RELIGION, EMOTION, SENSATION

Affect Theories and Theologies

KAREN BRAY AND STEPHEN D. MOORE, EDITORS

Reading (with) Rhythm for the Sake of the (I-n-)Islands: A Rastafarian Interpretation of Samson as Ambi(val)ent Affective Assemblage

A. PAIGE RAWSON

The book has become the body of passion. . . .
—GILLES DELEUZE AND FÉLIX GUATTARI, *A Thousand Plateaus*

Yes, as the (eye)land plays with itself, the sea, the horizon, and a vast beyond, should you pursue the pull, another (eye)land appears. . . . The drum beats a ready rhythm, the (eye)land transmoots its undulating seaing, w(e)aving.
—ALTHEA SPENCER MILLER, "Creolizing Hermeneutics: A Caribbean Invitation," in *Islands, Islanders, and the Bible: Ruminations*

THE BIBLE AS BLOOM SPACE

How are we *moved* by the Bible and why? What is it about this text that is worthy of an entire field of academic study, more commentaries than any other book ever written, and billions of devotees around the world? Just what is it about the Bible that (like Reggae) "moves" some bodies and not others? It draws or disgusts, but sometimes only amasses dust. Yet innumerable bodies, like my own, experience an ambi(val)ent affective resonance that binds us to the Bible in an inextricable[1] relationship of cruel optimism.[2] I hate it, I love it, I always find myself wanting more of it. And it is from this precarious positionality that I offer my ruminations on (the *in-between-ness* of) affectivity and divinity within the Bible through a reading (with) rhythm. Interpreting the story of Samson as affectual archetype, I propose that this *special something* about the Bible—that which matters to us and has the capacity to move us—is somatic and spiritual, sympathetic and structural. It is a body without organs, an ambi(val)ent affective assemblage. The Bible is bloom space.[3]

Reading the Bible as bloom space can actually resemble listening to music, and Reggae music in particular. In each we encounter a narrative, a history, and a particular structure—one that I will call *rhythm*—characterized by distinctive and distinguishing formal features that make *this* text the Bible and

not some other work of literature and make *this* tune Reggae and not some other musical genre. Everyday human engagements with both the Bible and Reggae, while most often conscious, are typically nonconceptual and pre-propositional: We *feel* them rather than analyze them structurally or exegete them formally. This holds particular valence when one considers those who are affectively drawn to the Bible as God's Word because they take it to be God's words. These particular interpretive communities understand the Bible to be more than an amalgam of theologies—God-talk or words about God—from particular historical communities, and even more than a literary medium through which God has and might continue to reveal Godself to humanity. For these folks the Bible is a spiritual emollient, literally God's mouth speaking—to them, their community, and at times the entire world—directly, personally, and intimately. This perception of and relationship to the Bible evinces the ways in which the Bible, in common with all sacred texts, holds affective intensities or resonances—and with as much significance in and for affect theory as for biblical and religious studies.[4]

The Bible is oral literature, *oraliture* (Glissant) and *oraliterary* (Jones), in sundry ways, and, as such, reading the Bible from and with perspectives, hermeneutical lenses, and/or cultures that privilege orality (as epistemology) over the literary can benefit our interpretation of this sacred text.[5] The Rastafari are, in fact, prototypical in this way, for their oraliterary interpretation, "citing up," of the Bible is a bold example of the Bible's re-membering and (re)definition as a Caribbean text, and I contend that their approach has the capacity to facilitate a new-old, avant-garde hermeneutical approach with the potential to push us further in our interpretive endeavors.[6] Reading the Bible for the Rastafari, orchestral architects of Reggae music, requires a profound reverence for and resonance with (its) *rhythm*—an expression of the intimate interconnection between Jah, *I-n-I*, and creation embodied in the(ir) reasoning of the biblical "text."[7] In this way, Rastafari biblical hermeneutics necessitates an apprehension of orality as musicality, birthed of the creativity that is their "*hermeneutical privilege* as a once oppressed group."[8] Just as in Édouard Glissant's *oraliture*, in which *the written becomes oral* only to expose the literary as inherently oral, the Rastafari orality erupts in a melody of meaning amid the persistent—and at times perilous—rhythms and resonances of livity and language. According to Glissant, in fact, Rastafari is "an irruption into modernity" and, I would add, Eurocentric biblical interpretation.[9]

Rastafari biblical interpretation is the embodiment of and "the upsurge of the oral into the written."[10] Through the creation of a musical medium that is but one manifestation of their biblical interpretation, and/as the aesthetic expression of "the imposition of lived rhythms," the Rastafari enact an ambient affective assemblage in and by which they are able to incorporate (through

resonance and resistance) a "reality," or text as it were, that previously appeared to restrain them.[11] It is for these reasons and more that I engage Rastafarian hermeneutics to reinterpret the biblical story of Samson. I do so, not as a representative of the Rastafari movement, a representation of a ubiquitous or even a common Rastafarian interpretation, nor as a reading characteristic of a particular Rastafari community, mansion, or house, but in order to proffer a re-presentation, a re-membering, of Samson. Engaging concepts and conversations from Afro-Caribbean and continental philosophy with significant affective resonances, in this essay I perform an exegesis inspired and animated by a Rastafari biblical hermeneutics in an effort to advocate for the necessity of reading the Bible with rhythm in order that it might be re-membered entirely otherwise, that is, as ambi(val)ent affective assemblage and archipelagic bloom space.[12]

For Glissant, the oral-musicality of Caribbean peoples in general, and the Rastafari in particular, is inextricably linked to their relationship to history and to landscape—to the rhythm of the islands.[13] The rhythmic repetition of the undulating and unceasing waves on the shore, surrounding as a resounding reminder of all that these waters, as rhythm, represent: both enslavement and liberation, motion and inertia, order and chaos, establishment and its undoing.[14] Glissant understands rhythm, then, as a means of accessing (Caribbean) memory and of understanding and recuperating history. Rhythm is "a lever of awareness,"[15] integral to our understanding of ourselves as always already in relation to other bodies—of land, water, and knowledge, human, divine, textual, and otherwise—bodies comingling, converging, and diverging, in and across time and space. As integral as rhythm is to a *poetics of relation*, it is equally indispensable to the affective aesthetics of oral-musicality as a biblical hermeneutic. The rhythmic oralizing of the Bible, which the Rastafari embody in their citing up of scripture, invigorates my interpretation, as does the(ir) desire to *find expression in the imposition of lived rhythms*. Rhythm is lived, imposing upon, accepting, resisting, moving with, against; forging new identities in refusal; always risking the threat of reification. Rhythms delineate and define, yet always already exceed the bindings of the book and the bounds of our all-too-porous encasement, this weak flesh, this thin veil of skin. To be a body, according to Bruno Latour, is to learn to be moved.[16]

