



ADVANCING BIBLICAL STUDIES

VOLUME I: DECENTRING WHITENESS

EDITED BY WONGI PARK

ADVANCING BIBLICAL STUDIES



Bible in the Modern World, 88

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

ADVANCING BIBLICAL STUDIES

I. DECENTRING WHITENESS

edited by
Wongi Park



SHEFFIELD PHOENIX PRESS

2026

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Copyright © 2026 Sheffield Phoenix Press
First published in ePDF, 2026

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press
www.sheffieldphoenix.com

Sheffield Centre for Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies (SCIBS),
University of Sheffield, S10 2TN

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the publisher's permission in writing.

Typeset by ISB Typesetting

A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-918358-01-8 (hardback)
ISBN: 978-1-918358-25-4 (ePDF)

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	ix
List of Contributors	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Wongi Park</i>	

PART I

DECENTRING WHITENESS IN BIBLICAL STUDIES

2. DECENTRING WHITENESS: MONORACIAL IDENTITIES, METHODS, AND SOURCES	
<i>Wongi Park</i>	33

A. DECENTRING WHITENESS IN BIBLICAL STUDIES

3. HOW WHITENESS BECAME CENTRED IN BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP	
<i>Shawn Kelley</i>	45
4. THE PROTESTANT WHITENESS OF BIBLICAL STUDIES	
<i>Susannah Heschel</i>	65
5. THE PARTING OF THE WAYS AND THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF WHITENESS	
<i>M. Adryael Tong</i>	83
6. WHITENESS AND THE DISMISSAL OF EMANCIPATORY HERMENEUTICS IN BIBLICAL STUDIES: A DECOLONIAL GENEALOGY	
<i>Luis Menéndez-Antuña</i>	99
7. OUTSIDE OF THE HEGEMONIC EURO-WESTERN HERMENEUTICAL PRACTICES: DECOLONIAL MUSINGS ON OLD TESTAMENT HERMENEUTICS IN THE (SOUTH) AFRICAN CONTEXT	
<i>Hulisani Ramantswana</i>	117
8. HISTORICAL CRITICISM	
<i>Joel Baden</i>	135
9. THE LIBERATING COLONIZER AND HIS OBJECTIVE TEXT	
<i>Lisa J. Cleath</i>	150

10. JESUS AS NON-RACED: THE GALILEAN JESUS AS PROXY TO EUROPEAN WHITENESS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY JESUS STUDIES	
<i>Halvor Moxnes</i>	171
11. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM AND GERMAN NATIONALISM	
<i>Ekaputra Tupamahu</i>	188
B. REPRODUCTIONS OF WHITENESS IN BIBLICAL RECEPTION HISTORY	
12. THE 'IMPLICATED SUBJECT' AS A DECOLONIAL HEURISTIC KEY TO INTERPRET THE FOUR MAIN CHARACTERS IN THE JACOB-ESAU CYCLE	
<i>Gerrie F. Snyman</i>	205
13. HAPPY SABBATH (?): OVEREMPHASIZED LIBERATIVE SABBATH AND WHITE IGNORANCE	
<i>Ludwig Beethoven J. Noya</i>	224
14. XENOPHILIA, XENOPHOBIA, AND THE WORLD BEHIND THE TEXT: HOW INTEREST CONVERGENCE CAN MAKE MEANING OF THE CANAANITES IN GENESIS	
<i>Justin Michael Reed</i>	245
15. FOLLOW THE RAVEN: HERMENEUTICS BEYOND THE ARK	
<i>Kenneth Ngwa</i>	265
16. THE COLOR OF SECTS: WHITENESS AND THE INTERPRETATION OF JOHANNINE SECTARIANISM	
<i>Greg Carey</i>	285
17. THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND... WHITE? WHEN, HOW, AND WHY JESUS BECAME WHITE	
<i>Stephen D. Moore</i>	305
18. SPRAY TANNING JESUS: THE RACIALIZATION OF JESUS IN US CHILDREN'S BIBLES	
<i>Amy Lindeman Allen</i>	327
19. BRITAIN FIRST AND THE FEEL-GOOD-BIBLE	
<i>Hannah M. Strømmen</i>	349
20. UNPEELING WHITENESS: A READING OF US IMMIGRATION HISTORY ALONGSIDE US BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION	
<i>Francisco Lozada Jr</i>	366
Index of References	386
Index of Authors	389

PREFACE TO VOLUME 1

The singular aim of this two-volume project is to advance biblical studies. It does so by bringing together a multiracial coalition of scholars to rethink the Eurocentric history and origins of the field and provide new multiracial models and methods to diversify the practices of biblical interpretation.

This project emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. As such, the entire life of the project was virtual from beginning to end. In 2020, I conducted a series of Zoom interviews with 50 biblical scholars inquiring about the current state of the field. Each individual was asked to describe biblical studies using only three words. Old, White, male, elitist, and boring—these were the most common words to describe the field of biblical studies. At the same time, a number of terms were used to characterize the field in more constructive ways: innovative, transitioning, methodologically-diverse, promising, and global.

Based on these Zoom interviews in 2020, the two central aims of the project came front and center: to diagnose the monoracial origins of biblical studies and chart a new multiracial path forward. Both goals were crystalized through a series of Zoom convenings in 2021 with the central question: How can we cultivate and sustain mutual dialogue, collaboration, and engagement across racial/ethnic, generational, and geographical boundaries? The Zoom convenings led to a public-facing virtual symposium in 2022.

The symposium was organized around three primary objectives: first, to decenter the monoracial history and methods of the field; second, to model a less traditional and hierarchical approach to biblical studies through dialogue and collaboration; third, to foreground a multiplicity of voices, perspectives, and starting points to diversify biblical studies. The heart of the project is summarized in the first goal. But equally important is the means of achieving that goal in a collaborative way. A distinctive feature of this project, therefore, is gathering a multiracial coalition of Africana, Asian, Euro American, European, Indigenous, Islander, and Latinx scholars that models an alternative approach to biblical studies.

The virtual symposium was co-sponsored by the Society of Biblical Literature, Belmont University, NAIITS: An Indigenous Learning Community, Baker Academic, Baylor University Press, and Westminster John Knox Press. Over 500 attendees from 23 countries and 25 US states participated

in 15 virtual sessions over a 2-week period with 55 biblical scholars from around the world. The interest generated by the symposium is indicative of the desire and need to diversify the field of biblical studies.

Volume 1 encompasses the first week of the symposium. All of the papers diagnose the monoracial Eurocentrism of biblical studies in three moves: by examining the problem of whiteness in the Eurocentric origins of the field; reframing traditional methods, tools, and institutions of biblical studies; and tracing how whiteness has been reproduced in texts, representations, and colonial legacies in biblical reception history. Together, Volume 1 diagnoses the problem of whiteness and sets the stage for moving the conversation forward in Volume 2.

The primary task of Volume 2 is to imagine biblical studies afresh in two ways. On a theoretical level, it is necessary to posit new sources and starting points for a contextual and multiracial approach to biblical studies. On a practical level, it is also necessary to implement alternative paradigms and models of biblical interpretation. Both goals are in service to current and future generations of Africana, Asian, Euro American, European, Indigenous, Islander, and Latinx scholars. In this way, the design of the entire project, including the bios and footnotes, is in service to the ultimate goal of advancing biblical studies.

ABBREVIATIONS

AARAS	American Academy of Religion Academy Series
AB	Anchor Bible
<i>ABR</i>	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
<i>AcT</i>	<i>Acta Theologica</i>
Aelius Aristides, <i>Or.</i>	<i>Orationes</i>
ATLA	American Theological Library Association
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
<i>Biblic. World</i>	<i>The Biblical World</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BSNA	Biblical Scholarship in North America
BNTC	British New Testament Conference
BW	Bible and Women
<i>Can. Rev. Stud. Natl.</i>	<i>Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBS	Contextual Bible Study
<i>CRT</i>	<i>Critical Race Theory</i>
<i>CurBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CUREMP	Committee on Underrepresented Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession
DACA	Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals
EABS	European Association of Biblical Studies
<i>ExAud</i>	<i>Ex Auditu</i>
GPBS	Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship
<i>Harv. Law Rev.</i>	<i>Harvard Law Review</i>
HB	Hebrew Bible
<i>Hist. Eur. Ideas</i>	<i>History of European Ideas</i>
<i>Hist. Polit. Thought</i>	<i>History of Political Thought</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HvTSt</i>	<i>Hervormde theologiese studies</i>
<i>J. Biblic. Lit.</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>J. Pop. Cult.</i>	<i>Journal of Popular Culture</i>
<i>J. Study Hist. Jesus</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
<i>J. Study New Testam.</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>Jahrb. Für Protestantische Theol.</i>	<i>Jahrbuch Für Protestantische Theologie</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JECH</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian History</i>
<i>JITC</i>	<i>Journal of the Interdenominational Theological Centre</i>
<i>JRE</i>	<i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i>

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

<i>JSCE</i>	<i>Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
KAB	Cape Town Archives Repository
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LULAC	League of United Latin American Citizens
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>New Testam. Stud.</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OG	Old Greek
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTSSA	Old Testament Society of Southern Africa
<i>Philos. Afr.</i>	<i>Philosophia Africana</i>
<i>Plato, Leg.</i>	<i>Leges</i>
<i>Plutarch, Mor.</i>	<i>Moralia</i>
PLWHA	people living with HIV/Aids
<i>PMLA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Modern Language Association</i>
<i>R&T</i>	<i>Religion and Theology</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
<i>SHE</i>	<i>Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae</i>
SLV	State Library of Victoria
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
<i>Vic. Rev.</i>	<i>Victorian Review</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>WUNT</i>	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLUME I

Wongi Park is an Asian American of Korean descent whose family immigrated to Los Angeles from South Korea in the mid 1970s. As a second generation Korean American, he explores how the Bible has been used as a weapon for racial oppression and a tool for social transformation. He is the author of *The Politics of Race and Ethnicity in Matthew's Passion Narrative* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2019). He hopes to build a multiracial coalition to reimagine the field of biblical studies and the practice of biblical interpretation.

