

Suffering-satisfaction-reconciliation.

A pastoral psychology view about the Job paradigm.

## Tabel of Contents

Forward	3
The method of research	5
1. Suffering	8
1.1 History of religion outline.	9
1.1.1 Babylon	9
1.1.2 Egypt	28
1.2 Suffering in the Old Testament	34
1.2.1 A couple of theological viewpoints	34
1.2.2 The experience of suffering in the Old Testament	38
1.2.3 Suffering and wisdom literature	61
1.3. Psychological approaches to suffering	65
1.3.1 Introductory thoughts	65
1.3.2 Different perspectives and responses to human suffering. Diversity and Deficiency.	68
1.3.3 In focus. What is the name of suffering? Misunderstanding cracks.	104
1.3.4 Suffering and the "Ego". One as sufferer.	123
1.4.4 The existential suffering through the specter of psychology. Summary.	131
2. From suffering to satisfaction. From opportunity to assurance.	133
2.1 Introductory thoughts	133
2.2 The border position of suffering as a problem of knowledge	135
2.3 Suffering as knowledge and ignorance (the endless theodical experiment).	138

2.4 (Job) the prophets' faith and metaphysical rebellion as the unbearable hidden being.	144
2.5 Suffering as initiation. Titles and masks.	148
2.6 The "speaking" mask. Language and understanding.	152
2.6.1 On (the) hermeneutics (of Job). Text interpretation and intuition.	152
2.6.2 Suffering as an encounter. The Me-You (lexical) event	161
2.7 The possibility of the "I", as coping mechanism.	
The psychological interpretation of the metaphysical rebellion.	164
2.8 Coping questionnaire. The possibilities of "Job" nowadays.	169
Subjects.	169
2.9 Testing methodology.	171
2.9.1 Comparison of data along the rural-city pairing.	172
Processing the results taking into account the gender distribution.	187
2.9.3 Summary	195
2.9.4 Conclusions	198
3. Satisfaction (reconciliation)-fulfillment in Job's book.	200
3.1 Encounters, events, from hearing to vision, from suffering to contentment.	206
3.2 Satisfaction (reconciliation)-fulfillment	212
3.3 Pastoral Psychology as a border discipline. Conclusions about the self-definition of pastoral psychology.	219
3.3.1 Pastoral Psychology as the hermeneutics of a holistic vision	222
4. Summary	230
Bibliography	234
Web links:	246

Keywords: suffering, satisfaction, reconciliation, Job, pastoral psychology, hermeneutics, metaphysical, borderline.

The first idea with which we begin our writing is the pronouncement of the essence of human existence, namely, that it is as impossible to live a life with no suffering as it is to live a life with no communication. Suffering, even if it is not inherent to life, it certainly is a constituent part of it. You can revolt against it, and perhaps it is even natural to do so, but we must also take on the struggle. In fact, our society is trying shield itself away from misery, indicating that our view of misery and suffering is rather different.

In the Book of Job, suffering and the questions related to this existential situation appear at the same time, as a concentrate. The suffering, the suffering person, the search for answers of its environment, the search for answers of Job, the search for its transcendent voice, the moral of it, the arrival of the answer, which is not really an answer, but much more than that. All of this belongs to the narrative of the Book of Job. This is an outstanding work belonging to the literature of the Old Testament, which is not afraid of sharp phrasings, of framing sharp questions, of revolts, and finally of embarking us on admiration.

The paper is nothing more than a kind of battle. A battle with the subject, the text, the understanding and the interpretation, therefore it is nothing more than the impressions of an interpretation, an option among the numerous possibilities. At the same time, it is also an attempt, an adaptation to the struggle of Job, which cries for answers, then searches for a Witness, and ultimately ends in a meeting and a conversation. All of these are not imponderable fragments of everything that Job and his work embody, but the climax and the maximum of what we call human suffering. In addition to experiencing pain, Job's story also states the following: to fight, means to continue to live without guilt, to move on. Because when we fought through suffering, text and ultimately everything, we find ourselves in an authentic reality. In connection with God. It is not the addiction that has been born, but the loyalty. It is the opportunity to articulate one's opinion and position, the creation of this opportunity. The struggle to cope is, however, the thing that makes a living relationship possible and authentic. A struggle to stop everyone putting me in brackets and quotation marks. This is how Job's story becomes an authentic event of finding each other. A struggle to make people speak with each other.

