



ASET
SERIES

Forgiveness, Peacemaking, and Reconciliation

EDITED BY
DAVID K. NGARUIYA
AND RODNEY L. REED

Forgiveness, Peacemaking, and Reconciliation

General Editors

**David K. Ngaruiya
and
Rodney L. Reed**



Langham

GLOBAL LIBRARY

- 8 The Church and Ethnopolitical Conflict in Kenya, 1982–2013. 169
David Tarus

Part 3: Reconciliation

- 9 The Consequences of Taking Advantage of a Brother's Misfortune . . 195
Situational Irony in the Use of the Hebrew and Names Concept *התש*
(*Shatah*) in Obadiah 16
Peter Kamande Thuo
- 10 Some New Testament Invitations to Ethnic Reconciliation. 207
John 4:4–42; Luke 10:29–37; Romans; Ephesians 2:11–22
Craig Keener
- 11 Implications of Acts 15 for Forgiveness, Peace, and
Reconciliation Today. 231
Rowland D. Van Es, Jr.
- 12 Reconciliation as Separation. 251
Socio-Location and Validity of Othering in 1 John
Julius Kithinji
- 13 The Gospel of Honor for Shame-Based Cultures. 265
Rethinking Mission Theology in Violent Societies in Africa
Martin Munyao
- 14 Interreligious Dialogue as Means for Public Theology. 287
Promises and Challenges for Social Justice and Democracy in Kenya
Elias K. Ng'etich
- 15 Integrative Systems of Pastoral Care and Counseling for Victims of
Violence in Kenya 301
A Biblical, Classical, Clinical, Prophetic, Contextual, and Reframing
Approach for African Christianity
Ndung'u J. B. Ikenye
- List of Contributors. 333
- Subject and Names Index. 337
- Scripture Index 343

The Consequences of Taking Advantage of a Brother's Misfortune

Situational Irony in the Use of the Hebrew Concept שְׁתָּה (*Shatah*) in Obadiah 16

Peter Kamande Thuo

Bible Translation Consultant and Part-Time Lecturer

Abstract

The presence of God is supposed to be a place of reconciliation between brothers as well as where they stand together to face a common enemy.¹ The key to understanding God's judgment in Obadiah against the people of Edom, and by extension of the other nations, is to appreciate the use of situational irony in the use of the Hebrew verb שְׁתָּה (transliterated as *shatah*, which has the lexical meaning "to drink") in Obadiah 16. The argument made in this research is that both literal and metaphorical senses of שְׁתָּה paint a picture of the abstract concept of divine wrath. An eclectic theoretical approach between Frame Semantics and Relevance Theory is used in this work to advance this argument by formulating the frame of שְׁתָּה and also by addressing exegetical issues that arise in the context of Obadiah 16, with the suggested solutions

1. See Ps 133:1; John 17:11.

expected to meet expectations of relevance.² In its application, this research seeks to sound a warning to the African church where believers tend to turn to their ethnic alignments when it comes to addressing political and societal challenges. After providing a brief historical and contextual setting of Obadiah 16 and examining the theoretical framework of this work, the chapter explores the uses of the verb שָׁתָה with its implied referent(s) and object(s) before concluding with an application.

Key words: Obadiah, situational irony, literal meaning, metaphorical meaning, שָׁתָה, eclectic theoretical approach, Frame Semantics, Relevance Theory, ad hoc concept.

A Brief Historical and Contextual Setting of Obadiah 16

The people of Edom are said to have had a hand in the attack and capture of the city of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 587 BC as well as in making life difficult for the remnants of that city even after the attack.³ Now the time was ripe for God to turn the tables on the people of Edom and make them suffer for what they had done to his chosen people, a judgment that is extended to neighboring nations who were also enemies to the nation of Israel.⁴ Most English Bibles tend to agree on two main divisions for the book of Obadiah.⁵ The first section, which runs from verse 1 to verse 14, talks of the punishment which was coming upon the people of Edom for their offenses against the people of Judah. The remaining section, which runs from verse 15 to verse 21, talks about the eschatological events of the Day of the Lord in which Israel will be restored and other nations judged. This second major section, which is the focus of this chapter, is treated by some English translations as one section,⁶ while others subdivide it into two, namely, verses 15–16, which talk of God's judgment to the nations, and verses 17–21, which foretell the restoration of

2. Charles Fillmore, "Frame Semantics," in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, The Linguistic Society of Korea, edited by Han'guk Ōnō Hakhoe (Seoul: Hanshin, 1982); Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995).

