refuses not to shine; here the sun burns into delicate skin and here the heat oppresses unbearably.

Post: after the time of leaving the known, before the time of making the unknown known, after the time of claiming the unknown. How does one claim the unknown?

Post: a claimer of the unknown, a movement to a place of uncertainty of unsettling settlement, an invasion.

Yet an invasion that contains the seeds of its own dispossession by its mere inability to contain: the post refuses polarisation as it marks the excluded middle, as it is the excluded middle, as it defies A and not-A, as it marks the boundaries and erases the boundaries simultaneously. Is a post always a boundary or is it also a marker of the impossibility of a boundary?

This is the centre: that is the margin. What posts along the way to mark the end of the centre and the beginning of the margin? We stay in the centre, a blurry vision of essence marked by the uprightness of phallicism. Now the phallicism of the Word, the Word of Truth. This is a good Word, *The Good Word*. This is a link between past/present: this is the acceptance of past/present, the revalorisation of what is known, a revisionist claim to Authority and Truth. But look how it marks: look what it marks: its own phallicism, its own oppression, its own refusal of wild possibility, of abandonment of the known for the unknown. Abandon the post, the marker: abandon the Good Word, ineluctably tied to phallic Authority and Truth. Disclaim that Authority and Truth, acknowledge its poison for the Erotic Other, the downtrodden and marginalised. Move to a new time and order; deny the post: make an exodus to a new wilderness where there is new life and freedom.

Stay or go. Perhaps there is no choice, perhaps there is not one or the other. Perhaps there is only the certainty that the post, marker of the past, signifier also of the future, cannot be ignored, that its occupation of the excluded middle, that its being the excluded middle, founds the possibilities of departures yet also fractures those possibilities. A post, a signifier leaving its trace always and everywhere in the future, in the beyond that is not yet, points to the excess of itself, its inability to contain the past and the future, yet its undeniable marking of both. A triple figuring: post as marker, post as trace, post as after. And after itself.

What does the post take with it and what does it leave behind? What do we want, we, these voices formed by the markings, by the tracings we find inscribed in/on our phallicised flesh? What does our experience tell us of the past, and the future, and the now? How does the post intersect with the experience we feel, we see, we are, and the experience we want as transformative? Can we overcome the phallicised flesh, the word markings that give birth to the phallicism that colonises, restrains, contains, limits, refuses the possibility of difference and thus of liberation? Can the post move, even as it is in excess of itself, even as it collapses on itself, to transform its own colonising practices? Post-colonial, post-restraint, post-containment, post-limitation. Post-sameness?

And women's experience: how is this to be re-figured: is it to be re-figured? An escape from the phallicism of the Word? Women's experience re-figured, women's subjectivity re-figured, a re-figuration in time and space not yet known where wo/men, the

marginalised and oppressed of the world, will be liberated. Cast an eye to the past and envision, now, the future in the light of the eye cast. Not an isolated eye, decontextualised, but knowing its very situatedness in the complexity of its own historicity. The fragility this knowing brings with it problematises, yet asserts, that experiential context. Women's experience emerges from historical pre-figuring, from textual con-figuring (White 1994:135-155). How can it be otherwise? Women's experience is life experience, is lived experience (Merleau Ponty 1962). And lived experience is lived experience of/in the texts that construct us, all of us without exception.

Feminist Theology and the Post Christian Condition

Clearly, a state called "post-Christianity" is intimately connected to post-colonialism. In particular, we want to draw attention to the destabilising effect of the term "post", on the relationship between Christianity and feminism. Rather than suggest, as theologians like Daphne Hampson have, that post equals "after" Christianity (whose effect is to repolarise exodus/apologist debates and de-legitimate his/herstory): we would want to argue that post-Christianity actually invites a critical examination of the project of her/story, particularly where specific histories—the histories of women—have been forcibly repressed and which may be sources of liberative moments. Unlike postmodernity which might reject the authorising canons of modernity and grand narratives, post-colonialism interrogates prototypical texts and canons for the ways in

which they have colonized text and subject, and the ways in which they might be reclaimed for the purposes of liberation⁷.

A post-Christian, post-colonial condition makes it possible for feminist theological discourse to destabilise the relationships between text and tradition, between subject and knowledge. It may allow for the emergence of other, colonized voices, whose histories and stories have been repressed and hidden by colonial powers. This is all good, but if we take Gelder and Jacobs' claim seriously—that the instability of postcolonialism has resulted in elite groups claiming a marginalised status—we should then be cautious about the potential for feminist theologies to reproduce oppressive forms of text and practices; as well as for feminist theologies to be appropriated by theological [male] elites, and dominant textual practices. In fact we want to suggest that post-colonialism has hardly figured consciously in Australian feminist theological discourse and, as Roland Boer (1998) points out, the problem with such a lack of awareness is that it can make the strategic realm of the post-colonial more potent if it remains hidden.