Shawn Kelley is a White New Testament scholar of Irish-American heritage. His formal training is in literary approaches to the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. His research explores the role that racial and imperial discourse played in the formation of formative New Testament scholarship (*Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern biblical Scholarship*, 2002). He is currently exploring theoretical approaches to the study of Genocide ('Genocide, the Bible and Biblical Scholarship', *Brill Research Perspectives in Biblical Interpretation*, 2016) and is examining the destruction of Jerusalem as an example of ancient genocide ('Perpetrators', in *A Cultural History of Genocide*. 2021; 'Genocide in Antiquity', in *Routledge Handbook of Religion, Mass Atrocity and Genocide*, 2022). He hopes that, given recent events, his fellow White scholars will become willing to take seriously the racialized social location of modern scholarship and will become willing to explore possible connections between the Bible, its scholarly study, and racialized genocide.

Susannah Heschel is a Jew and Eli M. Black Distinguished Professor of Jewish Studies at Dartmouth College. Her research has examined 19th Century interactions between Jewish and Protestant Bible scholars in Germany; Protestant theologians in Nazi Germany who supported Hitler; and, more recently, the history of Jewish scholarship on Islam. She works with feminist theory, postcolonial theory, critical race theory, and other modalities, including in her studies of antisemitism.

M Adryael Tong is an Asian American of Chinese descent whose mother immigrated to New York City from Hong Kong in the 1970s and whose father immigrated to Seattle from Taiwan in the 1960s. M is interested in

Difference as a philosophical concept and, in particular, focuses on Jewish-Christian Difference and the Parting of the Ways. She is the author of *Difference and Circumcision: Bodily Discourse and the Parting of the Ways*, which is forthcoming with Oxford University Press. Since racism in the West evolved from Christian anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, M believes that the only hope for a biblical studies beyond whiteness lies in an end to Christian hegemony within the field.

Luis Menéndez-Antuña, originally from Spain, is a queer Latinx biblical scholar. With a long history in social activism and community organizing, he is committed to emancipatory hermeneutics and contextual interpretation. He is the author of *Thinking Sex with the Great Whore. Deviant Sexualities and Empire in the Book of Revelation* (Routledge, 2018) and *Bridging the Interpretive Abyss. New Testament Studies After the Cultural Studies Turn* (Society of Biblical Literature, 2025). He has published peer-reviewed articles in *Biblical Interpretation*, *Journal of Religious Ethics*, *Critical Research of Religion*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, and *Harvard Theological Review*. He hopes to build a future for biblical studies where issues of cultural and political relevance are at the center of the hermeneutical task.

Hulisani Ramantswana is a South African from the Vhavenda people group (Muvenda mubikwa na ive), a descendant of Vhavhirwa. His research interests are inter alia on African Biblical Hermeneutics and decolonial readings of the Bible. He argues for the importance of reading the Bible through African knowledge systems and in terms of our life experiences and our life experiences in terms of the Bible. In his view issues such as poverty, inequality, landlessness, abuse of power, xenophobia, colonial experiences, coloniality, imperialism, globalisation, among others, should inform our readings of the Bible. His recent publication includes ‘Negotiation and/or Conquest of Land: Reading the Land of Promise Motif in the Hexateuch through Decolonial Lenses’, in *Theologies of Land: Contested Land, Spatial Justice, and Identity* (Cascade Books, 2021); ‘Sacred Texts Produced under the Shadows of Empires: Double Consciousness and Decolonial Options in Reading the Hebrew Bible’, *Old Testament Essays* 36/1 (2023): 235-64.

Joel Baden is Jewish, with ancestors from the area of Ukraine and Lithuania. His family came to America mostly during the great Jewish immigration wave at the beginning of the twentieth century. He works primarily on the literary history of the Pentateuch, with occasional ventures into disability studies and other areas of biblical scholarship. He is the author of *The Book of Exodus: A Biography* (Princeton University Press, 2019), and the

editor of *The Routledge Handbook of Marginalization in the Bible* (forthcoming). He looks forward to a dramatically less siloed biblical studies, and one in which historical criticism is no longer the default definition of biblical scholarship.

Lisa J. Cleath is of mixed Asian American descent. Both sides of her family arrived in the United States in the late 1800s, her maternal Chinese ancestors settling in California and her paternal Scandinavian ancestors settling in Minnesota. She works on the politics of textual authority in the ancient Middle East in order to explore the origins of the idea of a ‘Bible’ and thus analyze political usage of the Bible today. She has written on postcolonial framing of Jewish identity in a Persian Egyptian colony—and thereby reflected on the power dynamics in her own hybrid, mixed-race identity. She has considered Ezra–Nehemiah in light of historical trauma so that she might understand deeper the impact of her ancestors settling North America. In the future, she hopes the field of biblical studies will foster more open discussions of whiteness.

Halvor Moxnes was born and lives in Norway. He is a White European in a privileged position as a professor emeritus, with some minority experiences as a gay activist. His most important experience as a teacher and advisor has been to African students over a period of 15 years. It is in collaboration with them that he sees most hope for a multiracial future of Biblical studies. His publications include *Jesus and the Rise of Nationalism: A New Quest for the Nineteenth Century Historical Jesus* (Tauris, 2012), ‘From Ernest Renan to Anders Behring Breivik: Continuities in Racial Stereotypes of Muslims and Jews’ (in Hockey and Horrell [ed.]; T&T Clark, 2018). His hope for the future of biblical studies is more representation from minorities ‘speaking from this place’.

Ekaputra Tupamahu is a first-generation Indonesian immigrant to the United States whose research focuses on the politics of language, postcolonial studies, and racial-ethnic criticism of the New Testament. He is the author of *Contesting Languages: Heteroglossia and the Politics of Language in the Early Church* (Oxford University Press, 2023) and *1 Corinthians: A Community in Dissent* (T&T Clark, 2025). He envisions the future of biblical scholarship will be multilingual.

Gerrie Snyman whose colonial and slave heritage dates back to the 17th century has been a professor in Old Testament at the University of South Africa in Pretoria for the past 30 years. He focuses on the decolonial turn in Biblical interpretation in the South African context. Currently, he is delineating a hermeneutic of vulnerability that can empower whiteness to face

its racial past in accounting for it in the interpretation of the Bible. To this end he explores people implicated in evil doing in the Old Testament like Cain, Jacob, Rebekah, Esau and the Edomites. In 2007 he published *To read the Bible differently: The Ethics of Interpretation*, published in Afrikaans as *Om die Bybel anders te lees: Die Etiek van Bybelles* (Pretoria: Griffel). The last ten years he focussed on a hermeneutic of vulnerability and published on this topic in various journals (OTE, Scriptura, In luce Verbi, HTS). His aim is to enable people within the mindset of whiteness to confront their racializing past in the decolonizing process in order to come to terms with their loss of power in a previously colonized country.

Ludwig Beethoven J. Noya was born and raised in an Indonesian family of mixed ethnicities, with Moluccan and Javanese roots, in the capital city of Jakarta. He is concerned about how the intersectionality of race, class, gender, colonial relations, et ceteras, influences biblical interpretations. His first book project, *Rest as a Site of Struggle: Reconsidering the Sabbath Transgression Narratives in the Hebrew Bible*, is under contract with Oxford University Press. He currently explores the Sabbath politics in the prophetic and legal texts, as well as an introductory pedagogical resource for minoritized and underrepresented biblical interpretations. He hopes for broader awareness of the role of socioeconomic privileges and power dynamics—particularly related to racialized identities—in the field of biblical studies.

Justin Michael Reed was raised in Los Angeles by a family who taught him to love and appreciate his Black heritage. The seeds that were planted early in his life continue to grow in his current scholarship that engages the Hebrew Bible through ideological criticism, literary approaches, reception history, and the study of race and ethnicity. These interests come together in his dissertation, which earned him the Manfred Lautenschlaeger Award for Theological Promise and is the basis for his first monograph, *The Injustice of Noah's Curse* (Oxford University Press, 2025). He hopes that the future of biblical studies will generate hermeneutics and interpretations that support multiracial working-class leftist politics.

Kenneth Ngwa was born in Cameroon where he grew up and worked, before coming to the United States in 1999 as part of the new African Diaspora. His passion is around justice and equity. His major research interests are in the areas of ancient Israelite Wisdom Literature and Africana biblical hermeneutics. He is the author of ‘The Hermeneutics of the “Happy” Ending in Job 42:7-17’ (2005) and *Let My People Live: An Africana Reading of Exodus* (2022). His approach to biblical interpretation is theorized around

what he calls ‘badass womanism’—an epistemological and hermeneutical approach that identifies, engages, and seeks to overcome a triple consciousness of erasure, marginalization, and singularity in biblical texts and interpretive approaches. He is the founder and of the Religion and Global Health Forum housed at Drew Theological School, and the Never Stop Breathing initiative, aimed at challenging systemic inequities and creating health and social equity. He hopes that biblical studies will quickly expand into a more fully embodied global endeavor.

Greg Carey is a White person who grew up in an Alabama county seat. He knows very little about his ancestry, though it appears to consist of English persons who settled in Virginia in the 18th century and eventually migrated south and west. Greg’s work has focused on apocalyptic literature, particularly Revelation, and rhetorical criticism of the New Testament. Over time Greg has attended to public biblical interpretation, including how Whiteness interfaces with biblical scholarship. Most recently he is the author of *Death, the End of History, and Beyond: Eschatology in the Bible* and *Using Our Outside Voice: Public Biblical Interpretation*. Greg aspires to see biblical studies as a field that embraces multiple perspectives, in which scholars interact with one another across methodological and social boundaries.

Stephen D. Moore is a white cultural Catholic who was born and raised in an ultra-white Ireland, emigrating to the United States in his early thirties. He has always been drawn to the transformative possibilities of transdisciplinary biblical scholarship. He is the author or editor of more than two dozen books. His current project is *Jesusviolence: Racism, Speciesism, and Other Violences in and after the Gospels* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming). His hope for biblical studies is that its margins will migrate to its center.

Amy Lindeman Allen is a White Euro American of German descent. Her research focuses on the roles of children and families in the New Testament and the impacts of those interpretations in the world today. Publications include: *For Theirs is the Kingdom: Children in the Gospel According to Luke* (Lexington/Fortress Press, 2019), *The Gifts They Bring: How Children in the Gospels Can Shape Inclusive Ministry* (Westminster John Knox, 2023), *The Critic in the World: Essays in Honor of Fernando F. Segovia* (SBL, 2024), co-edited with Francisco Lozada Jr and Yak-hwee Tan, and *Parenting Beyond Boundaries in Mark’s Gospel* (Eerdmans, forthcoming), co-authored with Sung Uk Lim. Her passion is for empowering children from all ethnic and social backgrounds to see themselves at the center of the gospel message of transformative justice.

