

Reading Yee's Intersectionality as an Intervening Counterdiscourse to Whiteness

Gregory L. Cuéllar, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary

Abstract

This article offers a critical reading of Gale A. Yee's presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature in 2019 that—in its focus on her contestations of whiteness—yields an intervening counterdiscourse. I argue that Yee's counterdiscourse comes in the form of an intersectionalizing strategy that renders whiteness visible as a culturally constructed and socio-historically produced racial category. It is the contestatory potential of this strategy, particularly in terms of stimulating an ethical and political critique of whiteness, that allows us to use it as an intervening counterdiscourse. Though her discussion of whiteness and visible renderings are brief in her presidential address, Yee bravely sets up a series of intersectional sites of whiteness for future interrogation. Among the most provocative include investigating “the ideologies of white privilege and white supremacy and the structures that legitimate and sustain them” (Yee 2020, 13).

Key Words

intersectionality, race, whiteness, orientalism, biblical studies, minoritized biblical criticism

Why did it take 139 years for the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) to elect its first Asian-American and first woman of color as its president? The same perplexing question can be posed for SBL's other unprecedented presidential milestones, like the lapse of 107 years before the Society elected its first woman president, Prof. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, and the sedulous passing of 130 years before its first person of color, Prof. Vincent Wimbush, assumed the office. This breakthrough in the representation of women and people of color in SBL's presidential leadership provides cause for long overdue celebration and yet, at the same time, familiar sorrow.

Assuming the presidency as the first Asian-American woman of a Society that since its inception has been a majority white male organization points to Prof. Gale Yee's tenacity, brilliance, collegiality, political savvy, and prolific scholarly production. Yet, on the other hand, the fact that it took this long is still shocking. A similar reaction was expressed in [Wimbush's presidential address](#) when he spoke of the scarcity of African American representation in the Society: “The fact that the most recent history of the Society (in observance of the centennial) does not even mention black folks, the fact that we cannot point to the official regularly scheduled

gathering of two or three African Americans in discourse before the eighth decade of the last century, is shocking” (2011, 7).

In her 1987 [presidential address, Schüssler Fiorenza](#) echoed a similar lament for the pervasive underrepresentation of women and people of color in the Society with these words: “I am privileged to inaugurate what will, it is hoped, be a long line of women presidents, consisting not only of white women but also of women of color, who are woefully underrepresented in the discipline” (1988, 6).

Thirty-two years later, Schüssler Fiorenza’s hope for a woman of color as SBL president was finally fulfilled in 2019 with Yee’s presidency. Unfortunately, her woeful vision of underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities in the profession continues to haunt the Society (SBL, 2019)—for as [Yee herself stated in the first line of her address](#), “It is a little daunting, as the first Asian American and the first woman of color, to be elected president of the Society of Biblical Literature” (2020, 7). What does it say about the Society when its three first minoritized presidents construed its relationship to women and people of color with trauma-related words like “shocking,” “woeful,” and “daunting?” Conversely, does the centenary existence of a white, male leadership structure point to a prevailing “ethos” (Schüssler Fiorenza 1988, 9) in the Society that is abusive and hence traumatic for women and people of color? Indeed, the late inclusion of minoritized scholars into the Society’s presidential leadership iterates a deviation from a professional norm that since its inception in 1880 privileged white males. Year after year before Schüssler Fiorenza, the Society’s majority white male membership not only grew quickly (e.g., from eight in 1880 to fifty-seven in 1881 to about three thousand in 2018 [SBL 1881, 211–212; SBL 2019]), but also by the early twentieth century it had solidified its international reputation as an authority in the scientific study of the Bible (Montgomery 1918, 5). Hence by 1987, Schüssler Fiorenza saw fit to give this presidential assessment of the Society’s accrued power in biblical knowledge production: “Interpretive communities such as the SBL are not just scholarly investigative communities, but also authoritative communities. They possess the power to ostracize or to embrace, to foster or to restrict membership, to recognize and to define what ‘true scholarship’ entails” (Schüssler Fiorenza 1988, 8). By the late twentieth century, the bulk of SBL’s scholarly prestige was the result of persistent investments in white male membership and their Western, scientific authority.