And so, it is here—in the rhythms enfleshed, encasing, and exceeding the boundaries of textual and corporeal bodies—that I find resonance, in the in-betweenness of affectivity and divinity that is (reading) the Bible; in fact, it is within the very concept of resonance.[17] According to Silvan Tomkins, resonance is a central characteristic of affect. It refers to a person's (bodily) capacity to experience the same affect in response to viewing an affectual display by another; it is a sort of *contagion*.[18] Tomkins understood *affective resonance*

to be the origin of and, therefore, foundation for all human communication (as embodied expression precedes verbal).[19] Affective resonance, however, is not simply personal or prepersonal, as Deleuze and Guattari point out: It is conceptual.[20] In *What Is Philosophy?* they assert that concepts (in distinction from propositions) are "centers of vibrations, each in itself and every one in relation to all the others. This is why they all resonate rather than cohere or correspond with each other."[21]

One might also think of concepts as the islands of an archipelago, such as the islands of the Caribbean. Glissant, in fact, challenges Eurocentric epistemologies and "continental thinking" through what he deems "archipelagic thinking," and what I have come to call *archipelogics*.[22] He explains this type of creative cognition as unique to archipelagic peoples, and in distinction from continental thought, since "in the Caribbean each island embodies openness. The dialectic between inside and outside is reflected in the relationship of land and sea. It is only those who are tied to the European continent who see insularity as confining. A Caribbean imagination liberates us from being smothered."[23] Like the Caribbean islands, Deleuzoguattarian concepts are connected according to their relationship to one another. Although the bridges from one concept to another may at times form a wall, Deleuze and Guattari assert, "Everything holds together along diverging lines"—even the traverses from one concept to another are movable, more aqueous than concrete; they are "junctions, or detours, which do not define any discursive whole."[24] They are archipelogical.

In Deleuzoguattarian terms, affects correspond to art, to aesthetics and poetics rather than science or philosophy, without, of course, precluding their interbreeding.[25] Affective resonance, then, as affect, is ineluctably prepersonal, prediscursive, and proprioceptive[26] as well as peripersonal, emerging in the encounter of human and nonhuman bodies (with internal consistency and exoconsistency) and impelling a vibrancy that is both convergent and divergent.[27] In both the Tomkinsian and Deleuzoguattarian iterations of affect, *resonance*, like waves and wave frequencies in physics, is defined by the affect of one body upon another—*movement* in/of one body producing some sort of corresponding response (amplification) in another body. Resonance is *sympathetic vibration* establishing a significant or meaningful relationship in the *movement* between two or more bodies: concepts, objects, or sentient beings.[28] As human body-beings, to state that we *resonate* is to say we relate, we connect, we understand, that we are in some way *moved*. This movement, this *force, in the midst of the in-betweenness*[29] of bodies, might even be conceptualized in terms of musicality.[30] And although this affective quality may be present in all music, the rhythm of the Rastafari—the irie[31] *island vibe*[32] of Reggae music—unequivocally conveys the "I feel ya" vibe of resonance.[33]

Eric Shouse, in his essay, "Feeling, Emotion, Affect," acknowledges that music is but one medium through which affect is transmitted. Shouse asserts that "every form of communication where facial expressions, respiration, tone of voice, and posture are perceptible" is capable of transmitting affect.[34] He then proceeds to list every mode of mediated communication *but* reading texts. Shouse's omission reflects a prevalent and pervasive error in judgment. In fact, one need only look to Eugenie Brinkema's affective interventions in *The Forms of the Affects* to grasp the gravity of this omission. Brinkema's critique of affect's allergy to textuality and subsequent solipsistic slip into sterility—as it reproduces the same sappy omphaloskeptic sentiments ad infinitum, ad nauseam—is incisive.[35] The film theorist announces in her introduction to *Forms* that "close reading" alone can save affect (from *itself*).[36] Many a Lit Crit might agree, but this is particularly "good news" *(euangelion)* for the Bible wonks among us, who are the Steve Urkels of academia—arguably the *least* sexy of all scholars(hip). While biblical scholarship is still considered a requisite interlocutor within religious studies, it is often difficult to know just where or how to fit us into the conversation. In light of the precarity and plight of the biblical scholar, then, Brinkema's (altar) call for close reading is an event, whereby the Bible wonk who *reads* her words, *feels* her words.

Those of us who, having so deeply resonated with the Bible, have devoted our lives to its study, know that it is not only possible but of absolute necessity to read (biblical) texts *so closely* that we are able to *see*, *hear*, and *feel* them, both structurally and sympathetically. Unfortunately, although we are aficionados of its formal, rhythmic analysis, many of us have yet to *feel* the Bible's rhythms. Although there are scholars who have begun this important work, biblical studies can only benefit from the increased acknowledgment and engagement of the rich entanglement that make up the various conceptual, and entirely movable, bridges between affect, orality, musicality, and textuality. It is in this space that biblical studies rescues and is rescued by affect,[37] where rhythm is both felt and formally exegeted. Not because this is their first encounter but because they have always been intimately intertwined comrades meeting again for the first time, each new time. Multifarious and diverse texts, voices, and hermeneutics always already converge in-and-as we approach the Bible. This is a text constructed by and, in its *in-betweenness*, inhabiting and inhabited by such profoundly human, nonhuman, and divine affective intensities, resonating throughout time, and around the world.

