

Note: This Work has been made available by the authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research and may not be copied or reproduced except as permitted by the copyright laws of Canada without the written authority from the copyright owner.

Leung Lai, Barbara M. "Word Becoming Flesh [On Appropriation]: Engaging Daniel as a Survival Manual." In *Global Voices: Reading the Bible in the Majority World*, edited by Craig S. Keener and M. Daniel Carroll R., 65-77. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2013.

GLOBAL VOICES

Reading the Bible in the Majority World

Edited by Craig Keener and M. Daniel Carroll R.

Foreword by Edwin Yamauchi

 HENDRICKSON
PUBLISHERS

Global Voices: Reading the Bible in the Majority World

© 2013 by Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC

P.O. Box 3473

Peabody, Massachusetts 01961-3473

ISBN: 978-1-61970-009-3

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

First Printing — January 2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Global voices: reading the Bible in the majority world / edited by

Craig S. Keener and M. Daniel Carroll R.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-1-61970-009-3 (alk. paper)

1. Bible—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Keener, Craig S., 1960-
II. Carroll R., M. Daniel.

BS511.3.G58 2013

220.6—dc23

2012016435

CHAPTER 5

Word Becoming Flesh [On Appropriation]: Engaging Daniel as a Survival Manual

Barbara M. Leung Lai

Appropriation is a two-way trip from the world of the Danielic text to the contextual situatedness of the reader (or vice versa). To begin any discussion on appropriation with a reflection on self-identity on the part of the reader is, therefore, a significant point of departure.

Who Am I?

Asking “Who am I?” signifies a self-reflective process rather than an assumed identity statement of “who I am.” If the same question were asked two decades ago, I would have formulated my answer in the realm of race and ethnicity, gender, culture, and the social location of reading.¹ Addressing this question today entails also a consideration of context, situatedness, as well as one’s lived experience. This essay seeks to provide a demonstrated example of perspectival reading as well as its appropriation (i.e., Daniel as a survival manual). My self-identity will naturally have some bearing on my representation.

I begin with a commonly accepted maxim: the postmodern self is socially constructed, fluidic, and multiple.² Randy Litchfield has stated

¹Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, eds., *Reading from This Place*, vol. 1: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*; vol. 2: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

²Randy G. Litchfield, “Rethinking Local Bible Study in a Postmodern Era,” in *Paradigms for Bible Study: The Bible in the Third Millennium* (ed. Robert Fowler et al.; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 236. In fact, postmodern theorists

that self “is not centered in one location, but decentered across many social settings. . . . We are many selves that must be orchestrated into coherence, an ongoing process that we recognize as our identity.”³

Since self is a complex, elusive concept, therefore self-engagement in constructing one’s self-identity is pivotal. I intend to approach my self-identity here from a new angle of perception, namely, the “external shaping forces” that continuously mold me into who I am as a shepherd-teacher (Eph 4:11) and scholar-saint (in the words of John Stott). Yet collapsing my specific ethnic-sociocultural identity as Chinese-Canadian in the academy⁴ would potentially or reversely⁵ silence my voice and diminish my influence (should there be any) on contextual biblical interpretation and perspectival reading of the chosen text—which is, to a certain extent, I suppose, the anticipated outcome of this essay.

External Shaping Forces

Theologically trained both in the East and West, I had the privilege of acquiring the best of both worlds. Teaching cross-culturally in Canada and the United States, South and Central America, Ukraine, Hong Kong, Southeast Asia, and China has collectively shaped my teaching career. This experience has imparted to me a moderate degree of competency in adapting to culturally diverse learning communities. With my allegiance to the interpretive community where evangelical biblical scholarship is nurtured and promoted among practitioners of postmodern interpretive methods, I have been immensely affected by my predecessors and colleagues.⁶

differ considerably about the determinacy of the context and the agency of the self (cf. 236–37).

³Ibid., 236–37.

⁴A collection of essays on “Reading in Between: Biblical Interpretation in Canada” is being considered for publication in Brill’s *Biblical Interpretation* series. As a Chinese-Canadian woman scholar, I have contributed a chapter to this volume.

⁵In the past two decades, in terms of the effect of the collective Asian interpretive voice, I witness the shift from a marginalized status to gaining a moderate degree of prominence in the academy. Yet, if any race- or culture-specific voice fails to affirm its culturally shaped and contextual distinctiveness, it would potentially be minimized or reduced to voiceless again.

