

The objective of this study is to examine certain key elements in each text with the intention of discerning their respective significances as well as what they have to say by way of comparative analysis.¹ The nature of these leading characteristics is determined on the basis of an analysis of the peculiarities of each text which is then followed by a more comparative examination. The conclusion of the study is that a comparative evaluation of the two texts is revealing because it highlights the distinctive peculiarities of each text and provides a useful reflection on the nature and significance of theophany in both traditions, particularly in connection with the phenomenon of supernatural sight.²

Job 38-42 as a Theophany

At first glance Job's encounter with God in chapters 38 to 42 of the Book of Job does not seem to constitute a theophany in the precise sense of the word since, strictly speaking, God does not 'manifest' himself to Job. He simply speaks to him out of a whirlwind.³ However, there are certain features of this response to Job which, in the context, do justify the title of theophany. Evidence drawn from other biblical sources confirms this interpretation.

Throughout the text Job has implored his God to answer him in the belief that only a divine response can satisfactorily explain his present predicament.⁴ Unlike Arjuna he does not specifically request that God appear directly to him, or manifest himself in some different form from that with which he is currently familiar. His desire is for a divine response which amounts to a request for a theophany since he refuses to

accept his tradition's understanding of God as represented by his friends. It is this request which necessitates some kind of direct divine response which eventually comes in the form of a series of speeches on aspects of the creation. It is not an account of the personal features of God as the terms of a theophany would normally require and are met, as will be shown, in the case for Arjuna. Rather this divine response constitutes a theophany of a different sort in which the presence of God is more indirectly represented but nonetheless profoundly present to its recipient Job. It is a theophany in the best biblical tradition since it contains vivid and convincing evidence of the immediate presence of God for Job.

Obviously then the definition of a theophany has to be altered to accommodate Job's direct experience of the divine. There are compelling reasons why this should be done. First, the relationship between God and man is often described in terms of the relationship of both to the world of nature, perhaps the best example of which is the beginning of Genesis.⁵ Other references to the Divine-Human relationship focus on sacred moment and event.⁶ God's appearance to Moses in the burning bush in Exodus 3 is also a good example of the former category. Job's encounter with God is also of the naturalistic kind except that in this instance God responds to Job out of a whirlwind.⁷

Second, divine disclosures of a biblical kind are frequently accompanied by a message of some kind, or a directive. Moses is directed to free the Hebrews from their enslavement; Isaiah is commissioned to prophecy; Job is informed of the nature of the divine relationship to the universe in which he lives and suffers. There is nothing novel in Job regarding this belief that God is manifest in his creation. The psalmist echoes this conviction when he says:

The heavens are telling the glory of God;
and the firmament proclaims his handiwork.⁸

What is novel in Job is that God himself points out this fact to him in such a manner that it is immediately evident to Job and totally different in kind from simple intellectual conviction. This perception is portrayed as something which is seen with an immediacy incomparable to any other sight and one which is necessarily derived from God. For Job it is a visible demonstration of God and of his benevolent dominion of the natural world.

Finally Job himself attests to his experience as a theophany when he says:

I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear,
but now my eye sees thee;
therefore I despise myself,
and repent in dust and ashes.⁹

These verses allude to Job's conviction that his previous knowledge of God was derivative and secondary, whereas now it is immediate, primary, and experiential. The effects of his present encounter resemble those of Moses and Isaiah when confronted with similar experiences. They are disorienting experiences and Job is appropriately reduced to uncharacteristic silence.

Thus it may be concluded that Job's theophany is worthy of the name although it is a theophany of a typically biblical sort. Although it is a personal God who reveals his presence in creation to Job it is not, as it is for Arjuna, a theophany in which the personal features of his god are described.

Distinctive Aspects of Job's Theophany

A distinctive characteristic of Job's theophany is the one just mentioned, namely, the absence of any personal description of Yahweh which

might be compared with the account of the transformed Kṛṣṇa. Instead the deity is represented in terms of his creative and providential deeds which are observable in the universe and which are truly indicative of the nature of Yahweh insofar as he may be described.

