

## THE FATE OF JOB IN JEWISH TRADITION

### On Job's counterpointist function

MARIANNE SCHLEICHER

*Aarhus*



**ABSTRACT** Job's piety in *The Book of Job* is so ideal that it becomes problematic on two levels. First, it renders God a tyrant. Second, no one can fully identify with Job. Surely, we may suffer just as much as Job does and even feel that God is unjust, but no man can ever claim to be as pious as Job. Limited to a few examples of the fate of Job in Jewish tradition and concerned with Scripture's role with respect to religious normativity, this article will be guided by the following question: How can *The Book of Job* maintain its role within Jewish tradition as a normative text? My reading suggests that *The Book of Job* in itself is not normative. Rather, it serves as a counterpoint up against which the reception and transformation of Jewish theology can unfold and as such *The Book of Job* exerts its function on Jewish religiosity.

Scholars within Jewish studies have always been grappling with the complexity of the biblical Book of Job. The Hebrew is difficult due to ambiguous poetic language including unique words not appearing elsewhere in the Bible. The composition is complex. It has a narrative prose frame and a poetic disputation in the centre characterised by many interpolations and lacunae. The content is complex as well. The prose frame is preponderantly portraying Job as the patient sufferer, while the poetic disputation allows Job to articulate his impatience and criticise God's providence.<sup>1</sup> This article does not pretend to be able to solve this puzzle of inconsistencies. What it aims at is to conduct a survey of reception and transformation of the Book of Job in Jewish tradition from Antiquity until the Middle Ages in order

to deduce one explanation of how this part of Scripture, despite its complexity, comes to serve a normative function for disseminating religious doctrines and forms of praxis as canonical texts are supposed to do.<sup>2</sup>

As a point of departure for the survey, I shall summarise what I consider the essence of this famous part of Scripture about one man's suffering. Job characterises himself as innocent (Job 10,7; 10,15) and therefore deserving of reward according to the paradigm of classic wisdom literature that says that prosperity is God's reward for righteous behaviour, while suffering is God's punishment for sin. Job argues that he did not sin (Job 1,22); that he has had no wicked thoughts (Job 21,16); and that he is so righteous (Job 23,10; 27,5; 42,15) that he in fact acts towards his fellowman as God ought to act towards mankind (Job 29; 32,2). Yet, Job suffers and God does not behave according to classic wisdom. God's acts are cruel (Job 6,4) and wrong (Job 19,6). God provides no reason for being righteous (Job 9,29), since God destroys sinners, repentants and innocents alike (Job 7,21; 9,22). Man is helplessly exposed to God's whims (Job 1,12; 2,6; 23,13), and should man find the courage to argue against God, God dumbfounds that person through the imposition of fear (Job 13,21; 23,15; 38,3/40,7).

The crux of the matter seems to be that surely God is the creator of the world including man and as such God is worthy of praise (Job 12,9; 14,9; 27,3; 26,14; 31) as one would praise the maker of the most unique, awe-inspiring and extraordinary piece of art. Yet, the lack of a dialogic relationship between God and man leads to fear of God. In *The Book of Job* man is not given one single reason to love God. Such reasons could have been that God would listen to prayer (Job 6,8; 9,16; 24,12); that God would reward righteousness (Job 9,29); or that God would correct man's behaviour by communicating a lesson to be learned (Job 6,24). However, a prerequisite for such reasons would be God's empathy with mankind, but God is not empathetic at all (Job 9,32).

Job's reactions deserve attention. Job finds the courage to complain about God's behaviour (Job 23,2) and to argue his case against God, at least while God is absent (Job 13,3; 23,4). The most severe blow that Job directs at God is in chapter 3, verse 1 where Job curses the day on which he was born. Job's curse stands in opposition to

God's demand to be praised with reference to his creation of the world including Job. Job himself is a metonymy of creation; yet he is actually saying that he is not willing to let God's role as creator – even as creator of Job – serve as a basis for his relationship to God. Job insists on a dialogic relationship, but does not get it. All he gets is God's concession that Job was right and then Job gets a compensation – double as it may be (Job 42,10). Nevertheless, this does not annul what Job had to go through. In the abrupt end of *The Book of Job*, God feigns a dialogue. God tells Job twice to »Gird your loins like a man« (Job 38,3; 40,7) and tells him to argue his case in front of him, but here, as Job predicted in chapter 13, verse 21, God has dumbfounded Job with fear, upon which Job claps his hand to his mouth (Job 40,4) and accepts to be but dust and ashes (Job 42,6). God's imposition of fear in Job prevents Job from arguing his case against God, when God is finally present, which is exactly what positions God as a tyrant.

