re-BUŚ

Title: The concept of GOD'S FACE as an anthropopathism in the Old Testament

Author: Marcin Kuczok

Citation style: Kuczok Marcin (2016). The concept of GOD'S FACE as an anthropopathism in the Old Testament. W: E. Bogdanowska-Jakubowska (red.), "New ways to face and (im)politeness" (S. 189-206). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego

UNIWERSYTET ŚLĄSKI W KATOWICACH   Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego   Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

C h a p t e r 10

The concept of GOD'S FACE
as an anthropopathism in the Old Testament

Marcin Kuczok

Abstract
The aim of the paper is to present the concept of GOD'S FACE functioning as an anthropopathism in the language of the Old Testament. According to biblical scholars, anthropopathisms along with anthropomorphisms constitute the metaphorical means for the personification of God in the Bible. It means that in biblical discourse, God is perceived as a human being by referring either to His appearance (anthropomorphism), or feelings, attitudes and ways of interaction with people (anthropopathism). Interestingly, from a linguistic perspective, the concept of FACE may function in language as a metonymy for emotions. In Anna Wierzbicka's view, facial paralanguage replaces the linguistic production and it is possible to talk about "the semantics of facial expression." In the Old Testament, the personified God's facial paralanguage includes showing and hiding His face, turning it to/against people, as well as looking, listening and eating. Those descriptions exhibit numerous instances of the application of the concept of GOD'S FACE to express a variety of God's feelings and attitudes towards people. The range of God's emotions presented in this way involves both positive feelings, such as joy, peace and safety, as well as the negative ones, such as offence, anger or terror. Moreover, GOD'S FACE teaches and guides people or judges and destroys them. In addition, it can be observed that THE FACE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF EMOTIONS metonymy co-occurs with such metonymies as THE FACE for the person, the presence, the personality, and the confrontation with someone, producing complex interactions of conceptual mappings.

1. Introduction

The aim of the present paper is to analyse the concept of GOD'S FACE as a way of describing God's feelings, emotions, and attitudes towards people

in the English version of the Old Testament. The first question posed by the author of the paper is: Is it possible to read God's emotions from the biblical references and descriptions of His face? The next question is: what emotions and attitudes can be identified in this way? The biblical text is analysed with the semasiological approach, which starts with the linguistic forms and aims at explaining their meanings (Geeraerts, 2010, pp. 264).

The study is based on two widely recognised English translations of the Bible: the *King James Version* (1611) and the *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985). The former version has been chosen since it is claimed to be the most common English translation of the Bible, accepted for use mainly by Protestant churches. This version of the Bible was translated with the strategy of "formal equivalence," which means that it is rather literal and faithful to the original Hebrew and Aramaic sources. It is also worth mentioning that the *King James Bible* does not contain any gender-inclusive modifications, which try to alter the generic uses of the masculine forms so that they also include women. The latter translation, the *New Jerusalem Bible* was written in contemporary English and is considered to be the most popular English Bible outside the United States of America. It is accepted in the Roman Catholic Church and includes the so-called deutero-canonical books, which originally existed only in the Greek Septuagint and are absent from other popular English versions. This Bible was translated with the technique of "moderate equivalence," which means that the text is in between a literal translation and a paraphrase of the original texts. The *New Jerusalem Bible* contains some politically-correct gender inclusive language (Kuczok, 2013, pp. 61–83). The original Hebrew and Aramaic texts of the Old Testament have not been taken into account since the purpose of the paper is not to analyse the translation strategies used in the English versions of the Bible or compare the English text with the original one, but to analyse the descriptions of God's face in the English translation of the Old Testament, as this is the translation of Scripture that influences our understanding and thinking of God rather than the source text.

The article starts with a short analysis of the mechanisms of conceptualising abstract reality, which also involves the religious sphere and the concept of GOD. Next, the paper presents the ways of conceptualising GOD in the Old Testament, with a special focus on the distinction between anthropomorphism and anthropopathism. Then, the concept of FACE is analysed as a metonymy functioning in our thought and language. In the following section, the focus goes to the role of the human face in expressing emotions. Next, the article studies examples of God's positive and negative emotions and attitudes towards people expressed by means of the descriptions of His face in the English translation of the Old Testament.

