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ABSTRACT
This article explores hermeneutical and methodological factors that contribute to the complexity of, and the ‘heat’ created by, endeavours to find Africa in the Old Testament. The first section deals with hermeneutical frameworks that guide explorations of attempts to find Africa in the Old Testament. Special attention is given to postcolonial criticism. The focus then shifts to the complexities we have to deal with when we use the terms ‘Old Testament’ and ‘Africa’. The third section focuses on the cultural dimension of biblical interpretation. The fourth section deals with eight metaphors that sharpen our awareness of social, linguistic, and discursive factors that leave their imprints on the interpretation process. Finally, a number of conclusions regarding the issue of finding Africa in the Old Testament are drawn.

A  INTRODUCTION
At the first glance, attempting to find Africa in the Old Testament seems a straightforward affair. But why do we find disagreement among scholars on matters such as the identification, interpretation, and translation of Old Testament texts that refer to African locations and peoples? Why do debates on this issue often take place in an adversarial climate, and why do these debates generate so much ‘heat’? Such questions have inspired me to reflect on the hermeneutical and methodological aspects of finding Africa in the Old Testament.

My involvement with a particular research project has sharpened my awareness of these issues and has inspired me to reflect on the hermeneutical and methodological aspects of finding Africa in the Old Testament. I am referring to the doctoral research project of Fr. Philip Lokel, a Ugandan Old Testament scholar, who explored the issue of finding Africa in the Old Testament. He narrowed his investigation down to the Cush texts in the Old
Testament, more specifically the importance and challenges of such an endeavor (cf. Lokel 2006).

An exploration of the relevant biblical texts and the interpretations given to them by biblical scholars shows that finding Africa in the Old Testament is a multi-faceted endeavor. Even the very concepts ‘Africa’ and ‘Old Testament’ needed further qualification. The purpose of this article is to consider some of the factors that contribute to the complexity of, and the ‘heat’ created by, this endeavor. My exploration is not comprehensive, but I hope it will contribute to an appreciation of the challenges we face when entering into dialogue with biblical texts and their interpreters on the issue of finding Africa in the Old Testament.

My investigation is structured as follows: The first section deals with hermeneutical frameworks that guide explorations of attempts to find Africa in the Old Testament. Special attention is given to postcolonial criticism. The focus then shifts to the complexities we have to deal with when we use the terms ‘Old Testament’ and ‘Africa’. The third section focuses on the cultural dimension of biblical interpretation. The fourth section deals with eight metaphors that sharpen our awareness of social, linguistic, and discursive factors that leave their imprints on the interpretation process. Finally, a number of conclusions regarding the issue of finding Africa in the Old Testament are drawn.

B HERMENEUTIC FRAMEWORKS: THE CASE OF POST-COLONIAL CRITICISM

Depending on one’s interests, social location, experiences, cultural world, academic training, et cetera, a particular hermeneutical framework might guide one’s exploration of biblical texts. For example, one’s guiding interest in finding Africa in the Old Testament might be geographical (compiling maps of the ancient biblical world), or historical (writing a history of the ancient Near East), or anthropological (studying ancient cultures), or socio-political (using biblical texts to subvert or legitimise a particular political order), and so forth. It is therefore to be expected that diverse hermeneutical frameworks will function in debates on finding Africa in the Old Testament, which contributes to the complexity of the endeavor. Furthermore, within a particular hermeneutical framework the issues of complexity and diversity still have to be addressed. In this section reference will be made to a postcolonial hermeneutical framework to illustrate the point.

Postcolonial studies emerged as a way of engaging with the textual, historical, and cultural articulations of societies affected by the historical reality of colonial presence. Postcolonialism as a hermeneutical and methodological category, has two aims: first, to analyze the diverse strategies by which the
colonizers constructed images of the colonized, and second, to study how the colonized, themselves, made use of and went beyond many of those strategies in order to articulate their identity, self-worth, and empowerment. Postcolonialism is a style of enquiry, a perspective, a catalyst, a new way of life. As an enquiry it provides a platform for the widest possible convergence of critical forces, of multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multicultural voices, to assert their denied rights and to rattle the center (cf. Sugirtharajah 2002:13).

As a field of enquiry, postcolonialism provides and caters to a variety of concerns and even oppositional stances. When used in conjunction with ‘theory’ or ‘criticism’, postcolonialism signifies a distinct methodological category. In its reconsideration of colonialism and its aftermath, it draws mainly on poststructuralism, Marxism, cultural studies, linguistics, and literary studies. It describes a remarkably heterogeneous set of subject positions, professional fields, and critical enterprises (cf. Slemon 1994:16). In the field of biblical studies a postcolonial stance can accommodate a variety of interests and methods.

As a critical theory, it has been able to magnify and draw attention to the importance and presence of minority and subjugated voices which have been lost, overlooked, or suppressed in histories, narratives and scriptures (cf. Sugirtharajah 2002:1). These are the very reasons why attempts have been made to Africanize biblical studies, which is the primary focus of the project that has inspired my reflection on finding Africa in the Old Testament. It seems postcolonial criticism provides one possible hermeneutical framework within which the issue of finding Africa in the Old Testament can be explored.

Sugirtharajah (2002:43-73) discerns six dimensions or emphases of postcolonial biblical criticism: dissident readings, resistant readings, nationalistic readings, liberationist readings, dissentient readings, and heritagist readings. Heritagist readings in particular are extremely relevant to the endeavour of finding Africa in the Old Testament, as I will attempt to show below. Heritagist readings should be seen as part of the bigger picture of postcolonial readings, therefore we first need a brief overview of all six dimensions of postcolonial biblical criticism:

First, a dissident reading is a form of oppositional discursive practice undertaken by some colonialists. Although located within and co-opted by the colonial system, what the discourse of dissidence has done, is to subvert it from within. According to Sugirtharajah (2002:49) several missionary figures engaged in this kind of biblical interpretation, for example John Colenso, who employed the then emerging historical criticism to voice his criticism against portrayals of the colonized people with reference to scriptures.
Secondly, *resistant* readings, on the other hand, were undertaken by the colonized, who made profitable use of a paradigm provided by the colonizers and tried to turn it against them. The Bible became a convenient cultural weapon for both the colonizer and the colonized. In the process the colonized sought to maintain their selfhood and dignity.

