FROM MULTICULTURALITY TO INTERCULTURALITY:

CAN INTERCULTURAL BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS BE OF ANY ASSISTANCE?

Louis Jonker
Department Old and New Testament
Stellenbosch University

Abstract

This paper, as well as other papers presented at the same interdisciplinary colloquium[1] form part of the theoretical reflection of a research project with the title "Utilising hermeneutics in the move from multiculturality to interculturality: Intercultural Bible reading as case study."[2] In the present contribution the problem that is investigated is identified, and the possible contribution of biblical hermeneutics is indicated. A preliminary discussion of key concepts such as "culture", "multiculturality" and "interculturality" is also presented here.

Key Words: Multiculturality, Interculturality, Biblical Hermeneutics

Introduction: The Problem to be Investigated

South Africa is often described as "the world in one country". This slogan refers to a rich variety of climatological and vegetational regions, but also to the rich variety of peoples, cultures, languages and religions. The slogan is often heard in contexts where attention is intentionally focused upon the positive potential of this rich diversity.

However, it is obvious that the rich diversity also brings along some serious challenges to those living in South Africa. Diversity of cultures, peoples, languages and religions is even experienced as a threat of the own identity in certain contexts. Although the world exists in one country in South Africa, the diversity often emphasizes that the different parts of South African society are worlds apart. It is not only a matter of diversity in South Africa – the political past of this country has transformed diversity into "apartheid", separateness. Many laws of the previous political regime have succeeded in drawing the lines between the different parts of this rich diversity so deeply, that these parts became "worlds apart"!

The political changes since 1990 have brought a much greater appreciation for the diversity of peoples, cultures, languages and religions. The right to form cultural, religious and linguistic communities is even entrenched in the Bill of Rights of the South African Constitution.[3] However, new and creative ways still have to be found to develop knowledge

---

[1]   The title of the colloquium that was held in Stellenbosch (on 2 September 2005) was: "From multiculturality to interculturality: An interdisciplinary consultation".

[2]   A project funded by the NRF (2005-2006).

[3]   Cf. arts. 30 and 31 of the Constitution (Act 200 of 1993 and amendments). Art. 30 reads: "Language and Culture: Everyone has the right to use the language and to participate in the cultural life of their choice, but no one exercising these rights may do so in a manner inconsistent with any provision of the Bill of Rights." Art. 31 follows thereafter: "Cultural, religious and linguistic communities: (1) Persons belonging to a cultural, religious or linguistic community may not be denied the right, with other members of that community (a) to enjoy their culture, practice their religion and use their language; and (b) to form, join and maintain cultural,

and understanding of, and respect for "the other" in South African society. The mere recognition of the "multi-" (be it multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, multi-language, multi-religion) does not guarantee that the rich diversity will function constructively in society.

The impact of the past on the diversity in this country is particularly clear on the level of culture. The policy of racial segregation had a double impact on culture. On the one hand, the social policy of classifying the population into four groups (Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Asians) ignored cultural differences. Although it is obvious that many different cultures were represented in each of those racial groups, these differences were ignored or underplayed. On the other hand (and even in contrast to the previous point) the cultural differences between the different racial groups were emphasized so strongly that it was even made impossible by law to cross these boundaries. The policy of Apartheid thus had the two-fold effect that the cultural identities within racial groups were not acknowledged, but simultaneously the cultural identities in different racial groups were emphasized so strongly that different worlds were created for these groups. The result of the South African past was that "the other" in the same country became an unknown, foreign entity, and even "the enemy".

This structuring of society by the Apartheid ideology also had a remarkable impact within Christian circles. Apart from the structural impact of the past on many Christian churches (namely, the formation of different racially-defined churches, best illustrated in the Dutch Reformed family), the past also had an immense impact on a hermeneutical[4] level. The divides of the past resulted in the different cultural-ethnic groups (even within one and the same church) not having (or even prevented from having) the opportunity to read the Bible together with "others". One could argue that this brought about a very serious hermeneutic "deficit" among the majority of the Christian community of not being exposed to (and even not having the capability of) Bible reading together with "the other"[5].