2. Conceptualisation of abstract reality in cognitive linguistics: metaphor – metonymy – metaphtonymy

Conceptualisation and description of abstract reality often requires special mechanisms of meaning extension. This phenomenon refers to such concepts as TIME or LIFE, but also to the spheres of science, religion and emotions. According to cognitive linguists, meaning extension in such cases often involves metaphor, metonymy, and more complex mechanisms combining both of the processes, called sometimes metaphtonymy.

Conceptual metaphor is "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 5). "Metaphor" in cognitive linguistics can be defined as a mapping between two different conceptual domains: one experiential domain may be partially mapped or projected onto a different experiential domain, so that the second domain is partially understood in terms of the first one. The domain that is mapped is called the source or donor domain, and the domain onto which the source is mapped is called the target or recipient domain (Barcelona, 2000, pp. 3–4).

Lakoff and Johnson have distinguished three types of conceptual metaphor: orientational, ontological, and structural (2003, pp. 4–34). Orientational metaphors constitute part of the spatial organisation of people's lives, which can be illustrated by the metaphor GOOD IS UP and BAD IS DOWN, exhibited in such sentences as "He's at the peak of health" and "He dropped dead." Ontological metaphors make a non-entity, such as an idea, an activity, or an event into an entity, such as a substance, a living creature, or a person. For example, the sentence "Life has cheated me" illustrates the metaphor LIFE IS A PERSON. In structural metaphors one abstract concept is structured by means of another concept; for example, the metaphor TIME IS MONEY can be illustrated by such sentences as "You're wasting my time" and "The flat tyre cost me an hour."

Conceptual metonymy is "using one entity to refer to another that is related to it" (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 35). In contrast to metaphor, "conceptual metonymy," generally speaking, is a mapping that occurs within the same conceptual domain (Barcelona, 2000, pp. 12–13). For instance, THE PART FOR THE WHOLE mapping in "We don't hire longhairs" and the PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT metonymy in "He bought a Ford."

Then, "metaphtonymy" is the interaction between metaphor and metonymy: usually, it is either "metaphor within/from metonymy," called also "metaphor motivated by metonymy," or "metonymy within/from metaphor," called also "metonymy motivated by metaphor" (Barcelona, 2000, pp. 9–10; Goossens 2002, pp. 366–367). For example, "I'm in low spirits" and "Cheer up!" exhibit the SADNESS IS DOWN/HAPPY IS UP metaphors, motivated by the

metonymy EFFECT (bodily posture in the domain of emotions) for CAUSE (emotions). Then, the sentence "She caught the Minister's ear" is based on the metaphor ATTENTION IS A PHYSICAL ENTITY, which gives rise to the metonymy EAR FOR ATTENTION.

Lakoff and Johnson (2003, p. 40) have claimed that "the conceptual systems of cultures and religions are metaphorical in nature," and that "symbolic metonymies are critical links between everyday experience and the coherent metaphorical systems that characterize religions and cultures." Similar observations have been made by philosophers and linguists who have studied the specific character of religious language and have claimed that using metaphor, symbol, imagery, analogy, poetry lies in the nature of religious discourse (Krzeszowski, 1997, pp. 261–262; Kołakowski, 2001, pp. 160–162; Termińska, 1991, p. 132). Moreover, metaphors in religious language often become models for interpreting religious experiences, as claimed by Barbour (1976, pp. 49–50), who defines models as dominant metaphors, extensively and frequently used in various contexts.

As it will be shown in the next part of this article, the conceptual mechanisms of metaphor, metonymy, and metaphtonymy play an important role in the conceptualisation of God in the Old Testament.

3. The concept of GOD in the Old Testament

The word "God" is unique because God is transcendent, which means that He is beyond human empirical cognition and differs from anything people know. Certain dictionaries of English distinguish the word "God," spelt with a capital letter, meaning "the being worshipped in Christianity, Judaism and Islam" from "a god" or "gods" used as a common noun referring to "male spirits in some other religions" (OALD, 2000, pp. 577–578). In the Bible, God introduces His name יהוה (YHWH), pronounced either "Yahweh" or "Yahveh", which can be interpreted as "He exists." He also wants people to call Him in this very way (cf. Exodus 3: 13–15). This revelation shows that the nature of God is His existence – and that is actually all we can learn about God's name (Guillet, 1985, pp. 330–331).

