Ganna V. Izyumtseva

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University,
Kyiv, Ukraine

CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS
IN THE PENTATEUCH TEXTS OF ENGLISH BIBLE
(NEW KING JAMES VERSION)

Bibliographic Description:

Abstract
The research study explored the Pentateuch texts to elicit conceptual metaphors that allow understanding of metaphysical (sacred) reality, and to characterize essential for its conceptualization cognitive structures. The analysis of the consistent patterns of metaphorical expansion from source-domain physical reality onto target-domain metaphysical reality of the Pentateuch was carried out within the framework of theolinguistics. It has revealed that onto transcendental (sacred) reality are metaphorically mapped as source domains: 1) tri-dimensional space (verticality, centre-periphery, distance, place, object, container, etc.); 2) human (physical, physiological, psychological features); 3) human interpersonal relationships (family relationships, social roles, status, authority, etc.). It has been proven that understanding of metaphysical reality is framed by the following conceptual metaphors: GOD'S STATUS IS UP, GOD IS OBJECT, BOWING DOWN IS BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL, BOWING DOWN IS DOWN, BLESSING IS UP, STATUS IS UP, LAW STATUS IS DOWN, IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE, THE TREE OF LIFE / THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE ARE CENTRAL / IMPORTANT, LEARNING IS EATING THE FRUIT, CROSS IS CENTRAL/IMPORTANT, GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME, GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION, HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS, CLEAN PEOPLE IS HOLY PEOPLE, HOLINESS IS PROXIMITY TO GOD, THE WORD OF GOD IS BREAD, ACCESSIBILITY TO GOD IS PROXIMITY, GOD'S COMMANDMENTS ARE CENTRAL, HEAVENS IS UP, HEAVENS IS THE PLACE, HEAVENS IS CONTAINER, ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT, GOD IS PERSON, GOD IS CREATOR, GOD IS KING, GOD IS FATHER, GOD IS JUDGE, GOD IS SHEPHERD, GOD IS THE MAN OF WAR, GOD IS HUSBAND OF HIS PEOPLE, GOD IS HELPER, GOD IS HEALER, GOD IS FRIEND, GOD IS THE LORD, GOD IS PROVIDER, GOD IS THE GUIDE, GOD IS THE SOJOURNER, COVENANT IS STRUCTURE, COVENANT IS OBJERCT, IDOLATRY IS ADULTERY,

ANGEL IS PERSON, SINNING IS DEVIATING / SWIRLING FROM GOD'S WAY, GOD'S COMMENDMENDS ARE THE PATH, MORAL CHOICE IS CHOICE OF WAY, LEADING A MORAL LIFE IS MAKING A JOURNEY ON GOD'S WAY.

The results indicated high relevance of theolinguistics, which adds a theological dimension to the investigation and secures the proper understanding of religious texts under investigation.

Keywords: *theolinguistics, the Pentateuch, conceptual metaphor, concept, image-schema, metaphorical expansion.*

1. Introduction.

Essential for modern anthropocentric linguistics pursuit of integral knowledge motivates researchers to investigate linguistic reality through prism of interaction of secular and religious worldviews. Such tendency brings into view the need to re-examine linguistic heritage in the light of the approaches allowing investigation of language in strong connection with principle aspects of human existence (Postovalova 2012, 2016). Theolinguistics (theological linguistics), which has emerged as the theology, religious anthropology and linguistics overlap, is one of such advanced approaches (D. Crystal, O. Gadomsky, E. Kucharska-Drayss, N. Mechkovska, J. P. van Noppen, V. I. Postovalova and others). According to Postovalova, *homo loquens religious* as a peculiar type of a language personality is the focus of its research. Within the more general framework of investigation, it is transempirical communication (Postovalova 2016: 200). At present, theolinguistics continues developing its research vocabulary and methodological basis. Theolinguists already use both linguistic and theological toolkit to conduct linguistic investigation of religious language. Although responses to some issues as, for instance, the Athos dispute on God's name interpretation, may never be found, this science holds much promise. It forms the basis for researchers to explain a number of theolinguistic issues by implementing scientific theoretical and empirical methods that allow meticulous structuring of all without exception human experience.

Among available methods (hermeneutic, comparative-historical, discursive, cognitive etc.), preference is given to methods of cognitive linguistics. Firstly, because cognitive linguistics allows searching the subconscious (Kubryakova 1996: 90) at the level of sense formation, that is at the conceptual level. In addition, religious concepts do not constitute an autonomous type; and thus, can be studied against other concepts (Boyer 2001). Secondly, since metaphysical (sacred) realities are abstract, one of main ways of their realization is metaphorisation. This process is the interaction of knowledge structures of a conceptual source-domain (perceptual experience) and target-domain (abstract), whereby conceptualization of metaphysical (sacred) in terms of perceptual experience is achieved (Lakoff 2008; Chudinov, Budaev 2007). In this way, metaphysical realities are expressed with the help of conceptual metaphor that becomes a cognitive mechanism of their modeling and comprehension.

In her research "YAHWH is the Husband of His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation", Stienstra (1993) points out that structuring the divine based on our limited perceptual experience is never complete. Therefore, anything we say about transcendental essence is a matter of partially structuring the concept, in other words is partially true. As the researcher stresses, on the one hand, the "use of metaphors to 'describe' God has inherent danger as God is 'totally different' from our physical world" (p. 51). However, on the other hand, metaphor and analogical language is the only possible way of expressing the divine (Ibid.).

Generalizing from the aforesaid, it should be noted that it is theolinguistic investigations that offer promising way to reconcile the issue. The discipline not only employs the methodological framework of conceptual metaphor to disclose the hidden knowledge about human experiences, but it also adds the theological dimension to

investigations that will secure the truthful understanding of vital truth and without which expanding of our world view horizon is impossible.

2. Literature Review.

Over the last decades, the volumes of publications have appeared testifying about active investigations of Biblical and the Bible-related material. Here are some of them "Metaphor and God-talk" (1999), "The Bible through Metaphor and Translation" (2003), Lieven Boeve, Kurt Freyaerts (Ed.); "Job 28: Cognition in Context" (Biblical Interpretation Series) (2003), E. Van Wolde (Ed.); "Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies" (2014), Howe Bonnie, B. Joel (Ed.); "Religion, Language, and the Human Mind" (2017), Paul Chilton and Monika Kopytowska (Ed.) and others.

As the analysis of publications have shown, the most attractive spheres of investigations are the study of conceptual field (T. P. Vilchinska (2010, 2011, 2013, 2014), P. V. Matskiv (2006, 2014, 2016), M. V. Skab (2008, 2009, 2015, 2018), A. Barcelona (1999), A. Basson (2006), O. Jakel (1999), Ph. King (2012), Lam (2012), T. R. Wardlaw (2008, 2010), E. van Wolde (2006, 2008, 2009, 2013), K. Zacharias (2004) and the study of metaphors (R. Bischops (2018), M. Th. DesCamp (2005, 2014), H. Hecke (2019), K. Marcin (2018), A. Somov (2014), P. M. Shitikov (2013), N. Stienstra (1993), J. Steen (1997), E. E. Sweetser (2014)).

Investigations of Alpatov, Boldyrev (2008), Korolyova, Cherkhava (2017) employ cognitive-matrix analysis that provides the gateway to different cognitive contexts in a course of analysis of religious texts. It is noteworthy to mention here the method of a cognitive relational approach developed by Ellen van Wolde based on the theory of Ronald Langacker (Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition and Context, 2009). Her method allows analysis of cognitive structures emerging as a result of interaction of Biblical words, texts and historical complexes in the light of massive concrete as well as metaphysical social and cultural contexts.

In their works Kovecses (The Biblical Story Retold; A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective, 2011) and Sweetser, Descamp (Motivating Biblical Metaphors for God Refining the Cognitive Model, 2014) re-examine major cognitive models characterizing Divine-human relationship. Kovecses reestablishes a fact that conceptualisation of main Christian truth does not require special "sacred" conceptual device, but it is provided by our everyday conceptual system (Kovecses 2011: 325–354). In the light of their earlier investigations, Sweetser and Descamp demonstrate that, like the rest of metaphors falling beyond of scope of religious sphere, the Divine-human relationship metaphors are motivated by embodied human experience (Sweetser, Descamp 2014). The findings of these researchers are of special value for us as once again they prove that it is appropriate to use cognitive methods for analysing metaphysical realities with the outlook for obtaining deeper understanding of all versatility of human being (existence).

The Old Testament scholars McClellan, Wolde, Wolde, Hecke, Der Merwe, Moore and other researchers developed new perspectives on Hebrew Biblical texts. Wolde offered a new insight into creation of the world act described in Genesis by means of interpretation of ancient Hebrew root ברא "to create" in Genesis 1:1–2:4a as "to spatially separate" (Why the Verb ברא Does Not Mean 'To Create' in Genesis 1.1–2.4a, 2009). The concept of the scholar has kindled the active discussion that finds its reflection in a number of publications (B. Becking, M. C. A. Korpel (2010), E. Wolde, R. Rezetko (2011), E. Wolde (2017)).

Thus, the language of a sacred sphere draws attention of many researchers. However, the metaphorics of the Bible in general, and in particular of the Pentateuch remains underexplored. There is no need to go into detail about the value and complexity of such investigation. Suffice it to say that for the particular contingent of the globe this Book is

considered to be the Vox Dei – the Word of God. Therefore, without understanding the deep knowledge it contains, there is no way to obtain the integral knowledge about a man, pursuit of which, as Postovalova emphasises, is a distinctive characteristics of modern science (Postovalova, 2016).

3. Aim and Objectives.

The aim of the article is to elicit conceptual metaphors that allow understanding of metaphysical (sacred) reality of the Pentateuch, and to describe essential for its conceptualization cognitive structures.

Objectives:

– to describe methodological foundations of the investigation;

– to analyse the consistent patterns of metaphorical expansion from source-domain "physical reality" onto target-domain "metaphysical reality";

– to characterise conceptual metaphors that allow understanding the metaphysical (sacred) reality of the Pentateuch.

4. Methodology.

To analyse the metaphorics of the Pentateuch texts, the Conceptual Metaphors Theory (CMT) developed by Lakoff and Jonson is applied (Metaphors we live by, 1980). The CMT, since its introduction, has been constantly enriched by way of critical comments (A. N. Baranov, J. Grady, Yu. M. Karaulov, Z. Kovecses, S. Coulson, M. Terner, G. Fauconnier, A. P. Chudinov and others); its postulates are being reconsidered and revised (M. Jonson, G. Lakoff, E. Mac Cormak, J. Steen, J. Zinken and others). As Gibbs (2014) aptly notes, like any other theory the CMT suffers from some problems; but "no single theory may be capable of explaining all aspects of the complex phenomena that are metaphorical language and thought" (p. 32). Thus, regardless of questions the critics have raised, major tenets of the CMT remain valid and elicit cognitive mechanism of metaphorisation (Ibid.).

In the context of exploration of religious metaphor, noteworthy is that within his doctrine of essences, Aristotle considered the metaphors inadequate tools for analysing or describing the ultimate, transcendent category, Being. The logic of philosopher is clear. Metaphor is based on grasping and transferring the similarities between categories. However, metaphors "fail to make such a transfer work in case of the category Being", because "there are no literal similarities between the category Being and the other categories" (Howe 2006: 25–26). Nevertheless, interestingly, based on investigations of Edvin Mahon, Anne Moore, demonstrates that it is in Aristotelian "Rethorics" that the roots of modern CMT is found (Moore 2009: 36–37).

