

Gerstenberger's observations are pertinent. However, they seem to be based more on a personal opinion than the biblical data preceding the statement. In other words: I was missing the sequential argument leading to this statement. Toward the end of the entry, Gerstenberger reiterates the notion of plurality in Israelite's theological traditions (see earlier his *Theologies in the Old Testament*, trans. John Bowden [London: T&T Clark / Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002]) and suggests a number of key characteristics that have shaped theological thinking about worship to the present age. These include locales and architecture of worship (space); sacrifice and Eucharist; the Word of God; hymn singing as response and participation; supplication, lament, and thanksgiving; and contemplation, instruction, and wisdom (1:184–87).

As a final example of *OEBT's* approach, I have chosen Daniel R. Driver's entry on "Forgiveness," a key concept of biblical theology. The author introduces the topic within the larger context of modern philosophy and recognizes forgiveness's moral, relational, and God-centered characteristics—after all, in biblical and theological tradition it is God who is the agent of forgiveness (1:372). Driver's engagement of current philosophical thinking about forgiveness is followed by sections dealing with the data found in the HB, Judaism, and the NT. Driver concludes his entry with a brief reception history within the Christian tradition and modern appropriations that focus more on the horizontal dimension of forgiveness as opposed to a predominantly vertical dimension. Considering the complexity of marrying ancient concepts with modern sensitivities, I particularly appreciated his cautionary observation toward the end of the entry, where he noted: "There is an additional danger of distorting ancient evidence by absorbing it into the dominant contemporary categories of forgiveness. Recent scholarship often searches ancient literature for evidence of interpersonal forgiveness, although the very notion looks like a category error" (1:376).

These examples illustrate some of the challenging issues that *OEBT* is trying to tackle. The approach followed by the contributors is truly innovative and, as most of us know, innovation always carries inherent risks and challenges. Kudos to the editor and his team for their willingness to produce a reference tool that is consciously seeking to tread new ground, something that the editor described in his preface as being able to "zoom in" (to the biblical data) and "'zoom out' in order to see how shifting historical contexts both extend traditional interpretations and generate new ones" (1:xvi). Those seeking to integrate biblical exegesis and theological reflection will feel right at home in these two volumes.

Gerald A. Klingbeil  
Andrews University

Bonnie Howe and Joel B. Green, eds. *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014. Pp. vi + 292. ISBN 978-3-11-034978-8. \$112.00 cloth.

This volume is the fruit of six years of presentations at the Cognitive Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation section of SBL (2006–12), which itself is

an outgrowth of the burgeoning cognitive research in many academic fields. Cognitive Linguistics (CL) takes as axiomatic that cognition is fundamentally embodied and therefore grounded in experience. The 11 essays included are thus focused on “how language makes meaning, how a text evokes authority, and how contemporary readers interact with ancient texts” vis-à-vis this kind of embodied cognition (p. 2).

In “Motivating Biblical Metaphors for God: Refining the Cognitive Model,” Sweetser and DesCamp provide introductory concepts and terms for CL, particularly metaphor theory, building on their prior work. They discuss the metaphors and conceptual blends in which God is portrayed as father, rock, potter, and lover, among others, commenting on the intersubjective accessibility or inaccessibility that makes them productive and influential across time and cultures.

Robinette’s “Looking beyond the Tree in Jeremiah 17:5–8” combines rhetorical criticism with CL to elucidate the meaning of כְּעֵרֶר in Jer 17:6. She demonstrates that the typical translation, “shrub” or “bush,” is implausible, and argues instead for “destitute (person).” This passage is taken by some as an instance of the Doctrine of Two Ways. But Robinette argues that this is due to surface-level similarities with Psalm 1 that are mapped over the cognitive frames present in Jer 17:5–8, which focuses instead on the believer’s state of dependence and object of trust.

In “‘Don’t Think of a Voice!’: Divine Silence, Metaphor, and Mental Spaces in Selected Psalms of Lament,” Andrews builds on earlier narrative readings of several psalms of lament (Pss 28, 35, 39, 83, 109). He highlights how the notion of divine silence—a negative mental space—in fact presupposes, a positive space, namely, a God who speaks. Invoking the concept of divine silence thus “call[s] into being a cognitive reality in which God Speaks and acts” (p. 71, emphasis original).