The question that rises from this reading is how *The Book of Job* can exert a function in Jewish tradition in a normative way. Without being a specialist on Christianity, I should venture the statement that Christians can find their solution to the lack of God's empathy in the concept of God's incarnation in Jesus Christ. In the Biblical *Book of Job*, the incompatibility of divine and human logic is the main cause for frustration. Job says about God: »He is not a man, like me, that I can answer Him, That we can go to law together« (Job 9,32). Christians overcome this incompatibility by believing that God incarnated himself into a man, Jesus Christ, and this enabled God's empathy with man. For Christians *The Book of Job* ends up having, what I have decided to call, a counterpointist function of emphasizing the need for an alternative to classic wisdom as it is represented in the Hebrew Bible. But how does Judaism deal with *The Book of Job*. I shall claim that it serves a counterpointist function as well, on quite similar premises, once we get to the Middle Ages. But first, I shall call for a methodological intermezzo.

The noun »counterpoint« stems from musicology. »Counterpoint« designates the melody which is added as accompaniment to a given melody within a piece of music. The counterpoint functions as a kind of antithesis to the main melody line, a point of otherness in music, up

against which the primary melody line positions itself. The counterpoint including its function for music is isomorphic to what goes on in the semiotic chora in the human psyche, as described by the linguist and psychoanalyst Julia Kristeva. In this chora, this psychic receptacle, in which the signifying process takes place, the inner drives of the individual clash with societal and biological constraints prior to the individual positioning himself through language. This clash does not only take place in pre-oedipal childhood. It constantly takes place in everyone's life; but still, common language does not take account of something so individual; and if common language were all that we had, we would not be able to articulate this clash. This is why we as human beings are in need of poetry, of literature. Poetic language is unique, says Kristeva, because the poet creates poetry by revisiting the semiotic chora where drives clash against constraints and remind the poet of where the drives would really want to take him/her.<sup>3</sup> Poetry even provides the reader with a potential for repositioning him-/herself, also at a theological level. The repositioning through poetry is enabled thanks to the mental activity of transference where the reader may associate with any other person – also a literary character – a potential signifying other whose signification may be incorporated as an attractive perspective.<sup>4</sup>

This theory has bearing on the present reading of the Book of Job. Job would really like God to be righteous, and if not righteous, God must at least exercise empathy with man. But according to the constraining distance that God, the creator, imposes upon Job, the man, Job is not likely to get what he wants. Job's chance lies in his language. Job is a poet, and so he listens to his drives and lines up all the arguments it takes to create a religious revolution with poetic language in which one can demand more from God than God is willing to give. If Job should accept the constraints that God imposes, the constraints should at least be defined according to a logic governed by God's righteousness. The scorn of Job's friends and Elihu reflects the expectation that the logic of classic wisdom, where God is righteous, functions as a kind of universal law. Initially, this is Job's expectation as well until he experiences the cognitive dissonance, telling him that this is not the case. Job's poetic language has provided a future ground for a revolution against God, the crea-

tor, and Job's alternative to classic wisdom suggests that a theology based on God's inclination to be empathetic could represent such an alternative.

The reception and transformation of *The Book of Job* begins, to the best of my knowledge, with *The Testament of Job*, probably written during the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE in an Egyptian Jewish context. During the Maccabean Revolt in 167–164 BCE, Jews experienced persecution for performing key religious acts such as keeping Shabbat and reading the Torah. Such persecution repeated itself in Antiquity on more occasions and suffering for being Jewish became part of the Jewish experience, not only in Judea but also in the Diaspora.<sup>5</sup> This experience contradicted the logic of classic wisdom where prosperity was considered a divine reward for just behaviour, while suffering and persecution were considered divine punishments for sin. Jews from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BCE and onwards, who were pious, God-fearing and considered deserving of reward, were not safeguarded from evil. This affected the concept of God's justice, the so-called theodicy, but also the Deuteronomistic notion that Israel's status as God's chosen people would remain intact as long as Israel adhered to the covenant. Accordingly, theodicy and chosenness became central themes in many apocalyptic writings, even with regard to the figure of Job despite his undefined ethnicity in the biblical *Book of Job*.