The Conceptual Metaphor Theory presents the essence of metaphor through mechanism of understanding and experiencing one phenomenon in terms of another (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). For our investigation, it is significant that in a course of metaphorisation: 1) by means of interaction between the source-domain (perceptual experience) and target-domain (abstract), the objectification of abstract is achieved; 2) one and the same conceptual space can be presented by more than one conceptual metaphor; 3) metaphorical mapping or cognitive mapping takes place as if one conceptual domain overlaps another one giving rise to some type of metaphorical concept (V. A. Maslova (2012), G. Lakoff, M. Turner (1989), A. Potts, E. Semino (2019), E. Semino, Z. Demjen, J. E. Demmen (2018), Steen (2011, 2013), E. Sweetser, M. Descamp (2014), P. H. Thibodeau, L. Boroditsky (2011)). Such overlapping generates fussiness of terms "conceptual metaphor" and "metaphorical concept". Within the framework of semantic-cognitive approach, metaphorical concepts are defined as specific mental constructs that reflect figurative analogy and associative relations between

realities and all together constitute metaphorical conceptual sphere of nation (Kravtsova 2013: 150).

Another essential point we find significant for our investigation is that metaphors as language / verbal expressions are possible (available) only because human conceptual system is metaphorical by nature. Noteworthy is that it is concepts formed within the consciousness of a man, not meanings of words or objective categories that constitute the foundation of metaphor. Thus, they are conceptual, not linguistic, in nature (Lakoff, 1993, 2003).

In a process of metaphorical conceptualization, categorization of the word occurs by simple, grounded in physical experience, cognitive structures image schemas such as UP-DOWN, CONTAINER, CENTER-PERIPHERY etc. (Lakoff, 1980). Hence, metaphorical mapping is understood as correspondence of whole structures. The speaker as if selectively transfer significant for him features of entities of a source domain onto conceptual target domain. However, "metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology (that is, the image-schema structure) of the source domain, in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain" (Lakoff, 1993: 215). (Invariance principle).

Categorisation of the world by image schemas determines the typology of basic (master) conceptual metaphors. Although the number of such metaphors is not big, it grows by means of their combinability. As a result, the number of their linguistic realizations can be unlimited (Lakoff, Turner, 1989: 26). There are among basic conceptual metaphors: 1) orientational metaphors that reflect an idea of spatial orientation (*the Spirit* <u>*come down from*</u> *heaven* (John 1:32)); 2) ontological metaphors, the "ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances" (Lakoff 1980: 25) (*if anyone is* <u>*in*</u> *Christ, the new creation has come)* (2 Corinth. 5:17); 3) structural metaphors, presenting one complex concept in terms of another (*God is Father* (Deut. 32:6)).

Within Lakoff and Johnson's initial theoretical framework, function of conceptual metaphor was reduced to the sphere of everyday communication. However, the bulk of studies have proved that it organizes spheres of feelings, reasoning, emotions, morality (Teliya, 1988: 195), spheres that require conceptualisation of realities of "invisible world" (Oparina 1988: 66–67), and therefore metaphysical world.

Because models of conceptual metaphors correspond to metaphorical schema with underlying verbalized concepts of source and target domains, the construction of cognitive model is done by means of conceptual analysis of its domains (Belekhova 2002: 158–159). However, in our opinion, such analysis ought to take into account the origins of a concept kernel organization. Korolyova, who has thoroughly analysed available approaches to a concept structure, has identified the genetic foundation of a concept, that is, in the opinion of the scholar, "etymology of a concept name as well as its representatives, their implicit form that allows a researcher to trace how the concept meaning has changed over time, and consequently, to establish semantic regularities revealing themselves in a process of categorization and conceptualization of a segment of reality named by this particular concept" (Korolyova 2011: 57). On this premise, the concept structure ought to be viewed within the framework of the diachronic-synchronic approach to analysis. The structural elements ought to be established "via correlation between original (primary) information of its names (historical and etymological) and such that is represented within a concept at the present stage (actual information)" (Korolyova 2011: 54).

To summarise it should be point out that conceptual metaphors are capable of structuring any aspect of human being. The basis of conceptual metaphors is laid by simple stereotypical models of cognitive nature. They structure our experience, "capture" prototypical knowledge about all aspects of our existence, and construct a logical system grounded on universal principles. Because metaphysical realities are abstract, they obtain

their actualization through the prism of concrete realities that is by means of conceptual metaphors that are mirrored by linguistic metaphorical expressions. Therefore, by examining metaphors of the Pentateuch texts, it is possible to reveal the conceptual metaphors and uncover the cognitive frame of the knowledge, without which our understanding of the world is fragmentary.

5. Results. Discussion.

As the results of the previous semantic and cognitive analysis of metaphors have shown, metaphysic (sacred) reality of the Pentateuch is conceived within the framework of the following mega-models: 1) Human → Transcendental essence; 2) Inorganic realm → Transcendental essence; 3) Society (socium) → Transcendental essence (transcendental essences are presented by God and Angels) (Izyumtseva, 2017). Within the framework of the current investigation, onto transcendental (metaphysical, sacred) reality are metaphorically mapped as source domains: 1) tri-dimensional space (verticality, centre-periphery, distance, place, object, container, etc.); 2) human (physical, physiological, psychological features); 3) human interpersonal relationships (family relationships, social roles, status, authority, etc.).

Let us start with metaphorical expansion from a source-domain tri-dimensional space (verticality, centre-periphery, distance, place, object, container, etc.) onto the metaphysical / transcendental.

Within Biblical framework for describing the origin of the world, from the very "beginning" transcendental God is conceptualised as the one that is above all things to be created or "separated" (using the term of E. van Wolde) from primordial matter (Wolde, van 2009). Genesis 1:2 points out that "God's spirit was hovering over the face of the waters". (By God's spirit is meant one of three Divine Persons of one God). Thus, God's location is associated with the place UP. Typically, this place is understood as heaven. The Book of Deuteronomy indicates that "heavens and the highest heavens belong to the Lord your God" (Deut. 10:14); "Out of heaven He let you hear His voice (Deut. 4:46), "You have seen that I have talked with you from heaven" (Ex. 20:22), "There is no one like God of Jeshurum, who rides the heavens to help you and in His excellency in the clouds" (Deut. 33:26), and also: "He looks down from His holy habitation, from heaven" (Deut. 26:15). The Genesis text assumes the same idea in the story about the Tower of Babel: "the Lord came down" (Gn. 11:5); "Come let us go down" (Gn. 11:7). Thus, the Old Testament God speaks out and comes down to His creation from His supreme place, place of His habitation, that is to say, from above.

We observe also that the heaven is a place of habitation of other transcendental entities. However, among all of them God's position is obviously the highest. To confirm this, suffice it to recall Jacob's dream during his escape-journey to his uncle Laban after stealing the blessing from his brother Esaw. Jacob dreamed about a ladder that "was set up on the earth, and its top reached to heaven; and there the angels of God were ascending and descending on it. And behold, the Lord stood above it" (Gen. 28 10-13). Thus, in a true vertical order we find, first, the heavens over the earth, which is over people; then there are angels above people, and, finally, we find God Jehovah on the very top.

Apart from already mentioned, other texts confirm the idea of spatial UP-location of God describing Him as "Most High" (Gn. 4:18, 21); unique and supreme: "the Lord Himself is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other (Deut. 4:39). Finally, we find that the UP-pole correlates with the very essence of God: He is "upright" (Deut. 32: 4).

In a context of Th. J. White's commentaries, it was only because Moses did keep the Lord's commandments, that Israelites were able to win in a battle against Amalek (Ex. 15:13). During the battle following YHWH's instruction, Moses stood on the top of the

hill with the rod of God in his hand UP. Not once the author of the Pentateuch texts emphasizes that it was the position of Moses' hands (with YAHWH's rod UP) that was a decisive factor in the outcome of the battle. The Bible says that "Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed; and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed" (Deut. 15:11-13). Significantly, in contrast to the Egyptian pharaoh magicians, Moses' actions were exclusive manifestation of God's mightiness in response to Moses' obedience. The obedience of this kind is submission to performance of the certain action with the belief that only under the condition of its performance the power of sacrament reveals itself. For Israelites (and Moses himself) the UP-position of Moses hands became a sign of and condition for God's empowerment. Thus, such sign-actions as if unite spiritual and material worlds providing the conduit for God's grace to descend upon the faithful ones from above. According to T. White, the New Testament Church considers sacraments such as Baptism, Holy Unction, the Eucharist, Confession (penance), Holy Orders, Marriage, and Funeral to be such sign-actions. Until they are observed, the Church is undefeatable. Analogically, until there is obedience to God's commandments, spiritual enemy embodied in a figure of Amalek will fail (White, 2016).

At this point it is reasonable to conclude that all foregoing passages strongly suggest the presence of an orientational metaphor that reflects societal structure based on spatial relationship UP-DOWN. In the UP-DOWN orientational metaphor the value of objects is determined by their vertical spatial location or distance between these objects (their position) on an imaginative vertical line. The up-pole is mapped onto positive concepts, while the opposite pole DOWN is mapped onto negative concepts. In Biblical times as well as in many societies today, the value of people as social entities is equated with being up. Consequently, a person with higher status is conceptualized as being above; in this way: STATUS IS UP, LAW STATUS IS DOWN (Lakoff, Espenson, Schwartz, 1991). From analyzed Biblical texts, it is quite clear that God is depicted as such that is located on the very top of UP-DOWN axis pole. It is that that defines His supreme UP-status and allows us to paraphrase the above-stated metaphorical ideas as GOD'S STATUS IS UP.

Unexpectedly, the presence of the metaphor GOD'S STATUS IS UP reveals itself through unique (it used only once in the Bible) name YHWH Nissi. From Exodus 17:15 we learn that to commemorate the fact of YHWH's victory in the combat against Amalek at Rephidim, Moses built the altar and gave it a metaphorical name *The Lord is My Banner* that is God's name YHWH Nissi. To make clear the course of our thoughts as far as to conceptual metaphors that structure the domain of meaning of Yahweh Nissi, we will dwell in short on reasons why the victory over Amalek was of such importance. The Amalekites were nomadic tribes – descendants of Esau who sold his firstborn right to his brother Jacob for a bowl of stew and as a result lost his father-patriarch's blessing. Since that event the conflict between two brothers and their clans (Amalekites and Israelites) had never ended. On the road from Egypt, the encounter of the Israelites (descendants of Jacob) with the Amalekites took place near the Mount of Sinai. The attack was unprovoked; Israelites were defeated. On the one hand, the attack was a sort of the massacre of the weak who were slow and exhausted. On the other hand, it was the very first time that people who were under protection of God of Exodus were defeated. Thus, the battle against Amalek became both spiritual and physical answer of YHWH Himself. It had serious spiritual consequences for future Amalek's descendants engraved as the name of the altar that Moses erected "The Lord is my Banner". We will generalize the sense of this metaphorical name referring to C. Houtman. According to the scholar, *The Lord is my Banner* is the "confession" (recognition of God's supremacy and power) (Houtman 1996: 390).

Our further survey of interpretation of metaphor embracing YHWH Nissi has yielded valuable linguistic insights in above-given theological commentary. In the Vulgate version of the Bible by Jerome the sense of the name of the altar is embedded in expression *The Lord is my exaltation* (The Latin Vulgate Old Testament Bible). According to Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon (Moses Mimonides), famous Hebrew Talmudist and philosopher, a verb "to exalt" means "to lift up" (vertical UP-direction move). In his study the scholar points out that in Hebrew texts in relation to the Lord with the meanings *to exalt* and *to lift up* two homonymic roots *nasa* "to lift up" and *ram* "high" are used. Both roots are used with the meaning "move UP", as well as with the meaning "to exalt", elevate in "space, rank and dignity" (Maimonides 2002: 29). For instance, "And the ark was lifted up (*va-tarom*) above the earth" (Gen. 7:17); "I have exalted (*harimoti*) one chosen out of the people" (Ps. 89:19). "And his kingdom will be exalted" *(ve-tinnase)* (Num. 24:7) or "Thus saith the High *(ram)* and Exalted *(nissa)* One" (Isa. 57:15). However, as the Talmudist observes, in respect to God the root *ram* is used exclusively with the second meaning: "Be exalted (*rumah*), O God, above heavens" (Ps. 57:5). Unlike it, the root *nasa* "to lift up" is used for rendition both senses, as well as for conveying the meaning "to carry", "to move" something from one place to another with a special emphasis on the fact that this kind of move assumes lifting the thing up (vertical UP-direction move) at first. "And his kingdom will be exalted" (*ve-tinnase*) (Num. 24:7) or "Thus saith the High (*ram*) and Exalted (*nissa*) One" (Isa. 57:15) (Mimonides 2002: 29-30). The above root analysis strongly suggests that metaphoric expression *The Lord is my exaltation* can be paraphrased as *The Lord is my lifting up* and implies the idea of it as a special case of the conceptual metaphor GOD'S STATUS IS UP.