To ensure the integrity—or rather homogeneity—of this governing infrastructure, the Society relied on an exclusionary logic for the first hundred years of its existence. This logic was reified in its constitution, by-laws, committee reports, and record-keeping as well as performed in the array of credentialing procedures, academic spaces, and regimented activities at its annual meetings. Consider this male-centric description of the Society’s presidential office in 1887: “It shall be the duty of the President, or, in his absence, of the Vice-President, to preside at all the meetings of the Society” (SBL 1887, 71). The gender-specific phrase “in his absence”

also appeared in the 1955 version of the Society's by-laws. When considering the list of presidents from 1880 to 1986, it is clear that the "his" referred to white males holding the office (SBL 1955, xxiii). Hence before hearing from the Society's first white woman, African American man, Latino from the Global South, and Asian-American woman presidents, its white male majority members were recruited, mentored, validated, briefed, and inspired by a long chain of white male presidents (SBL, n.d.). Here, white masculinity combined with knowledge-validating procedures and modes of professionalization ensured the hundred-year exclusion of women from the presidency (despite their early membership) (Taylor 2019, 1). Moreover, as gleaned from Wimbush's presidential address, these exclusions also complied with a racial logic that deemed white males as intellectually superior to women and people of color. As he disclosed in 2010, "I suggest that 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). Early membership lists (1890–1829) confirm that the Society's cultural foundations were calibrated to a majority white male ethos thereby securing their dominance in realms of leadership. (Before 1930, the Society's complete membership lists were published in the December issues of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*) This combined with Wimbush's grievance about the steady void in Black membership provides specificity as to who exactly created, performed, and sustained the "racialized discursive practices and politics."

To the public, the Society has advertised its purpose as promoting scientific-based studies of the bible by the reading and discussion of original papers. Yet within the first hundred years of its existence, its exclusionary logic had yielded primarily an all-white male leadership structure, membership profile, and credentialing apparatus. For Wimbush, his discovery of the Society's white identity was found simply by recognizing the egregious absence of "black membership." And when there was Black membership, he stated that "the Society did not recognize them and did little to support them or resist the polluted status quo" (Wimbush 2011, 8). Though Wimbush pointed us to the results of a racializing power dynamic operating within the Society, we are left to discover its specific nature on our own. Among the unresolved questions: How does scientific authority (e.g., textual criticism, historical criticism, biblical archaeology) become synonymous with white masculinity in the Society? How do peer relationships, professional networking, credentialing bodies, and award committees within it legitimate the conflation between white masculinity and valid scientific knowledge?

Rendering Whiteness Visible

As for recognizing the particularities of Wimbush's shocking diagnosis—literally a crisis of representation in the Society—Yee iterates the importance of intersectional thinking as an activist mode for interrogating "the ideologies of white privilege and