Thirdly, *nationalist* readings emerged immediately after the colonized nations gained their territorial independence. These discourses are often characterized by a mood of buoyancy and self-reliance. This way of reading is a way of providing a biblical basis for the Christian church’s participation in building up the newly emancipated nation states.

Fourthly, *liberationist* readings arose as an attempt to look at issues from the perspective of ethics. It is a way of seeking liberation based on biblical foundations — a total liberation which is capable of creating a new person and a qualitatively different society.

Fifthly, *dissentient* readings were undertaken by those who threw their lot in with the nationalists, but whose concerns were not registered in the independence struggles and now, after finding a political voice, challenge the national project in the name of class, gender, language, or ethnicity.

Sixthly, *heritagist* interpretation is an attempt by the colonized to find conceptual analogies to biblical texts in their own cultures, textual traditions, and philosophies, and also in their oral and visual art forms. It is an attempt to retrieve cultural memory from the amnesia caused by colonization. This retrieval often involves allusions or references to traditional stories, proverbs, riddles, and songs. This type of discursive practice was undertaken both during and after the colonial occupation.

In a discussion of collective memory and amnesia, Mark S. Smith (2004:124-140) argues that the Bible does not simply record fact or fiction, history or literature (largely modern distinctions). Instead, many biblical texts might be better characterized as constituting the record of Israel’s cultural memory. One basic purpose of memory is to use the past to address issues in the present. The representations of the past are shaped to the contours of the present-day issues. Therefore the endeavour of finding Africa in the Bible may serve the purpose of retrieving elements of African cultural memory that address the experiences in a postcolonial situation. Typically two levels of commemoration, the ancient and the modern, tend to flow into one another, and cannot remain separate (cf. Smith 2004:132). Furthermore, actual physical sites, or geographical locations, play an important role in shaping cultural memory. Concerted efforts to prove that certain place names in the Bible refer to particular present-day locations on the African continent demonstrate the importance of this facet of the retrieval of cultural memory (cf. Adamo
2001:67-68, 70-73; Mugambi 2001:7-10). Smith (2004:136) also emphasizes the importance of societal tragedy on the production of writing about the past in an effort to retrieve cultural memory. To retrieve images of the past, or the story of the past, is part of an attempt to put the present-day tragedy into perspective, figuratively speaking to ‘get past’ it. It is an effort to capture in memory what has been otherwise lost in life. To write back through the past is to enable moving through the present loss and toward the future. Biblical texts that portray African nations, for example the Cushites and Egyptians, as powerful and wealthy, play an important role in this regard.

According to Sugirtharajah (2002:58) the heritagist mode functions in at least two ways in African biblical hermeneutics: First, it makes use of the cultural concepts, and practices of Africa, and seeks for comparable echoes in the biblical texts as a way of validating indigenous cultures and of reinterpreting them. Here some of the popular folk tales, legends, riddles, plays, poems, and proverbs that are part of the common heritage of the people, are re-employed and placed vividly alongside biblical materials, in order to draw out their hermeneutical implications (cf. Sugirtharajah 2002:60).

The second African vision of the heritagist mode draws on the biblical heritage in order to highlight the presence of African people and place names in the biblical world. Such an exercise involves unearthing African personalities (like Moses’ Cushite wife, the Cushite messenger who brought the news of Absolom’s death to king David, the Ethiopian Eunuch, Hagar, Ebed-Melech, the Ethiopian who saved Jeremiah, Simon the Cyrene, Apollos of Alexandria); also identifying countries located in the continent of Africa (such as Egypt, Cush, Put, Lubim); and drawing attention to the significant role they played in the biblical narratives. Heritagist readings allow Africans to rectify negative images of Africa, and they potentially offer a positive space for overcoming the trauma of colonialism and for regaining the lost indigenous cultural consciousness.

According to Sugirtharajah (2002:62), one of the weaknesses of heritagist hermeneutics is that it gives Western audiences nicely finessed representations of the exotic. Another is that the glorification of native impulses, and their entrenchment in provincial contexts may continue to lead to insularity and isolation at a time when there is a lot of cross-over, interchange, and borrowing.

It has become clear that finding Africa in the Old Testament can be done as a heritagist reading. However, certain interpretations of the ‘African’ texts in the Old Testament can also be regarded as resistant readings (cf. Adamo 2001). Furthermore, several Old Testament scholars who are of European origin have joined the debates on finding Africa in the Old Testament (cf. Holter 2000[2001]; Hoyland-Lavik 2001). In terms of Sugirtharajah’s categories their contributions may be described as dissident readings.
Finding Africa in the Old Testament might sound like a straight-forward endeavor, but the two terms ‘Africa’ and the ‘Old Testament’ mean different things to different people. Knut Holter (2000[2001]:94) points out that, although most scholars take the term ‘Old Testament’ to refer to the Masoretic canon, no less than two broader canons, competing with the Masoretic, have their background in Africa: the Alexandrian and the Ethiopian. What constitutes the ‘Old Testament’ has therefore been made more problematic, and some have argued that African translations and interpretations of the Old Testament should follow the broader African canons. Therefore attempts at finding Africa in the Old Testament should indicate which canon of the Old Testament was selected for the exploration. A particular scholar’s denominational background will probably be a decisive factor as far as the choice of a canon is concerned.

The question ‘Which Africa?’ is an even more complex matter. First, the term ‘Africa’ usually designates the African continent. When culture-related issues lie at the root of one’s attempt at finding Africa in the Old Testament, the use of purely geographical borders can become problematic. It has been argued, for example, that for cultural reasons ancient Egypt could be seen as part of the ancient Near East. One may also ask whether a sharp distinction can be drawn between the countries surrounding the Red Sea — those on the African side, and the others on the Arabian side (Holter (2000[2001]:94).

Present-day African scholars south of the Sahara tend not to exclude Egypt when they explore the African presence in the Old Testament. They often emphasize the contact between Cush and Egypt, not to mention Israel (cf. 2 Sm 18) (Mugambi 2001:9; Adamo 1998; 2001:69). The approximately 680 references to Egypt in the Old Testament, compared to the 56 references to Cush, certainly add weight to the argument that Africa has a strong presence in the Old Testament. It would be costly to ignore the Egypt texts in an effort to focus, for cultural reasons, solely on Africa south of the Sahara. Furthermore, this distinction is problematic, precisely for cultural reasons: First, Africans south of the Sahara (Cushites) did not live in complete isolation from the peoples in the ancient Near East; secondly, the lives of the Egyptians and the Cushites were more entwined than has traditionally been thought. It has been argued that Cush and Egypt should be seen as more equal rivals, ‘two major powers competing for resources and lands of the Lower Nile.’ (O’Connor 1993:2). More importantly, from the mid-eighth to the mid-seventh centuries BCE Cushites controlled Egypt (the 25th, so-called Cushite dynasty) (cf. Holter 2000[2001]:100).