Hannah M. Strømmen is a half British and half Norwegian White biblical scholar, who grew up in a very White neighbourhood, a stroll away from a fjord in Trondheim. Her teaching and research focus on contemporary uses and interpretations of the Bible in philosophy, literature and politics. She has published and presented widely on these topics, from the Bible in crime fiction and popular novels, to populist and far-right allusions to the Bible. From an interest in critical theory, and particularly the work of Jacques Derrida, she has examined how the distinction between gods, humans, and animals are upheld by way of the biblical archive (*Biblical Animality after Jacques Derrida*, SBL Press, 2018). Over the last years she has been working on a book about the Bible and the contemporary far right, drawing on the thought of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Her latest monograph, co-written with Ulrich Schmiedel, is *The Claim to Christianity: Responding to the Far Right* (SCM Press, 2020). Her hope is that by studying uses of the Bible past and present, structures of oppression, xenophobia, and racism can be exposed and combatted.

Francisco Lozada, Jr is Latinx, born and raised in Cleveland, Ohio and of Puerto Rican descent. Dr. Lozada's most recent publications concern cultural and ideological interpretation while exploring how the Bible is employed and deployed in ethnic/racial communities. Some recent publications include: *Toward a Latino/a Biblical Interpretation* (SBL Press, 2017) and *Latino/a Biblical Hermeneutics: Problematic, Objectives, and Strategies* edited with Fernando F. Segovia (SBL Press, 2014). He hopes to call attention to the role racial/ethnic formation play around the study of biblical texts and contexts both in terms of production and in terms of reception

1

INTRODUCTION

Wongi Park

While the discourse around race and ethnicity in biblical studies has grown exponentially in recent years—especially since the work of Cain Hope Felder—there is a curious lack of attention to whiteness.¹ The absence is noticeable, especially given the expansion of biblical interpretation among various minoritized communities (Bailey, Liew, and Segovia 2009).²

For example, a keyword search of “whiteness” in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* yields only nineteen results, many of which are not relevant

1. An earlier version of this paper was shared in a research group at Belmont University and was delivered in the Minoritized Criticism and Biblical Interpretation section on critical race theory and biblical interpretation at the SBL Annual Meeting in San Diego, California, in 2019. My thanks to fellow members of the research group Ann Coble, Mark McEntire, Amanda Miller, and Beth Ritter-Conn; to Jin Young Choi and Gregory Cuéllar for organizing the session; to Jacqueline Hidalgo for presiding; to Steed Davidson and Shawn Kelley for thoughtful conversation afterward; and to the *JBL* editorial team and the anonymous reviewers for helpful feedback (this chapter originally appeared in *JBL* 140.3 and is reproduced with permission).

For classic and recent studies on race and ethnicity in biblical scholarship, see Felder 1989; Sugirtharajah 2016; Brett 1996; Segovia 2000; Wimbush 2000; Byron 2002; Kelley 2002; Sadler Jr 2003; Brown 2004; Heschel 2008; Nasrallah and Schüssler Fiorenza 2009; Byron and Lovelace 2016; Smith 2017; Hockey and Horrell 2018; Horrell 2020.

In the late 1980s, Thomas Hoyt Jr and John W. Waters paved the way for the first SBL program unit to foreground racial/ethnic identity. The generation of African American biblical scholars that preceded them includes Leon Edward Wright, Charles B. Copher, G. Murray Branch, and Joseph A. Johnson. See Felder 1991: ix-xi, 1-16. For a listing of dissertations and books from the early generation of African American biblical scholars, see Wimbush 2011: 7-8 n. 4. My thanks to Emerson Powery for his help locating this information.

Scholars who have used whiteness studies in biblical studies include Denise Kimber Buell, Greg Carey, David G. Horrell, Wongi Park, Tina Pippin, Jeremy Punt, Love L. Sechrest, Jeffrey Siker, and Gerrie Snyman.

2. For examples of multiracial collaboration between minoritized groups, see Liew and Wimbush 2002; Smith and Choi 2020.

to whiteness as a racial/ethnic signifier.³ Among the relevant results, four are in presidential addresses by Vincent Wimbush, Fernando Segovia, Gale Yee, and Adele Reinhartz (2011, 2015, 2020, 2021, respectively), three are in shorter reflections in *JBL* Forums by Wil Gafney, Tat-siong Benny Liew, and Jacqueline Hidalgo (2017, 2017, 2020), and three are in articles by Luis Menéndez-Antuña, Nyasha Junior, and Katherine A. Shaner (2019, 2020, 2021).⁴

What do these scant and limited references in the flagship journal of biblical studies say about the past formation and present configuration of the field? These search results unwittingly betray the power, normativity, and invisibility of whiteness that has dominated the field since its inception. The field of biblical studies in the United States and Europe is profoundly monoracial (Ramantswana 2020). At the same time, the recent flurry of references and shifting demographics are promising signs that the field is on the cusp of change (Ruiz 2001; Segovia 1996).

The primary goal of this essay is to provide justifications for moving from monoracial to multiracial biblical studies. I argue that a diagnosis of whiteness as a methodological problem is both timely and necessary and, further, that addressing the issue directly—rather than circumventing it—is crucial for diversifying biblical studies. To that end, decentering whiteness as a singular foundation and foregrounding a multiplicity of global voices, perspectives, and starting points are crucial for envisioning biblical studies beyond whiteness. In putting forth this claim, I appeal to multiracial coalitions of Africana, Asian, Indigenous, Islander, Latinx, and White scholars across racial/ethnic, generational, and geographical lines who have laid the foundation for this work.⁵

3. My thanks to Gypsy Moody for cross-referencing these search results from JSTOR against the ATLA Religion Database on EBSCOhost.

4. Curiously, most of these references occur not in research articles but in metareflections on the field by SBL presidents or in *JBL* Forums, which have not been subject to double-blind peer review (Reinhartz 2018: 787). Two other presidential addresses that discuss whiteness but technically do not use the term are Brenner-Idan 2016; Blount 2019. Another *JBL* Forum article that discusses whiteness but does not use the term is Newton 2017. Menéndez-Antuña 2019 contains a single footnote citation of David G. Horrell on Paul and whiteness. The second and only article in which “White” makes it into the title is Junior 2020. Shaner 2021 contains a few references to the interpretive practices of White liberal Protestant Christians. Other articles that contain references to White identity are Buell and Hodge 2004; Dube 2015; Schipper 2019.

5. For recent and representative works in Africana biblical interpretation, see Felder 1991; Dube 2001; Blount 2007; Page and Bailey 2010; Mbuvi, Mbuwayesango and Dube 2012; Smith 2015; Ramantswana 2016; Powery and Sadler Jr 2016; Masenya and Ngwa 2018; Bowens 2020; Smith, Parker, and Dunbar forthcoming; for recent and representative works in Asian American biblical interpretation, see Liew and Yee, 2002; Fosskett and Kuan 2006; Brock *et al.* 2007; Liew 2008; Yee 2010; Wan 2012; Choi 2014;

A number of obstacles and difficulties lie in the way of this goal. Perhaps the single greatest challenge is how to go about this project without alienating fellow colleagues in the field. In an era when divisive and inflammatory rhetoric has intensified, is it possible to pursue this goal without polarizing individuals and the communities they represent? Stated positively, is it possible to work creatively and collaboratively toward a multi- and interracial future for biblical studies? My goal is not to produce more cynicism or toxicity, which is becoming increasingly commonplace in academic and public discourse. Deconstruction for the sake of deconstruction is a path that leads nowhere. Yet avoiding a problem with deep systemic, structural, and institutional roots will not suffice either. The way forward, therefore, is to map a route directly through the problem of whiteness.

The first part of this essay considers what whiteness is and how it operates in biblical studies, by drilling down into three overlapping areas: the identity, methods, and sources of dominant biblical scholarship. To that end, critical race theory and whiteness studies are useful aids in rendering whiteness visible in various corners and pockets of the field.⁶ The second part of the argument reverses sequence by pivoting to new sources to rethink the normative Eurocentricity of biblical studies.

Kim and Yang 2019; Choi and Park 2020; for recent and representative works in Indigenous biblical interpretation, see Charleston 1996; Baldrige 1996; Clatterbuck 2017; Kidwell, Noley and Tinker 2001; Tinker 2001; Tamez 2016; Warrior 2016; Mtshiselwa 2011; Hoklotubbe 2021; for recent and representative works in Islander biblical interpretation, see Vaka'uta *et al.* 2011; Havea, Aymer and Davidson 2015; Havea, Neville and Wainwright 2014; Brett and Havea 2014; Davidson 2017; Kolia 2019; for recent and representative works in Latinx American biblical interpretation, see Lozada Jr and Segovia 2014, 2021; Lozada Jr 2017; Sandoval 2018; Hidalgo 2018; for recent and representative works in White or Euro-American biblical interpretation, see Pippin 2003; Snyman 2008; Carey 2013; Horrell 2017; Punt 2017; Buell 2018). My thanks to Mitzi Smith for sharing a copy of the book proposal for Smith, Parker, and Dunbar forthcoming. My thanks to Ray Aldred and T. Christopher Hoklotubbe for help with these references from North America. A number of works have also been published by tribal authors in India and Myanmar, often without an exclusive focus on biblical studies, which raises another set of methodological questions. See, e.g., *Rays*, the journal of the Myanmar Institute of Theology.

6. The central tenets of critical race theory are the following: (1) racism in the United States is ordinary; (2) there is a White-over-color ascendancy; (3) race is a social construction that is not biologically determined; (4) minoritized groups are racialized in different ways at different times; (5) racial identities are intersectional; (6) minoritized groups have unique perspectives, based on their own experience of racism, compared to their White counterparts. See Delgado and Stefancic 2001.