white supremacy” (2020, 13). Here, the burden of diagnosing racialized politics lies not with minoritized people—or what she calls “the hyphenated”—but rather with white people themselves. In her words, “many white people do not consciously see themselves or their conceptual frameworks as raced. Instead of acknowledging its own sociohistorical production, whiteness sets itself up as the universal norm, disparaging all others as aberrations” (Yee 2020, 13). On the other hand, the way minoritized people have come to acknowledge “whiteness” is through its production of violence (both affects and effects). For Yee, one negative affect that whiteness has pushed on her as an Asian American is a sense of “internalized oppression.” For a fuller biography of the racializing violence of whiteness, she directs us to her 2006 essay “Yin/Yang is Not Me: An Exploration into an Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics.” In her words, “the historical responses of American white society to markers like my name and face has been racism. I have experienced this racism in its violent forms as a child growing up and in more subtle forms of American Orientalism, which I have consumed—a murky brew of both external [effects] and internalized [affects] oppression” (Yee 2006, 160). As a counterdiscourse, Yee (2020, 13) proposes an intersectionalizing strategy that renders whiteness visible as a culturally constructed and socio-historically produced racial category. It is the contestatory potential of this strategy, particularly in terms of stimulating an ethical and political critique of whiteness, that allows us to use it as an intervening counterdiscourse. Interrogating whiteness requires that we divest from its normative status and dismantle its racializing cultural materials (e.g., beliefs, values, ideologies, myths) or what Joe Feagin calls “white racial frame” (2010, 3). Though her discussion of whiteness and visible renderings are brief in her presidential address, Yee bravely sets up a series of intersectional sites of whiteness for future interrogation. Among the most provocative include investigating “the ideologies of white privilege and white supremacy and the structures that legitimate and sustain them” (Yee 2020, 13). For whereas we can infer whiteness from Wimbush’s diagnosis, Yee’s address revealed the exact coordinates of the white racializing enterprise—white privilege and white supremacy. Clearly, the term “white” not only refers to phenotypic whiteness but also serves as the locus of a political project of privilege and supremacy that is fueled by discursive fields (ideologies) and material dimensions (structures).

When applied to the very first proposition Yee averred in her address, “the first Asian American and the first woman of color to be elected president of the Society of Biblical Literature” (2020, 7), her intersectional counterdiscourse beckons the question, why did this take 139 years? By foregrounding her minoritized condition in her lead statement, I am led to use her visible renderings of the white racializing enterprise to interrogate the Society of Biblical Literature. Viewed as an intersectional site of whiteness, what are its current investments in white privilege and white supremacy? To answer this, I find Yee’s activist inflection of intersectionality to be extremely helpful, in part because this version channels

intersectionality's political edge and social justice agenda with "the goal of disrupting dominance and challenging systemic inequality in today's world" (2020, 12). Hence, rather than apply intersectional analyses to the ancient world, which I am reluctant to join, what does this approach tell us about the inequalities that whiteness has produced in "today's" Society of Biblical Literature? Again, Yee's first proposition stated at the outset of her address offers guidance on where to begin our activist intersectional analysis of the Society. It all hinges on the word "first."

By declaring herself as the first Asian American and woman of color SBL president, she brings into view the other presidential firsts of the Society. Indeed, interrogating intersectionally the late election of the first white woman, first African American man, first Latino from the Global South, and first Asian-American woman SBL presidents harnesses the spirit of Kimberlé Crenshaw's project which is to make visible the lived experiences of women of color and marginalized people for the purpose of making visible and addressing their marginalization (Crenshaw 1989, 140; Alexander-Floyd 2012, 9). As Crenshaw shows with black women, it is when Yee tells her own story of being slighted, marginalized, and circumscribed by white gatekeepers in the guild that we see the racializing violence of whiteness. As she recounts in her 2006 essay, "Except for my face and name, none of the usual ethnic markers of being Asian fit me, yet white society compels me, however well-intended, to explain how my Asian Americanness makes me different" (Yee 2006, 153). What if we heard from all minoritized members of the Society regarding their lived experiences with the white racializing enterprise in the guild? In Wimbush's vexing words, "they surely had stories to tell, lessons for our edification" (2011, 8). Would their stories render whiteness visible enough to eradicate its production of racial inequality and maintenance of discriminatory practices in the guild?

In reading Nikol Alexander-Floyd's work, however, the production and assessment of narratives only takes up part of the critiquing legacy of intersectionality. For her, this liberatory project is also committed to "challenging business as usual in mainstream disciplines' habits of knowledge production" (Alexander-Floyd 2012, 9). Still today, the positivist approach of scientific-based historical criticism serves as the benchmark for valid biblical knowledge in the academy in general and the Society in particular. The magnetic pull of this branch of knowledge production draws our socially "unfettered" gaze upon archaeological objects with the conviction that the ancient world can be fully reassembled. Yet through intersectionality, we are able to see how white privilege and even white supremacy are perpetuated within this history-making enterprise. One problematic feature of scientific-based historical criticism is its devaluation of subjectivity for both the biblical critic and the artifacts they use to support their arguments about the ancient world. As intersectionality has demonstrated, the notion of reaching a pristine disembodied state of being when analyzing ancient texts and artifacts is not just absurd but socially destructive. And yet this is exactly what historical critics

claim to have achieved in their research, which is an objective, unbiased, truth-claim about the biblical text using visible artifacts.