The striking quality of these chapters in Job (38-42) is that they contain lengthy descriptions of Yahweh's wisdom and power. His wisdom is demonstrated in his knowledge of the origins of all things and his power is shown in his ability to create and sustain a universe that conforms to his will. Yahweh is not content merely to point out to Job those features of his creation which exist for his well-being. He also deliberately and belligerently belittles man who is clearly incapable of threatening him.¹⁰ Furthermore he makes no reference to Job's misfortunes nor does he offer any explanation for his participation in the diabolical wager in the first place. Thus Yahweh's speeches appear on the surface at least to be extraordinarily inapposite.

However, they can be seen to be appropriate if regarded from another perspective.¹¹ From this vantage point it would appear that Yahweh's objective is to draw Job's attention away from himself and his own very real problems in order to convince him of the divinely ordered nature of the world which includes a chosen spot for man. Furthermore he attempts to show Job how much worse his lot might be if the world did not conform to a divine plan through extensive reference to the many wild and fierce creatures which inhabit it chief among whom are Behemoth and Leviathan. Although man may imagine himself to be significant, which the notion of his being made in the image of God might have elsewhere encouraged him to do, now he must be reminded that creation contains marvels and terrors greater than he had ever imagined of which Behemoth and

Leviathan are good examples. Job's attention must be riveted on God for it is only he who can discipline them which he specifically does for human well-being.

The gist of Yahweh's remarks is that Job has unwittingly attempted to compare himself with God through his questionings. Yahweh insists that he recognize the limitations imposed on him by his humanity. He will not tolerate any attempt, however subtle, to undermine his authority. While Job had not realized that this was where his argument would lead him he still refused to accept the facile recitation of scriptures which his friends offered by way of answers. This integrity allows God to reveal something more profound to him of the human condition than they have understood with their thoughtlessness.¹² This interpretation of Yahweh's speeches is vindicated on closer examination.

As indicated, the divine addresses have two distinct parts the first of which deals with God's wisdom and the second with his power. Both are fundamentally concerned with how these divine attributes are embedded in the workings of creation and their demonstration brooks no human response.

Yahweh begins with an inquiry as to Job's whereabouts when the creation was begun implying his knowledge of Job's absence. Because he was not there he is ignorant of the nature of this creative endeavour. This theme is continued throughout the speech in order to convince Job of his complete insufficiency as a competitor for God which his earlier summonses to him had implied he was capable of being. Job must realize that God and man occupy two distinct realms which are unbridgeable for man but not for God. Even though there is a relationship man's nature renders him unfit to be equal with God as his other futile attempts to

do so indicate.¹³ Man's ignorance then consists in part of his lack of knowledge of his real role in creation and of its limitations.

The second divine speech is chiefly concerned with Yahweh's power in and over creation. Its objective is the same as that of the first, namely to convince Job of his utter incomparability with God. This may be one way of saying that God is not simply identifiable with righteousness which is Job's outstanding characteristic. Neither is human creativity to be compared with the divine.

This second speech describes the many marvellous creatures which abound in creation. Behemoth and Leviathan of mythical and monstrous proportions dominate the scene. The latter are noted for the fear they instil in men but they pose no threat to God who contains them within their respective zones of land and sea.¹⁴ Again, although Job does not appear to have claimed to possess comparable powers the message seems to be that his questions imply such a challenge. Again Job is forced to realize the futility of such an attempt and to recognize the enormity of the gap which separates the earthly and divine realms.