For another reason the question ‘Which Africa?’ can produce several answers. Attempting to find Africa in the Old Testament can be compared to
searching for ancient Israel in the Old Testament. Philip Davies, in his book *In search of ‘ancient Israel’* (1992), says the book’s title may strike some readers as innocent, such as might dignify a lavishly illustrated account of archaeological discoveries revealing the life and times of biblical folk. To others it may seem perverse or pompous: why search for what others have found and indeed described *ad nauseam*? (cf. Davies 1992:11). Davies (1992:11) then argues:

Previous scholarship has left us with an ‘ancient Israel’, which I shall designate with quotation marks in order to distinguish it from the biblical Israel and the historical Israel. For I shall be dealing with three Israels: one is literary (the biblical), one is historical (the inhabitants of the northern Palestinian highlands during part of the Iron Age) and the third, ‘ancient Israel’, is what scholars have constructed out of an amalgamation of the two others.

Deist (2000:51) also distinguishes between the cultural worlds pictured, discussed, and affected by a text. Margaret Davies (1995:228) reminds us that ‘[t]he texts create a world and we do not know how far they reflect reality.’

The same distinction can be drawn with regard to Africa in the Bible. We actually deal with three Africas: literary Africa, historical Africa, and the Africa which was constructed by biblical scholars.

Davies (1992:12) explains that any character or event in the Bible is, in the first instance, a literary character or event. This does not mean, of course, that such literary characters/events are unrelated to history in some way. But it does mean that we should be inclined to be more cautious about confusing literature and history. Nothing in a literary text is necessarily or automatically real outside the text, unless we include the author’s head. This statement will be questioned by some (primarily fundamentalist) scholars.

To find the literary Israel in the Old Testament requires no search at all. Its history, its religion, its deity, and its hopes lie on the page, and to read them is to find them. The same can be said of finding the literary Africa in the Old Testament, although the African location of some references to places and names is not a settled matter. We know there are hundreds of references to Africa in the Old Testament: about 680 references to Egypt, 56 to Cush/Cushi, and a few references to Put, Lubim and Pathros. Some locations have ancient traditions in favor of an African location, for example Sheba, Seba (cf. Simons 1959; Holter 2000[2001]:104-105).

Davies (1992:12-13) points out that, as a literary construct, Israel is no more and no less than what the writers have made it, and if the picture is contradictory or confusing, that is not to be objected to in a literary work. Indeed, some biblical scholars display a certain amount of anti-historical
feeling, or at least agnosticism, regarding the historical Israel. Davies (1992:13) shows that the above distinctions have methodological implications:

[H]istorical research need have no bearing on the way a critic chooses to read a text. But if the reader decides to assume the identity of an historian, then reader-response, the meaning of the text, and history come together. It’s a matter of choice.

Attempts to find Africa in the Old Testament should therefore be clear about their methodological choices. The first option is a purely literary exercise in the sense that one explores the biblical author’s portrayals of African peoples and countries. However, how is one going to select the relevant texts for such an endeavor, without reference to geographical, historical, and cultural information?

Another option is to engage in historical research on Africa in the Bible. For such a project the use of extra-biblical material becomes relevant and necessary. However, the discipline of history itself has been affected by work done in literary criticism. Historians today, as in classical times, are aware of the elusiveness of ‘history’ in an objective sense. History is a narrative in which happenings and people are turned into events and characters (cf. Davies 1992:13). The result has a narrative form, and includes not just external events, but internal feelings, impressions and value-judgements. Whenever we try to understand the past — particularly in efforts to address and change situations in the present, which is one of the aims of postcolonial criticism — we indulge in story-telling. No story and no history is ever an innocent representation of the outside world (the danger of neopositivism). No story and no history, for that matter, is ever an accurate representation of a person or people’s inner world (the danger of romanticism) (cf. Alvesson 2003:15-16). The historian may like to invest trust in such accounts, but should never avoid the question why a particular story is being told. Literature is a form of persuasive communication and in a broad sense literature is ideology (a matter that will be explored in more detail in section E).

If scholars limit themselves to the study of biblical texts only in their attempts to find Africa in the Bible, a third option is available. Neither a purely literary reading, nor a historical investigation, but an ‘amalgamation’ of the two can be undertaken. The depth in which literary and historical studies can be done, depends on the scope of a particular project and the number of scholars involved. Two studies on the Cush texts, both with an exegetical focus, serve as illustration: Marta Høyland-Lavik (2004) devoted a whole doctoral thesis to a single text that refers to the people of Cush, namely Isaiah 18. In contrast, Fr. Philip Lokel (2006) attempted to cover all the Cush texts in the Old Testament in his doctoral research. He, too, took literary and historical matters into
consideration, but he was more interested in the bigger picture and the challenges one faces in an attempt to make sense of that bigger picture.

No piece of literature, any more than any individual human perception, is an objective portrayal of what we call the ‘real world’. Texts cannot reproduce reality except as a textual artefact, crafted by rhetoric, and limited by the boundaries of language. This applies to the work produced by the author of the text, as well as the interpretations crafted by its readers. Those who attempt to find Africa in the Old Testament can benefit from distinguishing between ‘literary Africa’ and ‘historical Africa’. But they should also know that both inform the stories they construct in order to address their particular concerns.

D INTERPRETATION, CULTURE, AND METHOD

According to Mugambi (2001:10) the documentary evidence of Europe’s cultural indebtedness to Africa was systematically destroyed during the colonial period. However, this destruction of evidence has not managed to erase the appreciation of Africa by other peoples in the ancient world. Mugambi (2001:10) argues that African scholars will have to reconstruct the history of their culture in the same way that scholars of other cultures have reconstructed their own in turn. This task, he says, cannot be delegated across cultures and across generations. This view links the importance of (African) culture and the exploration of ancient texts such as the Old Testament. Mugambi (2001:10) continues, saying that religion as a social phenomenon can function only in the context of culture, and any abstraction of a religion from the cultural context in which it is manifested will distort its essential features. This also applies to the interpretation of religious texts.