From a linguistic viewpoint, it is impossible to attribute to God any common or general names: He cannot be classed; God constitutes a "class" for himself. No properties can adequately describe God since He is by His very nature indescribable. Despite this fact theology tries to depict God in a few ways, for instance, by means of the revealed attributes of God, such as omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience or immutability, and by way of natural at-

tributes, such as infinity or the holiness (Huber, 2000, pp. 42–54; Krzeszowski, 1997, p. 71). When it comes to metaphor, St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae* (I, 1, 9) claimed that it is appropriate to describe the divine and the spiritual employing the mundane analogies found in biblical metaphors. Moreover, it is natural for human cognition to move from what is accessible for people through the senses to what is accessible through the mind. Hence, the Bible presents the spiritual messages in the form of physical metaphors. Using metaphor for this purpose has an important advantage: the simpler the metaphor the better the understanding of God and the supernatural.

In the Old Testament, it is possible to identify a number of metaphorical models for GOD, based either on personification as a type of ontological metaphor, orientational metaphor or structural metaphor (Kuczok, 2009, pp. 151–168). The personifications of God include such models as GOD IS A CREATOR-ARTIST (e.g., Genesis 1: 1–27), A FATHER (e.g., Isaiah 1: 2), A FRIEND (e.g., Exodus 33: 11), A JUDGE (e.g., Psalms 82: 8), A KING (e.g., 1 Kings 22: 19), A LOVER (e.g., Jeremiah 2: 2), A MOTHER (e.g., Isaiah 66: 13), A PROVIDER (e.g., Psalms 145: 15–16), A SHEPHERD (e.g., Jeremiah 50: 19), A TEACHER (e.g., Proverbs 8: 10–11), and A WARRIOR (e.g., Psalms 38: 1–2). The orientational metaphor for God in the Old Testament involves two models: GOD IS FAR (e.g., Psalms 10: 1) and GOD IS UP (e.g., Psalms 40: 1). Then, the structural metaphors are: GOD IS LOVE (e.g., Hosea 11: 4) and GOD IS A HIDEOUT (e.g., Isaiah 26: 4). The latter model often involves metaphtonymy: the idea of God being A HIDEOUT is often expressed metonymically as A ROCK, A WALL, A REFUGE, A TOWER, A SHIELD, A FORTRESS, STRENGTH, and A STRONGHOLD (e.g., 2 Samuel 22: 1–3).

The metonymic conceptualisation of GOD can be observed in the concept of HEAVEN (e.g., 1 Maccabees 4: 10), which can be treated as an instantiation of THE PLACE FOR INHABITANT metonymy. However, a number of models for GOD in the Old Testament involve metonymies based on personification. Hence, there are descriptions of GOD'S WORD (e.g., Wisdom 18: 14–15), or GOD'S RIGHT HAND (e.g., Psalms 48: 10), which are THE INSTRUMENT FOR THE AGENT metonymy motivated by the metaphor GOD IS A HUMAN BEING. Also, the concept of GOD'S FACE (e.g., Psalms 80: 3) can be treated as THE PART FOR WHOLE metonymy based on the GOD IS A HUMAN BEING metaphor. Then, WISDOM (e.g., Wisdom 9: 4) is used as THE QUALITY FOR THE PERSON metonymy, which is further conceptualised by the WISDOM IS A PERSON metaphor.

When it comes to personification of God in the Bible, Szlaga (1986; pp. 202–203) distinguishes between anthropomorphism and anthropopathism. The former mechanism refers to physical features of God, for instance, God has a mouth (e.g., Isaiah 1: 20), and a nose (e.g., Genesis 8: 21); He walks (e.g., Genesis 3: 8), and rests (e.g., Genesis 2: 2). Anthropopathism can be defined

as psychological anthropomorphism: it refers to human feelings, emotions and attitudes towards people: God rejoices (e.g., Psalms 104: 31), is angry (e.g., Exodus 4: 14), prepares revenge (e.g., Jeremiah 46: 10), as well as regrets His children (e.g., Genesis 6: 6).