Such a view allows a parallel of meanings that arises between metaphoric phrases expressing the Name YHWH Nissi, namely: *the Lord is my Banner, the Lord is my exaltation,* and added variant *the Lord is my lifting up* whereby the homonymity of these expressions and their embracement by a field of the metaphor GOD'S STATUS IS UP is rendered. Thus, like its variants expression *the Lord is my Banner* is covered by a field of GOD'S STATUS IS UP metaphor, which rests on experiencing God as the Supreme One, that is to say unconquerable. Such view enlarges our understanding of meaning of name YHWH Nissi, and linguistically confirms the afore-suggested theological interpretation of metaphorical expression *the Lord is my Banner.*

It should be noted, that viewing YHWH as a banner provides also ground for ontological metaphor GOD IS OBJECT. The lexicographical analysis of a name of BANNER has shown, that in the context of Exodus 17:15 it is not understood as a military standard, but it is an ensign (*ness*), a signal, "a figure or device of some kind elevated on a pole" (Peloubet 1947: 179-180). (Such interpretation evokes the image of the banner *(nēs)* with a figure of Nehushtan, a copper serpent that Moses had to lift up that everyone bitten by a serpent saraph, could look at it and recover by faith (Nu 21:4–9)).

In this light we conclude that a metaphoric expression *The Lord is my Banner* implicates the peculiar perspective on transcendental reality, namely GOD'S STATUS IS UP, and GOD IS OBJECT.

It is worth noting that both recognition and denial of God's UP-status can also be demonstrated in terms of spatial UP-DOWN relations. For instance, bowing down (vertical DOWN-direction move) in worshiping God – a deliberate action on the part of a worshipper – is a sign of recognition of God's spiritual authority and supremacy ("the man bowed down his head and worshiped the Lord" (Gn. 24:26)). The Book of Genesis recorded God's visit of Abraham, when in his deep love and appreciation Abraham "fell on his face" (Gn. 17:3) before the Lord, taking in such a way the lowest vertical position DOWN that was possible for him. In such case the metaphor LAW STATUS IS DOWN can be paraphrased to express

outlined above metaphorical idea as BOWING DOWN IS BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL with positive connotation.

Unlike Abraham, Israelite people in general are characterised as stiff-necked (Deut. 9:6, 13; 31:27). The concept STIFF-NECKED reflects the spiritual state of Israelite people. Its name, according to Merriam-Webster dictionary, stiff-necked means "a proud or stubborn person: one with a haughty bearing". Drawing on this definition and other investigations of the notions that form the sense of the given concept, we arrive to a conclusion, that obvious meaning of the concept STIFF-NECKED can be formulated as a following: the one who does not want to bow head (DOWN) in submission. Thinking spatially, STIFF-NECKED is the one who does not want to put himself in a position lower than the position of God; therefore, does not recognise His supremacy. Thus, in terms of UP-DOWN relations, the domain of meaning of the concept STIFF-NECKED can be presented by two primary metaphors LAW STATUS IS DOWN and BOWING DOWN IS BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL (BOWING DOWN IS DOWN).

The example below is selected to demonstrate the pervasiveness of UP-DOWN conceptual metaphors within the Pentateuch reality. It is necessary for us to see that they not only conceptualize the adopted order of things in society but, they direct and govern people's actions. Texts Genesis 37:7-9 narrate about prophetic dreams of Joseph (the son of the third Biblical patriarch). In his one dream Joseph saw that when he with his brothers were binding sheaves in the field, his sheaf "arose" and "stood upright" (vertical UP-direction move), while his brothers' sheaves "bowed down" to his sheaf (vertical DOWN-direction move): Then behold, my <u>sheaf arose</u> and also <u>stood upright</u>; and indeed <u>your sheaves</u> stood all around and <u>bowed down to my sheaf </u>(Gn. 37:7). Besides, in his another dream Joseph dreamed that the sun, the moon, and the eleven stars "bowed down" (vertical DOWN-direction move) to him (Gn. 37:9). Obviously, these texts suggest the presence of the orientational metaphor STATUS IS UP, LAW STATUS IS DOWN, though it is not the only metaphor. Indeed, Joseph's dreams cast in his brothers the role of subjects on the steps of invisible social ladder. Moreover, Joseph's dominion meant their subjection. "Bowing down" was understood as "being subject to control", that is "being down". Interpretation of the dream becomes evident through their reaction: "Shall you indeed reign over us? Or shall you indeed have dominion over us?" (Gn. 37:8). This allows implication of another metaphor BOWING DOWN IS BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL IS DOWN; that is BOWING DOWN IS DOWN. As the Bible tells the fact of the dream ("bowing down") was taken as a serious offence. Brothers hated Joseph and planned to avenge their humiliation. They "sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty *shekels* of silver" (Gn. 37:28). Thus, the conceptual metaphors that allowed interpretation of the dreams also led Joseph's brothers to particular actions.

Among other orientational metaphors, the BLESSING IS UP metaphor is noteworthy. Though concept BLESSING is not objectified transcendence, though, as our analysis, it is directly connected to metaphysical aspect of reality. Etymological analysis of a word "blessing" conducted by Gruneberg, allows us to see that in Christian religion, as well as in a number of other religions (Islamic, Phoenician-Punic, Ugaritic etc.), blessing is connected to God (Gruneberg, 2003: 104–105). Moreover, blessing belongs to God, He is a prime-source of it, and it is from Him that it comes (Mowvley, 1965: 79).

Importantly, when analysing the senses of words translated as blessing or bless (pronounced by God or people) both in the OT and NT, it becomes evident that they associate with happiness and prosperity, well-being (Gruneberg, 2003; Mewvley, 1965). According to The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament as well as Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, the word blessing means "a thing conducive to happiness or

welfare" that is to everything that, when described metaphorically, are the UP-states (HAPPY IS UP, WELL-BEING IS UP (Lakoff, 1991)), allowing thus BLESSING IS UP conceptual metaphor.

Interesting observations can be made with regard to etymology of a Hebrew word *berậkhậh* used for "blessing" in the OT texts. Firstly, the meaning of its root *brk* centers around meanings "the knee", "to kneel" and "to bless" (The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament 1999: 279). If to visualize how a knee functions as a part of a human body, it is easy to see that this joint changes the vertical position of a body moving it DOWN and then returning it back to the UP-position. "Kneeling", as Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines it, is "to position the body so that one or both knees rest on the floor". This assumes vertical move DOWN with setting the body at the lowest position DOWN. Thus, "kneeling" as well as "to kneel" assumes vertical move DOWN. Secondly, as we aforementioned, etymological analysis shows, blessing is the Divine Provision. In acknowledgment of God's blessing people pray to God, thank and exalt Him. It is a way a person responds to God's blessing (Mowvley, 1965: 79). As previously we have grounded, the concept GOD is metaphorically being realized as GOD'S STATUS IS UP, and, accordingly exalting Him as well as thanking God or praying to Him assumes recognition of His supremacy and, if described metaphorically, suggests a LAW STATUS-POSITION of a petitioner or worshipper. At the same time, submission, expected from the one willing that the blessing be bestowed upon him, is, according to Deuteronomy 28, a decisive factor for receiving the blessing. God-submissive person, as we have discussed earlier in this study, willingly puts himself in a position lower than the position of God, because admits His supremacy. And it is this LAW STATUS-POSITION before the Lord that secures his maximal UP-POSITION on a vertical ladder: "And the Lord will make you <u>the head and not the tail</u>; you shall <u>be above</u> only, and <u>not be beneath,</u> if you (d) heed the commandments of the Lord your God" (Deut. 28:13). Based on above discussion, we see that the domain of meaning of the concept BLESSING in terms of spatial UP-DOWN relations gets extra dimension: the blessing is viewed as something UP that suggests a DOWN-position of a recipient of the blessing.

Several additional points should be made considering the order of pronouncing the blessing. The Book of Genesis 48:17-20 describes Patriarch Jacob giving blessings to his son Joseph's children: "…when Joseph saw <u>his father put his right hand on the head of Ephraim</u>, it displeased him; so he took hold of his father's hand to remove it from Ephraim's head to Manasseh's head". However, Jacob insisted on bestowing the blessing first upon younger son (Ephraim before Manasseh). In the outlined passage the conceptual metaphor IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE (Lakoff, Espenson, Schwartz, 1991) reveals itself. It determines the angle of view on events described and directs our attention to sequence of certain actions, namely the order of pronouncing the blessing. According to this tradition, a firstborn son gets father's blessing first. By insisting on a reverse order, Jacob showed that it was an act of an exceptional spiritual value, emphasizing the role of Ephraim for future generations.

Thus, the conceptual field BLESSING is organized by the spatial metaphors BLESSING IS UP, STATUS IS UP, LAW STATUS IS DOWN and IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE.

In fact, the question arises in relation to the fact that why we do not observe the metaphor IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE in the passages describing the act of creation of the world that is given in sequence. We read that the man – a pinnacle of creation – was created after God created all creation. Also the Bible says that on the seventh day God rested, and it is that day not the very first one that God blessed and made holy. On this issue the only thing we can say that this question is a serious theological matter of God's creative act itself:

whether all we read about in Genesis 1 was created simultaneously or it appeared in a specific order. However, the discussion of this issue is beyond limits of this paper.

Though it is not possible to discuss all relevant passages, however, based on above considered cases, we can conclude that the orientational metaphors establish valuable cognitive links revealing significant aspects of metaphysical reality incorporated in metaphorical canvas of the Pentateuch. We will now proceed to the CENTER-PERIFERY structures within narrative context of the Pentateuch. Nevertheless, as the further discussion shows, not once we will refer to the already discussed metaphors, as all the metaphors exist not in isolation but many of them are integrated in the inseparable conceptual whole.

Image schemata CENTER-PEERIFERY reflects valuable sensory-motor experience of humans. A person experiences himself as a centre of his sensory field. Distance between a person and the object determines its significance for a person. If understood metaphorically, the distance between a person and the object determines its significance for a person. That is to say, "whatever occupies the centre of the perceptual horizon tends to become more important than that which is peripheral" (Johnson, 1989: 112).