In *The Testament of Job* (TJ),<sup>6</sup> Job is presented as the most pious and almsgiving king ever imaginable, and so one would expect his prosperity to be a matter of cause. Furthermore, he ought to have a share in the patriarchal blessing, since he is, in this writing, considered the son of Esau, brother of Jacob, son of Isaac, and the grandson of Abraham. Nevertheless, *The Testament of Job* promotes individualism, typical of Antiquity, by revealing that Job is chosen on account of his own merits and that his blessing follows from his love of God.

In the opening chapter of *The Testament of Job*, and as a reward for his intuitive conception of God as the saviour of souls, Job has a nightly dialogue with an archangel. The archangel promises to reveal to Job who God is, while Job, in return, promises to wage war against idol worship. The archangel foretells that Satan will direct his anger at Job, if Job takes up this fight; and that Job, if he can endure the satanic aggressions, will be rewarded with eternal fame,

a double compensation of whatever he loses, an unfading crown, resurrection and eternal life. Making use of the free will of man, a Pharisaic concern,<sup>7</sup> Job chooses the suffering himself. God is not the cause of Job's suffering. Job chooses to fight Satan on account of his own free will (TJ 1,27).

When Satan realises that Job will praise God no matter how much suffering Satan imposes upon him, Satan gives up. Satan recognises his defeat and compares the fight with Job to a wrestling-match. Satan says: »Thus thou, O Job, art beneath and stricken with plague and pain, and yet thou hast carried the victory in the wrestling-match with me, and behold, I yield to thee» (TJ 6,29). Remembering that Job is the son of Esau, this evokes associations to Esau's brother Jacob, who wrestled with God, upon which Jacob won his blessing.<sup>8</sup> This encourages me to see Job's fight against Satan as a transformation of the concepts of chosenness and blessing. Both are won here by enduring the strokes of evil and praising God all along. But to test God's righteousness we must ask what the reward is? The reward in the *Testament of Job* is apocalyptic knowledge about God and the divine realm. Jobs says:

35 Be silent and I will show you my throne, and the glory of its splendor: My glory will be everlasting.

36 The whole world shall perish, and its glory shall vanish, and all those who hold fast to it, will remain beneath, but my throne is in the upper world and its glory and splendor will be to the right of the Savior in the heavens.

37 My throne exists in the life of the »holy ones» and its glory in the imperishable world.

38 For rivers will be dried up and their arrogance shall go down to the depth of the abyss, but the streams of my land in which my throne is erected, shall not dry up, but shall remain unbroken in strength.

39 The kings perish and the rulers vanish, and their glory and pride is as the shadow in a looking glass, but my Kingdom lasts forever and ever, and its glory and beauty is in the chariot of my Father (TJ 7,35–39).

The reward will unfold in the world to come in the heavens in which Job will assume the status of some kind of messianic figure. As long as God's reward for justice, piety and righteousness comes, no matter

how postponed, suffering has at least become bearable and so has it that the logic of God lies beyond the grasp of mortal man.

When Job lies at his deathbed, he reveals that God was the one who gave him the remedies to heal himself once Job's self-chosen fight against Satan was won. God rewarded him with:

... three-stringed girdles about the appearance of which no man can speak. 13 For they were not earthly work, but celestial sparks of light flashed through them like the rays of the sun. 14 And he gave one string to each of His daughters and said: »Put these as girdles around you in order that all the days of your life they may encircle you and endow you with every thing good» (TJ 11,12–14).

From now on Job's daughters benefit from Job's fight against Satan. Thus, rewards are passed from one generation to another, indicating a surplus in God's righteousness and blessings. The girdles bestow on the daughters esoteric wisdom and magical powers. The girdles enable the daughters to communicate with angels and learn their hymns. The aim of learning the hymns of the angels and thereby praising God in a language closer to the logic of divine language became a religious ideal for example in the Qumran community and developed into Merkavah-mysticism.<sup>9</sup> Such language enables the religious to speak to God, to have a dialogic relationship to God.

On the third day upon his deathbed Job died. God arrived and bestowed upon Job death by a kiss, just as Moses before him had experienced.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the apocalyptic reception of *The Book of Job* transforms the concept of reward by allowing for its postponement. It furthermore replaces the Biblical absence of God with potential access to God in this world through esoteric wisdom and angelic language enabling a dialogic relationship between God and man, of which I believe death by God's kiss is a telling symbol.