Our world, our present and existence, coincides with the *Eclipse of God* of Job's story and finds itself in this drawn frame, so time and suffering can merge, that is, it allows a common

horizon. The 21st Century suffers from a lack of conversation, and most of the Book of Job also certifies this. We try to offset this deficit by the means of this paper.

Trying to do this is also a hermeneutic attempt. We believe that the triangular voice of psychology, philosophy, and theology is capable of sounding a melodious and not a discordant melody, but more like a harmonious polyphony. We will try to have an approach to the Book of Job, in which this hermeneutic circle will involve all three sciences mentioned above. We are convinced that we can get a complete picture of this very hard thing to understand. That is, suffering.

According to our *hypothesis*, Job's suffering is transformed qualitatively due to encountering God, as a result of existential changes and changes concerning the outlook on life. These are expressed and are happening in the (eye) testimony of divine revelation, as an involved participant; we want to grasp and walk around it with the concept of satisfaction (reconciliation), as to point out the consequences of this meeting.

Because of the fact that the *original* text of the Book of Job got to be known by the Israelites only during the Babylonian captivity, the Old Testament use of this text, its interpretation and its extension to reality, is full of Babylonian and Egyptian cultural mindsets. Attitudes to suffering in the view of the Old Testament do not necessarily mean that Israel has borrowed the views of surrounding cultures without any criticism, without incorporating filters into their own eyes, but as a result of internally generated polemic, which subsequently gave birth to a pure and personal vision.

This is not only a sign of openness but also of a certain self-confidence, which appears as a method of theological vision in the Book of Job. Portions of traditions containing suffering in the cultures of the people surrounding Israel can be found in the various strata of the Old Testament's tradition, therefore in the Book of Job as well. But like all traditions from this region, Israel subjected it to its own *editorial* work, and in our case, this is also true for the book of Job. One kind of correction that can be traced in the book of Job regards what we call suffering, and thus, the attitude towards the suffering person is also in a new dimension.

Most theological positions seek to find some sort of cause and purpose for misery. This is partly a natural human effort to create some kind of uniform and meaningful image of the world surrounding us. As such, through the pursuit of meaningfulness, we live through it as an inner compulsion to make sense of the various decisions and events of our everyday life, to trace a path, to have a *road* in mind.

As we have already mentioned, the theological attempt to find human causes of suffering in some sort of predictable reality is certainly not a mistake, but it is not certain that one goes

through the path that, as understanding and interpretation, i.e. opportunity stands before him/her. By opportunity, we mean that, in the case of a conceived response, there is, as inconvenient as it is, the possibility of asking a follow-up question, therefore of making sure.

There is less debate about the approach which highlights the prospect of *shortage*. Psychology speaks of this as a *loss*, but the theological viewpoint of *shortage* does not only show the eternal timelessness, but also the exact loss at one given time, also predicting its fulfillment within the theological tradition. The shortage is the deepest and most authentic feeling of human existence. Not only because we are *unfinished* beings, not only because our existence is fragmentary, but because we carry the memory of a past entity, which appears in the present as *thirst*, as a „downgraded” condition.

This „degraded state” forces a person into an existence of shortages, into a vacuum. At the (only) partial dissolution/end of this vacuum, something gets *dragged* in. The *idolatry*, the „*Golden Calf*” is a rigid god-image, fatality etc. Very similar to the Buberian *Eclipse of God*.