In the narrative context of Genesis, valuable entailment arises in regard to a metaphorical extension IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL – LESS IMPORTANT IS PERIPHERY (Lakoff, Espenson, Schwartz, 1991) of image schemata CENTER-PEERIFERY. To fully embrace it, the metaphor expansion ought to be studied in the context of all Holy Scriptures. On the one hand, this metaphor reveals itself through the centrality of the Tree of life and Tree of knowledge of good and evil, planted "in the middle of" the grand Garden, which will always be associated with a place of the highest but lost happiness (Gen. 2:9). It is logical to conclude that centrality of these Trees indicates their importance for men living in that place. Such reasoning leads us to metaphorical extension THE TREE OF LIFE AND THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE ARE CENTRAL / IMPORTANT. Generalising from exegetes Landy (1983) and Tsevart (1975), Van Wolde considers the meaning of these Trees in the Garden. The scholar makes a point that the Tree of immorality indicates the very essence of the garden. That is why it is in a centre of the garden. "The content of the tree of knowledge depends on the tree of life: "The Tree of knowledge is functionally the Tree of Death … stylistically complementing the Tree of life" (Landy, 1983:12) […]. In his opinion the knowledge of good and evil (these are inclusive terms) is the awareness of the universe divided as it is into good and evil; these two extremes determine existence. Knowing death is an essential part of the knowledge of evil" (Cited in: Wolde, Van, 1994: 34–35). Landy also views two Trees as Eros and Thanatos in man. Eros is connected with immorality and immutability. Thanatos is linked with experience and change, "he considers the desire for truth to be the basis of the tree" (Cited in: Wolde, Van, 1994: 35). Furthermore, disregarding the fact whether the first people ate from the tree of life, the Bible not once highlights the prohibition to eat from the tree of knowledge. As following text reveals eating from this specific tree will give them all knowledge in all its fullness? Providing the ground in this way for the conceptual metaphor LEARNING IS EATING (Lakoff 1994) and its contextual paraphrase LEARNING IS EATING THE FRUIT.

Because the men did eat the forbidden fruit, they were sent out of the Garden limits, unless they eat from the tree of life – the source of their life (Gen. 3: 22–24). How far they were sent out is not important; the point is that the men were sent out in a zone of spiritual periphery. With increasing distance between the men and the source of life, their complete spiritual decline started. It explains at the conceptual level why, as the *Genesis 6* writes, that God saw the wickedness of people and became sorry for creating the man (Gen. 6:6).

On the other hand, the men become more ego-centric as they have to provide for their own physical needs out of the Paradise limits. However, the principle incorporated by the schemata IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL – LESS IMPORTANT IS PERIPHERY remains unchanged, with the difference that now the centre of their life, and the spiritual things they enjoyed in God's presence are left so far away that access to them disappear completely. That God who walked in the Garden at a near distance is now practically beyond reach. The act of expelling Adam and Eve the Paradise, prohibition to eat from the trees in a centre of the Garden, with subsequent spreading around the globe seems to be the act of spiritual disintegration.

Drawing on the above delineated ideas in soteriological context generally and the event of crucifixion of Christ particularly, valuable implications can be made with regard to how the spiritual re-centering of men allows them to return a lost spiritual centre. Implementation of the conceptual blending theory of M. Turner and G. Fauconnier for interpretation of Christ's crucifixion based on the *Gospel of Philip,* allowed Lundhaug to demonstrate that at a conceptual level the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge are identified as the Cross that is the embodiment of the New Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge (CROSS IS NEW TREE OF LIFE AND TREE OF KNOWLEDGE). Moreover, Christ Himself arises as "the life-giving fruit of a new Tree of Knowledge, which is also identified as the Tree of Life" (Lundhaug 2014: 73–98). Nowadays, Christians partaking in Holy Eucharist eat this FRUIT. By doing this the partaker is being united with God whereby once lost spiritual integration is returned. Because distance between God and partaker becomes obliterated, the access to the center – the Tree of Life and Tree of Knowledge identified with the Cross – is regained. The above conclusions are essential for our investigation. Conceptualizing the CROSS as the NEW TREE OF LIFE AND TREE OF KNOWLEDGE allows paraphrasing the formulated afore-given metaphor THE TREE OF LIFE AND THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE ARE CENTRAL/IMPORTANT in CROSS IS CENTRAL/IMPORTANT.

As a matter of fact, the idea that Lundhaug disclosed at the conceptual level is confirmation of one of the core ideas stated long ago by key Apologists of Christianity. In his works John of Damascus defines centrality of the Cross and points out that the Tree of Life prefigures the Cross: "just as the four extremities of the Cross are held fast and bound together by the bolt in the middle, so also by God's power the height and the depth, the length and the breadth, that is, every creature visible and invisible, is maintained" (Schaff 2007: 80). Moreover, "The honourable Cross," says St. John of Damascus, "was foreshadowed by the tree of life planted by God in the midst of Paradise; for as the fall and death came about through a tree, so it was fitting that through a tree life and resurrection should be given" (True Orthodox Christianity). The importance of the Cross is confirmed by all the NT and OT texts. The OT texts prefigure the Cross and the One who had to suffer on it. Next two examples are taken from the Book of Exodus. Moses prefigured the Cross to part and to return back the Red sea waters. First, he was said to lift up the rod, and stretch out his hand over the sea, and then, when Israelites were in a secure place, to stretch the hand over the sea (Deut. 14:16–21), in this way making the sign of the Cross. In Exodus 17:8–13 during the battle against Amalek, Moses prefigured not only the Cross but also the One who had to suffer on it (John of Damascus, J. Krondshtatsky, S. Yavorsky). Thus, the conceptual metaphor THE CROSS IS CENTRAL / IMPORTANT, in spite of absence of its surface and direct exhibition, is present in Biblical texts and constitutes, using the words of Mechkovskaya, "invariant knowledge (news, meaning, memory) about Jesus' death on the cross for the sake of people, and His resurrection" (Mechkovskaya 2004: 586).

Important aspect of transcendental God's essence is conceptualised by ontological metaphor TIME IS CONTAINER (Lakoff, 1994). The very first verses of the Bible describe

God as such that exists before time. In human terms people exist IN TIME (*in the beginning*). That is the container of time is located in space, which itself is beyond time, that is in eternity. Thus, God that exists before "in the beginning" exists beyond time-container. In other words, He exists OUTSIDE CONTAINER, thus OUTSIDE TIME. So, He is conceptualized by metaphor GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME.

Further speculations about God's creative acts, their sequence (the first day, the second etc.; the evening and the morning were the such and such day) that is perceived as if a move through out space, make it clear that time is also conceptualized as a trajectory. In addition, the time itself is marks, landmarks on this trajectory. Such understanding is mirrored metaphorically TIME IS A LANDSCAPE WE MOVE THROUGH (Lakoff, Espenson, Schwartz, 1991), with the source – domain landscape and the target-domain time. In a context of God's creative work this metaphor gets extension TIME IS CREATION WE MOVE THROUGH. In this way, God IS OUTSIDE TIME where TIME IS CREATION WE MOVE THROUGH. Two metaphorical ideas brought together allow us to conceptualize God as following: GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION WE MOVE THROUGH. Such conceptual metaphor undoubtedly reflects significant aspect of God's nature: He is the One who exists beyond both the time-space continuum and His creation. The logic behind this is simple: God cannot be experienced directly in His perfection but only through His creation or in moments of theophany. Thus, GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME and GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION WE MOVE THROUGH. In short, GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME and GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION.

Another crucial aspect of transcendental God become evident through conceptualization of morality as cleanliness in the texts of the Pentateuch. Following scholars Wolden, Douglas, Milgrom's reasoning, we recognize that the core category of Israelites' moral conscience is the category of PURE / IMPURE (M. Douglas), the more complex variant of which is the category of HOLY / COMMON and PURE / IMPURE (Milgrom) (Wolden, 2009: 207–210). This compound category reflects, shapes and orders a system of values of Israelites, accordingly, their life in the context of provisions on purification, distinguishing between clean and unclean, holy and common / profane (Duet. 29:37; 30:29–37; 31: 14, 15; 35:19; 39:1, 30, 41; 40:13; Lev. 5; 6:18; 11–16; та ін.) etc.

Interesting observations Milgrom made with regard to four states reflected by the category of HOLY / COMMON and PURE / IMPURE and conceptualized as HOLY, COMMON, PURE, IMPURE. In fact, the state of *purity* is interpreted as absence of *impurity*, while *commonness* is understood as absence of *holiness*; both states can simultaneously coexist. Everything considered to be holy must be kept separately from what is profane or impure. Such view, according to Milgrom (1991), leads to understanding the fact that concepts HOLY and IMPURE function as antonyms, and are linked, though not directly, by relation of opposition (p. 731).

Similarly, our lexicographical study has proved that concepts HOLY and PURE function as synonyms. Indeed, Cambridge Dictionary interprets HOLY as very religious or pure. Collins Dictionary defines the it as "spiritually perfect" or "pure"; "untainted by evil or sin". Confirmation of above ideas is also found in Dictionaries of synonyms (Oxford, Synonyms and Antonyms of Words, The Synonym Finder, Webster's New Dictionary and Thesaurus). KJV Dictionary Definition points out that the concept HOLY means "pure in heart". Such view of the concept is metaphorical. The heart is conceptualized as a centre of a man. Therefore, its purity assumes overall purity of a man. In fact, Apostle Matthew emphasizes that only people with pure heart shall see God (Mtt. 5:8).

Thus, our lexicographical interpretation shows that concepts PURE and HOLY are, though indirectly, related as synonyms. This conclusion is essential for our investigation,

because the synonymic relation between concepts PURE and HOLY allows us in the context of the Pentateuch to reformulate, evolved on the basis of correlation between *purity* and *cleanliness,* metaphor *PURITY IS CLEANLINESS* (Lakoff, Johnson 1999: 307) in *HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS*. In addition, taking in consideration definition of *a common impurity* as *dirt* (Ibid.), following M. Douglas' view of *clean* and *unclean* (Douglas 1966: 7–41), we come to understanding that perception of an object as impure / unclean, not always is associated with dirt. Douglas generalises that classification of objects as *clean / unclean* is relative. What is sacred / clean for one person (or culture) can be unclean or common for another. Admittedly, classifications like this are culturally conditioned means of creating and maintaining symbolic order in the world. "Clean" is everything that fits the pattern maintained; uncleanness refuse to be fitted in established symbolic order; thus, uncleanness is the "matter out of place" (Douglas 1966: 41).

Ontological metaphor *HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS* allows conceptualisation of abstract concept HOLINESS, which reflects the nature of YHWH (Isaiah 6:3; 57:15; Joshua 24:19). Concept CLEANLINESS incorporates one of the most significant domains of life experience of a man. From early childhood every individual is taught the rules of personal hygiene, keep clean your clothes, the place where you live etc. In this way, natural is the analogical and associative link arising between inner and outward cleanness of a person (Lev. 6–16), cleanness of the living place (Deut. 23:14). It helps a person to comprehend what holiness is and that it is possible to be holy; to learn that everything that penetrates into a person from outside with what they hear, see or eat draw them nearer to God or lead to opposite from God direction. As we observe, much of Leviticus and Deuteronomy is taken up with teaching what is clean and what is unclean. Attainment of holiness by God's people is conceptualised as attainment of "cleanliness"; "cleanliness" of people is objectified as the condition and guarantee of their holiness, whereby ensuring in the context of the Pentateuch implicit presence of conceptual metaphor CLEAN PEOPLE IS HOLY PEOPLE.

To illustrate the above metaphor, we will use the texts teaching the Dietary law rules given to Israelites through Moses are stated in terms of *clean* and *unclean*, and are based on clear separation between clean and *unclean* animals, along with admonition not to eat "unclean" food. Violation of the law had serious spiritual consequences. By eating *unclean* person makes himself *unclean*, that is to say *defiles* himself. Thus, falls into a state incompatible with God's holiness. According to the law, a beast that is *clean* chews the cud, and its hooves are divided. Also "whatsoever hath fins and scales […] in the seas and in the rivers" is clean and therefore edible (Lev. 11:9). The list then continues with other edible creatures, but, we should remember that it is given just to exemplify the case. The purpose of the author was by no means to give the exhausted list. The point was to express the idea of exquisiteness of relation with holy God and significance of spiritual purity of His people.