Whiteness as Identity

Rather than begin with a preconceived definition of whiteness—as privilege, property, working-class racism, an unmarked marker differentiating non-White others, the consolidation of power, colonialism, and wealth, or some other notion according to whiteness studies (McIntosh 1989; Weekes 2009; Harris 1993; Roediger 2007; Frankenberg 1993, 198; Lipsitz 2009; Delgado and Stefancic 1997; Allen 1994–97)—a better place to begin for a biblical studies audience is to consider the current makeup of the field as reflected in a demographic analysis of SBL’s membership (Gushee 2019; Schneider and Bjork-James 2020; Jennings 2020; Joshi 2020; Bond 2017; Kennedy *et al.* 2005; Casey 2020).⁷

In January 2019, SBL produced a member profile report based on 2018 membership data.⁸ At the time of the survey, SBL had a total of 8,324 members with a response rate of 67%. A few statistics stand out from this report that are pertinent to the present discussion. Regarding gender, 75.11% of members surveyed are male, 24.77% are female, and .12% are transgender. Regarding race and ethnicity (a question that was asked only of members who indicated the United States as their country of birth), 85.62% are of European or Caucasian descent, 4.12% are of African descent, 3.73% are of Latin American descent, 3.39% are of Asian descent, 2.87% are of Native American, Alaska Native, or First Nation Descent, and .23% are of Native Hawaiian or Oceanian descent. These numbers provide a quick snapshot of the field in the United States (Wan 2018). While women make up approximately 25% of total members, racial/ethnic minorities make up only 14.38%—both of which are proportionately much lower in comparison to the general population according to the 2018–2019 US Census Bureau.⁹ The statistics speak for themselves: biblical studies in the United States is mostly male dominated and, even more so, White dominated.

Notably, the history of women participating in the Society precedes that of racial/ethnic minorities by a good margin. The first female member, Anna Ely Rhoads (1862–1943), joined what was then the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in 1894 (Taylor 2019). By contrast, there is no documentation for scholars of African descent before the 1940s. There is no documentation of the first female African American scholar of the Society (Byron 2019: 158). In fact, there is no mention of a single Africana scholar in the printed volume of the centennial anniversary (Wimbush 2011: 7 regarding Saunders 1982). One of the early organizing efforts occurs in the 1980s, marking the first scheduled gathering of two or more scholars

7. My thanks to Luis Menéndez-Antuña for sending me a copy of Casey 2020.

8. The report is available on the SBL website: ‘Member Data Report, 2019’ (<https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/sblMemberProfile2019.pdf>).

9. Available here: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>.

of color (Wimbush 2011: 6-7). Less known, further still, is information regarding the earliest Asian, Indigenous, Islander, or Latinx members of the Society.¹⁰

The history of SBL presidents parallels this pattern of gender and race/ethnicity. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza was the first female president of the Society in 1987. The first African American president was Vincent Wimbush in 2010; the first Latino president from the Global South, Fernando F. Segovia, in 2014; the second African American male, Brian Blount, in 2018; and the first woman of color and Asian American, Gale A. Yee, in 2019.¹¹ This brief history of SBL presidents is a microcosm that underscores the dominant White European and Euro-American and male identity in the origins of the field. As Angela N. Parker notes, ‘Established in 1880 at a time where segregation was the norm and not everyone had access to membership or the education for critical biblical scholarship, White men established what the critical investigation of the Bible would entail. Scholars must never forget that founding identity and must push against the inherent biases of “established” approaches’ (Parker 2020b).

First and foremost, then, the whiteness of biblical studies is plainly visible by the ‘startlingly lop-sided demographics’ of the field (Wan 2018: 221). Yet the whiteness of biblical studies does not consist only in dominant phenotypic traits in the majority of SBL’s membership base in the United States. To define whiteness solely and exclusively in relation to biological markers, which in and of themselves have no meaning, runs the risk of perpetuating the modern myth of race (Miles and Brown 2004: 87-113; Bailey, Liew, and Segovia 2009). To be crystal clear, race is a social construct that has no physical, genetic, or biological basis in human blood and DNA. In point of fact, there is greater genetic variation within—rather than between—racial groups, thereby rendering any system of racial classification arbitrary.¹²

10. This information is not readily available in the SBL Archive (<http://pid.emory.edu/ark:/25593/s9fht>). Unofficially, some of the early self-identifying Latino members of SBL include Francisco Garcia-Treto, Fernando F. Segovia, and Efrain Agosto. Some of the early Asian and Asian American scholars include R.S. Sugirtharajah, Archie Lee, Joseph Wang, and Chan-Hie Kim; my thanks to Fernando Segovia and Choon-Leong Seow for this information. Regarding the early generation of female scholars, Dominican-born Aida Besançon Spencer earned a PhD in New Testament from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1982. One of the first African American women to earn a PhD in New Testament at Duke University was Clarice J. Martin in 1985, the same year that Chinese American Gale Yee earned her doctorate in Old Testament at Saint Michael’s College. See Taylor 2019: 23; my thanks to Nicole Tilford for this reference.

11. For a list of past presidents, see <https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pastpresidents.pdf>.

12. The American Anthropological Association issued a statement on May 17, 1998 prepared by a committee of anthropologists. The key point in this statement is as follows: ‘In the United States both scholars and the general public have been conditioned

Race does not exist biologically, yet ideologically it is alive and well, and herein lies the tension.¹³ As a biological myth with innumerable religious, civic, social, and political ramifications, race is the modern paradox par excellence. It is a windy and complex mirage, a labyrinth of representations (Heschel 2015: 6).

For these reasons, equating whiteness with White people is not only simplistic and pseudoscientific, but it also reinforces a common misconception that race is reducible to skin color (Park 2019: 52-58; Buell 2018: 151; Park 2016). A similar logic applies to blackness and Black people¹⁴—hence

to viewing human races as natural and separate divisions within the human species based on visible physical differences. With the vast expansion of scientific knowledge in this century, however, it has become clear that human populations are not unambiguous, clearly demarcated, biologically distinct groups. Evidence from the analysis of genetics (e.g., DNA) indicates that most physical variation, about 94%, lies within so-called racial groups. Conventional geographic ‘racial’ groupings differ from one another only in about 6% of their genes. This means that there is greater variation within ‘racial’ groups than between them. In neighboring populations there is much overlapping of genes and their phenotypic (physical) expressions. Throughout history whenever different groups have come into contact, they have interbred. The continued sharing of genetic materials has maintained all of humankind as a single species’. The full statement is available at <https://www.americananthro.org/ConnectWithAAA/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2583>. See further Sussman 2014.

13. ‘To the extent that US and global evangelicalism (and beyond?!) have been dominated by straight white men, and to the extent that these leaders have interpreted Scripture and tradition in a way that reinforces their power, they have produced exiles from the margins of their community—those who are not white, not male, and not straight’ (Gushee 2020: 9). For an astute analysis of whiteness and tribalism among White evangelicals, see Wan 2020.

14. Another preferred term, according to Zakiyyah Iman Jackson, is *blackened* people, which refers to a process of ‘violent imposition and appropriation—inclusion and recognition—of black(ened) humanity in the interest of plasticizing that very humanity’ (Jackson 2020: 3; my thanks to Mitzi Smith for this reference). This theorization of blackness as process is akin to the term *minoritized*. As Tat-siong Benny Liew and Fernando F. Segovia note in their forthcoming volume, *Reading Biblical Texts Together: Doing Minoritized Biblical Criticism*: ‘First, ‘minority’ forms part of an opposition alongside ‘dominant’ to signify the presence of differential formations and relations of power in society and culture. Second, this opposition, dominant–minority, applies across the multiple axes of identity that mark human existence, including that of ethnicity-race. Third, the term ‘minoritized’ emphasizes this relation of domination and subordination, superiority and inferiority, at work in all axes of human identity, whereby one formation erects itself as ‘dominant’ while casting others as ‘minorities’. Consequently, a minority formation is the product of a process of minoritization, whereby that formation has been rendered minoritized by another’. In other words, no one is born ontologically Black; they are blackened into existence. In the same way, no one is born as a minority; they are minoritized into existence. Curiously, White and Black are the only two racial categories that refer to both race and color. For an analysis

my preference for the terms *Africana*, *African*, or *African American*, all of which denote geography rather than color and thus better align with other racial/ethnic terminology such as *Asian* and *Latinx*.¹⁵ How Native and Indigenous peoples fit in the modern narrative of race is another story.¹⁶

While demographic data are undoubtedly relevant to this discussion, they are wholly insufficient for arriving at a full-orbed understanding of whiteness. A closer analysis reveals how whiteness extends far beyond phenotypes and pigmentation into the very methods and tools of dominant biblical scholarship.

Whiteness as Method

There are several ways whiteness can be detected in the traditional methods of biblical studies. The first and most visible way is the sheer dominance of ‘historical criticism’ stemming from the origins of the field. No other methodology has singularly defined biblical studies more than historical criticism. Beyond the recognition of linguistic and cultural differences that are expressed in biblical texts, historical criticism is a product of the Enlightenment that constituted the field of biblical studies and cemented its rise in the modern university (Sheehan 2007; Legaspi 2010; Rogerson 2008). While historical criticism is not a monolithic approach, the principles of historical criticism (doubt, analogy, correlation, and autonomy; Troeltsch 1912–25: 2: 729–53; 1914: 6: 716–23; Harvey 1966) were integral in making the scientific application of value-free methods the defining feature of modern biblical scholarship.

Second, historical criticism not only is central to the origins of biblical studies but also serves as the primary point of entry into the field. Especially in the United States and Europe, there is generally only one single methodological pathway into the guild. Historical criticism is the industry standard at virtually every PhD-granting institution in biblical studies from Western Europe to North America and across the Global North. As

of the dominant–minority dialectic *vis-à-vis* deracialization and whiteness studies, see Park 2017.

15. This critique is informed by critical race theory and the lament that the Black/White binary is a deeply flawed logic all too common in popular and academic discourse. See Delgado and Stefancic, 2001: 75: ‘[The Black/White binary] effectively dictates that nonblack minority groups must compare their treatment to that of African Americans to redress their grievances. The paradigm holds that one group, blacks, constitutes the prototypical minority group. ‘Race’ means, quintessentially, African American. Other groups such as Asian, American Indians, and Latino/as, are minorities only insofar as their experience and treatment can be analogized to those of blacks’. For more on the Black/White binary, see Alcoff 2003; Kim 1999; Kim 2018.

16. One of the more difficult and challenging readings on the topic is by Tink Tinker (wazhazhe/Osage Nation) (2019). My thanks to Mark G. Brett for sharing this article.