That these divine demonstrations are convincing to Job is evident from his own timid responses.¹⁵ The brevity of these replies and their terms of reference indicate his new apprehensions of his role in creation and of his knowledge of God which is based on immediate perception. His present apparent fright contrasts sharply with his earlier bravado and his calm reactions to the news of unimaginable disasters. His previous unnerving response to frequent disasters 'the LORD gave and the LORD has taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD', is replaced by a sense of total worthlessness in the face of the divine.¹⁶ He no longer has anything to say as his quotation of the divine words themselves indicates.¹⁷

A summary of the main characteristics of Job's theophany includes the following points: Job's encounter with God is not a theophany except in a special biblical sense because there is no description of the person of God. The latter is replaced by an account of the divine attributes as they are evident in the created universe and in his dealings with Job. In other words, the world of nature, rather than the person of God, provides the locus for the divine demonstration. The message of this theophany is that the realms of God and man are quite separate and distinct whatever the relationship between the two and that the world is governed for human welfare by a divine providence. This insistence on, and demonstration of, the total difference between God and man which is visibly represented to Job promotes in him a profound sense of awe and worthlessness as compared with God. This proper human response is acknowledged by God by means of bestowing on Job an ample blessing. The latter amounts to a commission to fulfil the directives of Genesis by filling all the earth and subduing it. This prosperity and enjoyment of it are token of his blessed state and, typically, are of a materialist kind.

Theophany in the Bhagavad-Gītā

Chapter 11 of the Gītā records Arjuna's experience of Kṛṣṇa in his form "as God" (XI:3). Kṛṣṇa, who has been conversing with Arjuna about his obligations as a member of the ksatriya (warrior, or ruling) class, accedes to Arjuna's request to show his true form as God. This is surely a bona fide theophany. However, if the definition of a theophany requires that the god not be present until his actual manifestation, then this theophany too is subject to qualification since Kṛṣṇa has been conversing with Arjuna for some time. Nonetheless Kṛṣṇa's extraordinarily transformed self as God is so utterly different

in kind and effect from his previous self that there can be no doubt that this appearance is entirely novel for Arjuna. It is also a lengthy and deliberate 'manifestation of-God' which is of the essence of a theophany.

In order to demonstrate the uniqueness of this theophanic occasion and its inaccessibility to ordinary mankind, not to mention the gods, Arjuna has to be endowed with a "supernatural eye" (8). Only then can he behold this marvellous sight. This endowment demonstrates the importance of sight, or vision, which is central to both texts as well as to the nature of the theophanic experience. In order to emphasize the importance of this kind of seeing the Gītā introduces a character called Saṁjaya whose function is to record the event for posterity as well perhaps as to testify to the reality of the experience. In other words, it was not something internal to Arjuna but something externally visible. Saṁjaya is Dhṛtarāṣṭra's charioteer who, earlier in the epic, has been gifted with divine sight.

Like Job the Gītā contains a lengthy and somewhat self-congratulatory account of the deity. However, whereas Yahweh is principally concerned with his singular ability as creator, Kṛṣṇa focuses on himself as the centre and arbiter of all that is, including creation. But what is immediately arresting about Kṛṣṇa's self-description is its sensuousness as well as the emphasis on his person, whereas the description of Yahweh is totally devoid of any attempt at physical representation.¹⁸ A brief examination of some of Krishna's attributes is informative.¹⁹

The sensuousness, perhaps even sensuality, of Kṛṣṇa's person is strongly emphasized.²⁰ He has "many mouths and eyes....marvellous.... ornaments....garlands....garments....perfumes....ointments....faces" (10-11) which have such an electrifying 'effect' on Arjuna that his hair

is left "standing upright" (14). So observes Saṁjaya, the onlooker. Arjuna's own experience is similar to that of Saṁjaya. He notes the "many arms, bellies, mouths, and eyes....(16) of Kṛṣṇa and that his face is "flaming fire" (19). It is not simply like "flaming fire" but is the phenomenon.

Again, he has many "mouths and eyes" which shake his "inmost soul" (24). So terrible are these mouths with their "great tusks" that they promote in Arjuna a sense of profound dislocation: "I know not the directions of the sky" (25). His fear is justifiable because he sees his fellow warriors being consumed by these awful mouths some of whom are unfortunate enough to remain "stuck between the teeth...with their heads crushed" (27). None escape this dreadful fate for "the heroes of the world of men into Thy flaming mouths do enter" (28) and are devoured "as moths into a burning flame" (29).