3. John Barton, *Joel and Obadiah: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 120; Obad 10–14.

4. Obad 15–16, 19–20.

5. Cf. English Standard Version (ESV), the Contemporary English Version (CEV), the Good News Bible (GNB), the New Living Translation (NLT), and the New English Translation (NET).

6. See NLT and NET.

the people of Israel.⁷ In this work, verses 15–16 are treated as a unit. The next section provides the theoretical underpinning of this work.

Theoretical Framework

Situational irony is implied in what is argued in this chapter, as both literal and metaphorical uses of the verb שָׂתָה in Obadiah 16 paint a picture of the consequences that will take place at the coming of the Day of the Lord. Situational irony, also referred to as irony of events, points to a situation that is contrary to what the reader expects, or to what is deemed appropriate.⁸ The literal meaning of a word has to do with its plain meaning, or what is referred to as its truth condition, while the metaphorical meaning has to do with the use of a word in a way that is suggestive of another, with the compared concepts sharing some sort of resemblance.⁹ One factor that influences the meaning of any lexical unit is its underlying cognitive frame since “frames provide the fundamental representation of knowledge in human cognition.”¹⁰ A cognitive frame is a detailed knowledge structure or schema that “represents a schematisation of experience (a knowledge structure), which is represented at the conceptual level and held in long-term memory, and which relates by elements and entities associated with a particular culturally-embedded scene, situation or event from human experience.”¹¹ Frames as knowledge structures are shaped by how particular societies view the world and hence include beliefs, values, and emotions.¹² Frame Semantics will help to highlight the contextual knowledge as well as related encyclopedic entries that are evoked

7. ESV subdivides it as vv. 15–18 and vv. 19–21, while CEV and GNB subdivide it into vv. 15–16 and vv. 17–21.

8. Leland Ryken, *How Bible Stories Work: A Guided Study of Biblical Narrative* (Ashland, OH: Weaver Book Company), 2015.

9. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 6; Janet M. Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 15; Antonio Barcelona, “Introduction: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy,” in *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, edited by Antonio Barcelona (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 3.

10. L. W. Barsalou, “Frames, Concepts, and Conceptual Fields,” in *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization*, edited by Adrienne Lehrer and Eva F. Kittay (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 21.

11. Vyvyan Evans and Melanie Green, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 211.

12. Ana R. López, “Applying Frame Semantics to Translation: A Practical Example,” *Translator's Journal* 47, no. 3 (2002): 312.

by the concept שְׁתָּה.¹³ The general assumption of Relevance Theory (RT) is that the more cognitive effects an utterance has and the less the mental effort used to process it, the more relevant it becomes to an individual.¹⁴ RT makes two general claims with respect to how our minds process information and how we communicate. The first claim, referred to as the Cognition Principle of Relevance, is that human cognition is geared toward maximization of relevance; and the second claim, referred to as the Communicative Principle of Relevance, is that utterances raise anticipations of relevance to their addressees. This theory, which states that the linguistic meaning of an utterance is only a hint to the speaker's intentions, will prove useful in addressing textual issues that arise in Obadiah 16, which include lexical adjustment processes of narrowing (restricting the category) and broadening (extending the category), solving cases of ambiguity, assigning referents to referential expressions, supplying contextual assumptions, and deriving implications with the solutions expected to meet expectations of relevance.¹⁵ Since RT is a cognition-based communication theory, it will go a long way to addressing both the cognitive and the communication processes involved in the understanding and use of the ad hoc concept שְׁתָּה*.¹⁶ An ad hoc concept is an occasion-specific concept that involves an interaction between the encoded concept, contextual information, and the expectation of relevance.¹⁷ The next section explores the literal and metaphorical uses of the ad hoc concept שְׁתָּה*.

The Literal and Metaphorical Uses of שְׁתָּה

The following is the Hebrew text of Obadiah 16 and its free translation with the three occurrences of שְׁתָּה underlined.

כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר שְׁתִּיתֶם עַל־הַר קְדְשִׁי יִשְׁתּוּ כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם תָּמִיד וְשָׁתוּ וְלָעוּ וְהָיוּ כְּלוֹא הָיוּ

For just as you have drunk on my holy mountain,
so all the nations will drink continually.

13. John I. Saeed, *Semantics*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 343; Evans and Green, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 216.

14. Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*, 158, 260, 263–266.