Ekaputra Tupamahu notes, ‘In the United States, a doctoral student has to pass a comprehensive or qualifying exam after their taking their coursework, and in many schools the materials for the comprehensive exams are a huge stack of books written by white scholars’ (Tupamahu 2020b). Earning a degree in biblical studies is virtually synonymous with learning Western history, tools, and methods of interpretation.

Third, after one enters the field, historical criticism is commonly construed as the bedrock of biblical exegesis (Lieu and Rogerson 2008: xvii). Many dissertations, even when they display methodological innovation, are informed by and indebted to a historical reading of the text. The centrality of historical criticism is evident also in newer forms of biblical scholarship—be they literary, cultural, ideological, or global—all of which depart from and point back to historical criticism. In the structure and naming of SBL program units and sections, more traditional units and sections simply name the biblical corpus under consideration. By contrast, other units and sections are explicit in identifying an interpretive approach that departs from the standard. In either case, historical criticism enjoys a privileged status as an invisible norm (Buell 2018: 155) that renders other approaches as aberrations (Yee 2020: 13). Despite the pluralizing of methods—including literary, feminist, queer, disability, economic, and postcolonial interpretation—the Eurocentric core of biblical studies remains.¹⁷

Fourth, historical criticism continues to enjoy popularity and currency in the field today. Despite numerous refutations and rebuttals, the prominence of historical criticism has not at all diminished (Aichele, Miscall and Walsh 2009; Hendel 2014; Moore 2014; Adam 1995; Collins 2005; Hagner 2006). To the contrary, it remains the most popular method as the lingua franca of biblical studies. Again, the numbers speak for themselves. To return to the 2019 SBL Membership Data report, the most frequently selected method of interpretation was none other than historical criticism.

To be clear, the fact that a majority of scholars prefer historical criticism, in and of itself, is not the issue—just as the fact that a majority of scholars identify as male and White is not the issue either. The problem, at root, lies in the intricate relationship between the two. The way historical criticism functions in biblical studies as a universal, normative, unmarked method of interpretation is a telltale sign of its proximity to whiteness. But the problem is not simply that historical criticism, like whiteness, is unmarked, or even ironically defended on the basis that it recognizes ancient cultural differences. The underlying issue is that the dominant methodological center

17. ‘Contemporary biblical scholarship, including even those developments within it that most readily invite the label ‘postmodern(ist)’, is still fundamentally predetermined and contained by the Enlightenment *épistémè*, and far more than is generally realized’ (Moore and Sherwood 2011: 47).

of biblical studies elevates Eurocentric models of history, epistemology, and social location—a process that is centered through the very methods of the field.

In this sense, and only in this sense, White scholars enjoy a hermeneutical advantage insofar as their identities, locations, and methods are presumed as the norm. By contrast, many minoritized scholars do not enjoy the same luxury. Scholars of color are required to think more carefully about their identities, the methods they use, and to what ends. But are the dominant methods of the field neutral, objective, and value free as assumed?

A closer examination of standard reference works in biblical studies uncovers some often unstated assumptions. For example, Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie couple the pluralizing of methods with the subjectivity of interpretation: *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (Haynes and McKenzie 1999). In the introduction, they unpack the tension between historical, literary, and ideological approaches.

This disagreement can be expressed in simple terms by saying that historical methods such as source criticism, form criticism, tradition-historical criticism, and redaction criticism emphasize the historical, archaeological, or literary *backgrounds* or roots of a text, and the development of the text *through time*... On the other hand, literary methods such as structural criticism, narrative criticism, reader-response criticism, and poststructuralist criticism tend to focus on the *text itself*...and the interaction between texts and *readers*. (Haynes and McKenzie 1999: 7, emphasis original)

Here, the fraught relationship between text and reader, diachronic and synchronic methods, is fairly standard in accounts of the field's historical development (Moore and Sherwood 2011; Collins 2005). But what is revealing is how Haynes and McKenzie order, arrange, and prioritize the interpretive approaches. The structure of the volume provides a clue. Part 1, 'Traditional Methods of Biblical Criticism', covers precisely what one might expect: source criticism, form criticism, tradition-historical criticism, and redaction criticism. Part 2, 'Expanding the Tradition', covers methods that emerged in the 1970s: social-scientific criticism, canonical criticism, and rhetorical criticism. Part 3, 'Overturning the Tradition', covers methods that gained prominence in the 1990s following the linguistic turn: structural criticism, narrative criticism, reader-response criticism, poststructuralist criticism, feminist criticism, and socioeconomic criticism. The modern discipline of biblical studies, as the story goes, has been toppled by a plethora of postmodern approaches. But wherein lies the traditional core that is threatened with being overturned? The answer is latent.

A more explicit answer is found in the *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, originally published in 1976 and currently in its fourth edition. The editors, Richard N. Soulen and R. Kendall Soulen, attribute the traditional methods

to the underlying androcentrism and Eurocentrism of the field. The preface is worth quoting at length:

When the first edition of the *Handbook* was conceived in the early 1970s, biblical studies was still largely dominated by German scholars whose chief concern was with questions of historical reconstruction (the world behind the text). The decades since have witnessed a truly breathtaking—and profoundly welcome—expansion of both practitioners in the field of biblical studies and approaches to the biblical text. . . . Along another axis it can be described as the spread of biblical studies from theological faculties of church related universities in the old world to departments of religion, literature, and philosophy in secular universities around the globe; and yet along another as the inclusion alongside liberal Protestant scholars of Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, evangelical, and Pentecostal ones (not to mention secularist, atheistic, and agnostic scholars as well); and along still another as the advent of women, African Americans, Africans, Asians, Latinos/Latinas, and others into a scholarly guild long dominated by men of European descent. (Soulen and Soulen 2011: v)

The framing of the narrative is telling. Prior to the 1970s, the guild was dominated by a singular demographic ('German scholars') and methodology ('historical reconstruction'). However, the advent of new practitioners ('women, African Americans, Africans, Asians, Latinos/Latinas, and others') resulted in a diversity of methodological and religious perspectives. Biblical studies is indeed diversifying, and the way that transformation is taking place is not simply through the application of new methods. The driving force of these changes, rather, is the result of emerging scholars who are challenging the status quo in a field 'dominated by men of European descent'. While Soulen and Soulen regard the changes as profoundly welcome, others are wary of what this implies for the future of the field.¹⁸ This narrative underscores how identity and method are, as a matter of fact, interconnected.

Finally, the contextual nature of methods can be detected in what is often regarded as the hallmark of methodological rigor in the field—double-blind peer review. This process is used in many, if not all, SBL program units to vet and rank submissions for the regional, annual, and international meetings. It is also widely used to ensure the quality of scholarship by book publishers and academic journals alike, including *JBL*. This process is designed to safeguard academic integrity and meritocracy, such that only the most rigorously argued and researched claims with demonstrable control of primary and secondary literature are accepted for publication. This is all well

18. John J. Collins writes, 'It is not the case that the postmodernists have captured the field. Far from it. Diversity of approaches is at best a mixed blessing, and sometimes threatens to become a curse. But neither is traditional historical criticism accurately described as the totalitarian monolith that some of its critics make it out to be' (2005: 3).

and good in theory. But in practice, does this process favor one group over another? As Mark G. Brett and Susan E. Hylen keenly observe,

A professional journal like *JBL* embodies at least some practices of ‘procedural justice’, especially in the double-blind reviewing of submissions and the proud tradition of meritocracy. When it comes to substantive justice, however, the issues are more vexed. Statistically, our evaluation of intellectual merit favors white men from well-resourced English-speaking universities, even when half of the members of the *JBL* editorial board are women, including four women of color. (Brett and Hylen 2020: 598)

The very process of double-blind peer review admittedly favors a certain demographic—namely, ‘White men from well-resourced English-speaking universities’. This stripping of identity from scholarship makes sense and works well for some but not others. What is deemed to be rigorous biblical scholarship differs from person to person—hence a conscious effort to diversify the *JBL* editorial board in terms of gender and race/ethnicity. The relevant point, of course, is not to do away with the peer review process but to show where whiteness is manifest even in the most objective and rigorous standard in the field.

Some scholars in the guild today may not view any of this to be inherently problematic. In fact, for some readers the move from whiteness as identity to whiteness as method may seem like a large jump. To put the matter somewhat differently as a question: Are methods neutral, objective, and acontextual tools? How, if at all, do the identity and social location of the reader matter in interpretation (Segovia 1995)? These questions are indicative of the great divide in the field today. As Katharine Doob Sakenfeld notes, ‘Perhaps the widest fissure in method lies between those who are committed to focusing on identity hermeneutics and those who are disinterested in this broad approach or continue to question its academic value’ (Sakenfeld 2008: 7). Even in the most methodologically conservative segments of the field, few would deny that social location matters in theory. But in practice, the kind of scholarship that prevails in scholarly journals such as *ABR*, *CBQ*, *HTR*, *JBL*, *JSOT*, *JSNT*, *NovT*, *NTS*, and *ZAW*, to name a few, is one that is disinterested, decontextualized, and, indeed for some, altogether disconnected from matters of identity.

How, then, does whiteness function methodologically in biblical studies? In sum, historical criticism is central to the European history of biblical studies; it serves as the primary point of entry into the field; it functions as a foundation and benchmark for biblical scholarship; and it enjoys widespread popularity as the most frequently selected method of interpretation. Simply put, a White identity and method lie at the core of the field. Even down to the most rigorous standard in the double-blind peer review process, whiteness prevails. In many ways, historical criticism does not require definition or justification since it is virtually synonymous with biblical scholarship.

While whiteness as identity and method are intertwined, one could argue that both are a function of something deeper and more fundamental. One further step in the argument is necessary to appreciate the full scope and depth of the problem.

Whiteness as Sources

The link between whiteness as identity and method can be further appreciated when a third element is brought into the equation—the discursive framework and sources of biblical studies. What exactly does this consist of?

First, the discursive framework and sources of biblical studies are characterized by Eurocentrism. Cain Hope Felder defines Eurocentrism as ‘the academic prejudice that the European way of doing things is ‘objective’ and somehow not culture bound’.¹⁹ As a form of prejudice, Eurocentrism asserts the preeminence of Euro-American culture, precisely when reconstructing ancient cultural differences (Felder 2014: 10). It is part and parcel of the received tradition that assumes its own superiority and excludes non-European perspectives as subordinate and inferior.