Ambiguity towards Job is what characterises the *Talmud*—an ambiguity that may be reflected in the limited amount of ritual or ritualistic use of *The Book of Job*. *The Book of Job* is read on *Tisha b'Av*—the day where the destruction of the two temples is commemorated. In the *Talmud* it says about the high priest's curriculum for that day: »Even such parts of Scripture which he does not usually read he may not

read, nor study parts of the *Mishnah* which he does not usually study, but he may read Job, Lamentations and the sad parts of Jeremiah» (bTa'anith 30a). Job's personal articulation of suffering here provides a model for collective/national mourning.

Ritualised conduct in front of a mourning person is deduced from *The Book of Job*. The *Talmud* renders the proper sequence of actions in this way:

Comforters are not permitted to say a word until the mourner opens [conversation], as it is said: 'So they sat down with him on the ground ... and none spake a word unto him; for they saw that his grief was very great. After this opened Job his mouth' [Job 2,12–3,1] ... 'Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite' [Job 4,1] (bMo'ed Katan 28b).

Finally, it seems that *The Book of Job* was considered a remedy for women against sorrow in marriage. According to the *Talmud*, it may have been customary to give a bride »a blanket, a book of the Psalms, a copy of Job and a copy of Proverbs» (bGittin 35a) along with her marriage contract.

In general, *The Book of Job* plays a limited role in ritual. Nevertheless and maybe because *the Book of Job* grapples so thoroughly with the problem of the suffering of the righteous, it is included in such ritual or ritualistic contexts that refer to something that is or could become unrighteous or at least unexplainable. With respect to the three Talmudic cases mentioned above, the religious person is encouraged to look to Job in situations where s/he is likely to ask: Why did God allow for the destruction of his earthly abode, thereby preventing future, innocent generations to have access to God? Why does God impose severe illness and pain, and sudden or premature death on our beloved thereby causing us to mourn? Why does religion defend marriage even in those cases where marriage includes fear, wife battering, isolation and neglect? Even though *The Book of Job* is obviously considered a means to console the religious person on Tisha b'Av, when mourning, or in marriage, *The Book of Job* does not provide any answers. Maybe this explains why the *Talmud* is reluctant to defend Job.



The rabbis could not make up their mind if Job was a heathen or not. If he was a heathen, it would contradict the prayer of Moses that *Shekhinah*, God's presence, should not rest upon anyone but Israel.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, the similarity between Job and Abraham was problematic, especially if Job ends up being more pious than Abraham, the hero of faith.

The *Talmud* elaborates on Job 2,2–3:

Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. ... Satan ... addressed the Holy One, blessed be He, thus: Sovereign of the Universe, I have traversed the whole world and found none so faithful as thy servant Abraham. ... Then the Lord said to Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job? for' there is none like him in the earth (bBaba Bathra 15b).

God's statement is contradicted further below in this tractate by an emphasis on Abraham's love for God while Job is supposed only to have feared him. Thus, Satan had a pious purpose when he attacked Job. R. Levi said: »Satan, when he saw God inclined to favour Job said, Far be it that God should forget the love of Abraham« (bBaba Bathra 16a). And in support of Satan's just cause, Raba continues and says about Job: »With his lips he did not sin, but he did sin within his heart« (bBaba Bathra 16a).

Seemingly caused by this reluctance towards Job, the rabbis did not hesitate to draw upon and promote superstition that turns Job into an ominous figure. It says in the *Talmud* that he who sees *The Book of Job* in a dream might expect punishment (bBerachot 57b).

It is as if the *Talmud* knows that the figure of Job cannot serve as a role model for the people. It says:

You may not quote miraculous deeds [in support of an argument]. ... it is written: 'He cleaveth my reins asunder and doth not spare' (Job 16,13); could he then continue to live on? You must therefore admit that a miracle is an exceptional case; [and the whole treatment of Job was miraculous] for it is written: 'Only spare his life' (Job 2,6), and so here a miracle is an exceptional case (bChullin 43a).

The figure of Job is so exceptional that one cannot argue for anything

by referring to Job. His piety is exceptional and so is his survival of divinely sanctioned calamities. Even God's intervention at the end of the book, where God concedes that Job was right and where Job was compensated, is an exception to the rule that God is creator and thus remains at a distance. But most importantly, according to my reading, the rabbis held the very Jobian image of God an exception, a threat, since monotheism cannot thrive with a god that first yields to Satan and then at the end of the book yields to the good angels when they petition God to restore to Job his prosperity. As it is in *The Book of Job*, man is subjected to the ruling of good and bad angels, which is hard to reconcile with monotheism.