15. Sperber and Wilson, 158–162, 260, 263–266.

16. The asterisk is used with concepts to indicate that the word has gone through the process of either narrowing or broadening.

17. Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*, 231–237; Deirdre Wilson and Robyn Carston, “A Unitary Approach to Lexical Pragmatics: Relevance, Inference and Ad Hoc Concepts,” in *Pragmatics*, edited by Noel Burton-Roberts (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2007), 230.

They will drink, and they will gulp down;
they will be as though they had never been.

(New English Translation)

Are the uses of the concept שָׂתָה in Obadiah 16, especially its first occurrence, literal, metaphorical, or both? The RT approach to metaphors allows for both literal and metaphorical interpretations of the same concept, with the literal meaning accommodating the metaphorical one as well. This loose use of words results in the creation of new ad hoc (occasion-specific) concepts through an inferential process using both linguistic and contextual clues, concepts which are broader or more general than their encoded lexical meaning.¹⁸ According to this theoretical framework, a hearer does not make a distinction in the interpretation process between words used literally and those used metaphorically, for as Wilson argues, "There is a continuum of cases of broadening, ranging from strictly literal use, through various shades of approximation to hyperbole and metaphor, with no sharp cut-off point between them."¹⁹ To illustrate this lack of a sharp cut-off point, he uses the sentence "The audience slept through the lecture," which can be interpreted literally to mean that the audience was asleep throughout the lecture; as an approximation by arguing for a slightly weaker claim that the audience was on the point of falling asleep; metaphorically as making a still weaker claim of a physical state of drowsiness; and metaphorically as making an even weaker claim that the audience was extremely bored with the lecture.²⁰ The choice between these different possible interpretations is context-dependent. Similarly, the ad hoc concept שָׂתָה* in Obadiah 16 is used literally to claim that the people of Edom did indeed hold a "merry party" on the mountain of God that involved drinking alcohol, and at the same time it is used metaphorically to bring out the irony that what they were really drinking was not the wine of celebration but God's wrath.²¹ Since there is no cut-off point that would involve different interpretive mechanisms, these two interpretations are accommodated in the ad hoc concept שָׂתָה*. The following subsections discuss the referent of the personal pronoun -הֵם as well as its implied object(s).

18. Deirdre Wilson, "Parallels and Differences in the Treatment of Metaphor in Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics," *Studies in Pragmatics* 11 (2009): 43.

19. Wilson, "Parallels and Differences," 44.

20. Wilson, 46.

21. Thomas E. McComiskey, *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992), 536.

The Referent(s) of the Personal Pronoun -תָּם

What is the referent implied by the second person plural pronoun -תָּם attached to the first occurrence of the *qal* perfect form of the verb שָׁתָה? There are those who argue that the relative particle כִּי־אֲשֶׁר compares the situation between the people of Judah, who were made to drink the cup of divine judgment, and the nations who are now to drink of it.²² One of the reasons given in support of this interpretation is the shift in the second personal pronoun from singular to plural, which is taken to justify the change in the people being addressed. It is important to note that such an alternation between singular and plural is not unusual especially when a nation is in view.²³ This change can be attributed to stylistic use of the grammatical person in poetry where prior to verse 16 the second person singular is necessitated by the choice to refer to the general group as an entity whereas in verse 16 the second person plural form is necessitated to identify the individuals within the group.²⁴

Another argument advanced to support the people of Judah as the referents of the pronoun -תָּם is that since in Obadiah 2–15 there is no distinction made between Edom and the other nations, the referent pronoun -תָּם does not refer to the Edomites alone.²⁵ However, going by the fact that in verse 1 the subjects of the first person common plural of the cohortative verb נִקְוָמָה “let us arise” are the nations who are urged to form a military alliance against the people of Edom, then, contrary to this argument, a distinction is made between Edom and the other nations.

Another reason given is that picturing other nations celebrating the downfall of Edom is reading too much into the text.²⁶ But is it really? Judging from the fact that these other nations are the ones invited to fight the people of Edom, it is not unreasonable to expect these very nations to rejoice at the downfall of the nation of Edom, with the predicative adjectival passive participle בָּזוּי “will be despised” in Obadiah 2 allowing for such an interpretation. It is only from verse 15 that the tables are turned on these other nations.