This exclusion works on two levels. On the one hand, a ‘Eurocentric overlay’ is superimposed onto biblical texts and contexts, which is evident not only in biblical studies but also in academic discourse more generally (Felder 2014: 17). As Felder notes, ‘The extent of uniformity in scholarly norms throughout the world is striking evidence of persisting Euro-American domination’ (Felder 1991: 6). On the other hand, there is an erasure that occurs at the level of both text and interpretation (Brown 2004: 21). African presence is downplayed, if not altogether dismissed, through a process of de-Africanizing the Bible (Slater 2000: 24). This effectively consists of denying the presence of African peoples, places, and characters in biblical narratives and removing Egypt and Ethiopia from Africa and remapping it as part of the Western world (Copher 1991; Byamungu 2006). In other words, Eurocentrism is not only a racializing ideology, as many scholars have noted, but also a deracializing ideology that sustains the power and privilege of the dominant group in active and passive ways.²⁰ Whiteness ignores Eurocentric power while simultaneously wielding it.²¹

19. ‘Even the apparently nonprejudicial search for ‘the original meaning’ of a text is usually driven by a desire to demonstrate that the Eurocentric interpreter’s own favored position is closest to that ‘original meaning’. ... What passes for normative hermeneutics is in fact white, male, Eurocentric hermeneutics’ (Felder 1991: 6).

20. Racializing refers to a process that occurs in relation to the minoritized other. Deracializing, by contrast, refers to a process that occurs in relation to the dominant self. For a fuller account of deracialization, see Park 2019: 47-87.

21. ‘Whiteness is powerblind Eurocentrism’ (Teel 2019: 411). My thanks to Beth Ritter-Conn for sending me this article.

Second, the discursive framework of biblical studies consists of racializing and deracializing practices. These default practices partially explain the lack of diversity in the field today. In 2011, Wimbush observed, ‘The paucity of black membership is due ultimately not to the bad faith and manners of members of the Society in the past but to something more profound—the *(unrecognized, unacknowledged) racialized discursive practices and politics that have defined it*’ (Wimbush 2011: 8, emphasis added). In much the same way, one of the reasons why there are so few Latinas in biblical studies, as Jacqueline Hidalgo suspects, is that a ‘limited cross section of biblical studies PhD programs provide a space in which US Latinas may study the questions, texts, practices, or issues that matter to many potential US Latina biblical scholars and their communities’ (Hidalgo 2013: 121). Many other minoritized scholars have expressed this sentiment.

The SBL Committee on Underrepresented Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession (CUREMP) echoes the same concerns. In concluding its twenty-fifth anniversary report in 2016, the committee underscored the need for ‘transforming not only the demography but also the *discourses and practices that have restrained demographic diversification*’.²² These issues are pertinent to SBL’s membership base in the United States, but they also speak to other academic societies beyond SBL. Commenting on this phenomenon, Wei Hsien Wan writes, ‘This dominance of white-European scholars in traditionally influential academic bodies and institutions outside the United States such as the British New Testament Conference (BNTC) or the European Association of Biblical Studies (EABS) is, not surprisingly, a remarkably stable phenomenon’ (Wan 2018: 220 n. 5).²³ Biblical studies—then and now, whether in the United States or Europe—is undergirded by a deep-seated Eurocentrism that characterizes the dominant discourse and practices of the field.

Third, the Eurocentrism of biblical studies plays heavily into the dominant narrative surrounding the origins of biblical studies and, more fundamentally, is grounded in the very sources of the field. The origins of biblical studies, as narrated by standard textbooks in the field, rarely moves

22. ‘25 Years and Counting: Reflecting on the Past and Future of SBL’s Committee on Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Minorities in the Profession’ (emphasis added), https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/CUREMP_25th_Anniv.Society_Report_final.pdf. A representative list of SBL units and sections that address racial/ethnic contexts includes African Biblical Hermeneutics; African American Biblical Hermeneutics; Asian and Asian American Hermeneutics; African Association for the Study of Religion; Contextual Biblical Interpretation; Latino/a and Latin American Biblical Interpretation. For more information, see https://www.sbl-site.org/sblcommittees_curemp_activities.aspx. My thanks to Raj Nadella for this information.

23. Notable exceptions would be the Society for Asian Biblical Studies and the Oceanic Biblical Studies Association.

further back than the Enlightenment. The implicit logic here is that the ancient world of biblical antiquity—effectively bypassing the history of Africa, Asia, Indigenous, Latin America, and Oceanic peoples all over the world—is a straight shot to the modern history of Western Europe and the United States. This way of thinking valorizes Greco–Judeo traditions and propagates the Bible as part of the modern colonial project.²⁴ According to Shawn Kelley’s diagnosis, the intellectual traditions of the Enlightenment that shaped modern biblical scholarship—from G.W.F. Hegel, Martin Heidegger, Rudolf Bultmann, and John Dominic Crossan—are ‘trapped in a racialized discourse’ (Kelley 2002: 211). Indeed, one could argue as many have that the related disciplines of theology and biblical studies over the last four centuries have imported ‘racial attitudes’ (Kidd 2006: 1) that have produced a Western Christianity with ‘a diseased social imagination’ (Jennings 2010: 6). Deane Galbraith minces no words when he asserts, ‘Historical-critical scholarship is racialized scholarship’ (Galbraith 2016: 133–34).

Postcolonial critics have drawn greater attention to the legacy of the Christian Bible in the history of European colonization (Dube 2000; Moore and Segovia 2007; Boer 2008; Brett 2009; Sugirtharajah 2009; Boer 2013; Havea 2017). In other words, it is not enough to ask about the origins of the methods and tools of the field. But, more importantly, ‘What kind of structures have been built—and continue to be built—with them?’ (Wan 2018: 220). Commenting on the twenty-fifth anniversary edition of *Voices from the Margin*, Sugirtharajah notes, ‘Biblical scholarship continues to be managed and controlled by the West. . . . Of all the disciplines in the humanities, biblical studies was the creation of the West and remains unabashedly Eurocentric’ (Sugirtharajah 2016: 603). The traditional European and Euro-American sources in the history of biblical scholarship are reproduced by the majority of PhD-granting institutions in North America as reflected in the language requirements of the field. The scales are tipped in favor of Greek and Hebrew over Syriac, Aramaic, and Ge‘ez, and German and French over every other modern research language (Buell 2018: 154; Byron 2009). Language plays a crucial role in mediating racialized boundaries (Tupamahu 2020a: 66–71). In this sense, as Haley Gabrielle rightly notes, whiteness is a form of racial capital that ‘can be transferred or denied and can confer social benefits through its acquisition’ (Gabrielle 2020: 24). Inasmuch as the traditional framework and sources of biblical studies remain intact, the deeply ingrained Eurocentrism of the field will by and large continue for the foreseeable future.

24. ‘Eurocentrism works on a double premise. It looks to Greece for its intellectual and philosophical roots, and dips into its Judaic heritage for its religious origins’ (Sugirtharajah 1998: 113).

In sum, whiteness is both more than and less than the 85 percent majority of members in the Society of Biblical Literature. It is a methodological norm that privileges and universalizes a White Eurocentric history, identity, and methodology. It is a set of racialized and deracialized practices. It is the point to which and from which all activities and processes of the field are directed. It is simultaneously everywhere and nowhere, invisible and omnipresent, embedded in the discursive framework of biblical studies. It is partially to blame for the lack of diversity and the current state of affairs in the biblical studies guild today. It continues to build a monoracial future by centering and importing European and Euro-American sources globally.

Multiracial Sources

If whiteness as identity and method is fundamentally connected to an underlying Eurocentrism in the framework and sources of biblical scholarship, then moving toward multiracial biblical studies involves a two-part process of unlearning and relearning biblical studies, or deintroducing and reintroducing biblical studies (Penner and Lopez 2015; Smith and Kim 2018).

There are several ways this two-part process can be enumerated. It is necessary to unlearn and deintroduce the racist and anti-Semitic origins of biblical studies and to trace their deleterious effects on minoritized communities (Kelley 2002: 211; Heschel 2008: 43; Levinson 2008; Levenson 1985). It involves a careful reconsideration of the commentary genre and museums and archives of the White Christian West, which store and preserve the traditional Eurocentric sources of biblical studies (Horrell 2017; Cuéllar 2019). It involves examining how whiteness is reproduced in texts, representations, and colonial legacies in biblical reception history—from Christology to children's Bibles and to justifications for anti-immigration policies (Grant 1989; Yancy 2012; Park 2016).

If the Eurocentric foundation for professional biblical studies were to be decentered, how might the field of study be rebuilt upon a multiplicity of sources and contexts? To that end, it seems that the formation of multiracial coalitions of Africana, Asian, Indigenous, Islander, Latinx, and White scholars to rethink the field is crucial. What would it mean, for example, to develop an approach to biblical studies using Aboriginal, Ethiopian, Jamaican, Korean, Malay, Mestizo, Native American, or South Asian sources? A contextual approach can doubly foreground context as identity through, for example, a *Singaporean reading* of Daniel, but it can also foreground context as space through, for example, reading Daniel *in Singapore* (Lim 2019: 3-9).²⁵ Moreover, how might a White-decentered approach to biblical interpretation be performed by White scholars? At the very least, it means

25. For two other articles that theorize a spatial approach to context by Chin Ming Stephen Lim, see Lim 2017; 2018.

contextualizing the secondary sources from a mostly White bibliography to a far more multiracial and contextual bibliography.

Crucial to the strategy of moving toward multiracial sources is stretching the conventional boundaries and borders of the field.²⁶ This involves a far more expansive definition of biblical canons (Buell 2014). It also involves a careful reconsideration of our conversation partners. As Buell notes, ‘Our citational practices reveal much about which interpretive approaches we value, and function to transmit generationally a narrow genealogy of legitimate voices’ (Buell 2018: 155). What Liew suggests for Asian American biblical interpretation may be applied to all groups: a ‘citational invention of tradition’ (Liew 2008: 8-9). For example, how might new sources and conversation partners shape our understanding of biblical sources and traditions? Breaking biblical texts into smaller and smaller pericopes and fragments makes little sense for Indigenous or Malay communities.²⁷ How might a view of oral scriptures or slave narrative traditions provide an alternative understanding to source criticism (Spencer-Miller 2013; Neemia 2014; Powery 2017)? Positing perspectives and sources contextual to the South Pacific may offer new source material that reflects a diverse array of multiracial histories and traditions (Havea 2018). The mere recognition of social location is not sufficient for addressing the legacies of slavery and colonialism (Ramantswana 2016: 178). In other words, unlearning and relearning biblical studies involves redefining what sources count and why. It means affirming that Black scholars matter and that Black scholarship matters (Liew 2017: 239). It means finding multiple languages for multilingual biblical studies (Tupamahu forthcoming).