Next, Lundhaug contributes “The Fruit of the Tree of Life: Ritual Interpretation of the Crucifixion in the *Gospel of Philip*,” in which he employs conceptual blend and frame analysis. While many deny that the *Gospel of Philip* contains any soteriology grounded in the cross, Lundhaug shows the intertextual influence of Scripture and ritual practice. There is a “coherent theology of the cross” that becomes evident in this otherwise “cryptic, allusive, and non-linear text” (p. 97).

Von Thaden’s “Pauline Rhetorical Invention: Seeing 1 Corinthians 6:12–7:7 through Conceptual Integration Theory” combines V. Robbins’s sociorhetorical models with CL conceptual integration theory. He shows how 1 Cor 6:12–7:7 is a coherent argument in which wisdom, apocalyptic, and priestly cultural frames appear in *rhetorolects* (rhetorical dialects), and are employed to create an persuasive argument.

In “Sapiential Synesthesia: The Conceptual Blending of Light and Word in Ben Sira’s Wisdom Instruction,” Goering investigates how cultural frames inform metaphorical mapping. The use of light imagery to describe wisdom instruction in Ben Sira bespeaks ancient assumptions about the anatomy and function of eyes and ears. Seeing was associated with continuity and similarity, and hearing with discontinuity and difference (p. 136). Thus, Goering finds that to some extent physical domains of cognition operate with and inform cultural

self-understanding, in this case “modes of acquiring knowledge in the Jewish wisdom tradition” (p. 141).

Nielsen then contributes “The Cognitive Structures in Galatians 1:4,” which uses CL approaches to describe “disparate” but innovative ideas in Paul’s theology (p. 145). While many commentators find the sacrificial and apocalyptic language in Gal 1:4 to be unrelated, Nielsen demonstrates Paul’s cognitive process in which Jesus’ voluntary death amounts to the turning of the ages. This conceptual blend flows from Paul’s understanding of Jesus’ identity and work that in turn formed the foundation for later Christian theology.

In “Who Is in Charge? Mental Space Analysis and Visualization in a Textual Study, Applied to 1 Samuel 28:3–25,” Vroon-van Vugt develops Fauconnier and Turner’s blend diagrams for more complex narrative and dialogue. By building on the work of other scholars, Vroon-van Vugt uses Saul’s consultation with the witch at Endor in 1 Sam 28 to demonstrate a sophisticated model in which narrative shifts and developments may be analyzed simultaneously with a cognitive nuance.

In van Wolde’s “Cognitive Grammar at Work in Sodom and Gomorrah” the principles of Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar (CG) are introduced and combined with linguistic and cultural analysis. In particular, the “cultural categories and cognitive domains” operative in Gen 18–19 are examined in order to explain the passage in its wider context (p. 198). Among other things, Van Wolde finds that Lot misunderstood “the kind of knowledge” the city inhabitants sought of his guests, which she suggests was merely investigatory (p. 221).

Then Parris contributes “1 John 1:5–10: Conditionals and Performativity,” in which he investigates conditional constructions by means of Mental Space Blending, CG, and metaphor theory. The conceptual contrast grammaticalized in conditionals functions on multiple levels, and Parris finds that these constructions activate mental spaces in the reader to facilitate interpretation.

Finally, in “Translating ‘Thinking’ and ‘Believing’ in the Bible,” Sanders employs the Basic Communicative Spaces Network approach to analyze causal connectives and “thinking” words in modern Dutch and English translations. She notes a trend to disambiguate causal structure in translated texts and yet increase narrative character subjectivity. Analyzing five narrative texts, Sanders finds that these translations add interpretive elements to shift focus toward internal (subjective) thoughts of the characters, especially with simplified portrayals of abstract “thinking” words.

A few comments about the volume. As a compendium of essays, the level of methodological sophistication and quality fluctuates. Along with the introduction, the contribution by Sweetser and DesCamp is most helpful for newcomers to CL, although useful definitions, tables, and applications appear throughout. To some extent, every essay demonstrates the potential of CL as an avenue of fruitful research in biblical studies, pointing toward fresh answers to old questions. Regrettably, the price point of this volume may prove detrimental to the cause. Most readers will likely dip into a library copy of this volume as it suits their interests and research agenda. Hopefully in so doing, more will become involved in this promising field for study of the biblical texts.

*William A. Ross*  
*University of Cambridge*