READING THE BIBLE WITH RHYTHM

And so, in this concrescence,[38] I now move into my own "close reading" of the Bible, an interpretation of the story of Samson and the Philistines in Judges 16. Although Samson is one of the more well known biblical characters in popular

culture, a brief summary of his story may serve as a refresher to some and an introduction to others. Samson (if he ever actually existed) was a judge over the people of Israel (c. 1200–1000 BCE) and a Nazirite. As a Nazirite, he was a special class of Israelite, designated by a more prohibitive consecration to God at birth. This vow and his status forbade the cutting of his hair, so he wore seven locks on his head. (All of these are reasons the Rastafari revere him.) There are a host of other things Samson was required to refrain from in order to remain pure, holy, and "set apart" as a Nazirite.[39] His repeated failure to do so, however, is so unfortunate, not to mention hyperbolic, as to be comical.[40] Arguably the most critical biographical information about Samson is (1) that his locks are (ostensibly) the source of his divine strength and (2) that his life is constituted in and by *in-betweenness* and especially in relation to the Philistines: He is incessantly and passionately embroiled with Philistine women and men. Samson is plagued by ambivalent affective resonance throughout the story and particularly in chapter 16, a bind resulting from the imposition of lived rhythms that his inevitable entanglement with the Philistines engenders.

In addition to the particulars of Samson's story, I would like to offer a word about what I mean by "reading (with) rhythm." In order to acknowledge more formally and honor the text's orality as musicality, I quite literally (philologically) foreground and follow the *beat* within the text. Judges, like all other books in the so-called Old Testament, was originally penned in Hebrew and the Hebrew word for "beat," *pa'am*, occurs on seven occasions in the Samson saga (Judges 13–16). Upon a closer reading of the biblical text and after much deliberation, I realized that, like Reggae music, the locations of the beats and their spatial relationship to one another defined the text: The timing of the beat appeared to determine the rhythm and, therefore, meaning of and in the medium.[41] The Bible so profoundly yearns to be read with rhythm that the repetition of the very Hebrew signifier for beat becomes the rhythmic medium and a mediator bridging all these bodies in order that we might feel the rhythm and be moved toward (a new understanding of) what the Bible means and what it means to read the Bible.[42] This interpretation of rhythm is actually quite Deleuzian, for according to Deleuze (and Spinoza before him), affect is achieved through the relationship of *rhythms and pauses* rather than in reference to concepts or objects—where the sense of absence, hesitation, holding back, or even halting creates the affective experience, and particularly affective resonance.[43] My exegesis, then, is guided by the structural placement of the beat (*pa'am*) and in terms of this sort of relational understanding of rhythm's affect, which functions as both structural and sympathetic framework for my Rastafari interpretation.

Pa'am's first occurrence in Judges is just after Samson's birth in 13:25. In its verbal form *pa'am* can mean "to *move*, thrust, impel, stir, trouble, agitate or

disrupt."[44] Thus, in this instance, the verse reads, "The *ruach* (or spirit) of Jah began moving [Samson]." As a noun, *pa'am* not only signifies "beat" but may also be translated "step, pace, foot, time, once, now, again, anvil or hammer."[45] The remaining six times *pa'am* appears in the folktale it is in this form.[46] As the story nears its conclusion, *pa'am*'s presence becomes more prevalent: We find it four times in 16:15–20—twice in verse 20 alone—and is then surprisingly entirely absent for another seven verses until it finally resurfaces in Samson's penultimate statement (16:28). One might, then, read this repetition as a *refrain*, *ritournelle*, or even *anaphora*—where the repetition of *pa'am* gives *prominence to the concept, rhythm to the passage*, and even *appeals to our emotions* in order to not only *move* the narrative and its protagonist but also us, its readers.[47] Without understanding *pa'am*'s context or linguistic signification in each of its occurrences, simply by identifying its appearances and their proximity to one another, we are able to interpret what it is *doing* (even as it is *undoing*).[48] It is as if the space between each subsequent *beat*—how the text's rhythm *and* affective resonance is established—is communicating with the audience, before and beyond cognition. As if the words become pauses that mean in excess of conscious activity. As if the beat of the rhythm is slowly and deliberately *moving* (Samson and us) forward, toward some dramatic end, yet simultaneously harkening back to the story's beginning and the first time Jah's *ruach moved*, stirring Samson. As if the rhythm is teasing the reader, gingerly, yet relentlessly luring us—the beat builds, heightens, and ceases altogether, then, it rests (for seven counts), only to *pound* (us), yet again, one last time.[49]

Now, when we read the narrative attentive to these rhythmic cues, we notice the beat becoming more vigorous at one of the most climactic and erotically charged moments in the narrative. We find the passage's first *pa'am* as the Philistine Delilah begs to know Samson's "whole secret," thereby proving his love for her, and—after hours of what is now assumed among queer Bible folk to be light bondage or edgeplay—Samson concedes.[50] Once he has proven himself by sharing his secret/strength, we encounter the next *pa'am*, and, then, out of sheer exhaustion Samson falls asleep on Delilah's lap. The actual Hebrew terminology in Judges 16:19 is *'al birkeyhâ*, which means "between her knees" and is an oblique reference to her genitalia.[51] So while the sleeping head of a sapped Samson is nestled there betwixt her legs, Delilah has a nameless man shear his seven locks and then rouses Samson just before her Philistine co-conspirators enslave him and gouge out his eyes.[52] When Samson awakens "helpless" in verse 20, his shock is palpable as one beat immediately follows the next, in rapid succession, *pa'am* pulsating: *k'pa'am b'pa'am*. Up to this point in the narrative Samson has been inextricably bound *to* the Philistines, now, however, he is bound *by* them and in this encounter, Samson experiences an unprecedented inertia.[53] We watch as the protagonist emerges not from but

into a nightmare that becomes his reality. Possibly assuming himself to be in a hypnopompic state, Samson is unaware his strength has left him as he struggles to shake free. Samson fails. And yet this is not the end of the story; there must be one more beat.[54]

The entire folktale resonates with affective force but never more than in the denouement. Shackled by the Philistine "lords," now fashioning themselves as his masters, Samson is led down to Gaza and summoned to "entertain" them. He is then stationed between and bound to the pillars of the Philistine's temple.[55] Chained, imprisoned, incarcerated, in an entanglement that bears no resemblance to the in-betweenness, the liminality, which has previously characterized his livity, Samson implores the young boy leading him *by the hand* to release him. "Let me *grasp* and *feel* the pillars upon which the temple is established."[56] While the text proceeds without complication, reading with rhythm has led us to intuit otherwise. Awaiting, anticipating; the story is not over—there must be one more beat! Waiting, we watch a sightless Samson *embrace* and *feel* the pillars, *lean* into them. Our *eyes* follow the one whose *eyes* cannot see the crowd of 6,000 *eyes* all on him. And the beat returns, it resounds—*pa'am*—as Samson enacts *an active discharge of emotion* directed right at Jah.[57] In verse 28, Samson screams. "Oh Jah! Please. Re-member me!" He then demands strength just this one last time (*pa'am*) in order to be avenged.[58] Now, while Samson emphatically exclaims that he wants revenge, he does not implore that he be avenged for the Philistines' shearing his locks, enslaving, or ridiculing him. Samson proclaims that he desires vengeance "if only . . . for (one of) my *two eyes*." That is, for the sake of *I-an-I*.[59]