Multiracial Methods

Another important step that follows from changing the sources of biblical studies is unlearning and relearning methods. If historical criticism is not an objective tool but a lingua franca (with a number of dialects depending on the context, e.g., Germany, Israel, or the United States), then a more transparent account of interpretive methods is necessary. For instance, it is necessary to reconsider textual authority and textual criticism, conventional topics such as empire and the Synoptic Problem, and areas of study such as feminist interpretation, Pauline scholarship, and disability studies.²⁸

26. Among many other strategies, Bailey, Liew, and Segovia call for discursive cross-fertilization (2009: 6).

27. My thanks to Terry Leblanc and Wei Hsien Wan for this example.

28. On textual criticism, see Lin 2020: 91: ‘This particular, contextual perspective also endures because it enjoys a privileged position as the unmarked default viewpoint of biblical studies in general and textual criticism in particular. . . . I propose an exploration of textual criticism that shifts away from white textual criticism with its focus on reconstruction and the search for origins and genealogies’. On empire, see Davidson

If there are multiple points of entry and exit for multiracial biblical studies, then a radical rethinking of methods is in order. Again, this involves the multifaceted work of ‘making whiteness transparent’ (Yee 2006: 162), peeling off the layer of whiteness ‘spackled on biblical texts and characters’ (Gafney 2017: 204 n. 1), recovering African presence (Bailey and Grant 1995), and deploying biblical interpretation for talking to and talking back to power structures (Smith 2018; Newton 2017). It involves a reclamation of the Afro-Asiatic texts and contexts of the biblical world (Byron 2002: 55-76). It is the work of retrieving lesser-known interpretive traditions that turn the dominant narrative on its head (Junior 2020: 662). It means developing biblical literacy to counter how the Bible has ‘dehumanized black identity and black humanity’ (Powery and Sadler Jr 2016: 60) and identifying ways of ‘unhinging’ (Parker 2020) and reclaiming biblical texts. On a structural and institutional level, it involves the recognition that overcoming racism is not simply a matter of individual agency but also engages intersectional methods for criticism that can address the most pressing issues of our time (Buell 2018: 151; Yee 2020: 8; Segovia 2015: 21-29).

Multiracial Identity

Finally, unlearning and relearning multiracial biblical studies requires a more honest account of our respective identities in the work of biblical scholarship (Schüssler Fiorenza 2009: 14). This involves transparency from scholars about their interests and investments—as readers, teachers, and individual members who are embedded in larger communities. Rather than continuing in a scholarly mode of disinterest and decontextualization, the social, religious, and institutional locations and communities we inhabit can be foregrounded and theorized as an essential part of the interpretive task. This can enhance our work and perhaps even make it more compelling for a broader audience, demanding not less rigor but a different kind of rigor that enlarges and enhances the academic enterprise.

Moving toward multiracial biblical studies entails a careful consideration of all three elements—sources, methods, and identities—in tandem as integral to biblical interpretation. In other words, who do we interpret with (West 2020) and how are those interpretations embodied (Parker 2018)? If this final element of identity is not critically incorporated, then the hermeneutical process is incomplete. For example, could a volume of essays be regarded as ‘Korean American biblical interpretation’ simply because the

2011; on the Synoptic Problem, see Tupamahu 2020b; on feminist scholarship, see Grant 1989: 177-94; on Pauline scholarship, see Concannon 2014: 172: ‘The ideology of Pauline studies privileges Paul’s voice over others and makes use of his voice to enforce and authorize the theological, political, and social views of the interpreter, who is usually white, Western, and male’.

authors were Koreans and Korean Americans? Alternatively, if a volume of essays did *not* mark the identity of the contributors, would it present an implicit claim to universal relevance?

Conclusion

The key questions are clear. If multiracial biblical studies represents the antithesis of a monoracial Eurocentric biblical studies, how can a new and emerging generation of scholars enact the necessary changes through mutual dialogue, partnerships, and coalition building? How can the dominant institutions yield power, restructure, change curricula, and promote shifts in sources, methods, and identities? Decentering whiteness does not mean eliminating Eurocentric sources entirely; it entails particularizing whiteness and examining its effects (Sechrest 2015: 75). This will involve particularizing and localizing White identity as Australian, Canadian, English, Euro-American, French, German, Scottish, and so on. If the underlying sources are not adapted and modified, the basic framework of traditional biblical studies will persist. From a rhetorical standpoint, particularity is the key for undoing universalism, with 'different sorts of bodies in the room' (Penner and Lopez 2015: 194). Ultimately, what is necessary are a diversity of texts, a diversity of readings, and a diversity of readers (Segovia 2000, 87-115).

References

- Adam, A.K.M.
 1995 *What Is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
- Aichele, G., P. Miscall, and R. Walsh
 2009 'An Elephant in the Room: Historical-Critical and Postmodern Interpretations of the Bible', *JBL* 128: 383-404. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25610189>.
- Alcoff, L.M.
 2003 'Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary', *Journal of Ethics* 7: 5-27.
- Allen, T.W.
 1994-97 *The Invention of the White Race* (Haymarket Series. London: Verso).
- Bailey, R.C., and J. Grant (eds)
 1995 *The Recovery of Black Presence: An Interdisciplinary Exploration: Essays in Honor of Dr. Charles B. Copher* (Nashville: Abingdon Press).
- Bailey, R.C., T.-s. B. Liew, and F.F. Segovia
 2009 'Toward Minority Biblical Criticism: Framework, Contours, Dynamics', in *They Were All Together in One Place? Toward Minority Biblical Criticism* (ed. R.C. Bailey, T.-s. B. Liew, and F.F. Segovia; SemeiaSt 57; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), 3-46.
- Baldrige, W.
 1996 'Native American Theology: A Biblical Basis', in *Native and Christian:*

Indigenous Voices on Religious Identity in the United States and Canada (ed. J. Treat; New York: Routledge), 100-101.

Blount, B.K.

2019 'The Souls of Biblical Folks and the Potential for Meaning', *JBL* 138: 6-21. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1381.2019.1382>.

Blount, B.K., C.H. Felder, C.J. Martin, and E.B. Powery (eds.)

2007 *True to Our Native Land: An African American New Testament Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

Boer, R.

2008 *Last Stop before Antarctica: The Bible and Postcolonialism in Australia* (SemeiaSt 64; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Boer, R.

2013 *Postcolonialism and the Hebrew Bible: The Next Step* (SemeiaSt 70; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Bond, S.

2017 'Whitewashing Ancient Statues: Whiteness, Racism and Color in the Ancient World', *Forbes* (April 27). <https://www.forbes.com/sites/drsarahbond/2017/04/27/whitewashing-ancient-statues-whiteness-racism-and-color-in-the-ancient-world>.

Bowens, L.M.

2020 *African American Readings of Paul: Reception, Resistance, and Transformation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Brenner-Idan, A.

2016 'On Scholarship and Related Animals: A Personal View from and for the Here and Now', *JBL* 135: 6-17. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1351.2016.1352>.

Brett, M.G (ed.)

1996 *Ethnicity and the Bible* (BibInt 19; Leiden: Brill).

2009 *Decolonizing God: The Bible in the Tides of Empire* (Bible in the Modern World 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press).

Brett, M.G., and J. Havea (eds.)

2014 *Colonial Contexts and Postcolonial Theologies: Storyweaving in the Asia-Pacific* (Postcolonialism and Religions; New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Brett, M.G. and S.E. Hylan

2020 'Biblical Studies in a Pandemic', *JBL* 139: 597-99. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1393.2020.9>.

Brock, R.N., J.H. Kim, K. Pui-Lan, and S.A. Yang (eds.)

2007 *Off the Menu: Asian and Asian North American Women's Religion and Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press).

Brown, M.J.

2004 *Blackening of the Bible: The Aims of African American Biblical Scholarship* (African American Religious Thought and Life; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International).

Buell, D.K.

2014 'Canons Unbound', in *Feminist Biblical Studies in the 20th Century: Scholarship and Movement* (ed. E. Schüssler Fiorenza; BW 9.1; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 293-306.

2018 'Anachronistic Whiteness and the Ethics of Interpretation', in *Ethnicity, Race, Religion: Identities and Ideologies in Early Jewish and Christian Texts, and*

- in *Modern Biblical Interpretation* (ed. K.M. Hockey and D.G. Horrell; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark), 149-67.
- Buell, D. K. and C. J. Hodge
 2004 'The Politics of Interpretation: The Rhetoric of Race and Ethnicity in Paul', *JBL* 123: 235-51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3267944>.
- Byamungu, G.T.M.
 2006 'Postcolonial Discourse and the Use of the Hebrew Bible in African Theology: The Case of Joshua 9', in *Inculturation and Postcolonial Discourse in African Theology* (ed. E.P. Antonio; Society and Politics in Africa 14; New York: Lang), 209-40.
- Byron, G.L.
 2002 *Symbolic Blackness and Ethnic Difference in Early Christian Literature* (London: Routledge).
 2009 'Ancient Ethiopia and the New Testament: Ethnic Contexts and Racialized Subtexts', in *They Were All Together in One Place? Toward Minority Biblical Criticism* (ed. R.C. Bailey, T.-s. B. Liew and F.F. Segovia; SemeiaSt 57; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), 161-90.
 2019 'My Society of Biblical Literature Journey: Service, Scholarship, and Staying Connected to the Call', in *Women and the Society of Biblical Literature* (ed. N.L. Tilford. BSNA 29. Atlanta: SBL Press), 157-66.
- Byron, G.L. and V. Lovelace (eds.)
 2016 *Womanist Interpretations of the Bible: Expanding the Discourse* (SemeiaSt 85; Atlanta: SBL Press).
- Carey, G.
 2013 'Introduction and a Proposal: Culture, Power, and Identity in White New Testament Studies', in *Soundings in Cultural Criticism: Perspectives and Methods in Culture, Power, and Identity in the New Testament* (ed. F. Lozada Jr and G. Carey; Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 1-13.
- Casey, Z.A (ed.)
 2020 *Encyclopedia of Critical Whiteness Studies in Education* (Critical Understanding in Education 2; Leiden: Brill).
- Charleston, S.
 1996 'The Old Testament of Native America', in *Native and Christian: Indigenous Voices on Religious Identity in the United States and Canada* (ed. J. Treat; New York: Routledge), 68-80.
- Choi, J.Y.
 2014 'Asian/Asian American Interpretation', in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender Studies* (ed. J.M. O'Brien; Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1-9.
- Choi, J.Y. and W. Park
 2020 'Systemic Racism and the Global Pandemic: Negotiating Race and Ethnicity in Asian American Biblical Criticism', *Bible and Critical Theory* 16: 1-18.
- Clatterbuck, M.
 2017 *Crow Jesus: Personal Stories of Native Religious Belonging* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press).
- Collins, J.J.
 2005 *The Bible after Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Concannon, C.W.