In other words, the *Talmud* is reluctant to receive the figure of Job as a role model for piety. In order to defend the supremacy of Abraham and avoid the revolution and chaos that follows in the footsteps of Job, the *Talmud* has occasionally turned Job into a scapegoat in the girardian sense: Job as the semi-stranger and outstanding exception in the midst of the community becomes the object of violent/malevolent attention in order to promote effervescence that again leads to coherence among the community-members despite their social differences.<sup>12</sup> Yet, it is thanks to this reluctant reception initiated by the rabbis that Job transforms into a potential counterpointist figure in Rabbinic Judaism, up against which anyone can define himself; i.e. Job is what we are not.

In the Middle Ages there was a revival of interest in the Book of Job. Seventy-six commentaries were written on the Book of Job from 900 to 1500. The majority of these were *peshat*-oriented; i.e. interested in establishing the plain meaning of the text; while seventeen dealt specifically with broad philosophical themes in Job such as providence, reward and punishment, divine knowledge, evil, prophesy and immortality.<sup>13</sup> The most famous philosophical works on Job in the guise of exegetical commentary are those of Sa'adia Gaon, Zerahiah Hen, Gersonides, and Simon ben Zemah Duran.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, mention should be made of Maimonides' tractate 22–23 in the *Guide of the Perplexed* and Samuel ibn Tibbon's *Ma'amar Yikkavu haMayim*, chapters 15–18. All seem influenced by Aristotelian philosophy in their attempt to bridge the gap between earlier positions on reason and revelation. This goes for the 11<sup>th</sup> century poet Shlomo ibn

Gabirol as well, especially in his philosophical work *Fons Vitae*, but mention here is made of this medieval, Spanish-Jewish poet because he used Job for a counterpointist purpose in what many consider the most beautiful poem in Hebrew, namely *Keter Malkhut, the Kingly Crown*<sup>15</sup> – a hymn that is recited for Yom Kippur in Sephardic liturgy even today.

*The Kingly Crown* is a patchwork of Biblical quotations, transposed into the logic of Gabirol's theology. This is evident right from the preface to the hymn:

By my prayer a »man shall profit» (Job 34,9)  
 For in it he will learn righteousness and purity  
 In it I tell the wonders of the living God,  
 Briefly, and not at length.  
 I put it at the head of my praises  
 And call it The »Kingly Crown» (Esther 2,17)  
 »Marvellous are Thy Works; and that my soul knoweth  
 right well» (Ps 139,14)<sup>16</sup>

The hymn opens with an inversion of Elihu's claim that Job no more believes in God's righteousness or that man profits from having God as a friend. By offering the hymn as a prayer to God, Gabirol denounces Elihu's slander, not by referring to what Job says, but by quoting David, the singer of psalms.

Gabirol, who suffered social isolation because of a painful skin disease and his provocative attempts to transform Judaism and thereby ensure its survival in multi-religious Spain, was truly touched by the fate of Job. Yet, as the literary critic Harold Bloom would notice, Gabirol is such a strong poet that he is fully aware of the exact point where his hero Job failed as a poet. Job was stricken with fear when he finally had the chance to argue his case against God in God's very presence.<sup>17</sup> Job halted his law suit when he clapped his hand to his mouth and gave up. Subsequently, Gabirol turns to David, famous for his dialogues with God, hoping to draw upon God's favourite in order to make God respond by arguing the case for every man who experiences suffering, sinful as man may be. The contrasting of Job and David is particularly evident in the 38. song, where the central hope-providing message is based on David admitting to his sins, something that Job did not do.

If I cannot hope for Thy mercies, who but Thou will have pity on me?

Therefore, »though Thou kill me, I shall hope in Thee« (Job 13,15),

And if Thou search out my sin, I shall flee from Thee to Thee, and hide myself from Thy wrath in Thy shadow, I shall hold on to the skirts of Thy mercy until Thou hast pity on me. »I will not let Thee go, except Thou bless me« (Gen. 32,27)

Remember that of clay Thou didst make me, and with these afflictions didst Thou try me.

Therefore do not visit my acts upon me, nor make me eat the fruits of my deeds ...