The Politics of Eurocentric Male Citations

Since its inception in nineteenth-century Europe, historical critical knowledge production has been an ethical haven for white male biblical scholars, in part because it has allowed their whiteness to go unseen and thus uninterrogated. For again, core to its mission is entering a detached state in which critics simply sever themselves from all cultural, social, and political entanglements. Here, European male orientalist and historical critics alike were self-appointed archetypes of reaching this detached cognitive position and over time became the default arbiters of valid knowledge in the field of biblical studies. Assisting in their ascension in the first hundred years was racial science—also called biblical ethnology—and its championing of white racial superiority in areas like civilizational capacities, intellect, morals, and physical beauty. (Although not a historical critic, the biblical ethnology [i.e., racial science] of nineteenth-century British orientalist Archibald Henry Sayce was an authority in the field of biblical studies, beginning with his book *The Races of the Old Testament* (1891). In 1904, the Council of the Society of Biblical Literature affirmed his authority in the field by recommending him for honorary membership—a distinction he held until his death in 1933.)

We see a glimpse of this superiority complex iterated in [David G. Lyon's 1910 SBL presidential address](#), titled “On the Archaeological Exploration of Palestine.” In his description of European archaeology in Western Asia, he stated the following:

The explorer [European] is much hampered by the ignorance, superstition, and trickery of the natives [Asian], who believe that he is digging for treasure, and who invent and circulate for selfish ends the most absurd reports. And while these natives can be trained to efficiency in the use of their own simple utensils, it is very difficult to make them effective users of improved modern tools. (Lyon 1911, 7–9)

Affirmed in his public claim was a value system in which the European explorer was the standard-bearer of modern progress and civilizational advancement. In stark contrast, Lyon viewed the natives of Southwest Asia to be in an irreversible state of mental and social inferiority—an accepted rationale that legitimated their subjugation to Western empires (Cuéllar 2019, 15–48). Though this orientalist and explicitly racist rhetoric may be less apparent in present-day SBL presidential addresses, its unchecked legacy has reduced its rate of depreciation in the field of biblical studies. The guild cannot assume that it will simply disappear or dissolve under the weight of new historical critical scholarship. To go uninterrogated only ensures future returns on the guild's early investments in white supremacist ideology. Hence, a viable corrective measure is a targeted and tenacious critique of this rhetoric in the sources that historical critics cite to support their arguments about life in the ancient world. Here, intersectionality as a critical race Black feminist

approach directs our interrogative gaze to the politics of citation (Alexander-Floyd 2012, 18). When substantiating a historical claim about the biblical text, who is cited the most, European scholars or minoritized scholars? How do bibliographies perpetuate the conflation of white masculinity with expert status in the field? In what ways does the whiteness of our citations re-inscribe the same notions of Asian inferiority expressed in Lyon's 1910 presidential address?

In the "Application" section of her presidential address, Yee deployed intersectionality to analyze widows in ancient Israel. Using 2 Kings 4:1–7 as her focal text, she focused her reading on the widow's relations of power—interpersonal and structural. The historical objectives of Yee's reading put intersectionality in conversation with primarily historical critical knowledge producers—the majority of whom are European male biblical scholars. Though the result of this discursive interaction yielded a fresh historical portrait of widowhood in ancient Israel, her overreliance on European male historical critics seems to deplete—albeit inadvertently—intersectionality of its radical position. As Nikol Alexander-Floyd has argued, "tailoring intersectionality to conform to received methodological priorities within disciplines, however, feeds into the dominance of positivist approaches" (2012, 18). In reclaiming intersectionality's radical position, I am ethically drawn to interrogate two European male biblical scholars that Yee cited to support her intersectional reading of widows – Marten Stol and J. Alberto Soggin. Indeed, I am cued by the critical race reflex of intersectionality—the kind reacting to anti-black female racism—to audit these two scholars' investments in racializing rhetoric.