Certain developments in the fields of ancient Near Eastern and biblical studies form part of a much wider renewed interest in culture. Deist (2000:80) points out that for quite some time the study of culture had not enjoyed enthusiastic support from all circles, especially not from those who had been the ‘objects’ of earlier ethnological research. Two circumstances have, to some extent, contributed to overcoming entrenched suspicions (Deist 2000:81): First, resistance in former colonies to colonial hegemony tended to foster among local populations a strong sense of identity. Culture steadily became something not to be ashamed but proud of. Secondly, in some Western countries minority groups gradually came to resist ‘melting pot’ assimilationist and integrationist majority policies and to press for the recognition of ‘local’ identities and cultures.

The emphasis on culture in both the pleas of African scholars and in recent developments in the field of biblical studies invite a critical awareness of the role played by culture in biblical interpretation. Deist (2000:23) identified
three dimensions of such a critical awareness. All three dimensions are relevant to attempts at finding Africa in the Bible: First, acquaintance with the biblical cultures has a heuristic function in that it enhances the readers’ intuitive ability to formulate relevant hypotheses about the speakers’ intentions, also if the exegete chooses a synchronic or immanent approach. Secondly, cultural knowledge has a validatory function in that it avails exegetes of a range of arguments that may assist in arguing about a particular interpretation. Thirdly, cultural knowledge has a hermeneutical function in creating an opportunity for readers to discover the features of the worlds they think they inhabit, thereby preventing them from substituting their own cultural (religious, political and social) orientation for that of the biblical text.

Feyerabend (1996:198) argues that it is difficult, if not impossible, to examine something we are using all the time (for example a particular methodology) and to discover the kind of world we presuppose in doing so. Although a present-day reader’s cultural heritage cannot be bracketed while he/she is interpreting, communication cannot take place without knowledge of who he/she is. Without such knowledge communication and exegesis becomes a soliloquy. But how does one discover oneself in order to prevent this? Not through introspection, says Feyerabend (1996:198). The reader needs an ‘other’. In biblical literature, the interpreter is confronted with such an alternative, ‘external’ world, which allows the reader’s culture to become ‘visible’ to him/herself.

From a postcolonial point of view, interesting questions arise: Did colonialism result in the negation of the cultures of the colonized as ‘others’? If so, does it perhaps explain why the attitudes of colonizers remained largely ‘invisible’ to themselves? Is it possible that the colonized prefer to find an ‘other’ (which could assist them in making their own cultures more visible to themselves) in their ‘former selves’, for example in the Africa they have found in the Bible, instead of finding it in the colonial ‘other’?

The purpose of considering cultural matters when interpreting ancient texts like the Old Testament is of great importance, since it has, among others, methodological implications. If, for example, the main purpose of interpreting the Old Testament is to understand either the cultures pictured in the biblical text or the cultures producing the texts, certain approaches to the study of cultures might appeal to the Bible reader. If, however, one’s primary aim is to read the biblical text with a view to (re)constructing in the present the ‘story’ of one’s own culture (for example in the aftermath of colonialism), other approaches might be regarded as more appropriate.

argues that, if the purpose of interpreting the Old Testament is to understand either the cultures pictured in the biblical texts or the cultures producing the texts, a configurationalist approach, supplemented by an evolutionist approach is to be preferred. It results, to a certain extent, in an eclectic use of elements of these approaches. However, an ethnohistorical approach seems to be tailor-made for the purpose of (re)constructing in the present the ‘story’ of one’s own culture (cf. Deist 2000:92-94). In such an endeavour, an ethnohistorical approach can be supplemented with, for example, an evolutionist approach (with reference to environmental factors that shaped one’s culture); a structural-functionalist approach (with reference to the satisfaction of certain human needs); or a configurationalist approach (with reference to meanings that cluster around certain central values, premises, or goals).

The demise of colonialism has stimulated interest in what has become known as ‘ethnohistory’, that is, the history of a people with little or no historical records other than what archaeology and folklore (and, on a different level, textual evidence from other cultures) can provide (Deist 2000:93). Mugambi’s remarks above (Mugambi 2001:10) seem to highlight the relevance of an ethnohistorical approach towards finding Africa in the Old Testament, and the use of relevant texts to (re)construct the story of one’s culture and identity as an African.

It should, however, be emphasized that here one is using the texts of other ancient cultures that reflect on ancient African cultures. Can such second-hand textual ‘evidence’ be used as building blocks for constructing the history of one’s culture? In functional studies a persuasive doctrine was developed according to which all statements made by informants which purported to be about the past were to be taken as statements about the present, in the sense that they were justificatory of present social arrangements. Freedman (1978:83) maintains that it is now, at a later stage of scholarship, clear that the scepticism was too widely applied. All accounts of informants are not necessarily flights of fancy about the past.

Deist (2000:96-101) identifies two more challenges: First, extended first-hand exposure to the culture under investigation has always been a prerequisite for sound anthropological work. This opportunity does not exist for biblical scholars, who like cultural archaeologists, only have the meagre remains of a bygone culture to work with. There will consequently always be huge gaps in our knowledge.

Another challenge is pluralism in cultures (then and now) and cultural change. During a certain period the Cushites, for example, were a major military and economic force in the Ancient Near East, namely during the so-called 25th Cushite dynasty in Egypt from the mid-eighth to the mid-seventh centuries BCE. This situation is in sharp contrast to the situation in Africa
during colonial times. However, precisely this gap between present experiences and the picture of the past, or a certain element in a plural culture, might assist Africans in (re)constructing their identity in postcolonial times. In this case the ‘other’, which is necessary for making one’s own culture ‘visible’ to oneself, is none other than the precursor to one’s own culture. As Feyerabend (1996:198) said: ‘[W]e need a dream-world in order to discover the features of the real world we think we inhabit.’ In narrative therapeutic terms the biblical texts that refer to Africa become the sparkling moments that enable Africans today to retell the story of their past in such a way that they can imagine a less clouded future. It seems when a particular ‘other’ has systematically negated one’s culture, as happened during the colonial era, a ‘former self’ can assume the role of an ‘other’ in assisting one in the (re)construction of one’s identity.