One more reason which is given to rule out the possibility of the people of Edom being the subjects of the verb שָׁתָה is that a metaphorical interpretation

22. Irvin Busenitz, *Joel and Obadiah*, Mentor Commentary (Fearn, Ross-shire: Christian Focus, 2002), 266.

23. Busenitz, *Joel and Obadiah*, 266.

24. McComiskey, *Minor Prophets*, 535.

25. Paul R. Raabe, *Obadiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 203; Johan Renkema, *Obadiah*, trans. Brian Doyle, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 40.

26. Raabe, *Obadiah*, 203.

of the verb שָׁתָה does not allow the personal pronoun to refer to the people of Edom.²⁷ Since I have argued for an interpretation that takes both literal and metaphorical interpretations of the verb שָׁתָה on board, this argument is inconsequential. The main problem with interpreting the first occurrence of שָׁתָה as referring to the people of Judah is the abrupt transition from the people of Edom in the preceding context.²⁸ It is not convincing to introduce the people of Judah as new participants with a pronoun since in Hebrew discourse new participants are introduced by the use of a proper noun or a descriptive phrase and then referred back to by use of personal pronouns, not the other way round.²⁹ An example is in Obadiah 1 where the people of Edom are introduced using a proper noun and then mainly referred to later in the entire book by the use of the second person singular pronoun. Another example is in verse 6 of the same book where (the people of) Esau are first mentioned using a proper noun and then referred to in the following verses using third person pronoun referents. This also applies to (the people of) Jacob who are introduced by a proper noun in verse 10 and then in verse 11 are referred back to using the third person singular pronoun. According to the Communicative Principle of Relevance, a communicator attempts to formulate his or her utterance in such a way as to guide the addressees to access the intended assumptions and into drawing the intended conclusion(s), and in the process spend the least possible effort.³⁰ The same principle guarantees that the first interpretation that is consistent with this principle is the only one that is intended by the speaker. The referent(s) of the pronoun אֲנִי who can be easily accessed from short-term memory are the people of Edom, since they are the ones mentioned in the immediate context.

The Implied Objects of שָׁתָה

What are the implied objects of the three occurrences of שָׁתָה in Obadiah 16? To address this issue there is a need to draw the underlying cognitive frame of שָׁתָה.³¹ There are a number of potential objects that the first occurrence of the verb שָׁתָה can take. They are water (in the context both of quenching thirst

27. Raabe, 203.

28. Renkema, *Obadiah*, 190.

29. Thomas J. Finley, *Joel, Amos, Obadiah: An Exegetical Commentary* (repr., Peabody, MA: Biblical Studies Press, 2003), 327.

30. Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*, 155–162, 271.

31. Barsalou, "Frames, Concepts," 21.

and of being a mark of generosity to identify a potential bride), (fermented) wine (which if taken to excess makes one lose control, and which also should not be taken by those set apart to serve God since they would become ritually unclean), milk (which is used for nourishment), as well as urine (to refer to the devastating effects of the siege against Jerusalem by the Assyrians).³² In light of the demands of RT, the context of the book of Obadiah rules out water, milk, and urine as being the likely objects of the first occurrence of the verb שתה since it is not about the people of Edom quenching their thirst, being refreshed, or even being under siege. Therefore, the most probable object for the first occurrence of the verb שתה is wine.

The verb שתה is also used figuratively in a number of ways. It is used with the object “blood” to refer to the water which David’s men risked their lives to bring to their king, symbolizing their sacrifice, and also to represent an act of slaughter.³³ The challenge with this interpretation is that the people of Edom are accused of having done this action when the people of Israel were escaping and not on God’s holy mountain.³⁴ Another likely object is poison, which symbolizes the sufferings Job was going through because of his righteousness.³⁵ Another object is “water from one’s own cistern,” which symbolizes enjoyment of sexual relations with one’s spouse.³⁶ Evil and slander as abstract objects of שתה are given in the context of a person committing evil and slander with the same ease with which he or she drinks water.³⁷ The object “violence” is compared to sending a message through a fool, which can have injurious consequences.³⁸ Evil, slander, and violence are ruled out in the context of the book of Obadiah since they would require more processing effort. The most likely object for these remaining two occurrences of שתה is the cup of God’s wrath.³⁹ The common noun כוס “cup” is one of the encyclopedic entries related to the concept שתה referring to a vessel that is used for drinking wine.⁴⁰

32. F. Brown, S. Driver, and C. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon (BDB)* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 1059bf; cf. Num 20:11; Gen 19:33; 24:14; Judg 13:4, 7, 14; Ezek 25:4; 2 Kgs 18:27; Isa 36:12.