4. The concept of FACE as a conceptual metonymy

Analysing the concept of FACE from a cognitive-linguistic perspective, Bogdanowska-Jakubowska (2010, pp. 34–51) has identified a number of metonymic extensions of FACE, which shows that the concept is used with various meanings in English. The following list illustrates the identified metonymic senses of FACE:

1. THE FACE FOR THE PERSON (THE PART FOR THE WHOLE):

We need some new *faces* here.

2. THE FACE FOR THE REPRESENTATIVE:

The new *face* of the Democratic Party – and America. (about Barack Obama)

3. THE FACE FOR THE (PERSON'S) LOOK:

I know your *face*. You're Mary Robinson.

4. THE FACE FOR THE PERSON'S INNER SELF:

His *face* bore the mark/sign of disease.

5. THE FACE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF EMOTION:

Robert tried to compose his *face* into an expression of humble trust.

6. THE FACE FOR THE PERSON'S PERSONALITY/CHARACTER:

He was an old man with a kind *face*.

7. THE FACE FOR (A POSITIVE) IMAGE OF SELF:

He was afraid of failure because he didn't want to lose *face* with his colleagues.

8. THE FACE FOR THE PRESENCE OF SOMEBODY/SOMETHING:

How can you show your *face* here after the way you behaved last night?

9. THE FACE FOR THE CONFRONTATION WITH SOMEBODY/SOME-
THING:

In the *face* of great hardship, she managed to keep her sense of humour.

As can be noticed in the above list, one of the metonymic mappings identified in English links FACE to the sphere of EMOTIONS. This very metonymy usually underlies the anthropopathisms studied in the present paper: GOD'S FACE in the language of the Old Testament can be interpreted as a metonymy for GOD'S EMOTIONS. Also, the mappings THE FACE FOR THE PERSON'S PERSONALITY/CHARACTER and THE FACE FOR CONFRONTATION WITH SOMEONE play an important role in analysing the biblical anthropopathisms.

5. The role of the human face in expressing emotions

According to Bogdanowska-Jakubowska (2010, pp. 76–82), the role of the face in communicating feelings and emotions can be interpreted in two complementary rather than antithetical ways: either as a biologically determined reaction to a certain limited number of situations or as a paralanguage that can often replace the linguistic production.

The former understanding of the human face has been described by Ekman (1990), for whom facial expressions are a consequence of neural programming. In his views, based on Duchenne de Boulogne's observations (1862/1990), facial muscle actions can occur involuntarily and only some facial muscle actions can be produced deliberately. In addition, although it is possible to state that certain facial patterns are universal, common to humanity, the number of innate facial expressions is limited to six basic emotions: happiness, anger, disgust, sadness, fear, and surprise. Ekman and Friesen (1969) provide a typology of facial expressions, classifying them into "emblems," "adaptors," "illustrators," and "regulators." "Emblems" are facial gestures used to replace words, for example, "the facial shrug" may mean "I don't know." Next, "adaptors" are self-manipulative facial actions, such as biting the lips or

working the jaws. "Illustrators" are facial movements that function as means for vivifying speech, for instance, placing accent on the uttered word with raising the eyebrows. Finally, "regulators" are used to regulate access to the floor during conversation, for example, with the head nod indicating that we have got the point.

Another viewpoint is presented by Wierzbicka (1999, p. 177; 2000, p. 176) who has written about "the semantics of facial expression" which is analogous to verbal utterances. In her opinion, human faces should be analysed from the point of view of human understanding rather than neural programming. The semantic study of the face should aim at identifying such minimal units of facial behaviour as, for instance, eyebrows raised, eyes wide open, brow furrowed, lips pressed together, corners of the mouth raised or lowered, or nose raised. Such facial messages are always expressed in the first person singular in the present tense since they reveal the speaker's current state of mind. For instance, someone is smiling because it is him or her that is feeling something good, and they are feeling it while smiling, right now, and not in the past.