What is noteworthy from the point of view of comparison of the two texts is the all-encompassing sensuousness of the description. Even the knowledge that this is just another way of saying that all men eventually reach their destiny in Brahman is somewhat unappealing, especially to one weaned on biblical expression for whom a similar account of Yahweh having a voracious appetite like that of Kṛṣṇa with its strong sexual overtones would be unthinkable. However, in the Gītā this is clearly the most appropriate way to express the world as a part of Kṛṣṇa's body. ²¹ Thus highly sensuous description plays an important role in the representation of Krishna's divinity. ²²

This representation of Kṛṣṇa's power in highly personalistic and erotic terms stands in marked contrast to the account of Yahweh's power in Job. There the evidence of God's potency is to be seen in his ability

as creator and benevolent ruler. The description is attributive rather than personalistic. As in Genesis, the account of creation is remarkable for its lack of reference to sexual and sensual potency even when talking about generation of the most creative sort. In the Gītā, on the other hand, to use this terminology is to employ the most sublime language to describe the ineffable.

Other aspects of Arjuna's theophany deserve attention. Not only is Kṛṣṇa, like Yahweh, associated with power, but he is also the "supreme object of knowledge" (18) and the source of "eternal right" (18).²³ His physical and religious dimensions inspire terror on all sides. He is Time itself (32), the kind of Time which causes the death and destruction of all that is. It is time in the sense of an endless sequence of passing, inconsequential moments. There is no salvific content to this notion of time as there is in certain parts of the Bible, excluding Job, except in the very extended sense that the end of all things brings nearer the possibility for self-liberation.²⁴ Even Arjuna himself is insignificant in relation to this notion of time as the unfolding of continuing destruction. This on-going, all-pervasive destruction has already been set in motion and will eventually overtake all the "warrior-heroes" (34). All he can do is speed up the process but even this comparatively insignificant task is worthy of him and should be done immediately because it affords him the opportunity to practise the virtue of performance of duty as well as to recognize that destruction is inherent in all things.

At this stage it is appropriate to begin a more specifically comparative examination of the two texts, especially of those points which they have in common and on matters important to each. In Job's theophany there are creatures which can be taken to represent destruction, namely,

Leviathan and Behemoth. The biblical text refers extensively to both their destructive powers and to their lack of domesticity which they share with the other wild beasts, but emphasizes their containment for human comfort. These creatures are not loosed upon the world precisely because of divinely imposed restrictions on their movements. Similarly man is restricted in his movements for his own benefit. Both texts show destruction is an inherent part of existence. For the Gītā the sooner destruction is loosed from its moorings, through Arjuna's faithful performance of duty, the better for him. For Job, continuance of existence in the world is essential to his well-being and, consequently, the forces of destruction must remain under constraint. If it were not so creation would not be good. The universal presence of this destruction causes both heroes to realize fully how marginal is their existence and how dependent they are upon the will of the gods. What they are required to do as a consequence of this realization differs enormously. It is imperative for Arjuna that he perform his duty disinterestedly which includes both his duties as ruler and warrior, so that he can eventually secure the release of his true self which will then find its identity with Kṛṣṇa. Job's identity depends on the proper observance of divinity in the world and of modifying his worldly life in relationship to that fact.²⁵

In his exemplary speech of this state of affairs (42:1-6) Job is commended by Yahweh (42:7, 9) and blessed with the possession of "twice as much as he had before" (42:10). He has more sons and daughters whom he names emulating Adam's own exercise of dominion in Genesis, and confirming his connection with the creator God.²⁶ As further proof of the goodness of existence in the world and of his blessing he lives to be "an old man, and full of days" (42:17).