33. 1 Chr 11:19; Num 23:24; Isa 49:26; Deut 32:42.

34. Obad 14.

35. Job 6:4.

36. Prov 5:15.

37. Job 15:16; 34:7.

38. Prov 26:6.

39. Renkema, *Obadiah*, 191; Busenitz, *Joel and Obadiah*, 266; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:16, 26–27; 49:12; 51:7; Ezek 23:32–34; Obad 16; Job 21:20; Pss 11:6; 75:8; Lam 4:21; Hab 2:16.

40. Busenitz, *Joel and Obadiah*, 468a; Gen 40:11, 13, 21; Prov 23:31; Jer 35:5.

Metaphorically, כוס is also used to refer to a person's allotted destiny whether bad or good.⁴¹ In Obadiah 16 it has a negative denotation to metaphorically symbolize God's judgment, with Babylon being referred to as a golden cup used to punish other nations including the city of Jerusalem.⁴² This cup of God's wrath is deep and wide, symbolizing that it is full of God's anger and rage, with those who partake of it staggering from its effects which are horrible and disastrous.⁴³ Therefore the figurative use of the cup of wine is used in Obadiah 16 as a picture of God's anger against the people of Edom for having treated their brothers, the people of Israel, with cruelty. The same figure is also used in the New Testament to symbolize Christ's suffering and God's anger.⁴⁴ The encyclopedic entry for the concept יין "wine" refers to a common drink for refreshment which mostly formed part of regular meals as well as feasts.⁴⁵ There are related entries that are stored and retrieved as an extension of the ad hoc concept שֶׁתָּה*.⁴⁶ In the context of Obadiah 16, the ad hoc concept שֶׁתָּה* is broadened to refer to excessive drinking of wine which the people of Edom most likely did in the name of their heathen gods as they rejoiced over the downfall of Jerusalem.⁴⁷ A related concept within this same ad hoc concept is the entry "drunkenness," which results from an excessive use of alcoholic drink, with its effects compared to the state of those who are under God's wrath. There are other instances where celebration parties involving the drinking of wine are held by raiding parties, with the prophecy that such nations will be punished for their disrespect for human life.⁴⁸ Other uses of wine include consoling mourners and sustaining those who are faint, which are ruled out here in light of the principle of relevance since the people of Edom are accused of doing the opposite.⁴⁹

The encyclopedic entry list of the negative effects of wine, which points to the effects of God's wrath, is long and includes "staggering, confusion, insensibility . . . sleep," and disgraceful acts including treading in one's own vomit and exposing one's nakedness, which was considered shameful; it can

41. Pss 11:6; 16:5.

42. Hab 2:16; Jer 49:12; 51:7; Lam 4:21; Ps 75:8.

43. Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15; Ezek 23:32, 33.

44. Mark 14:36; John 18:11; Rev 14:10; 16:19.

45. BDB, 406b, c; Gen 27:25; Judg 19:19; Amos 5:11; Eccl 9:7; Isa 5:12; Esth 5:6.

46. Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*, 86.

47. Deut 32:38; Ps 104:14–15.

48. 1 Sam 30:16; Joel 3:3; Lam 2:7.

49. Jer 16:7; 2 Sam 16:2; Obad 10–14.

also be used to lure someone to his or her death.⁵⁰ Even though, as discussed above, the most likely object for the first occurrence of שֶׁתָּה is (fermented) wine, it is important to point out that there is implied irony in taking this interpretation. According to God, what the people of Edom really drank, in the name of celebrating their triumph, was the wine not of celebration but of divine wrath.⁵¹ Their joyful celebrations turned out to be short-lived, giving way to drunkenness and its effects, which were associated with the “cup of wrath” of the Lord.⁵²

Therefore, the ad hoc concept שֶׁתָּה* in Obadiah 16 has both literal and metaphorical senses. On the one hand, it is literal, since it refers to someone who has swallowed some alcoholic substance; but, on the other hand, it is metaphorical, in that it has some figurative use. There is no cut-off point that would involve different interpretive mechanisms for the literal and metaphorical uses; they are blended together within the same context.