In our analysis of the anthropomorphic references to God's face in the Old Testament, we will take into account both approaches to studying facial expressions: as natural reactions to emotions and as a paralanguage used in biblical descriptions of God's communication with people.

6. The concept of GOD'S FACE as a description of God's positive emotions and attitudes

The descriptions of God's facial paralanguage connected with positive emotions and attitudes include: showing the face in (1), hiding the face in (5), lifting up the face in (4), letting people come before God's face in (2), setting or keeping the eyes upon and looking at people in (6) and (7), speaking face to face with people in (8), and making the face shine in (3) and (10). It seems that, following Ekman and Friesen's classification of facial expressions, the biblical descriptions of God's facial gestures function as emblems: they are used instead of words that might have been used to express those emotions or attitudes. Additionally, example (9) does not include any particular description of a facial gesture, but has been included in this analysis since it contains a reference to God's face and reveals some of God's emotions and traits of personality.

Thus, as shown in example (1) below, God shows His face to good people: the honest people can see His face or countenance, which functions as a kind of reward for their righteousness. God appears here as good and just.

(1) Psalms 11: 7:

> The *King James Version* (hereafter abbreviated as *KJV*): For the righteous
> LORD loveth righteousness; his *countenance* doth behold the upright.
> The *New Jerusalem Bible* (hereafter abbreviated as *NJB*): For Yahweh is
> upright and loves uprightness, the honest will ever see his *face*.

Next, in example (2), God's face brings joy to a man who has the privilege
of seeing His face. This fact makes the man joyful, which may be the result
of meeting God who is joyful Himself. Again, the example portraits God as
good for people.

(2) Job 33: 26:

> *KJV:* He shall pray unto God, and he will be favourable unto him: and he
> shall see his *face* with joy: for he will render unto man his righteousness.
> *NJB:* He will pray to God who has restored him to favour, and will come into
> his *presence* with joy. He will tell others how he has received saving justice.

In example (3), God's face shines on people and saves them. This descrip-
tion shows God as caring: He guarantees safety to people.

(3) Psalms 80: 3:

> *KJV:* Turn us again, O God, and cause thy *face* to shine; and we shall be saved.
> *NJB:* God, bring us back, let your *face* shine on us and we shall be safe.

Another good gift given to people by God's face, which is lifted or shown
to people, is peace, perhaps because God's face is peaceful itself (4).

(4) Numbers 6: 26:

> *KJV:* The LORD lift up his *countenance* upon thee, and give thee peace.
> *NJB:* May Yahweh show you his *face* and bring you peace.

God's face can also give life: when it is turned away or hidden from people,
they die (5). God here appears as good and generous to people.

(5) Psalms 104: 28–29:

> *KJV:* That thou givest them they gather: thou openest thine hand, they are
> filled with good. Thou hidest thy *face*, they are troubled: thou takest away
> their breath, they die, and return to their dust.
> *NJB:* You provide the food they gather, your open hand gives them their fill.
> Turn away your *face* and they panic; take back their breath and they die and
> revert to dust.

Similarly, in example (6), God's look fills earth with goods: He is good, generous and caring.

(6) Jeremiah 24: 6:

> *KJV:* For I will set mine *eyes* upon them for good, and I will bring them again to this land: and I will build them, and not pull them down; and I will plant them, and not pluck them up.
> *NJB:* My *eyes* will watch over them for their good, to bring them back to this country, to build them up and not to break them down, to plant them and not to uproot them.

Moreover, God's look teaches people and guides them: He keeps eyes on people (7). In this example, God is presented as interested in people, caring, and helpful.

(7) Psalms 32: 8:

> *KJV:* I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will guide thee with mine *eye.*
> *NJB:* I shall instruct you and teach you the way to go; I shall not take my *eyes* off you.

In example (8), God talks to Moses face to face, which is supposed to show His friendly attitude and intimate relationship with the man.

(8) Exodus 33: 11:

> *KJV:* And the Lord spake unto Moses *face to face*, as a man speaketh unto his friend.
> *NJB:* Yahweh would talk to Moses *face to face*, as a man talks to his friend.