⁶To name a few, John E. Goldingay’s narrative approach to constructing OT theology (*Old Testament Theology* [3 vols.], vol. 1: *Israel’s Gospel*; vol. 2:

My six-year appointment as one of the pioneering members of the Committee on Race and Ethnicity (CORE) at the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) has provided many cross-feeding forums for culture-specific and cross-cultural dialogues among African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and First Nation faculty members and administrators. My service in the past two years as a member of the Advisory Council of “Women in Leadership in Theological Education” (WiL) at ATS has tremendously shaped my perspectives on gender issues in theological leadership. Most significant of all, teaching for fifteen years at my current institution, known as one of the most culturally diverse student communities in North America, has immensely enriched me in fulfilling my role as a shepherd-teacher.

As a prime-timer engaging in the flesh-and-blood collective lived experience of my faith community—a mega, multicultural, and multigenerational ethnic church in metro Toronto—has further enabled me to have the capacity to read the Danielic text contextually: Despite present chaotic situations, God is still in control.

These are my life contexts (or in the words of Thiselton, “life-worlds”⁷), and the result of this more or less narrative approach to my self-identity indicates, on the one hand, that my self is still unfinalized. Yet, on the other hand, there are layers of lived contextual experience that are being accumulated into my ever enriching and dynamic self. One cannot seek to construct the message of Daniel in a vacuum or within the borders of a loosely defined framework of Chinese-Canadian or Asian-American

Israel's Faith; vol. 3: *Israel's Life* [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2003, 2006, 2009]); Anthony C. Thiselton's elaboration on the “capacity to transform” for texts and readers, and providing a conceptual framework for the “hermeneutics of self-involvement” (see *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, chaps. 1, 8 [London: HarperCollins, 1992]); the refreshing perspectives and approaches to biblical interpretation provided by Craig G. Bartholomew (e.g., in *After Pentecost: Language and Biblical Interpretation* [ed. Craig G. Bartholomew et al.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001]; and *Ecclesiastes* [BCOTWP; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008]).

⁷Thiselton, *New Horizons*, 247–52. David R. Blumenthal draws on the same concept and refers to the whole flesh-and-blood life experience of an individual as a “text-of-life” (see *Facing the Abusing God: A Theology of Protest* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993], esp. 61). Cf. my employment of the concept in developing a theology of lament and protest contextually in Barbara M. Leung Lai, “Psalm 44 and the Function of Lament and Protest,” *OTE* 20, no. 2 (2007): 418–31.

reading. As I put my world in front of the world of the text, I have to approach the text self-engagingly out of my different life contexts.

Tools and Parameters

In this reading of Daniel, I operate with a text-anchored and reader-oriented model in biblical interpretation. I seek to incorporate the three worlds of the text (the world behind, the world of, and the world in front of the text).⁸ In essence, any three-world approach to the biblical text would necessitate an integration of competing methods and tools. Engaging the apocalyptic text of Daniel with this holistic approach entails a reading strategy that seeks to integrate several sets of polarities: diachronic and synchronic; objective and pragmatic (subjective); and historical-critical and empirical (or experiential). My point of departure is to approach the task with a view that the three worlds are intimately interconnected and that the interface of text and reader shapes all three worlds.

As a demonstrated example, my reading exemplifies an intentional effort to move from meaning to the two dimensions of contemporary significance: what it means to the Christian church at large and what it means to me as individual member of the faith community contextually. The three procedural steps together should be considered as a complete hermeneutical cycle—from meaning to significance, or from interpretation to appropriation. This interpretive process should be considered as the ultimate goal of *any* interpretive task.⁹

Four components that make up competency in biblical interpretation are at work here: mind, will, emotion, and imagination. The demand for a sound analytical mind (e.g., to identify the multiplicity of speaking voices and the significant sets of repetitions in the narrative description of Dan 3); the will in living out the hope and trust as embedded in the

⁸ Cf. Randolph W. Tate, *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach* (3d ed.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008).

⁹ The SBL promotion (2011 annual meeting) of the featured session on “Romans through History and Culture” states that the group “respects diverging interpretations by acknowledging that any interpretation of a text of Scripture necessarily involves three interpretive choices: an analytical choice, a hermeneutical/theological choice, and a contextual choice” (SBL president’s letter, November 1, 2011). I would like to restate that these are not to be perceived as three alternative interpretive agendas undertaken by the interpreter but three pivotal steps to complete an interpretive cycle for any given text.

overarching message of the book (“in spite of the present appearances, God is in control”¹⁰); engaging our emotions in taking Daniel on his own terms and immersing ourselves in the visionary experience as he describes it;¹¹ and the capacity to exercise our imagination in character profiling (e.g., comparing the two characters, King Darius and Daniel in Dan 6).