One racial construct of white supremacy that both biblical critics have used in their historical critical scholarship is "Negro." In his book *Women in the Ancient Near East*, Stol, a Dutch biblical scholar (2016, 689) reproduces an English translation of a Sumerian text in which the term "Negro" is added anachronistically to define Blackness—"Black like Meluḥḥan [=a Negro]." Although absent in the essay by Soggin, an Italian biblical scholar that Yee cited, the term "Negro" appears in all three editions (1970, 1980, 1989) of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, which was translated by Rev. Dr. John Bowden, editor and managing director of Student Christian Movement Press. In the third section of the book, Jeremiah 13:23 is rendered in English as "the negro [translation of Cushite/כּוּשִׁי] cannot change the colour of his skin nor a leopard that of his coat" (Soggin 1989, 347). The use of "negro" here was a direct translation of Soggin's (1974, 410) Italian version: "*un negro non può mutare il colore della sua pelle né un leopardo quello del suo manto.*" In following the signifying investments made to this label, it is hard to avoid its origins within the discursive fields of European empire-building and white supremacy. Perhaps its most lethal inflections were how it conflated phenotypic Blackness with the conditionality of slavery (Sawyer 2020, 48) and then, within racial science, associating Black people with perpetual savagery (Prichard 1813, 236–237). Eventually in US society, these two inflections of "Negro" elided into a state

ontology of the Black body as socially lacking and naturally inclined to criminality. The yielding reality for the Black community is what Malcom X called a “police state.” As he stated in a 1962 speech after a police killing in Los Angeles, “Once the police have convinced the white public that the ‘So-called’ Negro community is a criminal element they can go in and question, brutalize, murder, unarmed innocent Negroes and the white population is gullible enough to back them up. This makes the Negro community a police state” (Sawyer 2020, 62). Here, Malcom X not only signaled the white supremacist inflection of the label “Negro” with his phrase “so-called” but also pointed to its resulting product of state-sanctioned violence against the Black community.

If intersectional hermeneutics requires an interrogation of writers—as Yee proposed—how have biblical scholars contributed to the white supremacist framing of the “So-called Negro”? Consider the portrait of “the Negro” that British orientalist A. H. Sayce gave in his seminal book on biblical ethnology, *The Races of the Old Testament*:

He has but little sympathy for art, except music, of which he is passionately fond. He is moved by emotion rather than by argument, and it is alleged that negro children seldom advance in their studies after the age of fourteen. In character the negro is indolent, superstitious, affectionate, and faithful. The two latter qualities have him to be sought after as slave or servant (1891, 146).

Published in 1891, Sayce’s book was likely a publication that the SBL Council considered as part of his distinguished attainments when deciding his candidacy for honorary membership in 1904 (SBL 1905, ii). A defining feature of Sayce’s contributions to the Society’s knowledge production enterprise was his biblical ethnology, as attested in his published essay “The Tenth Chapter of Genesis” for the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1925). Revealed in this article was his positive racial genealogy of white people, or what he called “a blond race with blue eyes” (Sayce 1925, 198). The Society benefited from Sayce’s honorary membership for nearly thirty years, until his death in 1933. As stated in the memorial resolutions read at the Society’s annual meeting in 1933, “Our Society has lost a distinguished name from its list by the death of this noted scholar” (SBL 1934, vii).