In example (9), people open their hearts before God's face: He is understanding, interested, sympathetic, and willing to listen to people talking about their problems.

(9) Lamentations 2: 19:

> *KJV:* Arise, cry out in the night: in the beginning of the watches pour out thine heart like water before the *face* of the Lord.
> *NJB:* Up, cry out in the night-time as each watch begins! Pour your heart out like water in Yahweh's *presence*!

In example (10), God's face is gracious: again, it shines on people, and the helpful and caring good God gives grace to them.

(10) Numbers 6: 25:

> *KJV:* The LORD make his *face* shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee.
> *NJB:* May Yahweh let his *face* shine on you and be gracious to you.

As can be observed in the above examples from the English translations of the Old Testament, the various references to the facial paralanguage in the descriptions of God's face include various lexical correlates of FACE. Sometimes the two analysed translations of the Bible even differ in this respect. Thus, besides "face," there is also "countenance," "presence," and "eye(s)." However, all of these words denote concepts that are metonymically connected to FACE: COUNTENANCE and EYES may be treated as instantiations of THE PART FOR THE WHOLE metonymy, while someone's PRESENCE is what FACE often metonymically stands for, as shown in example (8) in section 4 of the present paper.

Additionally, the metonymic mappings connected with the concept of God's FACE often co-occur in the studied examples. Thus, the metonymic mapping THE FACE FOR THE PERSON (God's face signifies God Himself) or THE FACE FOR THE PRESENCE co-occurs with THE FACE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF EMOTIONS metonymy: in example (4) God is peaceful, and in (2) He is joyful. Then, in example (8), THE FACE FOR THE PERSON or PRESENCE metonymy co-occurs with THE FACE FOR INTERACTION WITH SOMEONE metonymy, when God is talking face to face with Moses. Finally, in a number of examples, THE FACE FOR THE PERSON or PRESENCE co-occurs with THE FACE FOR THE PERSON'S PERSONALITY or CHARACTER metonymy: God is good in (1), (2), (5), (6), and (10), caring in (3), (6), (7), and (10), helpful in (7) and (10), interested in (7) and (9), generous in (5) and (6), just in (1), friendly in (8), understanding in (9), gracious in (10), and sympathetic in (9).

7. The concept of GOD'S FACE as a description of God's negative emotions and attitudes

The facial paralanguage used in the descriptions of God's face, which exhibit God's negative feelings, emotions, and attitudes towards people, involves setting or turning the face away from sinners in (11), hiding the face in (12) and (13), looking in such a way that makes people scared and causes destruction in (15) and (16), swallowing or devouring people in (18), and judging them face to face in (14). Again, similarly to the examples showing God's positive emotions

and attitudes, also here the studied facial gestures function mainly as emblems: they replace verbal communication. Additionally, the list of biblical examples contains example (17) in which there is a reference to God's face, and which contributes to the study of God's emotions, although there is no information about God's facial paralanguage.

First, God's face sets or turns against sinners in anger, as shown in example (11). God seems to be touchy or sensitive, offended by people's sins, but also aggressive towards them.

(11) Leviticus 20: 3:

> *KJV:* And I will set my *face* against that man, and will cut him off from among his people.
> *NJB:* And I shall set my *face* against that man and outlaw him from his people.

Moreover, God hides His face from evil people (12): again, He appears to be sensitive and offended by people.

(12) Deuteronomy 32: 20:

> *KJV:* And he said, I will hide my *face* from them, I will see what their end shall be: for they are a very froward generation, children in whom is no faith.
> *NJB:* 'I shall hide my *face* from them,' he said, 'and see what will become of them. For they are a deceitful brood, children with no loyalty in them.

Then, as shown in example (13), God hides His face in anger. Here, the sensitive God is irritated and offended by sinners, but also forgiving, when He promises to take pity on people.

(13) Isaiah 54: 8:

> *KJV:* In a little wrath I hid my *face* from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the LORD thy Redeemer.
> *NJB:* In a flood of anger, for a moment I hid my *face* from you. But in everlasting love I have taken pity on you, says Yahweh, your redeemer.

In example (14), God's face judges people: similarly to example (8), where God is shown talking face to face with people, also here He has a close relationship with them and a direct attitude towards them.