Reading: Engaging Daniel as a Survival Manual¹²

I concur with Mark G. Brett that, as a methodological procedure, any talk about reading strategy must be preceded by an analysis of interpretive interest; a reading strategy “will only be coherent if it is guided by a clearly articulated question or goal.”¹³ Following this schema, my reading strategy of Daniel is goal-oriented and tailor-made to suit the objective of this essay—a version of perspectival reading (i.e., reading Daniel as a survival manual) and its appropriation to both immigrant families or minorities in the profession and to the community of pastors. This is also representative of my core interpretive interest—the characterization of Daniel in its two dimensions: the public Daniel (Dan 1–6) and the private Daniel (Dan 7–12). I have adopted John Goldingay’s recommended approach in reading Daniel here; to him, “the best approach is to take him on his own terms and immerse ourselves in the visionary experience as he describes it.”¹⁴

¹⁰This is also the identified core message in Tremper Longman III, *Daniel* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 13.

¹¹John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word, 1987), xl.

¹²For a more comprehensive methodological orientation and exegetical basis of this reading, please refer to Barbara Leung Lai, *Through the “I”-Window: The Inner Life of Characters in the Old Testament* (HBM 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011), chaps. 2–3; “Daniel,” in *The People’s Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2009), 1014–15; “Aspirant Sage or Dysfunctional Seer? Cognitive Dissonance and Pastoral Vulnerability in the Profile of Daniel,” *PastPsych* 57, nos. 3–4 (2008): 199–210.

¹³Mark G. Brett, “Four or Five Things to Do with Texts: A Taxonomy of Interpretive Interests,” in *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* (ed. D. J. A. Clines et al.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 357 (357–77).

¹⁴Goldingay, *Daniel*, xl, cites S. Niditch, “The Visionary,” in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. J. Collins; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 153–79.

***Point of Departure: Two Dimensions of the Danielic Self
(the Public Daniel and the Private Daniel)***

In *Circle of Sovereignty*, Danna Nolan Fewell has provided the most comprehensive narrative reading of the court tales of the book (Dan 1–6). While the public Daniel emerges naturally as a figure in Fewell’s literary analysis, the sage is presented as one among the other prominent characters (his three friends and the foreign kings) in the narrative framework of the book. The interiority (or being) of Daniel that could be uncovered through his “I” voice (places where the character speaks in the first person) in the apocalyptic portion of the book (Dan 7–12) is absent in Fewell’s discussion. Since Fewell’s seminal contribution, literary approaches to the apocalyptic portion of the book (Dan 7–12) have flourished,¹⁵ and each in its own way has provided new angles of perception toward the overall structure of the book. However, the Danielic internal profile has never been given any attention thus far in the field of OT character studies.¹⁶

No Danielic characterization will be complete without attending to both the public Daniel as portrayed in the court tales of Dan 1–6 as well as the private Daniel as self-presented in the exotic visions of Dan 7–12 through his “I” voice. Failing to identify the importance of this “I”-window is, at the same time, missing an important interpretive link. In other words, this Danielic self-referential “I” in Dan 7–12 serves as a port of entry to the inner life of Daniel.

***Survival in Diaspora in Service to Four Foreign Kings:
The Public Daniel***

Daniel’s public self as portrayed in Dan 1–6 is the epitome of self-confidence—an aspiring sage. He climbs the corporate ladder from a

¹⁵The representative examples are John E. Goldingay, “Story, Vision, Interpretation: Literary Approaches to Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel in Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. Van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 295–313; M. A. Knibb, “You Are Indeed Wiser Than Daniel: Reflections on the Character of the Book of Daniel,” in *ibid.*, 339–411; Paul L. Redditt, “Daniel 9: Its Structure and Meaning,” *CBQ* 62, no. 2 (2000): 236–49; Paul J. Tanner, “The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel,” *BSac* 160, no. 3 (2003): 269–82; B. L. Woodward Jr., “Literary Strategies and Authorship in the Book of Daniel,” *JETS* 37, no. 1 (1994): 39–53.