It is hypothesized in the present research project that:

▪ A development of hermeneutical skills among Christian communities of reading the Bible together with "the other" could contribute significantly towards the fostering of interculturality in the broader South African society. In a move towards interculturality where a "fusion of horizons" (cf. Gadamer) is called for, hermeneutics can make a valuable input.

▪ The studying of the dynamics of intercultural Bible reading could provide us with better insight into the dynamics of a shift from multiculturality to interculturality in the South African society.

Towards Defining Multiculturality and Interculturality

When speaking of "interculturality" and "intercultural biblical hermeneutics" the question "What is culture?" is of central importance. Although I leave the task of defining culture to those specialists who are better equipped than a biblical scholar[6], I will briefly discuss in

---

religious and linguistic associations and other organs of civil society. (2) The rights in subsection (1) may not be exercised in a manner inconsistent with any provision of the Bill of Rights."

4   Hermeneutics could be defined as the discipline dealing with and the reflection on the structures and dynamics of understanding. (See also the discussion below.)

5   Present-day conflicts on Bible interpretation (particularly within Dutch Reformed circles) could – at least in part – be traced back to this "deficit". Cf. e.g. the present debate on homosexuality.

6   My expectation of the interdisciplinary colloquium is that specialists from other fields could help to bring conceptual clarity in this respect.

the next section certain trends in defining culture which have become clear to me from the literature.

Trends in Defining Culture

Previously, culture has been defined in static terms as a holistic system that gives clear meaning to the world and reality. Nowadays, however, a more dynamic, semiotic definition of culture is used. Culture is viewed as a system that is in constant movement and subject to change. Culture is a permanent activity of meaning construction in which new connections between old and new are established.[7] It is not a static entity of values or habits, but a permanent process of constructing meaning.[8]

Geertz (1993) talks about culture as a varying "pattern of meanings" and differentiates four aspects: Culture is (1) a pattern of meanings and a system of conceptions, (2) historically transmitted and inherited, (3) embodied in verbal and non-verbal symbols, and (4) the vehicle to shape a people's knowledge about and attitude toward life.

Another attempt towards the differentiation of various aspects of culture is the following: (1) Culture is ideational: It provides systems or frameworks of meaning which serve both to interpret the world and to provide guidance for living in the world. Culture therefore embodies values, insights, attitudes, norms and rules for behaviour. (2) Culture is performance: It includes rituals which the group celebrates, commemorates, remembers and looks forward to. Culture is therefore a group happening. (3) Culture is material: It involves artifacts and symbols that serve as a source of identity (e.g. language, food, clothes, music, organization of space, etc.).[9]

There are different anthropological approaches to the study of culture. Deist (2000: 82ff.) provides a useful summary of these approaches:

1. *Evolutionist approaches*: "In evolutionist approaches the interest lies in the *origins* of human culture and the mechanisms that caused its forward thrust… The main characteristics of evolutionary explanations of human culture are naturalism and determinism. That is, the forces that caused culture to evolve and change are natural rather than spiritual and operate in a law-like fashion…" (2000: 84-85).

2. *Structuralist approaches*: "…(S)tructuralist studies of culture view observable human behaviour, which is normally taken for 'culture', as the mere local surface structure of 'culture' itself. Viewed on the level of surface structures, individual cultures differ quite considerably. Those differences are, however, not of an 'essential' nature. They are caused by physical, social and historical factors. On a 'deeper' level, though, they all share one (mental) structure, constituted by oppositional pairs… Basic to all these oppositions is that of 'self-others', on which not only all human communication depends, but also certain social practices and rules are founded…" (2000: 87).

3. *Structural-functionalist approaches*: "In the structuralist-functionalist view, mostly simply referred to as 'functionalism', culture exhibits not only a certain structuredness but also a dynamic interactive relationship among elements of that structure… (F)unctionalist explanations of cultural differences tend to look at the different ways in which cultures 'organize' themselves" (2000: 88-90).

4. *Configurational approaches*: "In this view, all cultural behaviour is of a *symbolic* nature, that is, carries *meaning* that is shared by the group and abstracted by the

---

[7] Cf. Hoedemaker (1997).
[8] Cf. Geertz (1993).
[9] Cf. Blount (1995).

individual from the social system through participatory interaction. Each human act thus has meaning. All such meanings tend to 'cluster' around central or core values, premises or goals. Culture is looked upon as an integrative configurational symbolic system to which a cultural group ascribes… (2000: 90).