According to Deist (2000:81), cultural and social anthropologists’ renewed emphasis on ‘cultural identity’ has advantages as well as disadvantages. On the positive side it has replaced hierarchy with equality in intercultural communication. The liberal appeal to a so-called common humanity and the consequent disregard for cultural difference often showed itself in the past, especially during the era of colonialism, to be oppressive. What was viewed as ‘common’ or ‘universal’ more often than not turned out to be nothing else but Western cultural assumptions paraded as normative (cf. also Banks 1996:69-78, 109). The acknowledgement of difference in equality assisted in making at least some people aware of the cultural assumptions informing their way of thinking and to accept the relative validity of other ways of looking at the world.

On the negative side, the appeal to identity and difference has in the twentieth century caused immense human suffering in those countries where cultural identity was assigned ontological status and where difference was politicized. However, shying away from the concept of cultural identity and the honest search for ‘the other’ in biblical texts might deprive readers from enhancing, and perhaps fundamentally changing their understanding of biblical literature and themselves.

Whichever approach one follows when dealing with cultural matters in the process of biblical interpretation, the endeavour should not be looked upon as a reconstruction of how ancient peoples (Israelites, Cushites, Egyptians, etc.) really thought or lived, but as a systematic construction from the perspective of a present-day analyst on the basis of a particular anthropological theory, and with a particular purpose in mind, for example restorying, in a postcolonial situation, one’s culture with reference to the past in order to imagine a less clouded future.
EIGHT METAPHORS AND THE SOCIAL, LINGUISTIC, AND DISCURSIVE FACTORS THAT LEAVE THEIR IMPRINTS ON INTERPRETATIONS

From the above it seems finding Africa in the Old Testament is not a simple matter — at least if this endeavour involves more than merely listing all biblical texts containing the names of locations and peoples that can be traced to the African continent. Seemingly straight-forward concepts such as ‘Africa’ and ‘culture’ confront interpreters of the Bible with complex issues and difficult choices, especially from a methodological and hermeneutical point of view.

This awareness of the complexity of the interpretation process is also emphasized by Mats Alvesson (2003) who investigated the interpretation of interviews for research purposes. The issues highlighted by him are also relevant to the study of biblical interpretation. The role assigned by Alvesson to the interviewer, may be compared to the position of the biblical interpreter, and the role of the interviewee may be compared to that of the biblical text, or even the biblical author.

Alvesson (2003:15) points out that two major positions on interviewing dominate the scene: neopositivism and romanticism. (He attempts to overcome the shortcomings of both positions.) Neopositivists are eager to establish a context-free truth about reality ‘out there’ through following the correct research procedures. Romanticists believe that one can establish the truth about reality ‘in here’, referring to the mind of a person (in his case the interviewee) who is the source of information about a certain phenomenon. Finding the truth ‘in here’ depends largely on the correct relationship between the researcher and the person who is the source of information.

If attempts at finding Africa in the Old Testament are done within one of the above two frameworks, they will be characterized by either naïve realistic readings of texts (finding the truth ‘out there’: neopositivism), or easy identification with certain persons who wrote the texts, or to whom the texts refer (finding the truth ‘in here’: romanticism).

Attempting to find the truth ‘out there’ might entail the collection and systematization of ‘objective’ biblical evidence about locations, people, and events to which the texts refer.Crudely stated, the argument would go: ‘If the Bible mentions a location (or person, or event), it obviously existed in real life in the way the Bible describes it.’ This naïve-realistic way of reading the Bible is blind to the distinctions drawn by Philip Davies (1992:11) between literary Israel, historical Israel, and scholarly reconstructions of Israel.
Attempting to find the truth ‘in here’ might mean that the reader experiences special rapport with certain people of the biblical texts. The reader might feel those peoples would understand his/her meanings, ideas, feelings and intentions, and vice versa. Romanticists emphasize closeness to the people who are the source of information. Present-day interpreters of the Bible who stress the similarities between the Israelite (not to mention Cushite) and the present-day African cultural and religious heritage (cf. Dickson 1984:148ff; Mugambi 2001:15) are enticed to transfer concepts pertaining to present-day African cultures directly to the biblical peoples, and vice versa. Deist (2000:97) argues that such experiences of closeness to the biblical peoples may in fact disturb the picture one creates when interpreting the Bible. Some scholars, for example, based their theories about ancient Israel on the perceived similarities between present-day African cultures and ancient Israelite culture. They mistakenly explained Israelite religion almost exclusively in terms of magic and mysticism (cf. Deist 2000:97).

The aim of Alvesson’s study is to overcome the pitfalls of neopositivist and romanticist positions on the interpretation of interviews. He opts for a reflexive pragmatic approach. He argues that recent insights about problems of developing knowledge and the limitations of social science as a rational project need to be connected more strongly to research practices. He aims at strengthening the interface between philosophy, theory, and method (Alvesson 2003:13). According to him the interview situation is a socially and linguistically complex situation. Such complexities should not be seen as just sources of bias that should be overcome. Rather, it calls for a reflexive approach in which a set of various theoretical viewpoints can be considered and, when there are reasons for doing so, applied.

Alvesson (2003:14) believes that drawing attention to a number of theoretical ideas, expressed through metaphors, encourages a reconceptualization of the interpretation process (in his case with a view to the interpretation of interviews). This reconceptualization involves the use of a vocabulary encouraging openness to the complexity of matters, such as the complexities I have pointed out in the sections above where I dealt with the questions ‘which Africa?’ and ‘which Old Testament?’, as well as the intricacies of studying culture. Alvesson (2003:14) believes that the process of interpretation and its outcomes exist in a field of tensions between different logics, for example the communication of facts and experiences, political action, script following, and impression management.

The reflexive pragmatist approach proposed by Alvesson means working with alternative lines of interpretation and vocabularies and reinterpreting the favored line(s) of understanding through the systematic involvement of alternative points of departure. A reflexive approach to research and interpretation means two potential advantages: First, avoidance of naivety
associated with a belief that ‘data’ simply reveals reality, and secondly, creativity following from an appreciation of the potential richness of meaning in complex material. Reflexivity operates with a framework that stimulates an interplay between producing interpretations and challenging them. It includes opening up phenomena through exploring more than one set of meanings and acknowledging ambiguity in the phenomena and the lines of inquiry favoured, and it means bridging the gap between epistemological concerns and method. The *pragmatic* element of Alvesson’s approach means balancing endless reflexivity and radical skepticism with a sense of direction and accomplishment (Alvesson 2003:14).