¹⁶In Fewell’s comprehensive treatment on the characterization of Daniel, only a chapter (chap. 7) is devoted to Dan 7–12. See Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty*.

captive prisoner to the prime minister of the whole kingdom (2:28). The summary appraisal in 6:29 [28] best captures the accomplishment of the public Daniel: “So this Daniel is made prosperous in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus, the Persian.” Time and again, the figure of a man with the spirit of the holy gods and possessing superior qualities (loosing knots, interpreting dreams and riddles) stands out distinctively among his peers.

Reading Dan 1–6 as resistance literature and as a manual for survival, the coping strategy that Daniel has adopted is a key point of entry. Two prominent readings provide two different dimensions to the coping strategy as exhibited in the characterization of the public Daniel. To Fewell, Daniel’s prosperity is the result of Darius’s legislation (6:29 [28]). By living his life in prosperity, Daniel is able to remain faithful to both the earthly sovereigns (Darius and Cyrus) and the Hebrew God.¹⁷ Therefore, remaining in prosperity and in a position of power while navigating the troubled political waters requires certain wisdom, and indications of this wisdom are penetrated through the court tales in the first six chapters.¹⁸

The second reading is presented by David Valeta.¹⁹ He based his work on the Russian theorist Mikhael Bakhtin’s genre description of pre-novelistic Menippean satire as a conceptual framework and identification tool. Valeta reads the court tales as examples of Menippean satire and resistance literature against hegemonic regimes and control.²⁰ His analysis of this genre provides thought-provoking stimulations for our inquiry here. Daniel could be read as a manual for survival. The means of resisting kings and empires as reflected in Dan 1–6 is the creative use of satire and humor.²¹

Surviving His Inner Self: The Private Daniel

The twelve chapters of Daniel are not arranged in chronological order. The visions in Dan 7 and 8 occur during the reign of Belshazzar,

¹⁷Cf. *ibid.*, 118.

¹⁸E.g., Daniel’s request to the king for the appointment of his three friends as administrators over the province of Babylon at the opportune moment (2:48–49); restating his public role and re-establishing his high-ranking status in Dan 5; his wit and courageous resistance over conspiracy in Dan 6.

¹⁹David Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions: Satirical Reading of Daniel 1–6* (HBM 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008).

²⁰According to Bakhtin, this Menippean satire genre has fourteen characteristics. For a precise listing, see Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions*, 118.

²¹See also Leung Lai, “Daniel,” 1015.

presumably before the events of Dan 5. Daniel 9 and 6 take place during the reign of Darius. The last vision (10–12) occurs during the reign of Cyrus. An arrangement of the chronology of the chapters has important bearing on the Danielic self in that his public and private selves are simultaneously revealed within the same temporal timeframe. While he functions publicly as an aspirant sage with insight, intelligence, and outstanding wisdom to interpret dreams (5:12, 14), he simultaneously admits that the vision is beyond his understanding (8:27). Deeply troubled (7:15, 28) and exhausted by his visions, he lies ill for several days. Yet he still has to get up and attend to his public functions—the king’s business (8:27). In his private self, he has to keep the matter (troubled thoughts) to himself (7:28). As Fewell has observed, the setting in Dan 7 and 8 lends further irony and depth to the scenario in Dan 5.²² Another sharp contrast prevails as we compare the two Danielic selves. In Dan 5, a bold, self-confident Daniel confronts a weak and frightened Belshazzar. Yet in his private life, his fear is described in very much the same manner as the king’s (cf. 7:15, 28; 8:17, 27 with 5:6, 9–10).

A closer look at the inner conflict of the character suggests the idea of cognitive dissonance. Daniel’s ability to understand visions and dreams of all kinds is a gift from God (יְהוָה in 1:17). He distinguishes himself among the administrators and satraps by his exceptional qualities (6:3). Living through his own visionary experience as self-presented in Dan 7–12 places him at the disjunction of his expected role as an outstanding sage and his lived experience (as dysfunctional seer). This condition of cognitive dissonance may account for the emotional upheaval and symptoms of physical illness that the private Daniel is suffering. Yet if the overarching framework in 6:29 [28] and 12:13 is intentionally structured, the disharmony between his private and public selves can be compensated by the promissory charge in 12:13: “But you, go on to the end, and you shall rest and stand in your lot at the end of the days.”

Appropriation: “Word Becoming Flesh”

Appropriation is a two-way trip from the world of the text to the contextual situatedness of the reader (or vice versa).²³ As an example

²²Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty*, 121.