5. *Ethnohistorical approaches*: "Archaeological anthropology has always dealt with the earliest remains of culture (of a region) and historical anthropology studies *cultural change* that had occurred in the history of a particular group. The demise of colonialism has, however, stimulated the 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 can provide… (2000: 92).[10]

When defining culture in such a dynamic fashion, the question arises whether there are any depth dimensions that occur in all cultures.[11] The quest for depth dimensions in culture does not emerge from an attempt to differentiate between superior and inferior cultures – the concept of superiority cannot be applied to cultures – nor from a need to arrive at universal models, but rather from the need to distinguish whether diversity among people perhaps shows a structure which could serve as a basis for mutual understanding.

Hofstede (1995) has argued that a fixed number of such cultural depth dimensions exist. These dimensions are problem areas that can be found in all cultures and to which a certain response is given in all cultures. They are: (1) power and inequality; (2) individualism vs. collectivism; (3) masculinity vs. femininity; (4) uncertainty and fear for the unknown; (5) past, present and future. When understanding the dynamics of these depth dimensions in culture, they may serve as the basis for intercultural discourse and mutual understanding. These dimensions help us to understand the differences in thinking, feeling and acting by "others".

From the above discussion it becomes clear that the complexity of "culture" should not be underestimated – not to speak of the complexity of the interaction between different cultures (interculturality).

Is Interculturality Desirable?

If the phenomenon of culture is already so complex, why bother with the even more complex phenomenon of interculturality? Is interculturality an ideal that we should strive for?

In a glocal (global-local) world[12] intercultural exchange seems to be inevitable. It is only by means of extreme ascetic and sectarian strategies that a cultural community can guard themselves against interchange with other cultures.[13] The world has become a multicultural society within which globalization makes intercultural exchange inevitable. September 11, 2001 and its aftermath certainly serves as a convincing argument in this regard!

Moreover, on a more local scale South Africa is not the only country which is characterized by multiculturality. With the migration of peoples from Eastern Europe and Northern Africa to Western Europe, it has posed challenges in terms of intercultural exchange that have not been met before. In many of the Western European countries

---

[10] Deist (2000: 94ff.) opts for a combination of configurational and evolutionist approaches as the most appropriate for the studying of biblical literature.

[11] This question, as well as the model of Hofstede which is discussed below, show traits of the structuralist approaches to studying culture.

[12] Cf. Groenewald (1999).

[13] Cf. e.g. the Amish in the USA.

multiculturality has been accepted and has become a value to strive for in society. However, the acceptance of multiculturality has been challenged in recent times by certain acts of terror. The following assessment of the situation in the UK after the recent London bombings serves as illustration of this point: "… 'n … skokgolf spoel sedertdien deur die koninkryk. Die seismiese verskuiwing wat hierdie … golf uitgestuur het, was die onthulling dat die bomdraers van 7 Julie *Britte* was. Nie asielsoekers uit geweldgeteisterde lande nie. Jong mans soos hierdie, die suksesvol geïntegreerde kinders van immigrante, moes die toonbeeld gewees het van die multikulturele Brittanje ... Maar hulle was nie ... (H)et die dogma van multikulturalisme dan gefaal? Want multikulturalisme was tot onlangs die heilige koei van die Britse samelewing. Soos die meeste credo's met onbedoelde gevolge, het dit begin van 'n onaanvegbare en lofwaardige vertrekpunt, naamlik dat mense van verskeie kulture, godsdienste en agtergronde in Brittanje naas mekaar moet bestaan en dat die beste roete na dié vreedsame naasbestaan is om elke kultuur die geleentheid te bied om volledig uiting te vind sonder om 'n enkele stel waardes aan enige groep op te dwing ... Die onbedoelde gevolge van die nastreef van multikulturalisme het gevloei uit die verabsolutering daarvan, uit die aanheg van die '-isme'... En ironies genoeg vereis die sukses van 'n multikulturele Brittanje dalk 'n einde aan die dogma van multikulturalisme."[14]

If the above assessment of the situation in the UK is correct, should South Africa take a lesson from this development? The policy of apartheid segregated the South African society into "worlds apart", into multiculturalism. But what about the "New" South Africa?[15] I have argued above that we have already come a long way in terms of the acceptance of multiculturality in society. But is that enough? Could this also develop into another kind of multicultural*ism*? Is interculturality a better option for society? And how can interculturality be facilitated without denying the cultural identity of different communities? These are the difficult questions that will have to be answered in this research project (and to which this colloquium will hopefully contribute).