In sum, for Job the world is good although everything in his previous experience urges him to conclude otherwise. Through following the established code of conduct he can hope to avoid future calamities. Arjuna, on the other hand, must focus his attention on the destructive aspect of the world and of his god, and armed with that realization free himself from contact with it. His reward will be his extraction from this world.

The two texts share many common elements but contain significant differences. Both are remarkable for the fact that neither hero succumbs to despair although both have good reason to do so.²⁷ They are both faced with impossible situations yet neither resorts to suicide as a possible solution. Again, neither succumbs to the facile parroting of scripture (although Job's friends do), but each wrestles gallantly with the consequences of their individual situations. Arjuna refuses to perform his duty (dharma) because of the enormity of the consequences of that action, although he knows he must for his own well-being and that of his society. Job refuses to accept the friends' diagnoses of his ills because he knows they are wrong, although they are correct in terms of contemporary thinking on the subject. Consequently he himself cannot be familiar with any other interpretation of them. In the end, both men are granted a theophany which appears to speak to each in the language and thought best suited to their individual situations.

The behaviour of the gods, and their effect on Arjuna and Job also share some common elements. Both deities are supremely concerned with their own deeds and prowess and neither appears to speak directly to the awful dilemmas their protégés confront. Indeed, far from comforting them they instil in Arjuna and Job incredible fear to such an extent that both men are reduced to a feeling of total worthlessness and each has

to be comforted. ²⁸ However, this human reaction to the presence of the divine should probably be otherwise understood. Both men are experiencing a theophany and are overwhelmed by that experience. It is probably that their reactions are only meant to draw attention to the awe and mystery of the divine rather than to the unfortunate lot of some men. Despite their real problems these men would be seen in both traditions to be enormously fortunate to participate in a theophany. Their own concerns, which are real and oppressive, are totally insignificant in the light of their confrontation with their gods.

Another matter of consequence for both texts is that in each text it is recognized that some kind of unusually perspicacious seeing forms an essential part of the theophanic experience. ²⁹ Job specifically condemns his previous knowledge of God as inadequate when compared with his present vision. Since God only answered Job 'out of a whirlwind' (38:1) and there is no mention of his personal appearance, there can be no speculation about what Job saw of the person of God. It would seem more probably that this vision refers to the creation to which Yahweh makes extensive reference. Perhaps it was a first-hand perception of the divine presence as evidenced in the ordering of the universe of the kind the psalmist extols:

When I look at thy heavens, the work of thy fingers
the moon and the stars which thou has established;
what is man that thou art mindful of him,
and the son of man that thou dost care for him...
O LORD, our Lord,
how majestic is thy name in all the earth! ³⁰

Arjuna too had his first-hand experience of God which utterly devastates him and which is the product of a peculiar kind of seeing. His normal means of perception is said to be changed through the gift of a "supernatural eye" (8). It is implicit in both texts that even

the highest kind of wisdom is inferior to this mode of contact with the divine. ³¹ This may be so because seeing is a direct form of communication. Nothing intervenes between the seer and the seen which might prevent full awareness of the reality of what is seen from occurring. It is clearly a shattering experience given the reaction of the two men. Its implications for biblical thought are that other modes of divine self-disclosure may be secondary to this kind of immediate experience of the divine. However, it is evident not many men experience a theophany. It also implies a secondary role for jñāna 'wisdom' in the Gītā, but this is not so clearly established. ³²