"At their most philosophical," Patrick Taylor writes, "the Rastafari are the bearers of relational thinking in its fullest."[60] Incorporating the ambient and all-pervasive divinity of Jah through the acknowledgment of and reverence for Pan-Divinity *and* a profound livication (dedication) to self-awareness, through affirmation and assertion, I-an-I simultaneously represents personal agency and collective interdependence[61]—what I would identify as the divine assemblage, the plurality of God, *elohim* in all and through the all.[62] Like Plato's chaosmic *khora* and Keller's tehomic *many-one*, I-an-I is the one exploding into many: "out of many, one."[63] *We can seek the unity of rhythm only at the point where rhythm itself plunges into chaos, into the night, at the point where differences of level are perpetually and violently mixed.*[64] In the final scene of Samson's story, the rhythmic wave of Jah's *ruach* (spirit) as I-an-I su(bme)rges Samson, who is unsurrounded and engulfed by sensation and imbued with affective force: understanding to overcome.[65] In his last (scream)breath,[66] Samson cries out: "If the Philistines die, my livity will cease!"[67] In I-an-I we are many-one. "*A body is as much outside itself as in itself.*"[68] Samson violently pushes and pulls down the pillars of his captivity[69]—the boundaries of body as "organism . . . [which]

imprisons life."[70] He obliterates the strongholds of an edifice built to construct and constrict identity according to the downpressing dyad of either/or, in accordance with the relentless rhythms of Babylon, Western European imperialism's insidious apparatus.[71] Can the machines and machinations of war somehow bring peace? In a moment, death triumphs over (and in a distance of incremental) difference, bearing new possibility, generating life. The cycle begins again. The beat goes on. But (we are) never quite the same. A reading with rhythm redefines bodies interpreting and interpreted and their difference as ambient affective assemblage of divine multiplicity. This mass slaughter-suicide, aggregate annihilation, then, betrays undeniable affective resonance *when read with rhythm for the sake of the I-an-Islands*—engulfed as we all are in the waves of relatedness and *in-betweenness* amid ostensibly discrete and divergent (converging) bodies of land, of text, and of human and other-than-human beings; we are, as Glissant asserted, the world becoming archipelago.[72] And somehow, Samson's affective *undoing* becomes bloom space and a site of indefinite do-overs and perpetual becomings.[73] And so it is with the entire biblical corpus.

THE BIBLE IS ARCHIPELOGICAL; THE BIBLE IS BLOOM SPACE

An allegedly "closed" canon haunted and haunting by its excess of meaning, the Bible is itself bloom space—a gathering place always already open and opening in its capacity *to affect and be affected*, enduringly instantiating an event of innumerable incontrovertible (and irrepressible) reiterations in its capacity for illimitable interpretations of the human, the nonhuman, and the divine. Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, atheist, agnostic, anyone who has ever spent the night in a hotel since 1908, and even if you have never laid a finger on it—the Bible affects us all, human and nonhuman alike. Since its endorsement and promulgation by the cleaving (and collaboration) of the crown and the cross (and later capitalism), it has permeated, saturated, and supplied the planet with language, imagery, and/as a system and structure of meaning. In short, the Bible has (in)formed our world beyond and before consciousness—conditioning us to unconsciously collaborate in and corporealize these (binary) constructs as originary. The Bible's ubiquity (as imperial machine), in fact, makes it an ideal bloom space for interdisciplinary, cross- and countercultural, as well as transmediary, encounters—which is precisely why it must remain an integral interlocutor for affect studies (and the theorizing of affect) writ large. This bloom space opens limitless opportunities to consider how novel and otherwise unorthodox relationships of affective resonance might inaugurate avant-garde and effectual hermeneutical approaches (formalist and otherwise).[74] Reading the Bible with rhythm is but one of these affectual approaches, as it reads for the resonances betwixt and between bodies, in the

in-betweenness of livity (orality) and (biblical) literature, affectivity and divinity. And so . . . we are *moved* into the Spinozan "not yet-ness" of these diverse dancing bodies, "forward toward the next encounter of forces, and the next, and the next, and the next."[75] Our affective engagement with the porous and pulsating pages of the Bible makes these tales more than stories, these words more than God's—the Bible is connective, a corpus of corpuses, a body of bodies, touching each other touching us, tasting, retching, dancing, sweating, swooning, quivering, consuming, imbibing, expelling, aching, enjoining, forcing, receiving, holding, releasing, exploding, emerging, converging, coming, diverging, kissing, laughing, crying, syncing, and screaming in a multisensory, archipelogical, transtemporal, and always already intertextual interpretive orgy.[76] We—as *one* as we are *many*—*feel* the Bible and are *moved*. Reminded in its rhythmic resonances and in its archipelogical re-membering(s), that the Bible is bloom space, an ambi(val)ent affective assemblage, and that close reading (and biblical interpretation)—while at times insipid, and, yes, even soporific—can also be very sensual.

NOTES

1. That is, complicated, complex, tricky, involved, knotty, tangled, indissoluble, inseparable, indivisible, and anything but simple.
2. See Lauren Berlant, *Cruel Optimism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011).
3. See Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), 9. Also see Kathleen Stewart, "Worlding Refrains," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, 339–53. Stewart writes that "all the world is a bloom space now" and proceeds to define bloom space as "a promissory note. An allure and a threat that shows up in ordinary sensibilities of not knowing what compels, not being able to sit still, being exhausted, being left behind or being ahead of the curve, being in history, being in a predicament, being ready for something—anything—to happen, or orienting yourself to the sole goal of making sure that nothing (more) will happen. A bloom space can whisper from a half-lived sensibility that nevertheless marks whether or not you're in it. It demands collective attunement and a more adequate description of how things make sense, fall apart, become something else, and leave their marks, scoring refrains on bodies of all kinds—atmospheres, landscapes, expectations, institutions, states of acclimation or endurance or pleasure or being stuck or moving on. . . . Anything can be a bloom space" (340, 341).
4. This acutely personal, sympathetic, and invested view of and relationship with the Bible is, incidentally, one important reason that others are so disgusted by it. Applying Derrida, Barthes, and Kristeva, Dale Martin addresses this issue which has plagued the church and biblical interpretation for decades if not centuries, asserting that "texts don't speak" (Dale Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006], 1). As much as this may be a literally accurate and necessary corrective for

biblical fundamentalism's claims to inerrancy, those who have found themselves in affective entanglements with religious and nonreligious texts, works of fiction and nonfiction alike, know that although texts may not literally speak or "mean," they most certainly hold great affective intensities.