²³Hans-Georg Gadamer (*Truth and Method* [New York: Seabury, 1975], cited in Schuyler Brown, *Text and Psyche: Experiencing Scripture Today* [New

of perspectival reading, I intend to explicate the following two lines of appropriation here—they are both text-centered and reader-oriented.

To Immigrant Families and Minorities in the Profession

Daniel is a text peopled by members of diverse cultures. Daniel's social world is unpleasant and difficult because of foreign rule. Perseverance and the ability to adapt are necessary tools for survival. If one reads Daniel as a success story, the overall stance of the narratives in Dan 1–6 is one of loyalty, optimism and, perhaps, accommodation toward the ruling power. Crossing borders between the home and the host culture, immigrant families today have to go through the same journey of alienation, adaptation, assimilation, and, for some, reorientation. As in Daniel, pleasure or pain, success or failure are among the possibilities of this border-crossing experience in the diaspora. Likewise, remaining in a borderland experience or negotiating an ever-expanding in-between space is among the options in the life of an immigrant. Daniel exemplifies an individual's breaking away from a captive status to become an aspiring sage in an adopted culture. Failing to perceive this possibility in life, we would remain perpetual captives in a free land.

Daniel is a text that is often appropriated by people who discover that it speaks to the contexts in which they find themselves. In 9:2, Daniel himself turns to a book—Jeremiah—as he seeks to understand his present situation. In doing so, he mirrors our search for meaning and significance in our contexts. If Daniel can be read as a manual for survival—and even success—under hostile and dominating empires, yet, it is intriguing to note, as advocated by Valeta, Daniel and his group's coping strategy is the creative use of satire and humor cushioned with wisdom (not direct confrontation). This may have profound implications for coping strategies on the part of minorities today, particularly for those in the academic, religious, or theological disciplines.

York: Continuum, 1998], 47) has long been an advocate of this view. He affirms the centrality of appropriation in that in order to understand the ancient text, the interpreter “must not seek to disregard himself and his particular hermeneutical situation. He must relate the text to his situation if he wants to understand at all” (*Truth and Method*, 289).

To the “Daniel” (Potentially) in Each of Us

As a profoundly pastoral book, the effect of the inner life of Daniel on the corporate dimension—“the community of pastors”—has seldom been brought to the foreground of appropriation. As I immerse myself *in the Danielic visionary experience, something intriguing happens*. Yes, the world of Daniel is full of conflicts, turbulence, rising and falling of kings and kingdoms in the course of human history and beyond. It is also a world of archetypal imagery embedded in dreams and visions. Yet, as I penetrate through the service level of the text and zoom in to those deeper structures, I have been powerfully drawn to the internal world of Daniel—his private self. In other words, as the text engages my *unconscious feelings, I naturally bypass the turbulent external world of Daniel and touch his inner feelings through the transference of identity*. My reading takes me from the Danielic public self as an aspiring sage to my public role as a theological educator and shepherd-teacher; from his private self as a suffering and dysfunctional seer to aspects of my inner life.

Daniel’s interior world is a world of paradoxes. Daniel asks but cannot comprehend the answer; he wants to know but fails to understand; he sees but cannot perceive; he hears but is unable to respond. His “I” voice is heard everywhere, and it makes me pause every time it is uttered.²⁴ With the postmodern consciousness of the self, my previously subdued Chinese self has been brought to the foreground as I interact with the Danielic self in its two aspects, public and private. As I *re-live* the Danielic conflicting emotions and appropriate them to my context as a shepherd-teacher, I face the same dilemma of my inability to function well and live up to my role expectations.

To be able to look into the inner life of Daniel and to experience his feelings is a comforting path. In a way, my reading and emotive-experiencing event is a therapeutic exercise of appropriation. This reading is a demonstrated example of *re-expression*. The Danielic emotions are complex and psychophysical. Thus walking through this path of emotive-experiencing (*re-living*) has been exhausting! Yet at the end of

²⁴In strategic places where Daniel discloses himself and shares with his readers his psychological or physical state, the emphatic, self-referential “I, Daniel” (אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל) is used (7:15, 28; 8:27; 10:2, 7; 12:5), inviting his readers into his inner feelings (fear, bewilderment, anxiety, struggles). As Francis Landy has concluded, “If vision suggests clarity and exteriority, voice evokes the interiority of the person and an intimation beyond the horizon” (“Vision and Voice in Isaiah,” *JOT* 88 [2000], 36 [19–36]).

the journey what has been able to calm the tormented soul has the same soothing effect upon me: “But you, [Pastor Barbara], go on to the end; for you shall rest and stand in your lot at the end of the days” (Dan 12:13). It is a serene but assuring hope.