The Possible Contribution of Intercultural Biblical Hermeneutics

Culture and Hermeneutics

In a footnote above (fn. 4) "hermeneutics" has already been defined as the meta-discipline dealing with and reflecting on the structures and dynamics of understanding and interpretation.[16] Hermeneutics is not interpretation itself. It is rather the meta-theoretical reflection on the process of interpretation. This discipline deals with questions such as: How do we interpret? And why? Hermeneutics as theoretical discipline therefore provides the possibility of acknowledging diversity, but also of moving beyond diversity to a discussion about the "why?" of interpretation. This discussion creates the potential of developing respect for and understanding of "the other".

Nobody interprets and understands in a vacuum. We have also seen above that culture is defined as a dynamic process of meaning construction. Culture to a large extent determines the behaviour of people, their values, and their view of life and the world.[17]

---

[14] Quoted from an in-depth article with the title "Multikulturalisme in spervuur weens bomme" written by André Pretorius in *Die Burger* of 8 August 2005.

[15] Cf. Rathbone (2004: 273) who shows skepticism about the new multiculturalism that is characteristic of the "New" South Africa.

[16] Cf. Conradie & Jonker (2001).

[17] This insight is confirmed in many varying studies. Cf. e.g. De Wit (2004a: 26).

De Wit (2004a: 26) illustrates this insight with a very illuminating quote from Charles Larson[18] who taught English literature in Nigeria in the 1960's. In Larson's discussion of a Thomas Hardy novel with his Nigerian learners, an important question came up:

> "Excuse me, sir, what does it mean 'to kiss'?" That was a much more difficult question to answer than the usual ones relating to the plot or the characters of the novel – a real shock when it was brought to my attention that I had a rather naïve boy in my class. So I brushed the question off until it was repeated a number of times and I slowly began to realize that all of my students had no real idea of what it meant to kiss. This seemed an extremely odd thing to me because most of my students were upper-form boys in their late teens – some in their early twenties – and I had, of course, heard them talking on occasion about their girl friends. It was also rumoured that several of the boys were married, although by school regulations they were not supposed to be. Nevertheless, that question and others of a like nature kept recurring – in part, no doubt, because we were reading Thomas Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd*. Why did Hardy's characters get so flustered when they were kissed (or more likely, when they weren't kissed)? When I asked one of the European-educated African teachers why my students always seemed ready to return to that same question, I was more than surprised to learn that Africans, traditionally at least, do not kiss; to learn that what I thought was 'natural' in one society is not natural at all, but learned, that is, cultural. Not all people kiss. Or, stated more appropriately, not all peoples have learned to kiss… How was one to read a Thomas Hardy novel with all those frustrated kisses without ever having been kissed?"

Whether the observation that traditional Africans do not kiss can be generalized in the way Larson generalizes it, is uncertain. However, this experience in Nigeria illustrates well that culture forms an important context[19] within which the process of understanding and interpretation takes place. Hermeneutical reflection therefore has to take culture into account. The meta-theoretical reflection on interpretation should ask what role culture plays in understanding, and how understanding can take place across cultural divides.

Why Involve the Bible?

Why involve the Bible in a research project that aims at the stimulation of intercultural discourse in a multicultural and multireligious society? Will the Bible not be a stumbling block in the way of creating mutual understanding and respect for "the other"?