There appears to be different views regarding why some birds, beasts are classifying as unclean. As we have already seen, M. Douglass points out that it results from culturally conditioned symbolic ordering of the world (Douglas 1966: 41). For instance, the camel is unclean because though chewing the cud, its hooves are not divided. Maimonides, the theologist and philosopher, explains the dietary rules proceeding from moral and hygienic reasons (Maimonides 2002: 328). Furthermore, in "The Letter of Aristeas" Moses' rules are interpreted symbolically. They embrace the allegorical sense: "Eleazar's allegorical interpretation of the dietary laws focuses on their moral meanings, which depend on recognizing the inherent character of the animals that are either permitted or forbidden" (Wright 2015: 285). The Bible does not provide the direct explanation why the OT Dietary law had to be stated in terms of "clean" or "unclean" (although the separation of clean from unclean is found in the beginning in Genesis). However, its texts not ambiguously re-

emphasise that by eating "unclean" food Israelites become spiritually unclean (Deut. 14, Lev. 11), and only giving heed to the law, following it, abstaining from "unclean" a person as well as all people could be clean and sanctify themselves to fit God's holiness.

In addition, the Dietary law rules, afore-established metaphor *HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS* is implicitly present in the texts that regulate family-related, interpersonal relations, actions and behaviour in social and cult aspects. (These commandments are covered in the second part of the Book of Exodus and all Book of Leviticus). The man defiles himself by worshiping other gods: *do not commit any of these abominable customs* […], *and that you <u>do not defile yourselves </u>by them: I am the L<small>ORD</small> your God* (Lev. 18:30); make practice of forbidden things: *'Give no regard to mediums and familiar spirits; do not seek after them, to <u>be defiled by them</u>: I am the L<small>ORD</small> your God* (Lev. 19:31); consciously or unconsciously: <u>*human uncleanness --*</u> <u>*whatever uncleanness*</u> <u>*with which a man may be defiled*</u> (Lev 5:2).

Importantly, conceptualisation of human "uncleanness" (conscious or unconscious) takes place in close connection with such notions as the "guilt for committed sin", necessity of "sin confession and purification" to meet the requirements of "holiness". The vector of evolving correlating senses "defilement", "guilt", "sin", "purification / cleansing" and "holiness", in addition, points out that all "uncleanness", about which God admonishes in His instructions, leads to spiritual defilement and therefore requires spiritual purification. The man admitting his uncleanness was expected to bring sin offering. It is interesting that in Hebrew the notions *sin* and *sin offering* are rendered by the same word "hatta't" (Heart of Torah 2017: 37). The notion *sin offering* is used with the meaning of *uncleanness, impurity, pollution* itself, as well as with the meaning of means of purification *sin offering*. Uncleanness breaks the relations with God; relations can be restored by means of *sin offering*. So, a priest by following the ritual through sin offering purified the sinner restoring him to the state of cleanness, a required condition of his holiness, 5 <u>*'And it shall be, when he is guilty in any of these matters, that he shall confess that he has sinned in that thing; 6 and he shall bring his trespass offering to the* L<small>ORD</small> *for his sin which he has committed,* […] *10 So the priest shall make atonement on his behalf for his sin which he has committed, and it shall be forgiven him*</u> (Lev 5: 5–6,10).

According to Law given through Moses, it was priests' responsibility to distinguish between holy and profane, clean and unclean (Lev 10:10). It is worth noting that a priest who was conceptualized as embodiment of holiness required inner and outward purification as any other person of Israel community (Le 16:4, 6). Only after ritual purification he (a priest) was considered to be "clean" to perform the ceremony of cleansing impurity. Moreover, the tabernacle (God's abode) itself required purification as it was kept in the midst of Israelites' uncleanness, both physical and spiritual. It had to be purged once a year (on the Day of Atonement): he <u>*shall make atonement for the Holy Place, because of the uncleanness*</u> of the children of IsraelI (Lev 16:16).

Important aspect of conceptualizing the foundation of the ritual of purification from sin is hidden within expression *atoning blood*. "Although, the exact meaning and derivation of the Hebrew word *kipper*, "to make atonement" (Lev. 4:20a), is still disputable, following J. Sprinkle, it can arguably be understood as a derivation of the noun *koper* ("ransom, gift"), with an original meaning of "placate", "mollify", "satisfy," or "appease" an offended party by means of gifts" (Sprinkle 2015: 30–31). Dwelling on such interpretation of the term "to atone", we conceptualise *atoning blood,* as "the blood given as a gift". In this way, ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT. *For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul* (Lev. 17:11). ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT is an ontological metaphor and at the

same time is a structural one as assumes a giver of the gift (God) and a receiver of the gift (people)).

Thus, to become ritually closer to God or anything that was considered to be sanctified, every person, regardless of the status, had to be purified inwardly and outwardly. Those who failed to follow the Law brought over themselves divine punishment (Ex. 30:38; 31:14, 15; Lev. 7:20). Suffice it to recollect the fourth Commandment regarding remembering the Sabbath day. This Day was sanctified, thus it was sin to do any profane work (Ex. 20: 8). Another good example Leviticus 10:1 provides. It describes as "Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu were punished with death for brining before the Lord profane fire" (the one God did not command).

Investigation of the texts that lay the moral foundation of both the Old and New Testament society testify that HOLINESS of God, as well as HOLINESS of people, is perceived on the basis of one of the most important life domains, namely CLEANLINESS. The moral law, realized in the Pentateuch texts through conceptual oppositions purity / impurity, holy / common (profane), constitutes the foundation for implicit presence of ontological conceptual metaphor CLEANLINESS IS HOLINESS, and whereby A CLEAN PEOPLE IS A HOLY PEOPLE.

Conducted analysis allowed us also to conclude that attainment of cleanness, and that is holiness, is nearing to holy God. Contrary to this, uncleanness / impurity defiles, that is to say moves us away from God. In other words, if actions, way of living of a person or people are characterized by "purity" he / they can live near holy God; whereas in contrast, "impurity" or "profanity" moves them away from God. "When Israel' behaviour is characterised by PURITY, it means that it is fit to live in proximity to YHWH. Conversely, IMPURITY implies that Israelites are not fit to live in YAHWH's proximity". Thus, HOLINESS possesses a "spatial component" (Milgrom 1991: 48) and in the context of the Pentateuch can be conceptualised as PROXIMITY TO GOD; therefore, HOLINESS IS PROXIMITY TO GOD. The following text exemplify above-stated thought: worship to God (it always assumes glorifying and prayer) is metaphorically conceptualised as proximity to Him: *By those who come near Me I must be regarded as holy* (Lev. 10:3). By serving to God with the talents and skills, a person comes near to God: *to bring you near to Himself, to do the work of the tabernacle of the LORD* (Nu. 16:9). Dwelling God among people reduces the distance between God and man and therefore assumes proximity: *the LORD is among them* (Nu. 16:3). *For the LORD your God walks in the midst of your camp,* […]; *therefore, your camp shall be holy* (Deut. 23:15).

In the light of this discussion, it is worth noting that, no one could approach YHWH close enough to see His face and remain alive. As the Bible asserts even God's closest prophet Moses, who was called God's friend was shown only God's back when His glory passed by (Ex. 30:20–21). The cases of epiphany such as the "burning bush" and Mount Sinai events demonstrate that God emanates holiness, thus everything around Him is sanctified, therefore nearing to Him is forbidden: *Do not draw near this place. Take your sandals off your feet, for the place where you stand is holy ground (Ex 3:4-5).* In addition, every sanctified thing acquired specific status: nothing impure could approach Him: *who goes near the holy things which the children of Israel dedicate to the LORD, while he has uncleanness upon him, that person shall be cut off from My presence: I am the LORD* (Lev. 22:3).

However, proximity to God, experiencing closeness to Him is an inseparable aspect of spiritual life of a Christian. This explains the need to partake in Eucharist, cross himself with a sign of the Holy Cross. Perhaps, longing for closeness to God explains the desire of a man to contemplate the object of worship, have icons, to wear close to a heart a Holy Crucifix; as

if they by doing this, at the level of perception, a man can reduce the spiritual distance between him and invisible God to make Him near. Likewise, not once in the Holy Scriptures we find how God Himself reduces the distance between Him and a man by coming down to people from above, leading them on their way from Egypt in a form of cloud and fire pillar. Moreover, the passages telling about birth of God Himself in a human body (John 1:14; 14:9) and abiding in believers by the Holy Spirit (John14:16–17) can be interpreted as an act uniting (maximum possible for a mortal man reduction) corporal man and infinite God (Mtt. 18:20) and offering access to Him.

In the Pentateuch we find the metaphorical link between closeness of God to people allowing constant access to Him that provides a basis for metaphor ACCESS TO GOD IS PROXIMITY: "For what great nation is there that has God so <u>near</u> to it, as the LORD our God is to us, for whatever reason we may call upon Him? (Deut. 4:7). I will dwell <u>among</u> the children of Israel and will be their God (Ex. 29:45). Moreover, according to God's instruction Israelites had to build the tabernacle of meeting (Ex. 29: 42), the place of meeting of God with His worshipers. It is a place of contact – maximum reduction of distance (meeting is understood as "an act or process of coming together" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary)). It is the place where God speaks: "I will <u>meet </u>you to <u>speak with you</u>" (Ex. 29:43). At the same time, at the tabernacle of meeting, the Testimony (the Decalogue) was put in the ark and was kept at the heart of the Holy of Holies. When Israelites camped, Levites settled at the middle of the camps (Lev. 2:17). The tent of meeting was "at the centre of the camp with the priestly tribe of Levi immediately surrounding it. The Levites will be in the same position when the camp relocates and 'set[s] out'" (Sprinkle, 2015:191). We can picture the camp, the tabernacle at the very centre surrounded by Levites. Within the Holy of Holies there is the ark with the Decalogue. And it is "from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are on the ark of the Testimony that God spoke to the children of Israel" (Ex. 25:22). The Decalogue (the covenant commandments) is found at the centre of the Divine-human fellowship. Thus, the interweaving of metaphorical ideas about closeness between God and His law, as well as centrality of God's commandments becomes evident, and it results in overlapping the metaphors ACCESS TO GOD IS PROXIMITY and GOD'S COMMANDMENTS ARE CENTRAL.

Bible scholar Patrick Miller expresses the same idea pointing out that in the context of Deuteronomy "the nearness of God and the righteous laws are closely related". "For this commandment which I command you today is not […] far off. It is not in heaven, […] Nor is it beyond the sea, […] But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may do it" (Deut. 30:11–14). "The righteous laws being written on the heart and being kept are in some sense a manifestation of the presence of God. God draws near in the law that God gives. Israel keeps God close by heeding God's word" (The Heart of Torah 2017: 218) and by living it: "[…] man shall not live by bread alone; but man lives by every *word* that proceeds from the mouth of the Lord" (Deut. 8:2; Matt.4:4)). The last commandment invokes a chain of conceptual metaphors THE WORD OF GOD IS BREAD, WORD IS CHRIST, CHRIST IS BREAD OF LIFE whereby our understanding of the word as Christ Himself is framed. This explains why closeness to the Word of God is repeatedly stressed in the Pentateuch texts.

The above reasoning leads to conclusion about implicit presence of metaphor ACCESS TO GOD IS PROXIMITY. It is not possible to introduce all relevant contexts, but analysis does reveal, that this model is developed through a number of events, crucial for understanding the Bible (giving the Law, God's embodiment in Flesh and in the Word, descending as the Holy Spirit). This, we assume, underlines the centrality of this model for understanding our experience of transcendental in general and God in particular.