If human suffering is the rock of atheism, on which every Theodicy attempt fails, then Job's suffering is a critique (rock, if you will) of every attempt at Theodicy, which causes one to sink in his/her thoughts, that is not to let anyone rest. The historic spiritual arch drawn by numerous theodicy attempts lies somewhere on the path where Job was when he *ran until death and back*.

The Book of Job is a prominent work of wisdom of Israeli literature. The book itself deals with an eternal human problem, the issue of suffering, and this is the subject under rigorous investigation. Despite the fact that there are many literary, philosophical, psychological and, last but not least, theological writings on this subject, only in the Book of Job can we meet the light that puts the problem in such a way that it gives a very specific picture of the suffering person.

Concerning the problem of suffering, the unknown writer(s), during the period of wisdom in the times of crisis, in the 4th – 5th Century BC, presented the godly, true person's perseverance in its specific crisis situation. Suffering is concomitantly a question of existence and a question of faith, and as such, it is not only the question of Job, or just the people of Israel, but of all humanity, from all times and periods. It is a fact that Job was not an Israelite, but from Uz's land, a pagan-inhabited area, but this does not affect him and he continues to look at himself and his suffering through the lens of the chosen people. Moreover, the pagan world is also added to the Israelian world of faith, and the dramatic struggle of man's search for the secrets of life becomes a universal question.

But why does the Book of Job has its place in the Literature of Wisdom? The answer to this question is to be found in the development and in the characteristics of Israel's Wisdom Literature. During the captivity, Israel had to face itself. You have to evaluate the past and after drawing the conclusions you have to prepare yourself for the future. This is the era in which the individual's questions are getting more and more emphasis, compared to the community's problems, personal responsibility and the problem of suffering is clearly illuminated. In the era preceding the captivity, the premise that our actions have consequences, emerges. This is the premise on which the Prophet Abdias formulated the idea of paying out, in turn during the captivity, prophet Ezekiel emphasizing the personal responsibility, uttered the axiom of Israeli wisdom: the connection between action and consequence has statutory veracity.

Job's friends (Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, Elihu), according to this lawful truth, value Job's suffering so much so, that it is the only truth according to which they operate. Behind this conceptuality, the rule in the World works because of the contradictory pursuance of good or bad by people.

Every action is causality related, that is, if I follow the good, I will have a happy life, if I follow the bad, misery awaits me. In the 4th – 3rd Century BC, during the crisis of Israeli wisdom, the truth came to a halt, which resulted in the crisis where not every causality case prevailed in everyday life: not every deed met it's rewards or its worthy punishment. The Book of Job draws a critique of this rigid theological viewpoint, setting the suffering itself against its rigid interpretation, and subsequently absolutizes it all in the omnipotence of God. The answer to Job is not understandable with sheer reason, since suffering either. Much more is needed to meet, to contact.

Not only did the Old Testament's tradition look for answers to the question of human suffering, answers that are still present and sometimes intensify, but also other Humanities Sciences tried to find answers, all of them creating a canon of interpretation. With its own methodology, with its own image of humans, with specific conclusions, the science of psychology is now indispensable when we talk about of suffering. A more thorough research and comparison can show that there isn't such a big gap between the *theology of friends* and the *greats of psychology*. This is partly a hermeneutical situation, since these two disciplines, in many cases, use two types of languages that naturally differ. From the point of view of our research, it is an exciting experiment to see constructs next to each other, such as *stimulus – response*, *behavior – psychology* and *thinking, understanding – interpreting*, but also the idea of the friends *that Job has a secret sin*. Of course, this is only one instance that makes the

comparison possible. However, the place where these very different, far apart conceptual structures meet, is called an epistemological process. There is nothing new under the Sun.

As a theologian working as a pastoral psychologist, the possibility has been „given" to me to ponder about the imponderable, moving on the edge, on nobody's land, about things that one can only experience or live through. Something, however, implies that a marginal situation, i.e. suffering, could be more fully understood in a „different" marginal situation. Therefore, if we are interested in the viewpoint of psychology concerning suffering, we already know that „suffering is one's transcendence". It doesn't seem to be easy trying to approach the question of suffering from the standpoint of psychology. It's particular set of vocabulary and concepts, unique worldview and it's image of humans, alongside with philosophical thoughts of different schools of thought, have all contributed to it's „peculiar" viewpoint on the drama of suffering.