(14) Ezekiel 20: 35:

> *KJV:* And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you *face to face*.

NJB: I shall lead you into the desert of the nations and there I shall judge you *face to face*.

Next, in example (15), God's terrifying look makes people shake: God is irritated, wrathful, revengeful, and even aggressive.

(15) Habakkuk 3: 6:

KJV: He stood, and measured the earth: he *beheld*, and drove asunder the nations.
NJB: When he stands up, he makes the earth tremble, with his *glance* he makes the nations quake.

Another description of God's anger is shown in example (16). Here, God's angry look destroys sinners: He is sensitive and touchy but also wrathful, revengeful, and aggressive.

(16) Lamentations 4: 16:

KJV: The anger of the LORD hath divided them; he will no more regard them.
NJB: The *face* of Yahweh destroyed them, he will look on them no more.

God's sensitiveness and irritable character can be well observed in example (17), in which God's face is offended and must be propitiated by people.

(17) 1 Kings 13: 6:

KJV: And the king answered and said unto the man of God, Intreat now the *face* of the LORD thy God, and pray for me, that my hand may be restored me again.
NJB: The king said to the man of God, 'I beg you to placate Yahweh your God, and so restore me the use of my hand.'

In example (18), God's face is a fire of anger which swallows or devours His enemies. This description shows God's fury and aggression.

(18) Psalms 21: 9:

KJV: Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the LORD shall *swallow* them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them.
NJB: You will hurl them into a blazing furnace on the day when you appear; Yahweh will engulf them in his anger, and fire will *devour* them.

As in the case of the descriptions of God's face that exhibit God's positive emotions and attitudes towards people, also the examples studied in this part

involve various lexical correlates of the concept of GOD'S FACE. Besides the word "face," the list includes such items as the noun "glance," and the verbs "behold," "swallow," and "devour." Interestingly, in example (16), the *King James Version* reads "the anger of the Lord" where the *New Jerusalem Bible* reads "the face of Yahweh." The concept of FACE present in the *New Jerusalem Bible* can be said to stand metonymically for GOD'S ANGER, as this emotion is often pictured on the face (THE FACE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF EMOTIONS metonymy), while the rendering in the *King James Version* seems to be straightforward here, without this metonymy. Then, in example (17), the translation from the *King James Version* has the word "face" in the expression "intreat now the face of the LORD" while the text from the *New Jerusalem Bible* reads "I beg you to placate Yahweh." In this case, only the *King James Version* seems refer to GOD'S FACE, following the metonymic mapping THE FACE FOR SOMEONE'S PRESENCE.

The co-occurrence of various metonymic mappings can be also observed in the analysed examples. The metonymic mapping THE FACE FOR THE PERSON or PRESENCE co-occurs with THE FACE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF EMOTIONS metonymy: in examples (11), (12), (13), and (17), God is offended, in (13) and (15), God is irritated, and in (11), (13), and (16), He is angry or even furious in (18). Then, in example (14), the metonymy THE FACE FOR THE PERSON or PRESENCE co-occurs with another metonymy THE FACE FOR INTERACTION WITH SOMEONE, when God judges people face to face. In numerous examples, the mapping THE FACE FOR THE PERSON or PRESENCE co-occurs with the metonymy THE FACE FOR THE PERSON'S PERSONALITY or CHARACTER: God is touchy or sensitive in (11), (12), (13), (16), and (17), irritable in (13), (15), and (17), aggressive in (11), (15), (16), and (18), wrathful in (15) and (16), as well as revengeful in (15) and (16).

Interestingly, when referring to God's negative emotions and traits of personality, the descriptions give us certain information about God's positive sides. Thus, in example (13), God appears as forgiving though He is angry, and in (8), God seems to be close to people and straightforward in his decision to judge people face to face.

8. Conclusions

In the answer to the questions posed in the introduction to the article, we may say that it is possible to read God's feelings, emotions and attitudes towards people from the analysed biblical descriptions and references. This is possible thanks to the fact that the descriptions of God's face involve the facial

paralanguage. Table 1 presents God's emotions and attitudes towards people expressed by means of particular facial gestures in the English version of the Old Testament. The numbers provided in the brackets indicate the examples from the Bible that illustrate the expression of the given feeling, emotion, or God's attitude towards people through the descriptions of His face.