5. See Édouard Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1989) and Gayl Jones, *Liberating Voices: Oral Tradition in African American Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991).
6. See Patrick Taylor, "Sheba's Song: The Bible, the *Kebra Nagast*, and the Rastafarians," in *Nation Dance: Religion, Identity, and Cultural Difference in the Caribbean*, ed. Patrick Taylor (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 74. Taylor states unequivocally, "The Bible is a Caribbean text; in general, people in the Anglophone Caribbean know their Bible better than North Americans" (74). In "Sheba's Song," in fact, Taylor understands the weaving together of the Bible and the *Kebra Nagast* by the Rastafari in the creation and construction of their own counternarratives and identity to be exemplary of Caribbean creolization. Also see Rex Nettleford, "Discourse on Rastafarian Reality," in *Chanting Down Babylon: The Rastafari Reader*, ed. Nathaniel Samuel Murrell, William David Spencer, and Adrian Anthony McFarlane (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 311–25; and Nathaniel Samuel Murrell and Lewin Williams, "The Black Biblical Hermeneutics of Rastafari," in *Chanting Down Babylon*, 326–48.
7. The present essay is but one expression of my profound respect, devotion, and indebtedness to the Rastafari movement and the goodly folk—Jamaican and non-Jamaican alike—who introduced and encouraged me in study and in practice to pursue a Rastafarian biblical hermeneutics. I also acknowledge the complexities and complications that appear to inhere in this entanglement, since I myself am neither Jamaican nor Black. I cannot assuage any of my readers' discomfort but can certainly assure them that this project is more than a hermeneutical endeavor, much more than an exegetical experimentation. I am wholeheartedly committed to this work as a vehicle of spiritual, philosophical, professional, social, and personal transformation.
8. Murrell and Williams, "Black Biblical Hermeneutics of Rastafari," 343.
9. Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse*, 146–47. Murrell and Williams expound on the Rastafarians' challenge of the predetermined (Eurocentric) biblical interpretations inherited by many Jamaicans: "The Rastafarians' own ethnic experience, historical and cultural background, and social and economic reality are not divorced from their reading of and meditation on the Bible. The questions, issues, and challenges that surface from their social existence, which are of a most comprehensive nature, are lived through and in relation to the Scriptures. Reading the Bible from where they are, seeing what is redeemable there for their own reality, they detect convergence, correspondence, and continuities between the story of the people in the Bible and their own story in Jamaica" ("Black Biblical Hermeneutics of Rastafari," 343). These are the resonances the Rastafari capitalize on as they "cite up" the Bible.
10. Taylor, "Sheba's Song," 71.

11. Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse*, 108–9. Glissant writes that Reggae "in the realm of the 'audio-visual' corresponds to 'poetry.'" Rastafari is both a creolized (Caribbean) discourse and a poetics of relation. Bronwen Low and Mela Starker write that Glissant's oraliture "is writing infused with the characteristics of oral expression and tradition. . . . Within this vision the oral and the written enrich, contest, subvert and repeat the other—always in relationship" ("Translanguaging in the Multilingual Montreal Hip-Hop Community: Everyday Poetics as Counter to the Myths of the Monolingual Classroom," in *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*, ed. Adrianne Blackledge and Angela Cleese [London: Springer, 2014], 114). Also see Nettleford, "Discourse on Rastafarian Reality," 312.
12. See my explanation of Glissant's comparison of archipelagic and continental thinking. Also see note 23.
13. Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse*, 108. Reggae, Glissant writes, is "a necessary barbarian invasion [of] . . . the intellectual dream of the learned." He likens it to the drum-poetry of Derek Walcott as Caribbean discourse, which, as Glissant writes, "finds its expression as much in the explosion of the original cry, as in the patience of the landscape when it is recognized, as in the imposition of lived rhythms" (108).
14. As the Rastafari have reminded us through Reggae since the '70s, rhythm can be rambunctious, raucous, and rebellious, but it can also be rigid, apathetic, and unforgiving.
15. A *"levier de conscience"* in Glissant's *L'intention Poetique* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969), 216. A materialization of this distinctively Caribbean orality-musicality and the rhythm of the islands, Reggae was created by the Rastafari in relation to their landscape, history, culture, and community.
16. Bruno Latour, *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 205: "If the opposite of being a body is dead [and] there is no life apart from the body . . . [then] to have a body is to learn to be affected, meaning 'effectuated,' moved, put into motion by other entities, humans or nonhumans. If you are not engaged in this learning, you become insensitive, dumb, you drop dead." Seigworth and Gregg write: "The body becomes less about its nature as bounded substance or eternal essence and more about the body [quoting Latour] 'as an interface that becomes more and more describable when it learns to be affected by many more elements'" ("An Inventory of Shimmers," 11).
17. Resonance as it appears across discourses and disciplines, in art (music), science (physics), and philosophy—and in each of its affective trajectories. Rather than rehearsing the traditional bifurcated mapping of affect, I will simply appeal to this common thread in its multiple (and multiplying) discourses. (Resonance has significance regardless of the affective family tree from which you've fallen . . . and no matter how far.)
18. Silvan Tomkins, *Affect Imagery Consciousness:* vol. 1, *The Positive Affects* (New York: Springer, 1962), 296.
19. In addition, the affects provide urgency or motivation to less powerful drives, intensifying positive and negative experiences. Both Sedgwick and Berlant pick up the notion of resonance in their own work; see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Touching*

Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, and Performativity (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003), 21–23, 83–85, 170–171, and Lauren Berlant, *Cruel Optimism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011), 4–7.

20. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). Deleuze and Guattari juxtapose the notions of concept (an abstract idea) and proposition (an assertion of judgment or opinion that may be deemed true or false): "The concept is act of thought, it is thought operating at infinite (although greater or lesser) speed" (21).
21. Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* 22. As skeptical of totalizing transcendence as Glissant, Deleuze and Guattari conceptualize resonance in terms of a nondiscursive consistency between concepts. Concepts, in distinction from propositions (and prospects), "have only consistency or intensive ordinates outside of any coordinates, [and] freely enter into relationships of nondiscursive resonance—either because the components of one become concepts with other heterogeneous components or because there is no difference of scale between them at any level. . . . There is no reason why concepts should cohere" (*What Is Philosophy?* 22).
22. *Archipelogic* is a neologism I created, which signifies (and is, therefore, synonymous with) the oraliturary archipelagic thinking (and epistemologies) Glissant identifies as emerging within the Caribbean islands through Creolité. It thinks, writes, and creatively expresses the creolized creativity of a poetics of Relation (i.e., the *archipelogos*).
23. Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse*, 139. Comparing the Caribbean Sea with the Mediterranean, Glissant describes the latter as "an inner sea surrounded by lands, a sea that concentrates . . . [and, therefore,] imposes the thought of the One)," while "the Caribbean is, in contrast, a sea that explodes the scattered lands into an arc. A sea that diffracts" (33). Glissant observes, "The reality of archipelagos in the Caribbean or the Pacific provides a natural illustration of the thought of Relation" (34). Expounding on archipelagic thinking in Manthia Diawara's documentary on Glissant, the poet reiterates, "A tiny island cannot be closed upon itself. It needs the openness of the surrounding sea, which ties it to other places." Édouard Glissant, *One World in Relation*, dir. Manthia Diawara, *TWN* (2011). Diawara followed Glissant in a transatlantic journey from Southampton (U.K.) to Brooklyn (New York) on the Queen Mary II and then on to Martinique. *One World in Relation* documents the journey as Glissant reflects and offers his poetic ruminations on Relation and the tout-monde. For more on Glissant's ruminations regarding "the world becoming archipelago," see Édouard Glissant, "The Unforeseeable Diversity of the World," in *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, ed. M. Elisabeth Mudimbe Boyi (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 290; and idem, *Traité du Tout-Monde* (Paris: Gallimard, 1997), 194.
24. Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* 22.
25. Ibid., 23.
26. Particularly in the unconscious reception of movement.
27. Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* 23.

28. *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary*. The ways in which the Rastafari and Reggae are *resistant*—particularly to dominant culture and its discursive modalities and paradigms—is prolific and well established. The notion of *resonance*, however, offers us a new way to think of and with the Rastafari, politically, philosophically, and relationally. In fact, I would contend that thinking musicality with/in the Reggae rhythms of the Rastafari requires rumination on resonance—an affective term, which signifies *the quality in a sound* (especially a musical tone) *of being deep, full, and reverberating* due to its intensification, reinforcement, or prolongation by reflection from a surface *or* by the synchronous, or sympathetic, vibration of a neighboring body or bodies. Resonance is, then, the reflection of bodies with a lasting effect and, I would argue, a continuing *affect*—both its literal and figurative connotations convey this point. Equally as important to affect theorists such as Berlant, Ahmed, Cvetkovich, and even Sedgwick are questions of why persons are drawn to or repelled by certain music, images, objects, and/or affects.
29. Seigworth and Gregg, "Inventory of Shimmers," 1.
30. Eric Shouse, "Feeling, Emotion, Affect," *M/C Journal* 8 (December 2005): journal.mediaculture.org.au/0512/03.php. According to Shouse, music provides perhaps the clearest example of how the intensity of the impingement of sensations on the body can "mean" more to people than meaning itself. "While it would be wrong to say that meanings do not matter, it would be just as foolish to ignore the role of biology as we try to grasp the cultural effects of music." Appealing to the role of biology on the cultural effects of music, Shouse argues that in many cases "the pleasure that individuals derive from music has less to do with the communication of meaning, and far more to do with the way that a particular piece of music 'moves' them" (13).
31. *Irie* is patois for "all right." It signifies pleasure (i.e., nice, good, pleasing) and is also a greeting.
32. What I also consider is its *aura*. Aura has elsewhere been identified as "essence." I, however, find this attempt to associate affect with origin or static identity far too constricting, not to mention inaccurate. That is, an inimitable atmosphere or quality encompasses and emanates from Reggae and resonates around the world. Rather than examining *who* resonates with or is resistant to Reggae's vibe or *why*, I would like to instead consider *how* this vibe—the resonance of the Rastafari—might matter/materialize otherwise for and in biblical studies now.
33. As human animals, we are often but not always drawn to that with which we resonate—the people, the places, the music, and the stories with which we identify. Although the rhythm of Reggae has an often-inexplicable draw for some, it indubitably repels others. "I see ya, I hear ya, I get ya." I-an-I will never forget those words, spoken to me by Althea Spencer-Miller when I was on the cusp of quitting—questioning myself and resisting my career path. What did she do (with her words) that day? She related to me; more than that . . . she *resonated with* me.
34. Shouse, "Feeling, Emotion, Affect," 13. Quoting Jeremy Gilbert, Shouse asserts, "Music has *physical effects* which can be identified, described and discussed but

which are not the same thing as it having *meanings*, and any attempt to understand how music works in culture must . . . be able to say something about those effects without trying to collapse them into meanings." See Jeremy Gilbert, "Signifying Nothing: 'Culture,' 'Discourse' and the Sociality of Affect," *Culture Machine* 6 (2004): culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/8/7.