Conclusion

Almost ninety years after Sayce’s death, the Society added Prof. Gale Yee’s name to its distinguished list of presidents. In journeying through her address, Yee (2020, 7) started us at her social location as a Chinese American from the “poorest sections of Chicago’s South Side.” Then she carefully assembled her intersectional hermeneutics—with the caution that “it should not be depoliticized simply as a general abstract theory . . . neutralizing its political edge and its potential for justice-oriented change” (Yee 2020, 12). Armed with intersectionality’s activist impulse—

which, as she stated, disrupts dominance and challenges systemic inequality—she pivots us toward the oppressive edifice of whiteness. Here, she directs us to investigate the structures of dominance and inequalities created by white privilege and white supremacy. Ready to jump off this precipice for the cause of racial justice, Yee’s journey took an unexpected turn in the latter half of her address, particularly in her application section. My resistance to following her at the end only stemmed from the activist impulse that she assembled at the beginning of her address. An impulse that impels me to eradicate white privilege and white supremacy in the field of biblical studies.

Reference List

- Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G. 2012. “Disappearing Acts: Reclaiming Intersectionality in the Social Sciences in a Post-Black Feminist Era.” *Feminist Formations* 24.1: 1–25 (doi:10.1353/ff.2012.0003).
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1.8: 139–167.
- Cuéllar, Gregory L. 2019. *Empire, the British Museum, and the Making of the Biblical Scholar in the Nineteenth Century*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Feagin, Joe R. 2010. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*. New York: Routledge.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. 1988. “The Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: Decentering Biblical Scholarship.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107.1 (March): 3–17 (doi:10.2307/3267820).
- Lyon, David G. 1911. “On the Archaeological Exploration of Palestine: Presidential Address, 1910.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 30.1: 1–17.
- Montgomery, James A. 1919. “Present Tasks of American Biblical Scholarship.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 38.1: 1–14 (https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/presidentialaddresses/JBL38_1_1&2Montgomery1918.pdf).
- Prichard, James Cowles. 1813. *Researches into the Physical History of Man*. London: John and Arthur Arch.
- Sawyer, Michael E. 2020. *Black Minded*. London: Pluto.
- Sayce, Archibald Henry. 1891. *The Races of the Old Testament*. London: Religious Tract Society.
- . 1925. “The Tenth Chapter of Genesis.” *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature* 44.3/4: 193–202 (<https://doi.org/10.2307/3260251>).
- Society of Biblical Literature (SBL). 2019. “2019 SBL Membership Data.” Membership. Last modified January 2019 (<https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/sblMemberProfile2019.pdf>).
-

- . 1887. “Constitution and By-Laws.” *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 7.2: 71–77 (<https://doi.org/10.2307/3268733>).
- . 1955. “Constitution and By-Laws.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74.1: xxi–xiv (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3261947>).
- . 1881. “Proceedings in December, 1881.” *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature* 1.2 (December): 209–212 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268741>).
- . 1905. “Proceedings in December, 1904.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 24.2: i–xii (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3260224>).
- . 1934. “Proceedings, December 28th and 29th, 1933.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 53.1 (April): i–xxxiv (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3259334>).
- . n.d. “SBL PRESIDENTS” (<https://www.sbl-site.org/SBLpresidents.aspx>).
- Soggin, J. Alberto. 1974. *Introduzione all'Antico Testamento. Dalle origini alla chiusura del canone alessandrino*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice.
- . 1989. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Translated by John Bowden. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.
- Stol, Marten. 2016. *Women in the Ancient Near East*. Boston, MA and Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Taylor, Marion Ann. 2019. “Celebrating 125 Years of Women in the Society of Biblical Literature (1894–2019)” In *Women and the Society of Biblical Literature*, edited by Nicole L. Tilford, 1–46. Atlanta, GA: SBL.
- Wimbush, Vincent L. 2011. “Interpreters—Enslaving/Enslaved/Runagate.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (1): 5–24 ([doi:10.2307/41304184](https://doi.org/10.2307/41304184)).
- Yee, Gale A. 2006. “Yin/Yang is Not Me: An Exploration into an Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics.” In *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading: Asian American Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Mary F. Foskett, Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan, and John Ahn, 152–163. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.
- . 2020. “Thinking Intersectionally: Gender, Race, Class, and the Etceteras of Our Discipline.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 139.1: 7–26 (<https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1391.2020.1b>). Bibliography text



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)