Signposts to a Third Way: Two Readings

If there is a third way for biblical textual interpretation, it clearly needs to be able to engage the politics of late western modernity in quite specific ways, and to be able to respond to the re-organisation of power and identity, which bring with it new articulations of racism and sexism. We turn now to two essays which can read as productive attempts to engage text, body, identity and liberation in a post-colonial, post-

Christian condition. They signal a shift away from more defensive modes of theology and indicate some of the signposts that might lead to a less defensive theological discourse and an appreciation of the dynamic nature of tradition. Above all, they are attempts to disrupt dominant narratives—particularly of tradition and text—and make way for other voices, the voices of the “other”, whose aim it is to destabilise the normative relationship between Christianity and feminism.

I

The first text, by Australian feminist theologian Elaine Wainwright (1997), moves towards articulating a feminist post-colonial reading of Christology when she argues that any reading of Jesus will only be useful to the struggles of women when it speaks to women in their specific place of living. That is, feminist theology has greatest authority and integrity when it is embedded in the lived experiences of all women (Wainwright 1997: 168). Wainwright argues that there has been a dearth of theologies which have attempted to situate Christology within Australian cultural conditions. That failure to give conscious attention to socio-cultural locations in theologising has increased the tendency for Australian theologians to participate in a global theologising which may not touch the specifics of the Australian locale. This situation may have a particular impact in relation to women whose attentiveness to experience has become more acute.

Wainwright takes the New Testament text “Who do You Say that I Am?” which has received little attention from Australian theologians yet is a key text in excavating the

identity of Jesus (Wainwright 1997: 157). A situated reading of this text has the potential to be both dynamically interdisciplinary as well as disruptive to hegemonic articulations of (biblical) truth, particularly in the questions that she is able to generate. Who will speak about the text? Where are they located? What has been said about the text already, and how do those voices—which are silenced the most—become heard? How will these textual interpretations be brought into biblical discourse? Listening to the situated stories of who Jesus might be and how Christology might be connected—to empowerment, oppression and liberation—may make visible those voices in the discourse which are most disadvantaged by the techniques in which knowledge is consumed and distributed.

In surveying the field of feminist theology, Wainwright seeks specific evidence for a re-imagining of Jesus from both marginalised and mainstream feminist perspectives⁸. She retrieves a rich (and recent) body of feminist texts, which suggests that there is a substantial engagement between feminist accounts of Jesus and cultural forces. Yet while she argues that a feminist Christology needs to make room for many voices, a question remains about whose voices get access to textual domains; how texts are authorised into positions of influence and in particular, how those very marginalised voices that she acknowledges exist, manage to speak. While she does not specifically locate her analysis within post-colonial, post-Christian conditions, she certainly invites a theoretical space where marginalised voices are authenticated. If we take Wainwright's challenge seriously we could expect that difference—cultural, gendered, racial—*will* lead not only to different Christologies, and multiple claims on the identity of Jesus, but

also to a transformation of feminist theology as already constituted under certain racial conditions.

II Indigenous Claims to Theological Discourse

The second text is that of the indigenous theological scholar, Anne Pattel-Gray, whose most recent contribution to theology marks the beginning of a womanist biblical hermeneutics emerging from the lived experiences of indigenous women in Australia⁹.

Like Wainwright, Pattel-Gray (1999) argues that a biblical hermeneutic will be useful and meaningful when it can recognize oppression—in this case, racism—by interpreting biblical texts which reveal both the presence of racism in the text itself and how this might be relevant to contemporary indigenous struggles for freedom and autonomy.

Pattel-Gray begins with contextualising the conditions in which Aboriginal women have struggled for self-determination. On the whole, she argues that they have been sidelined in the predominantly white feminist movements, and that white women have largely failed to hear the stories of exclusion and oppression of black women. Biblical interpretation has largely fostered this exclusion utilising stereotypes and dualisms to reinforce the polarisation of white and black. She gives examples of the representation of Mary as pure and gentle with Eve as the mother of sin transposed into a white Mary and black Eve reinforcing black as evil “other”, and white as desirable and normative in colonial missionary Australia:

The church referred to Mary as the, “...ever virgin, merciful and tender, the epitome of feminine virtue”. This description was embodied within the “ ...