On the one hand, we should certainly be aware of the "danger" of biblical interpretation. The interpretation of the Bible does not escape the influence of pervasive ideologies. The word "ideology" may be used in two distinct ways.[20] It is sometimes equated with the notion of "world view" or "perspective" or "point of view". These concepts indicate that there may well be room for more than one legitimate interpretation (i.e. the acceptance of diversity). However, these differences are not always innocent. They often coincide with positions of power. The interpretation of the Bible may be used to justify the interpreter's position of power. This justification may take place deliberately. It may also take place subconsciously. The interpreter may even not be aware of how his/her own interests

---

[18] De Wit (2004a: 26) quotes from Charles Larson (1992) "Heroic Ethnocentrism: The idea of universality in literature", in Ashcroft, B et al (ed.) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 62-65.

[19] De Wit (2004c: 507) rightly emphasizes that "not everything is culture" in interpretation: "…(G)reat differences in interpretation can occur within a culture. Church background and theological insights, and moral views stemming from these sources also appear to play an important role."

[20] Cf. Conradie & Jonker (2001: 20ff.)

influence his/her interpretation. The second use of the concept "ideology" refers to this subconscious justification of a position of power.

On account of this reality some even say that the Bible is a dangerous book.[21] The South African past witnesses to this fact.[22] Biblical interpretation that takes place in isolation, that does not take part in a discourse with "others", is in danger of becoming a destructive tool in society. This emphasizes the need for intercultural biblical interpretation.

On the other hand, the Bible simultaneously is a powerful tool that crosses boundaries. It is estimated that more than 70% of the South African population confess to the Christian religion. People from all cultures, ethnic groups, genders and sexual orientations belong to the Christian part of South African society. The Bible is a common denominator for them as it is regarded as authoritative in their religious practice. The Bible is determinative in the values and norms pursued by this part of society. "Bible reading" is therefore an activity that cuts across cultural, racial and gender boundaries in South Africa.

Developments in Biblical Hermeneutics

Recent developments in the field of biblical hermeneutics – both on national and inter-national level – offer an interesting parallel to the developments in broader society, not only in South Africa, but also in a global world. These developments can be summarized as follows.[23]

Since the 1960's the role of the reader in the process of biblical interpretation has increasingly been acknowledged and emphasized.[24] A new awareness arose that meaning is not something inherent in signs (linguistic or others), but that meaning is a function of the context from which the sign is being observed and interpreted. In biblical interpretation this new awareness led to the realization that a diversity of interpretations of one and the same biblical text is indeed possible on account of the diverse contexts from which the Bible is being interpreted.

During the 1970s and 80s the focus on "context" gave rise to what can be called different genitive hermeneutics. These different genitive hermeneutics mirrored the new position of multiculturality and diversity in the field of biblical hermeneutics. Particularly in contexts of oppression and marginality readers of the Bible started claiming a special position for their particular perspective on Biblical texts. This gave rise to a long list of hermeneutical programmes.[25] These hermeneutical positions shared a set of goals: A new awareness of the individual situation or context prompted them to break with the universal pretensions of Western theology and with the dominance of Western modes of biblical interpretation. The decentering of biblical scholarship was called for, and attention was focused on the intimate connection between the text that is interpreted and the community for which the interpretation is made. Biblical texts were approached with new questions and presuppositions. Suffering and the fate of the poor, experiences of women, Indians, blacks and outcasts started serving as hermeneutical principle.

---

[21] Cf. Conradie & Jonker (2001: 24).
[22] Cf. Jonker (1999, 2001b & 2001c).
[23] This summary is based on the description of De Wit (2001) in the Project Handbook of an international project on intercultural Bible reading called "Through the eyes of the other".
[24] The names of Fish and McKnight are normally associated with this development.
[25] *Inter alia* Hermeneutics of liberation, Black hermeneutics in the USA and South Africa, Feminist hermeneutics, Dalit hermeneutics, Caribbean hermeneutics, Indigenous hermeneutics of North and South America, Post-colonial hermeneutics, etc.

The focus on contextuality, and the resultant development of the so-called genitive hermeneutics, resulted in a new appreciation of plurality and of the multicultural nature of biblical interpretation. Simultaneously, however, the acceptance of diversity posed new questions about validity in interpretation. What status does an interpretation have over and against the multiplicity of other interpretations? What claims can be made on account of your own interpretation? These questions become acute when cultural codes and values are attached to the text, and when cultural practices are legitimized by means of specific interpretations of a text. No hermeneutical model escapes cultural bias.[26] When a group or context is regarded as privileged, another is excluded or ignored.[27]

The acceptance of multiculturality in interpretation thus posed the question of the interrelationship and possible interaction between interpretations. In recent years a need for interculturality arose in biblical hermeneutics – the need to move beyond multicultural hermeneutics to intercultural hermeneutics.