Table 1. God's facial gestures in expressing emotions and attitudes towards people in the English version of Old Testament

God's facial gestures	God's emotions	God's attitudes towards people
showing the face/lifting up the face	joy (2) peace (4)	good (1), (2) just (1) peaceful (4)
hiding the face/turning the face away	anger (13) offence (12) pity (13)	sensitive (12) good (5) generous (5) forgiving (13)
talking/judging face to face	friendliness (8)	friendly (8) close (14) direct (14)
looking at people	irritation/anger (15), (16) aggression (16)	wrathful (15), (16) generous (6) caring (6) interested (7) helpful (7) aggressive (16) revengeful (16)
swallowing/devouring people	anger (18) aggression (18)	wrathful (18)
setting the face against people	offence (11) aggression (11) anger (11)	sensitive (11) aggressive (11)
the face shining		caring (3), (10) gracious (10) helpful (10)

The fact that the descriptions of God's face include both positive aspects as well as the negative ones seems to reflect the idea of personification: just like human beings who experience a range of both negative and positive emotions, and are characterised by various personality traits, also God is conceptualised as having both kinds of emotions and characteristics. Unfortunately, since God of the Bible is indescribable by His very nature, the question whether He really possesses the emotions and attitudes towards people that are identified in the studied examples or whether they are simply the matter of metaphorical thinking must remain unanswered. It seems that our conceptualisation of God

is determined by the limitations of our human experience and constitutes only an extension of our perception of the human being.

References

Barbour, I. G. (1976). *Myths, models and paradigms. A comparative study in science and religion.* New York: Harper and Row.

Barcelona, A. (2000). The cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy. In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads. A cognitive perspective* (pp. 1–28). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bogdanowska-Jakubowska, E. (2010). *FACE. An interdisciplinary perspective.* Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Duchenne de Boulogne, G.-B. (1990). *The mechanism of human facial expression* (R. A. Cuthbertson, Ed. and Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press/Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de L'Homme. (Original work published in 1862).

Ekman, P. (1990). Duchenne and facial expression of emotion. In A. Cuthbertson (Ed.), *The mechanism of facial expression by G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne* (pp. 270–284). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behaviour: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica, 1*, 49–98.

Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of lexical semantics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goosens, L. (2002). Metaphtonymy. The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 349–377). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Guillet, J. (1985). Jahwe. In X. Leon-Dufour (Ed.), *Słownik teologii biblijnej* (K. Romaniuk, Trans.). Poznań: Pallotinum.

Huber, C. (2000). *Speaking of God.* Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

King James Version. (1995). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (First published in 1862).

Kołakowski, L. (2001). *Religion. If there is no God... On God, the Devil, sin and other worries of the so-called philosophy of religion.* Chicago: St. Augustine's Press.

Krzeszowski, T. P. (1997). *Angels and devils in Hell. Elements of axiology in semantics.* Warszawa: Energeia.

Kuczok, M. (2009). Metaphor and metonymy as tools for describing God in the Old Testament. *Linguistica Silesiana, 30,* 151–168.

Kuczok, M. (2013). On approaches to translating the Bible into English. *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation, 6*(1), 61–83.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by. With a new Afterword.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (2000). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (OALD)

Radden, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In K. U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought,* (pp. 17–59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Szlaga, J. (1986). Hermeneutyka biblijna. In J. Szlaga (Ed.), *Wstęp ogólny do Pisma Świętego* (pp. 184–220). Poznań: Pallotinum.

Termińska K. (1991). Metaopis przeżycia metafizycznego (na przykładzie prozy Jarosława Iwaszkiewicza). *Język a kultura, 3,* 131–144.

Thomas Aquinas (2006). *Summa theologiae* (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wansbrough, H. (Ed.) (1985). *New Jerusalem Bible.* New York: Doubleday.

Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across languages and cultures. Diversity and universals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (2000). The semantics of human facial expressions. *Pragmatics and Cognition, 8*(1), 147–183.