Spirit as a fully distinct divine person existing before the creation of the world is nevertheless a remarkable landmark in the history of the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology" (p.191). This assertion partly rests on Hughes' belief that Tertullian's account supersedes that of Irenaeus. On pp. 183-4, for instance, he argues that Tertullian's account of the distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the divine economy "drives home (their) distinction in much more detail" than does Irenaeus' account. To substantiate this claim Hughes quotes a portion of *Against Praxeas* 8.5 & 7 to show that "whereas Irenaeus did not give analogies to describe how unity can coexist alongside of distinction within the Godhead, Tertullian gives several that ... are inclusive of ... all three divine persons." The trouble is that the statement that Irenaeus did not use "analogies" to describe how unity and distinction can exist within the Godhead is inaccurate. Indeed, two of the three analogies for divine production that appear in the quotation of Tertullian provided by Hughes—"as the root [brings forth] the tree ... and the sun the beam"—correspond to two of the analogies that Irenaeus gives in *Against Heresies* 2.17.2-7 to demonstrate that divine production entails unity and distinction within the Godhead: rays from the sun and branches from a tree.

Occasional mistakes can be set aside as not necessarily bearing upon the nature of an argument, but at a certain point misconstruals of prior scholarship and weaknesses in analysis threaten the argument of a thesis. In the case of *The Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit* such appears to be the case, with the result that Hughes' arguments do not demonstrate what is hoped. This is unfortunate for while there is much to be considered in this study, there is also much still left to be done.

Anthony Briggman
Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
anthony.a.briggman@emory.edu

Aleksander Gomola, *Conceptual Blending in Early Christian Discourse. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Pastoral Metaphors in Patristic Literature*, Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter 2018, XI + 231 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-058063-1, € 77.95 (hb).

As the subtitle indicates, Aleksander Gomola (Jagiellonian University, Kraków) in this volume provides a novel, cognitive-linguistic analysis of pastoral metaphors in a wide range of patristic texts. The phrase "pastoral metaphors" should be understood as a traditional designation for what the author comes to call the THE CHURCH IS A FLOCK network, i.e. (explained in a very basic way) a

complex of metaphors held together by the image that God is a shepherd and the faithful are his sheep. Rather than approaching this phenomenon with the classical ("aristotelian") conception of metaphor as merely figurative or "transitive" language, the author in a successful way adopts the methodological framework of "Conceptual Blending Theory", which was elaborated by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (e.g. in their 2002 *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*), but which traces its lineage back to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's groundbreaking 1980 *Metaphors We Live By* and Lakoff's 1987 *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*.

The essence of Conceptual Blending (or: Integration) Theory in Fauconnier and Turner's version is (a) that two different mental "input spaces" can be structured and understood in each other's terms, by way of a mental "generic space" consisting in the structural "lowest common denominator" between both input spaces, and (b) that this is a creative process, in that it generates new meanings and ideas (in principle in both directions), and that it innovates the ways in which we perceive, organize and shape reality. The book's main argument thus involves that rather than being a purely "ornamental" matter of *elocutio*, pastoral metaphors in early Christian literature constituted a network of conceptual blends that were together responsible for shaping Christian doctrine, liturgy and practice.

Having set, in a clear and detailed way, the general methodological framework of Conceptual Blending Theory in Chapter 1, Gomola moves on in Chapter 2 to discuss this approach as it has been applied in recent years to biblical exegesis. In doing so, he pays specific attention to instances of different types of conceptual networks, and deals with the transition from (novel) conceptual networks to stable ("entrenched") cultural metaphors. In Chapter 3, he provides the final elements in setting the stage for his analysis, by surveying various conceptual blends used for the Church, as well as the "cultural-experiential" basis for the image of the Church as a flock. Subsequently, he deals with the shepherding experience and with shepherding imagery in the Bible (Old and New Testament), and with the "folk model" of shepherding (on p. 27, "folk models" are defined, with Vyvyan Evans and Melanie Green, as "stable mental representations that represent [*sic*] theories about the world"). In Chapter 4, Gomola begins his actual analysis by proposing a taxonomy of interrelated blends which together constitute the image of the Church as a flock in early Christian discourse, distinguishing more specifically between (1) THE FLOCK OF THE CHURCH IS THE FLOCK OF ISRAEL, (2) SHEPHERDS ARE THE SHEPHERD, and (3) THE CHURCH IS GOD'S FLOCK. These are the specific blends that are discussed in more detail in the chapters that follow. While THE FLOCK OF THE CHURCH IS THE FLOCK OF ISRAEL is treated

rather briefly in Chapter 5, Gomolla in Chapter 6 explores more extensively the implications of the Shepherds are the shepherd blend for the authority and responsibility of members of the clergy. In Chapter 7 he turns to the The Church is God's flock blend in the New Testament (Luke 12:32 and Eph 4:11, Acts 20:28-30, and 1 Peter 5:2) and in *The Shepherd of Hermas*. Having analysed these three blends, Gomolla takes a closer look at the "creative" or "formative" role (as a "conceptual instrument") of the The Church is God's flock blend in early Christianity. Chapter 8 is concerned with Church life and practice, further exploring the blend's implications for the relationship between laity and clergy and the responsibilities of the latter. Chapter 9 in turn focuses on liturgy and theology, and more specifically on the blend's implications for baptismal, ecclesiological and soteriological issues. After an engaging conclusion, the volume closes with a bibliography of primary and secondary sources and with several indexes (subjects, ancient and medieval sources, and biblical sources and pseudepigrapha). The volume furthermore contains various clarifying tables and diagrams, which are listed at the outset of the volume.

The use of abbreviations for the respective cognitive blends (e.g. lsih for the the lost sheep is humanity blend) does not always improve the ease of reading, but this choice is practically justified and customary in the relevant literature, and in many cases it is made up for by a full description in the running title of the cognitive blend at issue. It is true, however, that the book could have been somewhat more carefully copy-edited, as can be seen from a number of slips and surprising typographical choices both in the source languages and in English. To give just one example, in the list of abbreviations (p. xi), "PG" and "PL" are respectively resolved as "*Patrologiae graeca*" and "*Patrologiae latina*". More importantly, for a study so heavily invested in the close and creative interaction between language and mind, it seems a bit unfortunate that it relies so strongly on English translations of source passages (as can also be seen from the bibliography of primary sources), the latter being quoted in a sparse and unsystematic way. Relatedly, the impression arises that the study could have profited from a more intensive integration of the cognitive-linguistic approach on the one hand, and traditional (philological and, broadly speaking, "church-historical") methods on the other. These observations notwithstanding, one should conclude that, in general, this study provides an innovative and convincing interpretation of pastoral metaphors in early Christian discourse, and of their instrumental role in the development of Christian life and doctrine.

Tim Denecker
Faculty of Arts, Comparative, Historical and Applied Linguistics, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
tim.denecker@kuleuven.be