Intercultural Biblical Hermeneutics

What is "intercultural biblical hermeneutics"? De Wit (2004b: 488)[28] defines it as follows:

> "Intercultural hermeneutics can then be defined as consisting of the following elements: Intercultural hermeneutics concerns itself with the analysis of the interaction between culture and the process of interpreting biblical texts, within the setting of intercultural confrontation and dialogue. Intercultural hermeneutics explores the conditions that make communication of the meaning of biblical texts possible across cultural boundaries. Intercultural hermeneutics also press questions of liberation and of truth across cultural boundaries."

Although all three these elements are certainly important and integral to the definition, the focus of the present project is particularly on the second point. What conditions are necessary for the communication of meaning across cultural boundaries? The answer to this question could be of great importance in studying the dynamics of the move from multi-culturality to interculturality in broader society.

The transformative potential of intercultural Bible reading has been emphasized by numerous studies.[29] Kool (2004) has, for example, identified certain conditions for change of perspective in intercultural communication on account of her analysis of the reading reports which were compiled in an international project on intercultural Bible reading. The first factor she mentions is "Attitude toward the partner group". She observes: "The most important condition for successful intercultural communication is the attitude people have

---

26   Cf. e.g. Bailey (1998).
27   De Wit (2004b: 480-481) criticizes the so-called genitive biblical hermeneutics exactly on this point when he says: "The question emerges: How can one arrive at hermeneutical models that, on the one hand, have an open eye for the personal context, but that, on the other, are less excluding, ideologically determined, and closed? … Genitive hermeneutics by definition understands itself as an alternative to ruling hermeneutics. The position represented by genitive hermeneutics makes genuine, profound interaction difficult. Interaction, certainly when it results in critical self-reflection, is easily interpreted as a betrayal of the issue of justice or liberation. For this reason, genitive hermeneutics often ends up maintaining a ghetto position. People from the outside cannot enter the insiders' interpretation. Sometimes, a significant reductionism is visible in genitive hermeneutics: Bible readers are reduced to flat categories. Precisely because one encounters one's position in greater and greater detail."
28   De Wit (2004a: 28-29) distinguishes, in line with the distinctions in anthropological research, between intercultural, intracultural and cross-cultural communication.
29   Cf. e.g. the studies of Hartman (2004), Kessler (2004), Kool (2004), Miranda-Feliciano (2004), Riches (2004) and Witvliet (2004).

when they enter the process. This attitude can make or break the process…" (2004: 363).[30] De Wit (2004c: 506-507) also presents a brief summary of basic conditions that were found to facilitate successful intercultural Bible reading.[31]

> *Attitude:* Successful interaction requires a basic attitude of openness, trust, vulnerability, and willingness to criticize oneself and to see one's own faith insights as relative. This attitude applies to the reading process of the group itself as well as to the interaction with the partner group.[32] Confrontation is allowed, but it must be based on trust. Not every type of motivation is productive. Motivation especially focused on acquiring new knowledge, focused on challenges, turns out to be enriching…

> *Knowledge:* The group needs basic knowledge of how cultures operate. Differences between groups soon become apparent, but it requires knowledge to see how these cultural differences can be identified and understood…

> *Insight:* Insight into the group's own reading attitude and interpretation method is also important. This insight enables participants to discover the connection between the method and the results of their interpretation and that of the partner group…"

Can these conditions be transposed onto wider society? Can the dynamics of intercultural Bible reading assist us in defining "interculturality" in society more adequately? And can the lessons learnt from Intercultural Biblical Hermeneutics be of any assistance in transforming the multicultural South African society into a society which is characterized by interculturality?

Conclusion

I have started this paper with an outline of the problem that will be investigated in this research project. It was argued that a move from multiculturality to interculturality is needed in the South African society. The second section investigated the intricate concept of "culture". It showed that we are dealing with a very complex phenomenon, and that interculturality is even more complex to analyze and achieve. The third main section argued that certain development in biblical hermeneutics could be of assistance in facilitating a move from multiculturality to interculturality in society.