Interesting enough is the fact that the distance to God is understood as a distance to the Heaven. As we have already seen, the heaven is conceptualised as the dwelling place of God Himself, a place up there above (ontological and orientational metaphors): "*Your holy habitation*" (Deut. 26:15); the place of "*hosts of heaven*" (Deut. 4:19); the place of angels: "*the Angel of God called* […] *out of heaven*" (Gn. 21:17; 22:15). Similarly to any other physical place, it has physical measurements (has limits): "*from one end of heaven to the other*" (4:32); there is a centre within it: "the midst of heaven" (Deut. 4:11). Similarly to a house construction, it is conceptualised with windows: "the windows of heaven were opened" (Gn. 7:11) (container metaphor). It is the storage of unseen abundance (container metaphor): "*The* LORD *will open the heavens, the storehouse of his bounty, to send rain on your land in season and to bless all the work of your hands*" (Deut. 28:12). Interesting enough is the fact that in a course of His creative work, God creates the firmament to separate the waters above from the waters below. This firmament is nothing but what we used to refer to as heavens. The spectre of outlined meaning is extended through etymology of a word "heaven". Ellen van Wolde explains that heaven in Genesis is the division between the waters. In Hebrew *sha-mayim* "heaven" "literary means 'what relates to (*sha*) the waters (*mayim*)': heaven, *sha-mayim*, divides the *mayim* above from *mayim* below" (Walde, van 1997: 16). In Priestly creation account in Genesis 1–6 cosmological term *rāqĭa'*, that is "firmament" is found. Another term used to refer to heavens is derived from *'gd* and means *bind together*; basic meaning is *bundle*. The term is used uniquely in Amos 9:6 ("He who builds His layers in the sky") to point out that "Israelites could imagine the vault of the sky not only as solid expanse (*rāqĭa'*) but also as a kind of batched roof made of reeds covering the earth, after the manner of Sumerian houses with their characteristic barrel-shaped roofs" (The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament 2006: 209). Surprisingly, but like *hell* (*kel-*), a terrible place of eternal punishment, *heaven* (*kem-*), a place that believers associate with the Paradise, final habitation, where no evil or sorrow can be find, derives from an Indo-European root meaning "to cover". However, unlike *kel-* (*to cover* or *conceal*), *kem-* means "cover". *Kem-* is from *ak-men* (stone, sharp stone tool) and is understood as a roof forming overarching, stony vault of the sky (Online Etymological Dictionary URL: https://www.etymonline.com/). Metaphoric conceptualisation of heavens as God's realm, and conceptualization of distance from God as distance from heaven, a place opposite to hell becomes gradually regular practice; references to heaven as a special spiritual place became metaphoric (The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament 2006: 204–237). Thus, the exploration of a concept HEAVENS revealed the entailments of the metaphors HEAVENS IS UP, HEAVENS IS THE PLACE and a container metaphor HEAVENS IS CONTAINER.

Our investigation also revealed that attainment of holiness imposes constant moral choice expressed within Pentateuch texts by one of basic metaphoric models LIFE IS JOURNEY. According Olaf Jakel, within religious discourse such metaphoric model assumes two-life-ways dichotomy – moral and unmoral one. Olaf Jakel considers this model in detail on the material of both the OT and NT texts (*Jakel*, 2003: 63). We will dwell on the Pentateuch texts within which LIFE IS JOURNEY structural metaphoric model is realized through conceptual metaphor LEADING A MORAL LIFE IS MAKING A JOURNEY ON GOD'S WAY: "walk in all the ways which the LORD your God has commanded you" (Deut. 6:32), "keep My ordinances, to walk in them" (Lev. 18 4–5); and also Deut. 8:6, 10:12; 11:22, Lev. 26: 3–5 and others. Such model involves a guide, travellers, path, destination, etc. Thus, on this way GOD IS THE GUIDE. He is "who went in the way before you to search out a place for you to pitch your tents, to show you the way you should go, in the fire by night and in the cloud by day" (Deut. 1:33); "the Lord your God is He who goes over before you" (Deut. 9:3), and other passages (Deut. 1:36; 13: 2–5; 26:16; 28:9, 14). Moreover,

God is one of travellers: GOD IS THE SOJOURNER. This conceptual metaphor reveals itself in a passages as "for the LORD your God, He is the One who goes with you" (Deut. 31:6)). Moreover, He is the One who will keep going with you in any circumstances: "He is the One who goes before you. He will be with you, He will not leave you nor forsake you; do not fear nor be dismayed" (Deut. 31:6, 8). Importantly, that turning aside God's way is understood as committing sin (SINNING IS DEVIATING / SWIRLING FROM GOD'S WAY conceptual metaphor). At the same time, doing what is right is metaphorically conceptualized as keeping God's way: "They will keep the way of the Lord, to do righteousness and judgment" (Gn.18:19). In this way "the way" is nothing but God's commandments. The ontological metaphor GOD'S COMMENDMENDS ARE THE PATH reveals itself: "you shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left" (Deut. 5:32; 17:20); "he may not turn aside from the commandment to the right hand or to the left" (Deut. 17:20); "you shall not turn aside from any of the words which I command you this day, to the right or the left" (Deut. 28:14). To keep God's way is the imperative. However, it is a man that makes moral choice, and this moral choice is the choice of ways: MORAL CHOICE IS CHOICE OF WAY; it is death-or-life choice; only God's way leads to (eternal) life. "See, I have set before you today life and good, death and evil, in that I command you today […] to walk in His ways, […] that you may live and multiply; […] But if your heart turns away […] that you shall surely perish" (Deut. 30:15–18); "And […] you shall not prosper in your ways" (Deut. 28:29). "You shall walk in all the ways which the LORD your God has commanded you, that you may live" (Deut. 5:33).

In sum, structuring of sacred reality of the Pentateuch by means of metaphorical expansion from a source domain tri-dimensional space onto a target-domain metaphysical reality is accomplished via a number of mappings (conceptual metaphors), namely: GOD'S STATUS IS UP, HEAVENS IS THE PLACE, HEAVENS IS UP, HEAVENS IS CONTAINER, BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL IS DOWN, BOWING DOWN IS DOWN, GOD IS OBJECT, GOD IS THE MAN OF WAR, BLESSING IS UP, IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE, CROSS IS CENTRAL, GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME, GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION, HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS, CLEAN PEOPLE IS HOLY PEOPLE, ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT, THE WORD OF GOD IS BREAD, HOLINESS IS PROXIMITY TO GOD, ACCESSIBILITY TO GOD IS PROXIMITY, GOD'S COMMANDMENTS ARE CENTRAL, GOD IS THE GUIDE, GOD IS THE SOJOURNER, SINNING IS DEVIATING / SWIRLING FROM GOD'S WAY, GOD'S COMMENDMENDS ARE THE PATH, MORAL CHOICE IS CHOICE OF WAY, LEADING A MORAL LIFE IS MAKING A JOURNEY ON GOD'S WAY.

Let us dwell now on metaphorical expansion from source-domains "human" (physical, physiological, psychological features) and "human interpersonal relationships" (family relationships, social roles, status, authority, etc.) onto the metaphysical / transcendental (God, Angels).

Metaphorical mappings with a source-domain human (physical, physiological, psychological features) occupy special place among the rest. Conceptualization of God in terms of HUMAN allows us to imagine His as having a body and possessing supra-natural cognitive abilities, omnipotent (all-powerful), omniscient (all-knowing) and omnipresent (is present everywhere), eternal and unchangeable. Although, such image of God is collective. It means that He never appears as an embodied person. However, cognitive metaphor allows the reader to think up lacking links to obtain the person-like gestalt. It is such metaphor that provides bridging ontological gap between limited human reason and transcendental God. Collectively, the sources of metaphorical mappings are:

1) physical features of a man: a) parts of human body: Your *right hand* (Ex. 15:6); I will stretch forth *My hand* (Ex. 9:14; 33:22); Under *His feet* was, as it were, a paved work of sapphire stone (Ex. 24:10); Then I will take away *My hand*, and you shall see *My back* (Ex. 33:23); I will set *My face* against that soul (Lv. 17:10); the Lord lift up *His countenance* (Nm. 26:6); *Your face* (Gn. 4:18) etc.; b) physical actions (action / motion): *God divided* (Gn. 1:7); *He formed* (Gn. 2:7); *God walking* (Gn. 3:8); *went up* (Gn. 35:13); *stood* (Gn. 28:13); c) physical states: *He rested* (Gn. 2:2); d) language / voice: they heard *the voice of the Lord God* (Gn. 2:8); *the Lord God called* Adam and said to him (Gn. 2:9); *I heard Your voice* (Gn. 3:10); etc.

2) physiological features of a man: a) physiological processes: *God saw* the light (Gn. 1:4); *looked* upon the earth (Gn. 6:12); *smelled s*weet aroma (Gn. 6:21); *God […] breathed* (Gn. 2:7); etc.

3) psychic features of a man: a) memory, reasoning / intellect: *God remembered* (Gn. 8:1); *God thought* (Gn. 6:21); *God knows* (Gn. 3:5); *He thought* this over (Gn. 6:6); etc.

4) soul-driven features of a man: a) moral virtues *faithful, trustworthy* (Gn. 22:12); *longsuffering* (Gn. 6:3; 15: 16); *loving* (Gn. 17:7); *graceful* (Gn. 6:8); *righteous, just* (Gn. 18:26); etc. b) feelings: *God was grieved* (Gn. 6:6); *delighted* (Gn. 1); etc.

Transcendent essences other than God undergo personification too. Among them there are Angels. They are "a race of spiritual beings of a nature exalted far above that of man, infinitely removed from that of God – whose office is 'to do him service in heaven, and by his appointment to succour and defend men on the earth'" (Peloubet, 1947: 34). They are major representatives of God. However, some of them have fallen apart from God and counteract Him. Destination and role of angels is explained within the heavenly hierarchy of Cyril of Jerusalem (IVc.), three Epistles of Apostle Paul (approximately 48/58 BC), in the Commentary "Regulations of Saint Apostles" of the theologian or Gregory Nazianzen (approximately 394), as well as Dionysius the Areopagite's "Celestial Hierarchy" (V c.). According to St. Thomas Aquinas, an angel is conceived as the bodiless substance, and "is said to be in a corporeal place by application of the angelic power in any manner whatever to any place" ("Summa Theologiae" by Thomas Aquinas, v.2. Q. 52, Article 1).

As our analysis has shown, in the Pentateuch texts ANGEL IS PERSON conceptual metaphor emerges through a number of entailments. There are some of them: *the Angel of the Lord found her by a* spring (Gn. 16:7); *The Angel of the Lord then said to her* (Gn. 16:9); *Now the two angels came to* Sodom in the evening (Gn. 19:1); *the angels urged Lot to hurry* (Gn. 19:15); *the Angel of God called to Hagar* (Gn. 21:17); *Then the Angel of the Lord called to Abraham* (Gn. 22:15); etc.

Moreover, metaphorical mapping of a source-domain human interpersonal relationships (family relationships, social roles, status, authority, etc.) to target-domain metaphysical and physical reality leads us back to conceptual metaphor GOD IS PERSON that allows considering God-human relationships by means of their metaphorical conceptualization as GOD IS CREATOR, GOD IS KING, GOD IS FATHER, GOD IS JUDGE, GOD IS SHEPHERD, GOD IS THE MAN OF WAR, GOD IS HUSBAND OF HIS PEOPLE, GOD IS HELPER, GOD IS PROVIDER, GOD IS HEALER, GOD IS FRIEND, GOD IS THE LORD. Different aspects of given conceptual metaphors gained a detail analysis in the works of a number of scholars (D. Aaron, A. Basson, Ralf Bisschops, G. B. Caird, S. Dille, A. Moore, N. Perrin, P. van Hecke, S. McFague, E. E. Sweetser, M. Th. DesCamp, M. Z. Brettler, J. M. Soskice, N. Stienstra, M. Lind, Z. Kovecses, L. J. Derdue, M. Tryggve, R. L. Platzner, E. J. van Wolde and many others). Importantly, those metaphorical extensions of a model GOD IS PERSON structure God-human relationships and are conceptually inseparable. Generalizing from the investigation of the

afore-mentioned scholars, within the Pentateuch texts God is modelled as a mature adult, all-powerful, active and strong, protector, provides the Law, leaders, freedom, special relations with Self to Israel as "first born son"; His children in their turn must honour and obey Him, give heed to His voice and follow Him (Deut. 2:4; 3:3, 18, 22; 4:1, 30; 7:6; 7:8;9, 10; 8:5, 20; 9: 23; 11:2; 21:16,17; 31:22–23, 26; 32:5–9, 15, 19–20, 36, 41–45, 48, 51; 33: 21, 27–29; etc.).