- 2014 *When You Were Gentiles: Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence* (Synkrisis; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Copher, C.B.

- 1991 'The Black Presence in the Old Testament', in *Stony the Road We Trod: African American Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C.H. Felder; Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 146-64.

Cuéllar, G.L.

- 2019 *Empire, the British Museum, and the Making of the Biblical Scholar in the Nineteenth Century: Archival Criticism* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan).

Davidson, S.V.

- 2011 *Empire and Exile: Postcolonial Readings of the Book of Jeremiah* (LHBOTS 542; New York: T&T Clark).

Davidson, S.V.

- 2017 'From Sola Scriptura to Maroonage: Reflections on Caribbean Biblical Interpretation', *Canadian-American Theological Review* 6: 1-16.

Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic (eds.)

- 1997 *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic

- 2001 *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction* (New York: New York University Press).

Dube, M.W.

- 2000 *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (St. Louis: Chalice).

Dube, M. W (ed.)

- 2001 *Other Ways of Reading: African Women and the Bible* (GPBS 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Dube, M.W.

- 2015 'A Luta Continua: Toward Trickster Intellectuals and Communities', *JBL* 134: 890-902. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1344.2015.1915>.

Felder, C.H.

- 1989 *Troubling Biblical Waters: Race, Class, and Family* (Bishop Henry McNeal Turner Studies in North American Black Religion 3. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis).

Felder, C.H.

- 2014 'Beyond Eurocentric Biblical Interpretation: Reshaping Racial and Cultural Lenses in Christian Education', *JITC* 40: 5-20.

Felder, C.H (ed.)

- 1991 *Stony the Road We Trod: African American Biblical Interpretation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

Foskett, M.F. and J.K.-J. Kuan (eds.)

- 2006 *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading: Asian American Biblical Interpretation* (St. Louis: Chalice).

Frankenberg, R.

- 1993 *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

Gabrielle, H.

- 2020 'DesiCrit in New Testament Interpretation: Paul's Ambiguous Identity in Acts', *Bible and Critical Theory* 16: 19-40.

Gafney, W.

- 2017 'A Reflection on the Black Lives Matter Movement and Its Impact on My Scholarship', *JBL* 136: 204-207. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1361.2017.1363>

Galbraith, D.

- 2016 'The Perpetuation of Racial Assumptions in Biblical Studies', in *History, Politics and the Bible from the Iron Age to the Media Age: Essays in Honour of Keith W. Whitelam* (ed. J.G. Crossley and J. West; LHBOTS 651; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark), 116-34.

Grant, J.

- 1989 *White Women's Christ and Black Women's Jesus: Feminist Christology and Womanist Response* (AARAS 64; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Gushee, D.P.

- 2019 'In the Ruins of White Evangelicalism: Interpreting a Compromised Christian Tradition through the Witness of African American Literature', *JAAR* 87: 1-17.
2020 *After Evangelicalism: The Path to a New Christianity* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press).

Hagner, D.

- 2006 'The Place of Exegesis in the Postmodern World' in *History and Exegesis: New Testament Essays in Honor of Dr. E. Earle Ellis for His 80th Birthday* (ed. S.-W. Son. New York: T&T Clark), 292-308.

Harris, C.I.

- 1993 'Whiteness as Property', *Harvard Law Review* 106: 1709-91.

Harvey, V.A.

- 1966 *The Historian and the Believer: The Morality of Historical Knowledge and Christian Belief* (New York: Macmillan).

Havea, J.M.

- 2017 *Postcolonial Voices from Downunder: Indigenous Matters, Confronting Readings* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick).
2018 *Sea of Readings: The Bible in the South Pacific* (SemeiaSt 90; Atlanta: SBL Press).

Havea, J., M.P. Aymer, and S.V. Davidson (eds.)

- 2015 *Islands, Islanders, and the Bible: Ruminations* (SemeiaSt 77; Atlanta: SBL Press).

Havea, J.M., D.J. Neville, and E.M. Wainwright (eds.)

- 2014 *Bible, Borders, Belongings: Engaging Readings from Oceania* (SemeiaSt 75; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Haynes, S.R., and S. L. McKenzie

- 1999 *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Rev. and expanded ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Hendel, R.

- 2014 'Mind the Gap: Modern and Postmodern in Biblical Studies', *JBL* 133: 422-43. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbibllite.133.2.422>.

Heschel, S.

- 2008 *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Heschel, S.

- 2015 'The Slippery Yet Tenacious Nature of Racism: New Developments in Critical Race Theory and Their Implications for the Study of Religion and Ethics', *JSCE* 35: 3-27.

- Hidalgo, J.M.
 2013 'The Politics of Reading: US Latinas, Biblical Studies, and Retrofitted Memory in Demetria Martínez's *Mother Tongue*', *JFSR* 29: 120-31.
- Hidalgo, J.M.
 2018 'Latina/o/x Studies and Biblical Studies', *Brill Research Perspectives in Biblical Interpretation* 3: 1-98.
 2020 'Scripturalizing the Pandemic', *JBL* 139: 625-34. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1393.2020.14>
- Hockey, K.M., and D.G. Horrell (eds.)
 2018 *Ethnicity, Race, Religion: Identities and Ideologies in Early Jewish and Christian Texts, and in Modern Biblical Interpretation* (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark).
- Hoklotubbe, T.C. Choctaw
 2021 'Native American Interpretation of the Bible', *Oxford Biblical Studies Online*. February 17. <http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/opr/t998/e70>.
- Horrell, D.G.
 2017 'Paul, Inclusion and Whiteness: Particularizing Interpretation', *JSNT* 40: 123-47.
- Horrell, D.G.
 2020 *Ethnicity and Inclusion: Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Jackson Z.I.
 2020 *Becoming Human: Matter and Meaning in an Antiracist World* (Sexual Cultures. New York: New York University Press).
- Jennings, W.J.
 2010 *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Jennings, W.J.
 2020 *After Whiteness: An Education in Belonging* (Theological Education between the Times. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Joshi, K.Y.
 2020 *White Christian Privilege: The Illusion of Religious Equality in America* (New York: New York University Press).
- Junior, N.
 2020 The Mark of Cain and White Violence. *JBL* 139: 661-73. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1394.2020.2>
- Kelley, S.
 2002 *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology, and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship* (Biblical Limits. London: Routledge).
- Kennedy, T.M., J.I. Middleton, K. Ratcliffe, K.E. Welch, C. Prendergast, I. Shor, T.R. West, E. Cushman, M. Kendrick, and L. Albrecht
 2005 'Symposium: Whiteness Studies', *Rhetoric Review* 24: 359-402.
- Kidd, C.
 2006 *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Kidwell, C.S., H. Noley, and G.E. Tink Tinker
 2001 *A Native American Theology* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books).
- Kim, C.K.
 2018 'Are Asians the New Blacks? Affirmative Action, Anti-Blackness, and the "Sociometry" of Race'. *Du Bois Review* 15 (2): 217-44.

- Kim, J.Y.
 1999 'Are Asians Black? The Asian-American Civil Rights Agenda and the Contemporary Significance of the Black/White Paradigm', *Yale Law Journal* 108: 2385-412.
- Kim, U.Y. and S.A. Yang (eds.)
 2019 *T&T Clark Handbook of Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics* (London: T&T Clark).
- Kolia, B.F.
 2019 'Eve, the Serpent, and a Samoan Love Story: A Fāgogo Reading of Genesis 3: 1-19 and Its Implications for Animal Studies', *Bible and Critical Theory* 15: 156-63.
- Legaspi, M.C.
 2010 *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (OSHT, Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Levenson, J.D.
 1985 'Is There a Counterpart in the Hebrew Bible to New Testament Anti-Semitism?', *JES* 22: 242-60.
- Levinson, B.M.
 2008 'Reading the Bible in Nazi Germany: Gerhard von Rad's Attempt to Reclaim the Old Testament for the Church', *Int* 62: 238-54.
- Lieu, J.M. and J.W. Rogerson (eds.)
 2008 *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Liew, T.-s. B.
 2008 *What Is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics? Reading the New Testament* (Intersections. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).
 2017 'Black Scholarship Matters', *JBL* 136: 237-44. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1361.2017.1368>
- Liew, T.-s. B., and V.L. Wimbush
 2002 'Contact Zones and Zoning Contexts: From the Los Angeles "Riot" to a New York Symposium', *USQR* 56 (1-2): 21-40.
- Liew, T.-s. B. and G.A. Yee (eds.)
 2002 *The Bible in Asian America. Semeia* 90/91.
- Lim, C.M.S.
 2017 'The Impe/arative of Dialogue in Asian Hermeneutics within the Modern/Colonial World System: Renegotiating Biblical Pasts for Planetary Futures', *BibInt* 25 (4-5): 663-78.
- Lim, C.M.S.
 2018 'Undoing Chinese Privilege through Reading with the Other', *Journal of Law and Social Sciences* 7: 3-10.
 2019 *Contextual Biblical Hermeneutics as Multicentric Dialogue: Towards a Singaporean Reading of Daniel* (BibInt 175. Leiden: Brill).
- Lin, Y.-J.
 2020 'Musical Performance Practice and New Testament Textual Criticism: A Proposal for Creative Philology', *Early Christianity* 11: 71-93.
- Lipsitz, G.
 2009 *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).
- Lozada, F., Jr
 2017 *Toward a Latino/a Biblical Interpretation* (RBS 91; Atlanta: SBL Press).