The discussion above has shown that conceptual clarity is needed on many aspects that are involved in this research. The papers that follow, will hopefully contribute to this aim. I am therefore grateful to those colleagues who have accepted the invitation to contribute to this interdisciplinary consultation.

---

[30] She refers to the studies done on intercultural communication by Spitzberg and Cupach when she states that the following three conditions influence the attitude towards "the other": (1) knowledge, (2) motivation and (3) skill (2004: 364-365).

[31] Elsewhere De Wit (2004a: 477ff.) relates these conditions to the distinctions made by Henk Procee in his study on transcultural morality. Two principles are emphasized in that discussion, namely (i) the principle of non-exclusion, and (ii) the principle of stimulating interactions.

[32] In the international research project "Through the eyes of another" established Bible study groups were given the task to all read the same biblical text. In a second round Bible study groups were then each linked to another partner group with a different cultural background. They then had the task of reacting to the interpretation of the biblical text by their partner group.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, RC 1998. "The danger of ignoring one's own cultural bias in interpreting the text", in *Sugirtharajah*, RS (ed.), 66-90.

Blount, BK 1995. *Cultural interpretation. Reorienting New Testament Criticism.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Conradie, EM & Jonker, LC 2001. *Angling for interpretation.* Bellville: UWC Publications.

Deist, FE 2000. *The material culture of the Bible. An introduction.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

De Wit, JH 2001. *Through the eyes of another. A project on intercultural reading of the Bible.* Unpublished project handbook. Amsterdam.

De Wit, JH et al (ed.) 2004. *Through the eyes of another. Intercultural reading of the Bible.* Elkhart, Indiana: Institute of Mennonite Studies.

De Wit, JH 2004a. "Through the eyes of another. Objectives and backgrounds", in De Wit et al (ed.), 3-53.

De Wit, JH 2004b. "Intercultural Bible reading and hermeneutics", in De Wit et al (ed.), 477-492.

De Wit, JH 2004c. "Epilogue", in De Wit et al (ed.), 503-511.

Geertz, C 1993. *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Groenewald, CJ 1999. "Social transformation. Between globalization and localization", *Scriptura* 72, 17-30.

Hartman, J 2004. "When people discuss the Word of God with one another, everything becomes real", in De Wit et al (ed.), 348-359.

Hofstede. G 1995. *Allemaal andersdenkenden. Omgaan met cultuurverschillen.* Amsterdam: Contact.

Jonker, LC 1999. "The influence of social transformation on the interpretation of the Bible: A methodological perspective", *Scriptura* 72, 1-14.

Jonker, LC 2001a. "Towards a 'communal' approach for reading the Bible in Africa", in Getui, MN et al (ed.) *Interpreting the Old Testament in Africa.* Nairobi: Acton Press, 77-88.

Jonker, LC 2001b. "The biblical legitimization of ethnic diversity in Apartheid Theology", *Scriptura* 77, 165-183.

Jonker, LC 2001c. "Social transformation and Biblical interpretation: A comparative study", *Scriptura* 77, 259-270.

Kessler, R 2004/ "From bipolar to multipolar understanding. Hermeneutical consequences of intercultural Bible reading", in De Wit et al (ed.), 452-459.

Kool, M 2004. "Intercultural Bible reading as a practical setting for intercultural communication", in De Wit et al (ed.), 360-376.

Miranda-Feliciano, E 2004. "Shaping our lives, transforming our communities, reaching out to the world", in De Wit et al (ed.), 261-272.

Rathbone, M 2004. "South African intercultural biblical interpretation. Toward a global postcolonial ethic of interpretation", in De Wit et al (ed.), 273-287.

Riches, J 2004. "Intercultural hermeneutics. Conversations across cultural and contextual divides", in De Wit et al (ed.), 460-476.

Sugirtharajah, RS (ed.) 1998. *The postcolonial Bible.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Witvliet, T 2004. "The ecumenical relevance of intercultural Bible reading", in De Wit et al (ed.), 493-502.