All thinking about complex phenomena is based on metaphors. As Morgan (1980:1996:228) argues, the use of metaphor is ‘a primal, generative process that is fundamental to the creation of human understanding and meaning in all aspects of life.’ Metaphors in the sense of root or organizing images, rather than poetic language, draw attention to implicit aspects and may function as powerful starting points for new ways of seeing. Metaphors may be used in order to provide overviews of intellectual fields and indicate what is illuminated and what is hidden in different perspectives and vocabularies.

The following eight metaphors (Alvesson 2003:15,19-24) suggest reconceptualizations with wide-ranging implications for the interpretation process:

1 **Interpretation is ‘local accomplishment’**

Biblical interpretation is a special kind of communication. The interplay between the Bible (especially as scripture) and reader, with gender, age, professional background and ethnicities, puts heavy imprints on the accounts produced. Biblical texts are in themselves empirical phenomena calling for explanation — not merely reflections of other empirical phenomena, or ‘proofs’ for explanations of these.

The project that inspired the writing of this article is a fine example of what can be elucidated by the metaphor of local accomplishment. The project involves a special kind of research situation: a research team works toward the goal of three of its members obtaining doctoral degrees in Old Testament. The title of the broad project is ‘Africanizing biblical studies’, which consists of three sub-projects, namely ‘Finding Africa in the Old Testament’, ‘Using Africa to interpret the Old Testament’, and ‘Using the Old Testament to interpret Africa’. The project on finding Africa in the Old Testament was conceptualized by the coordinator to have an exegetical slant, and it was narrowed down to the Cush texts in the Old Testament. Three project members are involved with this sub-project: An African, Roman Catholic priest/Old Testament scholar (doctoral student) (cf. Lokel 2006); A European, Evangelical Lutheran Old
Testament scholar (co-promoter); and a Euro-African, Dutch Reformed Old Testament scholar (promoter) — all three males. The metaphor of local accomplishment invites us to reflect on the imprints of factors like these on this particular project about finding Africa in the Old Testament.

2 Interpretation is the ‘establishment of a storyline’

This metaphor implies the framing of textual material in the process of sensemaking. This metaphor calls for an exploration of the basic assumptions underlying a particular instance of framing textual material. It cannot be assumed that the Bible reader and a biblical author have a shared miniparadigm, making possible the mere re-production of knowledge. Biblical interpreters sometimes erroneously assume that biblical authors put forward unambiguous information that is easily understood and given a standard, context-free meaning.

The question ‘which Africa?’ with which we dealt in a previous section is an example of framing in order to disambiguate. A project on finding Africa in the Old Testament can be framed as a literary analysis, or a historical investigation, or a scholarly reconstruction of (a part of) ancient Africa. Another example of how the ‘framing’ of texts guides one’s interpretation is provided by Lokel. He asks:

How does one do an analysis of the fifty-six Cush texts without compromising their exegetical import and depth? I too was faced with the problem of how to organise these texts so that they can be somehow beaten into some manageable shape. As a result I considered several possibilities, including canonical, chronological, morphological and thematic arrangements, among others. (Lokel 2006:255).

Each of the above possible arrangements boils down to a particular ‘framing’ of the material to be studied. If, for example, one opts for a chronological treatment of the Cush texts, matters of a historical nature will feature prominently. Organizing one’s analysis according to morphological considerations, implies that linguistic matters will be in the forefront. A thematic arrangement draws attention to yet other matters.

3 Interpretation is ‘identity work’

A basic aspect related to sensemaking activities is the identities that are called upon in the process of interpretation. These frame the situation and guide responses. No nontrivial reading of the Bible is produced outside or abstracted from identity — that is self-definition and efforts to accomplish a feeling of coherence and direction. Identities are multi-faceted and relational, therefore the reader in dialogue with the text invokes an identity. If a text is interpreted as ‘scripture’, or ‘literature’, or ‘history’, or when the reader assumes the role of
‘academic’, or ‘missionary’, or ‘oppressed’, different identities are invoked, which will determine what kinds of outcomes are appropriate. Being too explicit about the identity positions involved in a particular interpretation situation may be counterproductive, since it tends to fix the outcomes too firmly. The biblical author and/or the Bible reader may also use the interpretation situation to express, elaborate, strengthen and defend, or repair a favoured self-identity in order to construct a valued, coherent, self-image.

Most attempts of Africans at finding Africa in the Old Testament are about identity work, which, according to Mugambi (2001:10) cannot be delegated across cultures. Mugambi (2001:17) uses the concept of ‘reconstruction’ to express the importance of identity-formation in dialogue with biblical texts. Biblical texts should serve as

[…]

Salt for flavouring and seasoning food, and with light of illuminating the world. Salt dissolves in food, and light illuminates a room. Both give quality to existence, without losing essence. Reconstruction is the word I have used for the process through which African Christianity in particular, and African culture in general, will be reconstituted from characteristically African frames of reference.

Attempts at finding Africa in the Old Testament could be seen as part of this reconstitution of African Christianity and African culture. As Holter (2000[2001] says about African readers and those in the African diaspora:

[T]his topic touches existential questions; the place of Africa in the OT is related to their identity as well as their history. Accordingly, whether the topic Africa in the OT is seen as exotic or existential, depends on the eyes that see.’

4 Interpretation is cultural script application

In a Bible reading situation, the interpreter must rely on established cultural resources for describing issues at hand. This means that available vocabularies, metaphors, genres, and conventions for talking about issues are used. These are cultural scripts. Cultural scripts may be shared broadly across society, or in specific segments within it. Cultural scripts make it easier for the reader to deal with material. They, for example, reduce variation and complexity. Cultural scripts say much about people’s methods for putting together a world that is recognizable, orderly and moral.

To the user, cultural scripts seem to be evident. But not necessarily to the other parties in a communication situation. For example, African scholars have time and again argued that matters related to cultural scripts have contributed to the negligence of the African presence in the Bible (cf. Adamo 2001:73). He,
for example blames certain Eurocentric conventions such as the use of footnotes and glossaries for writing Africa out of the Bible. Adamo argues that ordinary African Bible readers do not care about the cultural scripts that apply in the world of (Western) scholarship. They are not interested in ideological problems and reading footnotes, when they read the Bible. These remarks were made in a debate with Holter on the translation of the words ‘Cush’ and ‘Cushite’ in the Old Testament. Adamo is in favor of rendering these words ‘Africa’ and ‘African’ in English, while Holter prefers the transliteration of these terms (cf. Adamo 2001:71-72; Holter 2000[2001]:114).