35. Eugenie Brinkema, *The Forms of the Affects* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press), 31. It is, unsurprisingly, her ironic antidote, her argument for the resurrection of formalism as vaccine (and lever) for virility, that most *moves* me.
36. Ibid., xv. Brinkema writes: "The one way out for affect is via a way into its specificities. That approach will be called—unsurprisingly, for historically it was always the way to unlock potentialities—close reading. There is a perversity to this: if affect theory is what is utterly fashionable, it is answered here with the corrective of the utterly unfashionable, with what is, let us say, an *unzeitgemässe* call for the sustained interpretations of texts. This book's insistence on the formal dimension of affect allows not only for specificity but for the wild and many fecundities of specificity: difference, change, the particular, the contingent (and) the essential, the definite, the distinct, all dense details, and—again, to return to the spirit of Deleuze—the minor, inconsequential, secret, atomic. Treating affect in such a way deforms any coherence to 'affect' in the singular, general, universal and transforms it into something not given in advance, not apprehendable except through the thickets of formalist analysis" (xv).
37. If affect is en vogue, then I suppose we might just save each other.
38. Which is not of original or organic singularity but systemically enforced segregation.
39. See Numbers 6:1–21 for the entire list.
40. Leading scholars of the Hebrew Bible, such as James Crenshaw, Cheryl Exum, Claudia Camp, Carole Fontaine, Susan Niditch, Edith Davidson, and Gregory Mobley, consider Samson's story to be a comedic and even carnivalesque-grotesque folktale.
41. See Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse*, 107. Take, for instance, the paradigmatic Reggae beat, One Drop: defined as much by the space between the beat as the beat itself, the space creates relationship between beats, *coaxing the rhythm forward*, and—in the words of Glissant—"creat[ing] a new economy of expressive forms."
42. Not to mention why it matters that we continue to do so.
43. See Gilles Deleuze, *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (San Francisco: City Lights Publishers, 2001), 122. In her volume on Deleuze, Claire Colebrook describes the affect of fear in this way, employing the poetry of Emily Dickinson to illustrate her claim. Claire Colebrook, *Gilles Deleuze* (London: Routledge, 2002), 22. See also Rebecca Coleman, "Affect," in *Gender: Sources, Perspectives, and Methodologies*, ed. Renée C. Hoogland (Macmillan Interdisciplinary Handbooks; Farmington Hills, Mich.: Macmillan Reference USA, 2016), 21; idem, "'Be(come) Yourself Only Better': Self-Transformation and the Materialisation of Images," in *Deleuze and the Body*, ed. Laura Guillaume and Joe Hughes (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 144–64. Also see Rebecca Coleman, *Transfiguring Images: Screens, Affect, Futures*

(London: Routledge, 2012); and Henri Lefebvre, *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time, and Everyday Life* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

44. Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, Johann Jakob Stamm, and M. E. J. Richardson, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 952–53. Henceforth, *HALOT*.

45. *HALOT* 952. *Pa'am* translated as "time" is essentially a shorthand version and a literal and literary translation. Its other denotations—"foot, anvil, occurrence," or *event*—are not without import, and I explore them in my dissertation, "Re-membering the Bible Other-Wise: An Archipelogical Hermeneutic of Biblioralty, Wisdom as Rhizome of Relation, and Other Poetic, Archipelagic Assemblages" (Drew University, 2017).

46. Judges 15:3; 16:15; 16:18; 16:20a; 16:20b; 16:28.

47. See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (London: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 312–16, and Félix Guattari, *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 15. Also see Stewart, "Worlding Refrains," 342. Stewart writes, "a bloom space is pulled into being by the tracks of refrains that etch out a way of living in the face of everything. These refrains stretch across everything, linking things, sensing them out—a worlding. Every refrain has its gradients, valences, moods, sensations, tempos, elements, and life spans." The notion of refrain with which she is working is a Guattarian conceptualization on which Lone Bertelsen and Andrew Murphie expound in their essay "An Ethics of Everyday Infinities and Powers: Félix Guattari on Affect and the Refrain," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Gregg and Seigworth, 138–60. For Bertelsen and Murphie, as for Guattari before them, the refrain, as a repetition, was constitutive and something akin to Stewart's notion of worlding. Refrains, they write (appealing to Guattari), "structure the affective into 'existential Territories.'" Bertelsen and Murphie continue, quoting Brian Massumi (in his introduction to Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus*, xv), "If affects are intensities, then refrains are affects 'cycled back'" (139).

48. See Seigworth and Gregg, "Inventory of Shimmers," 3.

49. The irony here is, of course, that each of the italicized words could be represented by *pa'am* in biblical Hebrew.

50. Cf. Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus*, 151: "Mistress . . . [you] may tie me down on the table, ropes drawn tight, for ten to fifteen minutes, time enough to prepare the instruments." Enter the Philistines. . . .

51. See Susan Ackerman, "What If Judges Had Been Written by a Philistine?" *Biblical Interpretation* 8, no. 1 (2000): 39.

52. The sexual innuendo here is thick. Psychologist Joan Gould is not the only scholar outside biblical studies who has drawn connections between Delilah, Judith, and Lorena Bobbitt. Gould, like so many others, identifies this as a metaphorical castration which reflects man's age-old fear of the woman's power to annihilate him by draining his "sexual juices." See Joan Gould, *Spinning Straw into Gold: What Fairytales Reveal about the Transformations in a Woman's Life* (New York: Random House, 2005), 93.

53. Cf. Gilles Deleuze, *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 21. The sensation produced in his encounter with these active forces is not enough to liberate him.
54. All, indeed, is not lost for in 16:21b the storyteller reveals that Samson's hair begins to *grow*.
55. I am sure that when performed this scene invited and involved raucous laughter and building excitement in anticipation of retaliation.
56. Samson's first words to the *na'ar* leading him by the hand are literally, "Let me go and let me *feel* the *amudim*" (16:26). While it seems to echo the request/command for release of the Hebrew people in Exodus 9:1, the roots are not the same.
57. Cf. Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus*, 400. Interestingly, the reader is left to assume that Jah responds for while Samson is certainly infused with the strength to pull down the pillars, there is no explicit acknowledgment of Jah's involvement nor even a textual reference to Jah by means of the divine signifier. Further on Deleuzoguattarian discharges of emotion, see Stephen Moore's "The Messiah Who Screamed," in his *Gospel Jesuses and Other Nonhumans: Biblical Criticism Post-poststructuralism* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 48–49.
58. The word here for remember (*zakar*) is incidentally the same word as for "male" in Genesis 1:27, which I believe holds a degree of significance for the re-membering of Samson as Israel. Interestingly, Samson cries out to YHWH but appeals to *Elohim* for vengeance.
59. There is also an oblique reference here to the infamous retributive injunction of Hammurabi's Code, "An eye for an eye" (cf. Exodus 21:24).
60. Taylor, "Sheba's Song," 75. In his conclusion to "Sheba's Song," Taylor identifies the I-an-I "logic of Rastafari discourse" as reflected in other discourses—particularly Buber's "I-Thou" and Kierkegaard's "God-relationship." While he gives a nod to poststructuralism, he only refers to Derrida to acknowledge that I-an-I is a supplement to "a European Judeo-Christian tradition told in accordance with the doctrine of 'the One'" (ibid.). Taylor does not, however, explicitly identify the resonances of I-an-I and deconstruction and poststructuralist discourse writ large, nor does he acknowledge the complexities and/or possibilities resident within this relationship.
61. Also see Adriane Anthony McFarlane, "The Epistemological Significance of 'I-an-I' as a Response to Quashie and Anancyism in Jamaican Culture," in *Chanting Down Babylon*, ed. Murrell et al., 107–21. McFarlane points out that "the zealous Rastas see no difference between being, knowing, and doing. This ontology underpins Rasta theory of knowledge and sense of responsibility. For one to know, one must be; and for one to do anything (efficaciously), one must know" (117).
62. See Nettleford, "Discourse on Rastafarian Reality," 311–25. Nettleford proclaims, "The Rastafarians have tuned into a major strategy of demarginalization: religion. Having one's own God in one's own image was a grand flowering in Rastafari of what had earlier begun in Myal and developed in Zion revivalism and Pocomania, with the hijacking of the oppressor's God in a move that served to discommode the oppressor. The slave forebears of Rastafarians understood fully that there are