Application

African Christians have been accused of living dichotomized lives such that their faith seems to have minimal effect on their everyday lives.⁵³ Indeed, they have not been immune to accusations of participating in divisive, politically driven ethnic tensions/violence over power and resources, with such fights even occurring in places of worship.⁵⁴ Just as the Edomites invited God’s wrath for using their ethnic identity to take advantage of their brothers the Israelites, so too do Christians who relegate their faith for the sake of selfish ethnic alignments with the goal of taking advantage of their brothers and sisters. The situational irony is that any such “advantage” is but a means toward inviting God’s punishment rather than his blessing. The will of God in this matter is for Christians to resist the temptations that come with negative ethnic diversity, for every person is created with dignity and thus deserves equal treatment

50. Raabe, *Obadiah*, 211; cf. Gen 9:21, 24; 19:32–38; Exod 20:26; Lev 10:9; Deut 21:20; Isa 19:14; 20:4; 24:20; 28:7–8; 47:3; Ezek 16:22; Ps 107:27; Lam 1:8; Job 12:25; 1 Sam 25:36–37; 2 Sam 6:20; Prov 23:20, 31–33, 35; 34:4–5; 1 Sam 1:12–16; Hab 2:15; 2 Sam 13:28; 1 Kgs 16:9–10; 20:16; Nah 3:5.

51. McComiskey, *Minor Prophets*, 536.

52. Lam 4:21; Richard J. Coggins and S. Paul Re’emi, *Israel among the Nations* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), 91.

53. Elizabeth Mburu, *African Hermeneutics* (Carlisle: Langham Publishers, 2019), 3.

54. Mary G. Wosyanju, “The Role of the Church in Combating Negative Ethnicity in Kenya: A Survey of Mainline Churches in Eldoret, Kenya,” *African Journal of Education, Science and Technology* (Dec. 2013), <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311671416>.

when it comes to accessing resources.⁵⁵ Justice, peace, and reconciliation are to be practiced equitably, including those who might seem disadvantaged or marginalized for one reason or another.⁵⁶ Therefore, the church in Africa needs to be at the forefront in rejecting ill-motivated ethnic group activities or beliefs which are against the will of God, for as the apostle Paul reminds us, we are one body called to one hope, through our Lord Jesus Christ.⁵⁷

Bibliography

- Barcelona, Antonio. "Introduction: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy." In *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, edited by Antonio Barcelona, 1–28. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.
- Barsalou, L. W. "Frames, Concepts, and Conceptual Fields." In *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization*, edited by Adrienne Lehrer and Eva F. Kittay, 21–74. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992.
- Barton, John. *Joel and Obadiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Brown, F., S. Driver, and C. Briggs. *The Brown–Driver–Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Busenitz, Irvin A. *Joel and Obadiah*. Mentor Commentary. Fearn, Ross-shire: Christian Focus, 2002.
- Coggins, Richard J., and S. Paul Re'emi. *Israel among the Nations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Evans, Vyvyan, and Melanie Green. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Fillmore, Charles. "Frame Semantics." In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, The Linguistic Society of Korea, edited by Han'guk Ŏnŏ Hakhoe, 111–138. Seoul: Hanshin, 1982.
- Finley, Thomas J. *Joel, Amos, Obadiah: An Exegetical Commentary*. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Biblical Studies Press, 2003.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- López, Ana R. "Applying Frame Semantics to Translation: A Practical Example." *Translator's Journal* 47, no. 3 (2002): 312–350.
- Mburu, Elizabeth. *African Hermeneutics*. Carlisle: Langham Publishers, 2019.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992.

55. Rev 5:9; 7:9; Gen 1:26–27.

56. Amos 5:25; cf. Mic 6:8; Acts 2:6; Eph 2:14–16; 5:19; 6:15; Rom 12:17–18; 14:19.

57. Eph 4:4–6.

- Raabe, Paul R. *Obadiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Renkema, Johan. *Obadiah*. Translated by Brian Doyle. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Ryken, Leland. *How Bible Stories Work: A Guided Study of Biblical Narrative*. Ashland, OH: Weaver Book Company, 2015.
- Saeed, John I. *Semantics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wilson, Deirdre. "Parallels and Differences in the Treatment of Metaphor in Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics." *Studies in Pragmatics* 11 (2009): 42–60.
- Wilson, Deirdre, and Robyn Carston. "A Unitary Approach to Lexical Pragmatics: Relevance, Inference and Ad Hoc Concepts." In *Pragmatics*, edited by Noel Burton-Roberts, 230–259. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2007.
- Wosyanju, Mary G. "The Role of the Church in Combating Negative Ethnicity in Kenya: A Survey of Mainline Churches in Eldoret, Kenya." *African Journal of Education, Science and Technology* (Dec. 2013). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311671416>.