Afterword

Interrelated Questions

Toward the end of this presentation, several interrelated questions come to mind: What constitutes the global perspective(s) in my reading? To what extent can my reading serve as an example of globalized reading? Or, alternatively, what does it mean to engage texts globally?

First, reflecting on my narrative-contextual approach to my self-identity, I have to admit that I am still very much a product of the West, including my social locations of reading. However, all biblical interpretive endeavors are in essence cross-cultural and demand a fusion of the two horizons: the horizon of the ancient text and that of the contemporary reader. To be able to identify what makes my reading an ethnic-, gender-, culture-specific representation is a rather wishful thinking. Conforming to the loosely established Chinese-Canadian or Asian-American way of reading may handicap ourselves and minimize our capacity to transform the meaning-significance of the text and the act of reading. To this end, could we legitimately speak of the consequences of globalized biblical interpretation?

Second, given the fact that the audience of this essay are all trained readers, what makes it a uniquely Leung Lai reading that reflects, to a certain extent, a Chinese-Canadian woman’s reading? Perhaps it is the continual external shaping forces that collectively play a strategic role in shaping my interpretive interests (the case in point is the Danielic internal profile), as well as the conscious demand for self-involvement in engaging texts out of my life contexts.

Third, perceiving globalization as both a dynamic movement and a challenge, we are reminded to embrace diversity and multiplicity of interpretive voices interdisciplinarily. We must be cautious of stereotyping.

Word Becoming Flesh: Toward an Appropriation Theory

Word Becoming Flesh: Wisdom and Appropriation is the working title of my sabbatical book project. Three conceptual terms have been

referred to in this presentation, and they are interconnected: globalization, contextualization, and appropriation. I find “appropriation” is more or less a more encompassing term. While appropriation and relevance theories are at the core of research across many disciplines, the goal of working out an appropriation theory has to aim at, first and foremost, its global applicability. The act of appropriation involves the engagement of one’s self out of one’s life contexts and situatedness.

According to Andrew Kille, “appropriation involves not only an analysis of various aspects of the text, it requires a *re-expression* of those elements in a way that the reader can grasp.”²⁵ Schuyler Brown further articulates the vibrant dynamics of the act of appropriation. Appropriation takes place in the imaginative space between the reader’s own world and the possible world projected by the text. It is controlled neither by the objectivity of the text alone nor by the subjectivity of the reader. Appropriation occurs in the lively intersection between text and reader.²⁶

The following slice of my lived experience best explains the act of appropriation: that is, from *reliving* to *re-expressing*. Kazoh Kitamori was probably the first Asian theologian to have contributed to the theology of the pain of God. The English version of his monograph was published in the mid-1960s. In identifying himself with the pain and suffering of the Japanese nation during the aftermath of the atomic bomb, he wrote the insightful and penetrating book, *Theology of the Pain of God*.²⁷ As a young seminarian reading his work in the early 1970s, I was profoundly impressed by the depth of his insights and the level of his engagement in the subject. As Kitamori *relived* the national suffering and shame and *re-expressed* the emotional pain through the production of his book, the same transitive impact was made on me. I hope this illustration may illuminate the act and dynamics of appropriation.

Appropriation, “Word Becoming Flesh,” is both an *indicative* and an *imperative* in the task of biblical interpretation.

²⁵D. Andrew Kille, *Psychological Biblical Criticism* (GBS/OT; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), 53.

²⁶Brown, *Text and Psyche*, 25.

²⁷Kazoh Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God* (Richmond: John Knox, 1965).

For Further Reading

- Fewell, Danna Nolan. *Circle of Sovereignty: A Story of Stories in Daniel 1–6*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 72. Sheffield: Almond, 1988.
- Hesselgrave, David J., and Edward Rommen. *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2003.
- Knut, Holter, and Louis C. Jonker, eds. *Global Hermeneutics? Reflections and Consequences*. International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament Congress. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Foskett, Mary F., and Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan, eds. *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading: Asian American Biblical Interpretation*. St. Louis: Chalice, 2006.
- Leung Lai, Barbara M. "Aspirant Sage or Dysfunctional Seer? Cognitive Dissonance and Pastoral Vulnerability in the Profile of Daniel." *PastPsych* 57 (2008): 199–210.
- Tate, Randolph W. *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*. 3d ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008.