areas of inviolability beyond the reach of oppressors, and that these are what guarantee survival and beyond. Such exercise of the creative imagination and intellect remains, then, the most powerful weapon against all acts of inhumanity; and the Rastafarians have drawn on the tradition, which was nurtured since the eighteenth century, to cope with and defy the harshness of twentieth-century indulgences. Wresting the Christian message from the Messenger as a strategy of demarginalization helped bring slaves and the free peasantry nearer a perceived mainstream as 'children of God.' Rastafari were to extend this by proclaiming themselves as 'pieces of God.' The divinity of all black people—in fact, of all human beings—here becomes the basis for the equality, liberty, dignity, mutual respect, and equity in terms of access to economic resources, and all the values claimed by civil or democratic society but yet to be achieved in . . . Babylon" (315). The contingency of identity (Rastafarian cultural and communal construction and co-constitution) is but one reason why the Rastafari re-membering of Samson must also be read in conversation with the experience of other (interpretive) bodies, including those of "Israel," within the Persian province of Yehud.

63. Édouard Glissant, *Poetics of Relation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 33. "The Caribbean, as far as I am concerned, may be held up as one of the places in the world where Relation presents itself most visibly, one of the explosive regions where it seems to be gathering strength" (ibid.).
64. Deleuze, *Francis Bacon*, 39.
65. The Rastafari themselves do not employ the word *understanding* to represent cognitive resonance, nor any other terminology within the English vernacular which incorporates a word that signifies oppression or subordination of any sort (e.g., *under* is replaced by *over*). Not only that, but the Rastafari consider true understanding to lead to overstanding in the face of the violent hegemony of Babylon. "Oppression" itself is represented in Rastafari dialect (*patois*) by the word "downpression," signifying resistance and making manifest the intention and result of such activity.
66. Deleuze, *Francis Bacon*, 40.
67. Judges 16:30, my translation.
68. Seigworth and Gregg, "Inventory of Shimmers," 3.
69. *HALOT* 692–93. Aptly, *natah*, the verb used here, has a vast and varied semantic range, signifying either/or, both/and, push/pull.
70. Deleuze, *Francis Bacon*, 40. Deleuze writes, "The organism is not life, it is what imprisons life. The body is completely living, and yet nonorganic. Likewise sensation, when it acquires a body through organism, takes on an excessive and spasmodic appearance, exceeding the bounds of organic activity. It is immediately conveyed in the flesh through the nervous wave or vital emotion" (ibid.)—a statement that describes Samson's spasmodic flesh throughout the story.
71. Following the beat, reading with rhythm, leads us to re-member Samson's final act, where his massacre-suicide effects *resistance* to imperial domination and difference constructed according to Western hierarchical dualisms, always already invigorated by the *resonance* of *I-an-I* theo-logics. It is uncertain just how the Rastafari reconcile Samson's status/subjectivity as a disabled, blind, bound, and enslaved body in their

renderings and re-memberings of him. Although I believe there is great political potential within the symbol of Samson's disabled (disfigured, disdained, yet not disqualified) body, in my admittedly limited research I have not yet found this body as accessible to, or appealing for, Rastafari re-membering Samson.

72. Édouard Glissant, "The Unforeseeable Diversity of the World," in *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, ed. Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 290. Glissant is expounding on our "worldness" as that which we all have in common according to creolization (i.e., "the meeting, interface, shock, harmonies, and disharmonies between cultures of the world, in the realized totality of the earth world" or what Glissant has elsewhere deemed the *tout-monde*). He proceeds to further elucidate creolization, which "has the following characteristics: the lightning speed of interaction among its elements; the 'awareness of awareness' thus provoked in us; the reevaluation of the various elements brought into contact (for creolization has no presupposed scale of values); and unforeseeable results. Creolization is not a simple crossbreeding that would produce easily anticipated syntheses" (ibid.). (It is neither *méstissage* nor hybridity.) And Glissant's ultimate proposition is: "'Today the whole world is becoming an archipelago and becoming creolized" (ibid). Also see Glissant, *Traité du Tout-Monde*, 194.
73. And, just like Samson, the Bible is a corpus that just won't die (no matter how much we wish it would)!
74. Now, there are at least three resonances—what Greg Seigworth and Melissa Gregg might deem affective bloom spaces—in effect in my interpretation of Samson's folktale (which, through an oral-literate hermeneutics, I consider an ambient affective assemblage). These are: (1) the resonance between Africana/Orality Theory (I mean no disrespect in this conflation, but following the work of African scholars such as Chinua Achebe, Solomon Iyasere, and Isodore Okpwewho in particular, I consider Diasporic Africana Critical Theory to be at the forefront of the complex discourse that is Orality Theory) and Affect Theory (most prolific in the work of Deleuze and Guattari), which I consider to be present in Édouard Glissant's poetics; (2) the irie vibes of the Rastafari, Reggae, and the Bible; and (3) the dynamic relationship emerging amid these diverse bodies and inaugurating new possibilities for avant-garde biblical interpretation, which hinges on the distinctively Caribbean musicality of the Reggae Riddims of the Rastafari.
75. Seigworth and Gregg, "Inventory of Shimmers," 3.
76. Very much alive to us because alive in and through us today.