It must also be noted that Arjuna has to be given this 'supernatural eye' before he can see Kṛṣṇa in his other forms. Evidently not even Arjuna could otherwise have done so. Not even the gods, who long for such a sight of Kṛṣṇa can see him in this form even though they presumably are most adept at worship and therefore most likely to reap its benefits. ³⁴ Arjuna's acquisition of the eye does not necessarily imply that he acquired it through merit, although it may be assumed that he was uniquely worthy of it in order to have been selected by Kṛṣṇa for that honour in the first place. Similarly Yahweh suddenly decides to 'answer' Job which for so long he seemed disinclined to do. The response seems to have little to do with Job's merit or lack of it. In fact, the gap between Job's last speeches and the divine replies suggests his despair of any answer. The composition of Yahweh's replies implies the inappropriateness of many of Job's questions. Job's own brevity of response to Yahweh, which is at odds with his earlier verbosity and vehemence, indicates his sense of utter unworthiness of any reply in the presence of God. The point seems to be that so great is his experience of the divine that even his normally loquacious self is

completely silenced despite his exemplary worthiness in the dialogue and monumental calm of the introduction.

Thus supernatural vision is of the essence of the theophanic experience. ³⁴ The Bible asserts that no man can see God face to face and live. ³⁵ However, Job is not said to have seen God personally except in the sense mentioned above. Job emphatically sees God in this latter sense of being visibly apparent in his universe. As mentioned the proof of his acute vision is that he lives to be "an old man, and full of days". Similarly Arjuna is distinguished above all gods who languish in vain for the sight he has been uniquely privileged to see and experience. In both instances this sight would seem to be an unmerited divine gift, although both men are supremely worthy of it as is made clear in each instance. Wisdom, although of great human importance for both traditions, occupies a lower place beside this primordial experience. Hence the elaborate attempt to draw attention to the wonderful sights of creation in Job and the marvellous appearance of Kṛṣṇa in the Gītā. It follows that this kind of religious seeing is at the pinnacle of religious endeavour but it is reserved for the very few. What distinguishes these two recipients is their steadfast refusal to capitulate to the tremendous adversity of their particular situations and the uniqueness of their individual rewards for their integrity.

Finally, mention should be made of the intention of both texts. That of the Gītā is demonstrably to cause dharma to be known once more in the world. This is necessary because presently knowledge of it is dead. Arjuna's direct encounter with Kṛṣṇa in his transformed and ordinary states of being provides him with the necessary impetus to implement his individual duty while simultaneously explaining to

him the nature of the world and of his relationship to it. His obligation, which he must fully realize, is to extract himself and his fellows from the world because belonging in it obscures man's real end. For Job, the intention of the text appears to be to teach him also about the nature of the world and of his relationship to it and his God. Job is instructed to remain usefully in this world for as long as is humanly possible and to enjoy the relationship of his God and himself to that world. For Arjuna, the world of nature is something from which wise men extract themselves; for Job it is the divinely ordained milieu in which men should learn to live profitably.

FOOTNOTES

1. The texts in which the theophanies are recorded are chapter 11 of the Bhagavad-Gītā and chapters 38 to 42 of the Book of Job. Edgerton's translation of the Gītā (New York: Harper, 1964) is used almost exclusively. The biblical text in translation is that of the Revised Standard Version (London: Collins, 1952).
2. It is not intended to ignore the enormous critical problems both texts present. However, no attempt is made to deal with them in this paper for reasons of length.
3. Cf. 38:1.
4. E.g. 7:17-21.
5. Reference to creation can also be found in certain Psalms and Second-Isaiah. Cf. A.E. Combs, The Creation Motif in the 'Enthronement Psalms' (Columbia Ph.D. Dissertation, 1963).
6. The exodus from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the receipt of the Law at Sinai all mark highly significant moments and events in Israel's religious consciousness.
7. The whirlwind, like the burning bush in Exodus 3, may invoke fear in the eye of the beholder. The appearance of God to Job in company with this natural phenomenon accords with previous theophanic disclosures.