In her investigation, Sally McFague sees more sense in using metaphor GOD IS MOTHER instead of such basic metaphor as GOD IS FATHER. Discussion of such shift is beyond the limits of this paper. We will just point out that conceiving one and the same divinity as both father and mother is a peculiar characteristic of ancient Near Eastern culture (gods Ptah, Osiris, Amon etc.), since attribution of both-gender epithets to a divinity highlighted his function of a creator (The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament 2006: 3). However, as far as the model offered by Sally McFague, we support A. Barselona's opinion on the issue. Regardless the benefits of the offered shift, we believe that there is no need to replace a traditional metaphorical model GOD IS FATHER of Christian God (Barcelona, 1999: 198). Moreover, Sally McFague herself points out that substitution of metaphorical model can result in substitution of religion (McFague 1982: 110).

Metaphors with the source-domain human interpersonal relationships express a significant aspect of God-human relationships, as they reveal the pursuit of God to restore relationships with the fallen men. Most accurately this pursuit is reflected by relationships that God had established with some chosen people as well as with a whole nation. These relations are lexicalized by an old Hebrew term *bērith*, which functioned as a constant reminder about the seriousness of consequences for those who break agreement / covenant. It is a derivative of a Babylonian term *birutu*, 'binding', interpreted as 'cutting', "referring to a custom of cutting or dividing animals in two and passing between the parts in ratifying a covenant" (Peloubet 1947: 127–128). At the same time, it demonstrated what punishment expected those who broke the agreement. The idea of the covenant as a structure / object (metaphors COVENANT IS STRUCTURE, COVENANT IS OBJERCT) becomes obvious as we analyse the entailments that present covenant in a way it can be established (*I will establish My covenant* (Gn. 9:11); *I will establish My covenant* (Gn.17:2); made (*the Lord made a covenant with Abram* (15:18); broken (*for he has broken My covenant* (Gn.17:14); it is an object of possession (*you shall keep My covenant,* (Gn. 17:9). This metaphoric idea is one of principal Biblical ideas, because, on the one hand, it conceptualizes Biblical story from Genesis to Revelation, incorporating the tenets of restoring trustworthy Divine-human relationships. On the other hand, it is a long way in a person's life, his own story of coming back to eternal home. This metaphor is a ground for a number of covenants starting from God's promise given to Noah (Gn. 9), covenant with Abraham (Gn.17:1), the Sinai covenant (Ex 19, 20; Deut. 30) to the New Testament covenant established by the blood of Jesus Christ (Mtt. 26:28).

According to Nelly Stienstra, Ralf Bisschops the sense of the Sinai covenant between YHWH and Israel is fixed by a metaphorical model COVENANT IS WEDDING and within the model by a conceptual metaphor YAHWEH IS HUSNBAND OF HIS PEOPLE (Stienstra 1993: 70–95; Bisschops 2003: 126). Presence of these metaphors is obvious in a context of all Scriptures and especially prophetic books, Song of Songs, in the New Testament where the Church is conceptualized as Christ's Bride and Christ Himself as Bridegroom. However, regardless of obvious presence, the metaphorical model COVENANT IS WEDDING as well as the conceptual metaphor YAHWEH IS ISRAEL'S HUSNBAND is elicited only by metaphorical implications and entailments. As it is expected from husband, YHWH loves and protects His people. Moreover, following the scholar

L. A. Hoffman, R. Bisschops points out that YHWH "also raises his people to the level of self-determination and national autonomy, that is to say 'sanctifies' it and this corresponds to the later rabbinical notion of marriage according to which the wife is 'sanctified' by the wedding" (Cited in Bisschops 2003: 129). In this connection, Israel is conceptualized as *holy nation, holy priesthood above other nations* (Deut. 10:15; 14:2; 15:6; 26:19; 28:1, 13; etc.) that is sanctified nation. In terms of YAHWEH IS ISRAEL'S HUSNBAND metaphor, Israel arises as wife. Thus, it justifies and explains jealousy on the part of YHWH. His warning not to follow other gods; idolatry is equalled to adultery. "From a semantic viewpoint there is the notion of 'otherness' which is understood as something different, opposite. It is in a context of the notion of 'otherness' that R. Bisschops considers the notions *idolatry* and *adultery*. The scholar establishes a parallel between idolatry, as worshiping other gods, and relationships out of wedlock, that is adultery. In both cases, it bears the sense of adultery. Thus, IDOLATRY IS ADULTERY (Bisschops, 2003: 133). This explains YHWH's warning not to follow other gods: "Do not worship any other god, for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God" (Ex. 34:14).

Thus, the analyses of metaphorical mappings of source-domains "human" (physical, physiological, psychological features) and "human interpersonal relationships" (family relationships, social roles, status, authority, etc.) onto the metaphysical / transcendental (God, Angels) allowed identification of the following conceptual metaphors: GOD IS PERSON, GOD IS CREATOR, GOD IS KING, GOD IS FATHER, GOD IS JUDGE, GOD IS SHEPHERD, GOD IS THE MAN OF WAR, GOD IS HUSBAND OF HIS PEOPLE, COVENANT IS STRUCTURE, COVENANT IS OBJERCT, IDOLATRY IS ADULTERY, GOD IS HELPER, GOD IS PROVIDER, GOD IS HEALER, GOD IS FRIEND, GOD IS THE LORD. ANGEL IS PERSON.

6. Conclusions.

Since recently the number of investigations conducted within theolinguistic framework has increased. It is explained, first, by the pursuit of integral knowledge about a man that motivates researchers to look beyond the world view box and requires cross-disciplinary approaches. Secondly, theolinguistics employs both linguistic and theological toolkit to conduct linguistic investigations of religious language. In this way it adds a theological dimension to linguistic investigations whereby the truthful understanding of knowledge hidden within religious texts is secured.

The current investigation was conducted on the material of the Pentateuch texts of New King James Bible. To analyse the metaphorics of the Pentateuch texts, the Conceptual Metaphors Theory (CMT) developed by Lakoff and Jonson was applied. As a result, the consistent patterns of metaphorical expansion from source-domain physical reality onto target-domain metaphysical (transcendental, sacred) reality were analysed. Conceptual metaphors that allow understanding the metaphysical (sacred) reality of the Pentateuch texts were characterized. Constant re-evaluation of gained results in the light of both linguistic and theological sources allowed new insights into metaphysical reality of the Bible.

The semantic and cognitive analysis of the metaphorics of the Pentateuch has shown that onto transcendental (sacred) reality are metaphorically mapped as source domains: 1) tri-dimensional space (verticality, centre-periphery, distance, place, object, container, etc.); 2) human (physical, physiological, psychological features); 3) human interpersonal relationships (family relationships, social roles, status, authority, etc.). Understanding of metaphysical (transcendental, sacred) reality is provided by the conceptual metaphors presented in the table below:

ORIENTATIONAL CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS

GOD'S STATUS IS UP	IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE
HEAVENS IS UP	BLESSING IS UP
BOWING DOWN IS BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL	CROSS IS CENTRAL
BOWING DOWN IS DOWN	ACCESSIBILITY TO GOD IS PROXIMITY
HOLINESS IS PROXIMITY TO GOD	STATUS IS UP
THE TREE OF LIFE/ THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE ARE CENTRAL/IMPORTANT	LAW STATUS IS DOWN
GOD'S COMMANDMENTS ARE CENTRAL	
ONTOLOGICAL METAPHORS	
GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME	GOD IS OBJECT
GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION	HEAVENS IS PLACE
HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS	ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT
GOD IS PERSON	CLEAN PEOPLE IS HOLY PEOPLE
ANGEL IS PERSON	GOD'S COMMANDMENTS ARE CENTRAL
THE WORD OF GOD IS BREAD	HEAVENS IS CONTAINER
STRUCTURAL/ONTOLOGICAL CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS	
COVENANT IS STRUCTURE	GOD IS JUDGE
COVENANT IS OBJERCT	GOD IS SHEPHERD
GOD IS CREATOR	GOD IS THE LORD
GOD IS FATHER	GOD IS HEALER
GOD IS HUSBAND OF HIS PEOPLE	GOD IS HELPER
GOD IS THE MAN OF WAR	GOD IS FRIEND
ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT	LEARNING IS EATING THE FRUIT
GOD IS PROVIDER	GOD IS KING
GOD IS THE GUIDE	SINNING IS DEVIATING\SWIRLING FROM GOD'S WAY
GOD IS THE SOJOURNER	GOD'S COMMENDMENDS ARE THE PATH
IDOLATRY IS ADULTERY	MORAL CHOICE IS CHOICE OF WAY
	LEADING A MORAL LIFE IS MAKING A JOURNEY ON GOD'S WAY

A b b r e v i a t i o n s

Gnu. – Genesis
Deut. – Deuteronomy
Ex. – Exodus
NKJV – New King James Version
Lev. – Leviticus
Nu. – Numbers
OT – Old Testament
NT – New Testament

R e f e r e n c e s

Barcelona, A. (1999). The metaphorical and metonymic understanding of the trinitarian dogma. *Metaphor and God-Talk.* P. 187–213.

Becking, B., Korpel, M. C. A. (2010). To Create, to Separate or to Construct: An Alternative for a Recent Proposal as to the Interpretation of ברא in Gen 1:1–2:4a. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, 10 (3). P. 2–21.

Belekhova, L. I. (2002). *Obraznyi prostir amerykanskoi poezii: lingvokognityvnyi aspekt* [Image Space of the American Poetry: Linguistic and Cognitive Aspect]: PhD Thesis. K.

Bisschops, R. (2003). Are religious metaphors rooted in experience? On Ezekiel's wedding metaphors. *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation.* P. 113–151.

Boldyrev, N. N., Alpatov, V. V. (2008) Kognitivno-matrichnyj analiz anglijskih hristianskih toponimov [A Cognitive-Matrix Analysis of English Christian Place-Names]. *Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki.* 4. P. 5–14.

Boldyrev, N. N. (2001). *Kognitivnaya semantika: Kurs lektsiy po angliyskoy filologii* [Cognitive Semantics: Course of Lectures in English Philology]. Tambov: Izd-vo Tamb. un-ta.

Boyer, P., Ramble, C. (2001). Cognitive Templates for Religious Concepts: Cross-cultural Evidence for Recall of Counter-Intuitive Representations. *Cognitive Science,* 25. P. 535–564.

Cherkhava, O. O. (2017). *Rekonstruktsiia teolinhvistychnoi matrytsi relihiino-populiarnoho dyskursu (na materiali anhliiskoi, nimetskoi ta ukrainskoi mov)* [Reconstruction of Theolinguistic Matrix of Religious Popular Discourse (Based on the English, German and Ukrainian Languages)]: Thesis. Kyiv.

Chudinov, A. P., Budaev, E. V. (2007). Stanovlenie i evolyuciya kognitivnogo podhoda k metafore [Establishment and evolution of Cognitive approach to Metaphor]. *Novyj filologicheskij vestnik,*1(4). P. 8–27.

Gibbs, R. (2014). Why do some people dislike conceptual metaphor theory? *Cognitive Semiotics,* 5. P. 14–36.

Gruneberg, K. N. (2003). *Abraham, blessing, and the nations: a philological and exegetical study of Genesis 12:3 in its narrative context.* Walter de Gruyter. Vol. Bd. 332, 333.

Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Held, S. (2017). *The Heart of Torah.* Volume 2: Essays on the Weekly Torah Portion: Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. The Jewish Publication Society.

Houtman, C. (1996). *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Exodus.* Vol. II. Chapters 8-19. Kampen : Kok Publishing House.

Howe, B. G. (2006). *Because You Bear This Name. Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter.* Brill, Leiden, Boston.

Izyumtseva, G. V. (2017). Typy metaforychnykh modelei u sakralnykh tekstakh Piatyknyzhzhia anhlomovnoi Biblii [Types of Metaphorical Models in Sacred Pentateuch Texts of English Bible]. *Naukovyi chasopys Natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Seriia 9. Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov,* 16. P. 102–113.

Jakel, O. (2003). How Can Moral Man Understand the Road He Travels? Prospects and Problems of the Cognitive Approach to Religious Metaphor. *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation.* P. 55–86.

Johnson, M. (1989). Image-Schematic Bases of Meaning. *Researchers Semiotique Semiotic Inquiry,* 9(1-2-3). P. 109–118.

Korolyova, A. V. (2011). Diakhronichnyi vektor doslidzhennia struktur svidomosti y myslennia [Diachronic vector of investigating the consciousness and cognition structures]. *Visnyk KNLU. Seriia Filolohiia,* 4(1). P. 52–58.

Kövecses, Z. (2011). The Biblical story retold. A cognitive linguistic perspective. In M. Brdar, S. T. Gries and M.Ž. Fuchs (eds.) *Cognitive linguistics. Convergence and expansion.* P. 325–354.

Kravtsova Yu. V. (2013). Metaforicheskaya kontseptualizatsiya mira v khudozhestvennom tekste [Metaphorical conceptualization of the world in artistic text]. *Naukovyi chasopys Natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Seriia 9. Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov,* 10. P. 149–159.

Lakoff, G., Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to a Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago : The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. *Metaphor and thought.* P. 202–251.

Lakoff D., Dzhonson M. (2008). *Metafory, kotorymi my zhivjom* [Mataphors We Live by]. per. s angl.; pod red. i s predisl. A. N. Baranova. M. : LKI.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy *in the* Flesh*: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought.* New York : Basic Books.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live by.* Chicago: The University of Chicago press.

Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., Schwartz, A. (1991). *Second Draft Copy. Master Metaphor List. Cognitive Linguistics Group.* California: University of California at Berkeley. Retrieved from: https://meta-guide.com/data-processing/computational-metaphorics/master-metaphor-list

Lundhaug, H. (2014). The Fruit of the Tree of Life. *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies.* P. 73–98.

Maslova, V. A. (2012). Teoriya konceptualnoj metafory i eyo rol v sovremennyh lingvisticheskih issledovaniyah [Theory of Conceptual Metaphor and its Role in Modern Linguistic Investigations]. *Linhvistyka. Linhvokulturolohiia.* Retrieved from: http://lingvodnu.com.ua/arxiv-nomeriv/lingvistika-lingvokulturologiya-2012/teoriya-konceptualnoj-metafory-i-eyo-rol-v-sovremennyx-lingvisticheskix-issledovaniyax/

McFague, S. (1982). *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Mechkovskaya, N. B. (2004). Lavina semiozisa, chastichno fiksiruemaya yazykom: Po dannym analiza simvoliki kresta i motivirovannyh im znakov [Avalanche of semiosis partially fixed by a language. Based on analysis of symbolics of the cross and motivated by the cross signs]. *Sokrovennye smysly: Slovo. Tekst. Kultura.* P. 575–587.

Millgrom, J. (1991). *Leviticus 1-16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* Anchor Bible 3. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Mimonides, M. (2002). *The Guide for Perplexed.* Translated from the original arabic text by M. Friedlдnder, ph.d. Skokie, Illinois, USA: Verda Books.

Moore, A. (2009). *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth: Understanding the Kingship of God of the Hebrew Bible through Metaphor.* Studies in Biblical Literature, 99. New York: Peter Lang.

Mowvley, H. (1965). The Concept and Content of "Blessing" in the Old Testament. *BT,* 16(2). P. 74–80.

Oparina, E. O. (1988). Konceptualnaya metafora [Conceptual Metaphor]. *Metafora v yazyke i tekste.* P. 65–77.

Postovalova, V. I. (2012). Teolingvistika v sovremennom gumanitarnom poznanii: istoki, osnovnye idei i napravleniya [Theolinguistics in Modern Humanities: Origins, Basic Ideas and Trends]. *Magister Dixit,* 4 (12). Retrieved from: http://md.islu.ru/.

Postovalova, V. I. (2016). *Nauka o yazyke v svete ideala celnogo znaniya: V poiskah integralnyh paradigm* [Science about Language in the Light of the Integral Knowledge Ideal: In the pursuit of Integrative Paradigm]. M.: LENAND. (Istoriya lingvofilosofskoj mysli).

Potts, A., Semino, E. (2019). Cancer as a metaphor. *Metaphor* and Symbol, 34 (2). P. 81–95.

Schaff, Ph. (2007). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series.* Vol. IX. Hilary of Poitiers, John of Damascus. Cosimo, Inc.

Semino, E., Demjen, Z., Demmen, J. E. (2018). An integrated approach to metaphor and framing in cognition, discourse and practice, with an application to metaphors for cancer. *Applied Linguistics,* 39(5). P. 625–645.

Sprinkle, J. M. (2015). *Leviticus and Numbers* (Teach the Text Commentary Series). Baker Books.

Steen, G. (2011). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor – now new and improved! *Review of Cognitive Linguistics,* 9(1). P. 26–64.

Stienstra, N. (1993). *YHVH* is the *Husband* of *His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation.* Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House.

"Summa Theologiae" by Thomas Aquinas. Retrieved from: https://arcdigital.media/summa-theologiae-by-thomas-aquinas-fbf190e03e1c

Sweetser, E., Descamp, M. T. (2014). Motivating biblical metaphors for God: Refining the cognitive model. *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies.* P. 7–23.

The Holy Bible. Containing the Old and New Testament. New King James Version. (1980). Thomas Nelson Publishers.

The Latin Vulgate Old Testament Bible. Exodus – Chapter 17. Retrieved from: http://vulgate.org /ot/exodus_17.htm

The Orthodox Christianity. Old Testament Prototypes of the Cross of the Lord. Retrieved from: https://www.trueorthodoxy.info/pat_old_testament_prototypes_cross.shtml

Thibodeau, P. H., Boroditsky, L. (201). *'Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning.* PLoS Vol. 6. № 2: e16782. Retrieved from: http://lera.ucsd.edu/papers/crime-metaphors.pdf

Teliya, V. N. (1988). Metaforizaciya i eyo rol v sozdanii yazykovoj kartiny mira [Metaphorisation and Its Role in Creating the Picture of the World]. *Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke. Yazyk i kartina mira.* P. 173–207.

White, Th. J. (2016). *Exodus (Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible).* Brazos Press.

Wolde, E. van. (1994). *Words become worlds: semantic studies of Genesis 1–11*. Biblical interpretation series, 6. Leiden: Brill.

Wolde, E. J. van. (1997). *Stories of the Beginning. Genesis 1–11 and Other Creation Stories.* Ridgefield: Morehouse Publishing.

Wolde, E. J. van. (2009). Why the Verb ברא Does Not Mean 'to Create' in Genesis 1.1–2.4a. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 34 (1). P. 3–*23.

Wolde E. J. van. (2009). *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition, and Context.* Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Wolde, E. J. van, Rezetko, R. (2011). Semantics and the Semantics of ברא: A Rejoinder to the Arguments Advanced by B. Becking and M. Korpel. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures,* 11(9). P. 2–39.

Wolde, E. J. van. (2017). Separation and Creation in Genesis 1 and Psalm 104: A Continuation of the Discussion of the Verb ברא. *Vetus Testamentum,* 67(4). P. 611–647.

Wright, B. G. (2015). *Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. The Letter of Aristeas. 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews'.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

L i s t   o f   L e x i c o g r a p h i c   S o u r c e s

Collins English Dictionary (2011). 6th ed. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Kubryakova, Ye. S. (1997). *Kratkiy slovar kognitivnykh terminov* [Concise dictionary of cognitive terms]. eds Ye. S. Kubryakova, V. Z. Demyankov, Yu. G. Pankrats, L. G. Luzina. pod obshchey red. Ye. S. Kubryakovoy. M. : Filol. f-t MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova.

Online Etymology Dictionary. Retrieved from: https: //www.etymonline.com/

Peloubet. F. N. (1947). *Peloubet's Bible dictionary.* Chicago: The J.C. Winston company in Philadelphia.

The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. ed. G. J. Botterweck. Eerdmands, 1999. Vol. 2.

The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. ed. G. J. Botterweck. Eerdmands, 2006. Vol. 15.

Анотація

У статті розглядаються концептуальні метафори, які уможливлюють осмислення метафізичної (сакральної) реальності П'ятикнижжя; характеризуються важливі для її концептуалізації когнітивні структури. Закономірності метафоричної експансії зі сфери-джерела фізичної реальності на сферу-ціль метафізичної реальності аналізуються у рамках інтегративної теолінгвістичної дисципліни. Установлено, що метафоричне структурування сакральної реальності здійснюється шляхом метафоричної експансії зі сфери-джерела 1) тривимірний простір (вертикальність, центр-периферія, відстань, об'єкти тощо); 2) людина (фізичні, фізіологічні, психічні, душевні властивості); 3) міжособистісні відношення (сімейні стосунки, соціальні ролі тощо) на сферу-ціль – метафізичне / трансцендентне (Бог, Ангели). Виявлено, що розуміння метафізичної реальності структуровано наступними концептуальними метафорами: GOD'S STATUS IS UP, GOD IS OBJECT, BOWING DOWN IS BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL, BOWING DOWN IS DOWN, BLESSING IS UP, STATUS IS UP, LAW STATUS IS DOWN, IMPORTANCE IS PRECEDENCE, THE TREE OF LIFE / THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE ARE CENTRAL / IMPORTANT, LEARNING IS EATING THE FRUIT, CROSS IS CENTRAL/IMPORTANT, GOD IS OUTSIDE TIME, GOD IS OUTSIDE CREATION, HOLINESS IS CLEANLINESS, CLEAN PEOPLE IS HOLY PEOPLE, HOLINESS IS PROXIMITY TO GOD, THE WORD OF GOD IS BREAD, ACCESSIBILITY TO GOD IS PROXIMITY, GOD'S COMMANDMENTS ARE CENTRAL, HEAVENS IS UP, HEAVENS IS THE PLACE, HEAVENS IS CONTAINER, ATONING BLOOD IS GIFT, GOD IS PERSON, GOD IS CREATOR, GOD IS KING, GOD IS FATHER, GOD IS JUDGE, GOD IS SHEPHERD, GOD IS THE MAN OF WAR, GOD IS HUSBAND OF HIS PEOPLE, GOD IS HELPER, GOD IS HEALER, GOD IS FRIEND, GOD IS THE LORD, GOD IS PROVIDER, GOD IS THE GUIDE, GOD IS

THE SOJOURNER, COVENANT IS STRUCTURE, COVENANT IS OBJERCT, IDOLATRY IS ADULTERY, ANGEL IS PERSON, SINNING IS DEVIATING / SWIRLING FROM GOD'S WAY, GOD'S COMMENDMENDS ARE THE PATH, MORAL CHOICE IS CHOICE OF WAY, LEADING A MORAL LIFE IS MAKING A JOURNEY ON GOD'S WAY.

Підтверджено ефективність застосування теолінгвістичного підходу для дослідження метафізичних реалій із перспективою розкриття глибинного розуміння всіх аспектів буття людини.

Ключові слова: *теолінгвістика, П'ятикнижжя, концептуальна метафора, концепт, образ-схема, метафорична експансія.*