What will it profit Thee if worms take me to eat me, »eat the labour of thine hands« (Ps 128,2) (*Keter Malkhut* 38)

Gabirol uses David to present a different kind of logic than that of classic wisdom. Man would be condemned to suffering if Judaism relied on God's righteous intervention. One furthermore knows that Job's piety was not sufficient to prevent his suffering. In *The Book of Job* God demands to be praised for being the creator of the world – and so Gabirol swerves against this claim of God and sets in his argumentative attack right here.<sup>18</sup> Yes, God created the world. And yes, God created man. However, God created man with a good and evil urge; and man cannot by his own free will escape or transcend this premise for existence that inevitably leads to sin. God must take upon himself a responsibility for the sins of man and this responsibility must articulate itself as mercy. Mercy is the suspension of legal thinking and this is what Gabirol pleads for, arguing the case of man, subjected to the very nature that God gave him.

To prevent the dominance of all sorts of intermediary beings in a monotheistic religion, one cannot embrace God's demand to be praised simply because he is the creator. The Jobian god, who destroys sinners, repentants and innocents alike, is no adequate choice of god, since this god neither provides man with a reason to accept the normative stance of religious ethics, nor to believe in God or the religious worldviews included in such a belief. Classic wisdom is inadequate; Job knows that and points alternatively to

the need of God's empathy with man, sinning as man may be. God must either be righteous or empathetic. The reward and punishment subsumed under the concept of God's righteousness secures one kind of relationship between God and man. The alternative relationship between God and man is based upon empathy.

Judaism, like any other religion, struggles with the injustice of fate. If Judaism shall be equipped to propose a worldview to hold on to in times of trouble and in the course of history, it must have an alternative to claims related to classic wisdom about God's righteousness in the main part of Jewish Scripture. This double theology where the call for empathetic mercy formulates an alternative to the claim about God's righteousness is what – from an analytical perspective – secures the survival of Judaism. From Gabirol and onwards, Judaism oscillates between God's mercy and God's righteousness in order to steer clear of the hurdles along the bumpy road of history, the course of man's life. By serving as the counterpoint that enables such steering, such oscillation between righteousness and mercy, *the Book of Job* has proven its indirect function of securing Judaism's claim to normativity in all aspects of life.

## Bibliography

- Bloom, H. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (1997)
- Cohen, S.J.D. 1987: *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Gruber, M. 2004. »Job«, In: *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by A. Berlin & M.Z. Brettler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1499–1505.
- Eisen, R. 2004. *The Book of Job in Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elior, R. 2003. *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism*. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.
- Frennsson, B. 1999. *In a common rejoicing: Liturgical communion with angels in Qumran*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Girard, R. 1987. *Job – the Victim of His People*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kristeva, J. 1974: *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Edited by K. Oliver: *The Portable Kristeva*, New York: Columbia University Press (2002), 35–49.
- Leiman, S.Z. 1976. *The canonization of the Hebrew scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic evidence*. Hamden: Archon Books.
- Schleicher, M. 2006. »Det andalusiske kulturmøde – Jødedom, kristendom og islam i Gabirols religiøse digtning.« In ed. E. Faber: *Religion*, vol. 3. Køge, 14–25.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. Gruber 2004, 1499–1505.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Leiman 1976, 127.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kristeva 1974, 35–49.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Kristeva 1974, 44–45.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. Cohen 1987, 27–34.

<sup>6</sup> *The Testament of Job* is available online in M.R. James' translation, cf. *Apocrypha anecdota 2. Texts and Studies 5/1*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1897, see: [http://wesley.nnu.edu/biblical\\_studies/noncanon/ot/pseudo/test-job.htm](http://wesley.nnu.edu/biblical_studies/noncanon/ot/pseudo/test-job.htm)

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Josephus: *Antiquitates* 18,11–25.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Gen. 32,25–30.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Frennsson 1999 and Elior 2003.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Deut. 34,5: »So Moses the servant of the LORD died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the LORD«. »The word of the LORD« is a translation of »על-פי יהודה« which could also mean »by God's mouth« which is why the rabbinic tradition speaks about Moses' death by God's kiss.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Ex. 33,16.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Girard 1987.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Eisen 2004, 13.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Eisen 2004, 8.

<sup>15</sup> There are several translations into English of this hymn. Here, quotations are taken from the translation of Bernard Lewis, cf. Shlomo ibn Gabirol: *The Kingly Crown – Keter Malkhut*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame 2002.

<sup>16</sup> I consider this line, the quotation from the Psalms, a part of the preface and not of the 1<sup>st</sup> song as does Lewis. Parts of my work on Gabirol has appeared in an article, cf. Schleicher 2006.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Job 40,4.

<sup>18</sup> On clinamen and swerving, cf. Bloom 1973, 14; 18; 29.