8. Ps. 19:1
9. Job 42:5-6.
10. Nonetheless Genesis 3:22-24 does suggest a divine apprehension that man might succeed in establishing himself on equal terms with God. The same kind of fear seems to underlie the divine speeches in Job.
11. The author's Ph.D. thesis ("The Creation Motif in the Book of Job", McMaster, 1975) was an elaborate attempt to document the centrality of creation thought in the Book of Job.
12. Arjuna is similar to Job in that he is immobilized by his recognition that dutiful action is impossible because the situation is much more complex for him than for other warriors.
13. Cf. note 10 above. The ejection from Eden, the flood narratives and the Tower of Babel story all express the divine fear of human encroachment and divine regret that man does not appear to accept prescribed limitations.
14. This theme is reiterated in Ps. 104 where Leviathan exists merely to "sport" in the sea which is described as part of the divine creation (vs. 26).
15. 40:4-5 and 42:1-6.
16. 1:21.
17. 42:1-6. Verses 3 and 4 are partial quotations of 38:2 and 3.
18. It is, of course, not intended to imply in this comparative study the superiority of one tradition over the other. If that were the intent then Yahweh's warlike and other characteristics would have to be taken into account.
19. Many different names are employed for Kṛṣṇa's transformed self and all are probably redolent with meaning but cannot be explored here.
20. Fowler (A Dictionary of Modern English Usage (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) provides an interesting comment on the history of the word 'sensuous':

sensuous is thought to have been expressly formed by Milton to convey what had originally been conveyed by the older sensual (connexion with the senses as opposed to the intellect) but had become associated in that word with the notion of undue indulgence in the grosser pleasures of sense. At any rate Milton's own phrase 'simple, sensuous, and passionate' in describing great poetry as compared with logic and rhetoric has much to do with ensuring that sensuous should remain free from the condemnation now inseparable from sensual.

20. (continued)

The point here is that Arjuna is indulged with an abundance of sensuous/sensual imagery which appears to be very far removed from intellectual representation.

21. R.C. Zaehner in his translation of the Gītā (The Bhagavad-Gītā With a Commentary Based on the Original Sources, Oxford: University Press, 1969, paper edition, 1973) observes that most of chapter 11 is "an account of the tremendous vision in which the universe in all its variety is seen as Krishna's body — all its multiplicity converging onto One (9-13)" (p. 303).
22. Biblical writing is noteworthy for its avoidance of sensual imagery when referring to deity. Even the notion that humanity is made in the image of God remarkably shuns sexual implications. Indeed, the biblical point seems to be that men, women, and God must not be identified in sexual or sensual terms. The Gītā's strong emphasis and erotic overtones, conveys a very different image and may suggest that sexual differentiation is essential to religious aspiration.
23. It is noteworthy that Kṛṣṇa is said to be these things whereas Yahweh himself is kept separate from what he does even though doing is the essence of his character.
24. Job is remarkable for the noticeable lack of reference to the important biblical teaching that God manifests himself in certain salvific events and contexts.
25. The beginning of Job describes Job's religious propriety. He is exemplary in the performance of his religious duties. His restoration and blessing at the conclusion of the work are striking in that no reference is made to his resumption of these duties. Perhaps for him, as distinct from Arjuna, the performance of duty is superseded following his encounter with Yahweh.
26. Job's naming of his children recalls Adam's naming of the animals and woman in Genesis 2:19f. and confirms the fact of his restoration and his concern with the issue of creation.
27. Job's equanimity in the opening chapters when confronted with news of monumental personal disasters must be seen as genuine and not as cynical.
28. Gītā XI:50 and Job 42:11.
29. Gītā XI:8 and Job 42:5.
30. Ps. 8:3.
31. Jñāna 'wisdom' is strongly emphasized elsewhere in the Gītā and may even supersede bhakti in importance for some persons.

32. The placing of Arjuna's vision in the middle of the text may be one way of limiting its importance.
33. 'But by unswerving devotion can
I in such a guise, Arjuna,
Be known and seen in very truth,
And entered into, scorcher of the foe.'
(Edgerton)
34. Extensive reference to the stars in Job, as well as to other parts of the creation, and to Kṛṣṇa's transformed self in the Gita, may be intended to shift man's focus of attention away from himself because it is unproductive in terms of discerning divine purposes.
35. Cf. Exodus 33:20.