Adamo (1998:28-37; 2001:72) interestingly mentions a cultural script that functions in African cultures: In Africa it is not unusual for certain persons to bear the names of their towns, districts, and countries. ‘Africa’ is a well-known name among Africans. For this reason, Adamo argues, there is nothing strange about rendering the word ‘Cush’ by ‘Africa’. This cultural script is not shared by all biblical scholars, which perhaps explains why some describe Adamo’s rendering of the word ‘Cush’ as ‘…[a] fresh and probably unexpected approach’ (Holter 2000[2001]:112).

5 Interpretation is ‘impression management’

People want to give a certain impression of themselves and also the institutions and groups with which they identify, and feel they represent. It involves certain values and ideals constraining one’s consciousness, as well as a moral imperative to express oneself in loyal terms. This does not preclude critique, but may still mean some, possibly nonconscious, holding back and an inclination to not break taboos.

When applied to the endeavour of finding Africa in the Bible, the metaphor of impression management elucidates scholars’ references to, on the one hand, so-called Western attitudes of supremacy, condescension, and paternalism (cf. Mugambi 2001:7); and on the other hand concerted efforts to restore the image of Africa as a continent of wealth and power, not to mention its presence in the scriptures of Judaism and Christianity, and as Mugambi (2001:9) argues, in the formation of Judaism and Christianity.

Adamo (2001:70) criticizes Eurocentric scholars whose interpretations of Old Testament texts in his opinion show that they think nothing good can come from Africa. He refers to a number of texts that have been interpreted in ways that degrade Africans. In 2 Samuel 18:19-33 a nameless person referred to as Cushite was one of the military men defending king David against his enemy and son, Absolom. The Cushite is the one sent to David to tell him of the death of Absolom. Adamo (2001:69) points out that the majority of Eurocentric scholars agree that the Cushite is of African descent. However, they also tend to argue that since he is of African descent, he must be a slave. Adamo claims that
only a very high-ranking military officer would be sent to report a calamity to
the king. Adamo (2001:69-70) finds another example in Jeremiah 38:7-13
where Ebed-Melech, the Cushite, rescued the prophet Jeremiah. At the crucial
moment when Jeremiah was thrown into a pit to die, Ebed-Melech summoned
the courage to challenge king Zedekiah for the wickedness of the nobles. He
was given permission to rescue the prophet. Again, Eurocentric scholars have
no problem identifying Ebed-Melech as having African ancestry, but his
position in the court of Zedekiah is disputed. Ebed-Melech is described as a
sarīs, which can mean eunuch. Adamo (2001:70) maintains that racial
prejudice forces most Eurocentric scholars to contend that Ebed-Melech must
be a eunuch from Africa. He points out that the term occurs about forty-five
times in the Old Testament and in most cases it does not mean eunuch since a
eunuch is not permitted in the congregation of Israel. The term could also mean
‘officer’, ‘prince’, or ‘commander of the army’, ‘he who is at the head of the
king’, or ‘he goes before the king, one of his confidential advisers’ (Adamo
2001:70).

Holter (1997:335-336) points out that certain Old Testament texts pose a
hermeneutical problem to those who use biblical texts to elevate the image of
Africa in the Bible. He refers to the texts that portray Africans as the enemy of
the chosen people. Adamo (2001:72), however, says it is not sufficient reason
for hiding the African identity in the Bible. According to him the Cush passages
where this negative portrayal comes up are very few and can be understood in
their context by the ordinary readers. It is noteworthy that ordinary readers
need to be equipped with some scholarly tools in order to reach such a
contextual understanding of these texts (see the discussion on cultural scripts
above).

The following quotation from the work of Adamo (2001:71) illustrates
how ‘impression management’ becomes part and parcel of the interpretation
process (applicable to interpretations of biblical texts as well as the production
of those texts themselves):

Any objective Old Testament researcher would know that I am not
trying to smuggle or elevate Africa in the Bible. The honest truth is
that already the people of ancient Israel acknowledged Africa and
elevated Africa. The Bible is consistent about Africa. Africa is
mentioned in every strand of biblical literature. Ancient Israel
trusted Africa and depended on it. God made it possible for Africa
and Africans to participate in the biblical drama of redemption. The
only problem is that the Eurocentric scholars who consistently have
dominated the translation and interpretation of the Bible do not want
to bring it out to the open.
6 Interpretation is ‘political action’

Both biblical interpreters may be and biblical authors might have been politically aware and politically motivated. Both the writing and the reading of biblical texts may be attempts to promote certain interests. Political awareness may lead to either active constructions in accordance with one’s interest, or defensive moves motivated by the fear that certain ‘truths’ may harm oneself, or the group, or interests with which one identifies.

Mugambi (2001:21-22) notes that South Africa has the largest concentration of missiologists and biblical scholars in the continent. What Africa can learn from this fact, he says, is that the Bible remained an important text in South Africa throughout the twentieth century, among both the beneficiaries and the victims of apartheid. However, the Old Testament means different things to the beneficiaries and the victims of apartheid, and particular texts have been used by both, but for different political purposes. Texts have either been ignored, or interpreted in particular ways, in order to achieve political aims. The portrayal in 2 Samuel 18:19-33 of an African messenger as a slave (cf. Ackroyd 1977:172; McKane 1963:37-60) serves the agenda of colonial powers better than describing him as a high-ranking military officer (Adamo 2001:69). On the other hand, the political appeal of the Old Testament, in general, and the ‘African’ texts in the Old Testament, in particular, have given Africans a frame of reference for their struggle against imperial domination (Dickson 1984:148). Mugambi (2001:22-23) suggests that African scholars should affirm the cultural and historical unity of the continent as a whole. He says political boundaries have become irrelevant, and cultural differences have become a luxury. The European Union has become a powerful political and economic entity without abolishing its internal borders. Mugambi (2001:22) claims that, in view of the cultural and historical convergence of Africa, it is much easier for Africa to achieve this kind of practical unity than it has been for Europe. Therefore he appeals to African scholars to re-visit the Old Testament as a unifying text for Africans, rather than a divisive one; as a text of affirmation rather than a text of negation with regard to Africa’s culture and history. He asks whether the Bible can be the basis for the reconstruction of Africa — politically, economically and culturally. According to him the shift from liberation to reconstruction in biblical hermeneutics makes this possible (Mugambi 2001:22). Finding Africa in the Old Testament is an essential element of this project characterized by ‘political action’.