early Christian, Catholic and Orthodox theology, and by the Virtuous Wife—demure and obedient helpmate to her strong and noble lord in the Reformed tradition”. This became the image with which Western women understood the missionary project. Just as the West understood Mary to give birth to The Word in the life of Jesus, so also did Western women see themselves as bringing Enlightenment to those primitive beings lost in darkness, by accompanying their Christian missionary husbands. Mary became “the mother of all good”... While Aboriginal women, like Eve, were labelled as having no virtue, the White woman, like Mary, was portrayed as having no sin. Because of this, White women became the norm by which all women would be *measured and judged*. It was considered that Aboriginal women would want to be like her, and would mirror all of her actions”. (1999:261)

In this intersection of race and gender, biblical interpretation has reinforced—or been a site of—colonial relationships. Pattel-Gray observes that this has remained largely hidden in Christian feminist discourse. This then provides an important insight into a critical feminist politics of liberation and the challenge to read texts—using what Schüssler Fiorenza would call a methodology of multiplicative oppressions—as both revelatory of gender and race oppression.

Pattel-Gray goes on to read the Old Testament text on Sarah and Hagar (1999: 261-2) as an opportunity to reflect on contemporary relationships between white women and Aboriginal women, particularly the authority of Sarah over Hagar and the sexual abuse of Hagar. She defines this relationship as one of slave/owner, a relationship verified by

many of the indigenous women who were taken from their Aboriginal families and placed into domestic (indentured) labour. This disrupts a (white) feminist analysis that might claim that Hagar and Sarah claim a similar location as women in patriarchal society. For Pattel-Gray, the most significant relationship is of race determined by Sarah's exploitation of Hagar:

Further into Genesis, at 21:8-21, we find Sarah's prejudice and contempt have no bounds; her venom and hatred towards Hagar and her son are clearly stated, "Cast out this slave woman and her son; for the son of this slave woman shall not inherit along with my son Isaac". Now that God had blessed her with a son, Sarah saw no need for her slave and Ishmael to stay, especially if he stood a chance to gain an inheritance from Abraham. Once again we find the Scripture to be problematic, as God is seen to endorse the actions of Sarah and Abraham, and Hagar is discarded and sent into the desert. (1999:262)

Pattel-Gray argues that the conditions in which [white] feminist theology might begin dealing with the effects of racism, lie in the hearing of Aboriginal women's stories of past and present oppressions (1995:191), and a clear understanding of the ways in which racism objectifies and devalues the "other". This is partly an answer to Wainwright's problematic of bringing the experiences of marginalised women to bear on biblical text: how this actually happens is something that feminists have to work out deliberately and concretely. There is a set of common ideas in the work of Wainwright and Pattel-Gray which signify steps towards a paradigm of listening and understanding, and which could be useful for feminist scholarship. They include: sensitivity to differences in women's

experience and the danger of universalising this experience through one set of cultural and religious values; the need to deconstruct the category of wo/man and interrogate its usage in texts (see also Mohanty 1991 and Ram 1993); the need to consider the material and ideological conditions in which (theological) knowledge is produced; the need to consider whiteness as a category of analysis and its tendency to invisibility; the need to contextualise not only Jesus but also God, discursively; commitment to excavating lost and hidden histories as central to theological/religionist scholarship.

Roland Boer (1998:24) has argued that in Australia at least colonialism and post-colonialism share overlapping histories. This may have direct implications for any feminist theological work that attempts seriously to excavate and support those voices which are most marginalised. In particular, Pattel-Gray (1999) makes *no* claims for a post-colonial condition in the lived experiences of indigenous women. Instead, she claims that racism is as dualistic, polarised and tight as it was 100 years ago. In identifying a “third way” which rejects both apology and exodus, and reads texts as opportunities to open up meaning and possibility, we have posited the idea of a third way as a post-Christian condition. This post-Christian condition should be understood in terms of a state or condition which has the potential to radically destabilise hegemonic discourses of race, gender and theology. Further, that its expression can transgress valorised boundaries of legitimate discursive practice is crucial to fracturing the economy of sameness which informs the interpretation of both text and lived experience.

Notes

1. A good example of this is the potentially oppositional discourse engaged in by both Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in her response to Erin White's paper "Figuring and Re-figuring the Female Self: Towards a Feminist Hermeneutic" (1994). White is at pains to talk about Ricoeur's notion of narrative and the narrative or discursive construction of identity. Yet, White argues that we cannot say "exactly how her refiguring and configuring are related to her own life because as readers of her work we do not access to the author herself, but only to the implied author who is configured in the work" (p.149). We think that White is right in identifying a tension between androcentric texts and the construction of women's subjectivity. [Back to text](#)
2. Rather than represent social analysis as a linear progression of task-oriented forms, we will take a spiraling approach, which aims to keep all points visible and connected to each other. In this way, we may be said to be approaching a (patri)kyriarchal analysis. [Back to text](#)
3. See in particular the essay by Anne McClintock, "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term Postcolonialism" (1993), which defines some of the perils associated with the use of the term "postcolonial". [Back to text](#)
4. Roland Boer describes post-colonial Australia in terms of overlapping histories of colonialism and post-colonialism. See Boer (1998). [Back to text](#)
5. The 1999 November referendum on Australia becoming a republic represents a recent example of conflict and instability, clearly visible in numerous contradictions that emerged including the fact that a significant proportion of the "No" vote was actually not from monarchist supporters but from republicans rejecting the particular republic model on offer. See Wark 1999. [Back to text](#)