7 Interpretation is ‘an arena for construction work’

This metaphor sheds light on the nature of language and language use. It is claimed that language is used for productive, forward-oriented purposes, not for mirroring reality. Biblical authors are not just ‘truth tellers’, or ‘informants’, but they use their language to do things, to order, request, persuade and accuse.
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(cf. Potter & Wetherell 1987:32). This point is not restricted to, but can, of course, not be separated from impression management and political interest. It relates, however, more to the active, functional, metaphorical, contextual character of language than any particular use or misuse of language. Language use means the construction of a world. ‘Objective reality’ is not just mirroring itself in a certain, correct language. Alvesson (2003:23) claims that the crafting of an account, as an act of interpretation, is similar to authorship. Even if an interpreter tries to be precise and honest, the elements of invention and fiction are significant.

Postcolonial criticism assumes the (after)effects of a colonial ‘world’ in which Africa is pictured in a certain way. The main aim of postcolonial criticism is to construct an alternative to this ‘world’. One important building-block for the construction of such a ‘world’ is heritagist readings of the Bible, of which attempts at finding Africa in the Bible is a prime example. The presence of Africa in the Bible is ‘languaged’ again, and language is used to, inter alia, persuade and accuse others in the process.

Bible translation is one of the areas in which one finds examples of how language use can construct an alternative ‘world’. Western scholars have been accused of constructing a world without Africa in the way they have translated the word ‘Cush’. The mere transliteration of the word amounts to de-Africanizing the Bible, says Adamo (2001:72). So how should the word be translated? Adamo’s solution lies in the construction of a ‘world’ with which all present-day Africans can identify. He renders the Hebrew word ‘Cush’ by ‘Africa’, even though the continent as we know it today was not part of the known world of the people of biblical times. Holter (2000[2001]:113) argues that certain problems arise from Adamo’s suggested translation. One such problem is the ‘world’ created by using the word ‘Africa’. The very term ‘Africa’ has developed ideologically pregnant connotations, both politically (for example in the term ‘pan-Africanism’) and theologically (for example in the term ‘African theology’), and a rendering of Cush as ‘Africa’ would bring these connotations into the Old Testament texts. Certain texts would then strengthen the idea of a close relationship between Africa and God’s chosen people in the Old Testament, for example Genesis 2:13 and Amos 9:7. However, texts such as 2 Chronicles 14:8-14, where Cush is portrayed as an enemy of Israel would create difficulties. The hermeneutical problems facing contemporary Egyptian, Palestinian, and Native American readers of the Old Testament — when they identify themselves with the ancient Egyptians, Philistines, and Canaanites, that is, enemies of God’s chosen people in the Old Testament — would then suddenly be transferred to the whole of Africa. Will African Bible readers then selectively identify with only the ‘positive’ texts, and ignore the others? Or will they be forced to develop a subversive strand in their theology based on the ‘negative’ texts? This example demonstrates that a
particular translation proposal, which identifies Africa as a whole with ancient Africa of Old Testament times, might affect the relevance and interpretation of certain Old Testament texts.

8 Interpretation is ‘a play of the powers of discourse’

Poststructuralists and postfoundationalists challenge the idea of the autonomous, clearly defined individual as the bearer of meaning and as an acting subject around which the social world rotates (cf. Foucault 1980; Hollway 1984). Instead, they view the individual (the subject) as constituted within discourse, which socially creates forms and expressions of subjectivity limited in time and space. Therefore, language is not an expression of subjectivity, rather it is what constitutes subjectivity. From this follows that subjectivity is frequently unstable and ambiguous — a process rather than a structure. Thinking and actions ‘depend on the circulation between subjectivities and discourses which are available’ (Hollway 1984:252). Identity is in flux as various social and linguistic constructs (discourses) vie with one another for supremacy (cf. Thomas & Linstead 2002:75). Discourses constitute the subject in that available discourses position the person in the world in a particular way prior to the individual’s having any sense of choice. This idea resonates well with the African view that a person is a person through others. Therefore accounts produced (whether in the form of biblical texts, or interpretations of those texts) are of interest, among others, as indications of the discourses at play and the powers over the individual subject. This metaphor to some extent parallels the one of interpretation as identity work, but the ‘discourse power play’ metaphor puts an emphasis on language use and its capacity to sweep subjectivity with it. The difference between the ‘discourse power play’ metaphor and the one of construction work lies in the latter’s focus on how the individual constructs reality, whereas the former emphasizes how discourses make themselves present through individuals — how individuals carry certain available discourses of the social world.

Debates on finding Africa in the Old Testament illustrate the idea behind the metaphor of ‘the play of powers of discourse’. The discourses of Eurocentric and Afrocentric interpretations are so strong that interpreters just get swept along by these discourses. It has become extremely difficult to explore issues like the presence of Africa in the Old Testament without having to borrow one’s vocabulary from these discourses. Furthermore, is it possible that even the vocabulary which characterizes Afrocentric discourses is still dominated by that of the Eurocentric ‘world’? Will we reach a stage when it becomes unnecessary to talk about the presence of Africa in the Old Testament in terms of these discourses?
F CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown that many factors contribute to the complexity of finding Africa in the Old Testament. Both the process (finding), and the object of study (Old Testament / Africa) are intricate and/or ambiguous as a result of diverse factors:

- the play of the powers of discourse
- the constructivist dimension of language
- the interpreter’s interests (described by Alvesson (2003:15) as political aims, impression management, identity work, etc.)
- the social location of the interpreter
- the specific interpretation situation
- the ‘framing’ of material in order to disambiguate
- the broad hermeneutical framework that guides one’s interpretation

These factors do not function in isolation from each other. Some factors concern existential matters. For this reason it is no surprise that many debates on finding Africa in the Old Testament are emotionally charged. Some factors function on a conscious and others on an unconscious level. For this reason it is so difficult to sit back and reflect on one’s own interpretations, not to mention those of others.

Having said this, my attempt to offer a few notes on hermeneutical and methodological considerations with regard to finding Africa in the Old Testament, fits Robert Carroll’s description of an article written by himself (on the reception history of the Bible). He says the article has produced ‘not so much scratches on the surface of the subject as a feeble attempt to polish up the surface so that others may make scratches on it’ (Carroll 1992:85).
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