6. Gelder and Jacobs (1998) refer to numerous situations including those of Coronation Hill, Hindmarsh Island and the One Nation party. [Back to text](#)

7. A further post-colonial connection can be found between modernity as skeptical and pre-modernity as traditional. Modernity unpicks the relationships between knowledge and belief and replaces it with forms of rationality, founded on skepticism, or the non-necessity of belief. Postmodernity unties the polarity of this relationship entirely: and creates a space where the two—belief and skepticism—lie closely together, tangled up, rather than polarised and separate. This condition could be represented as one of (dis)belief. So the conditions in which theology is being produced are contradictory, creating numerous political responses including, for example, the need to reform tradition and/or create new forms of spirituality where tradition is amplified by groups wanting church reform and those resisting change, and where individual subjectivity is characterised by the ability to both believe and doubt at the same time. [Back to text](#)

8. In particular, Wainwright (1997:156-172) draws on the work of Jacquelyn Grant, Kwok Pui Lan, Virginia Fabella, Chung Hyung Kyung and Anne Pattel-Gray. [Back to text](#)

9. A paper given at the Women Scholars in Religion and Theology Conference in Brisbane January 1998 by Janet Turpie Johnson, an indigenous Anglican minister-in-training addressed questions around racism and Christology but is yet to be published.

[Back to text](#)

Reference List

Boer, Roland. 1998. "Remembering Babylon: Postcolonialism and Australian Biblical Studies." In *The Post Colonial Bible*. Edited by R.S. Sugirtharajah. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 24-48.

Gelder, K. & J. Jacobs, J. 1998. *Uncanny Australia: Sacredness and Identity in a Postcolonial Nation*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Keller, Catherine. 1997. "Seeking and Sucking: On Relation and Essence in Feminist Theology." In *Horizons in Feminist Theology*. Edited by Rebecca Chopp & Sheila Greeve Davaney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Lee, Dorothy. 1997. "Abiding in the Fourth Gospel: A Case Study in Feminist Biblical Theology." *Pacifica* 10(2).

Hampson, Daphne. 1996 *After Christianity* London: SCM Press.

McClintock, Anne. 1993. "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term Postcolonialism." In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. Edited by P. Williams & L. Chrisman. Williams, P. & Chrisman, L. (eds). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf: 291-304.

Merleau Ponty, M. 1962 *Phenomenology of Perception* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mohanty, C. 1991. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Edited by C. Mohanty, A. Russo, & L. Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 51-80.

Pattel-Gray, Anne. 1999. "The Hard Truth: White Secrets, Black Realities." *Australian Feminist Studies* 14(30), 259-266.

——— 1995. "Not yet Tiddas." In *Freedom and Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. Edited by M. Confoy, D. Lee, & J. Nowotny. Melbourne: Dove, 165-192.

Ram, K. 1993 "Too 'Traditional' Once Again: Some Poststructuralists on the Aspirations of the Immigrant/Third World Female Subject." *Australian Feminist Studies* 17(Autumn), 5-28.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. 1997. "Struggle is a Name for Hope: A Critical Feminist Interpretation for Liberation." *Pacifica* 10(2), 224-248.

——— 1995. "Foreword." In *Freedom and Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. Edited by M. Confoy, D. Lee, & J. Nowotny. Melbourne: Dove, ix-xiii.

Sugirathajah, R.S. 1999. "The Postcolonial Bible." Seminar Paper. Harvard Divinity School. 18 November. (Unpublished).

The New Oxford Dictionary of English. 1998. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wainwright, E. M. 1997 "But Who Do you Say That I Am? An Australian Feminist Response." *Pacifica* 10(2), 156-172.

Wark, McKenzie. 1999. Higher Education Supplement. *The Australian* 10 November.

White, E. 1994 "Figuring and Re-figuring the Female Self: Towards a Feminist Hermeneutic." In *Reclaiming Our Rites*. Edited by Morny Joy & Penny Magee. Wollstonecraft: The Australian Association for the Study of Religions, 135–155.