Different schools have chosen different pathways for interpreting and understanding human operations, which (foreseeably) have led to different results. This is why polemics went on for a long time: *who is right?* The tempers have been settled now, neither side is louder than the other and the worst thing to do is to anchor oneself in only one viewpoint. Though „some" have done more research and „some" have a more comprehensive explanation, something(s) has/have always been left out. Humans are too complex and complicated, all this complexity points to infinite possible answers, moreover if we consider the uniqueness of billions of people. It is obvious that suffering is life-related, and as it is shown every day, it is not only part of human life but all living creatures. It is also clear for all of us that suffering is present not only in us but also in our environment, different life events, a variety of specific psychic states and situations that occur in succession, different times and situations. Suffering is, therefore, a concrete experience of a person, but also a condition. Also, a less voiced opinion is that suffering is a process and it requires a specific approach. When pastoral psychology approaches the issue of suffering, it cannot leave out the viewpoint of psychology. On the other hand, it also has a critical standpoint related to the findings of psychology.

The approach of psychology, as far as the issue of suffering is concerned, is different from the approach of theology. Theology approaches suffering theologically (although this is not so clear), while psychology does not deal with this part at all, its most important aim is eliminating suffering (as soon as possible). After all, every social system thinks of suffering as something that has to be eliminated. The progress of civilization can be characterized by reducing suffering. In this process, the prolongation of the average age is a sufficient indicator, even if we only partially recognize its role.



It is interesting to note that the setting of social behavior is unmatched for reducing the causes of the biological system. If we look at the development of healthcare, we can observe that as far as possible, everything is being done to develop it (research, education, health education, healing, care, rehabilitation, institutionalization) but on the other hand, there is nothing done about stopping negative effects on the environment. All of these have a repercussion on the functioning of suffering, in other words, the limitation of suffering is aggravated by helping it.

All of this is also an indicator that when we analyze the relationship between suffering and psychology, more precisely how the science of psychology itself tries to approach the issue of suffering, we encounter a very wide range and broad-spectrum, multidisciplinary approach. If we are interested in the viewpoint of psychology, we have to take into consideration the approaches of medicine, biology, law and many other sciences. From this point of view, it would be a much easier task if the birth of psychology and its evolution into science would have had a „more closed” framework. But all of this is excluded because of the very nature and development of the psychology itself.

There is no doubt that (behavioral) psychology is one of the best connoisseurs of human suffering. They meet constantly and the study is born from this encounter. Although it deals with humans, the limitations of human life and the *hidden* dynamics that make humans human, become visible only in high-pressure situations. The recognition, understanding and management of these things have shaped and still shape the doctrines and views of this science to this day.

At the same time, much much can be said about this science, but others have already done so. What we must, however, mention is that psychology refused to hear the voice of theology and did not want to become acquainted with its horizons of interpretation. Recognizing this deficit (of course, not only because of this) the need for pastoral psychology was born.

Today it is still possible to feel and perceive the long list of reasons for the long-gone separation of theologians and psychologists alike. It seems like we need *Solomon's* wisdom to find out who has the „right”. Although everyone who has known suffering and the power of existence, surely will experience what Job himself said: „*Surely I spoke of things I did not understand, things too wonderful for me to know.*” (Job 42:3) But until anyone gets to this discovery, he/she has to search for it unrelentingly and understand it. Because thinking is so typical of us human beings, that if we renounce it, perhaps we would be eliminated from this particular force of existence. From the authentic existence.

Today it is already clear: understanding suffering is a joint effort, as helping the suffering person also. This is only possible if no one gives up on themselves, but also opens up to the others. This is nothing else than the border. No man's land. The outermost verge. Where we look at each other. Because humans are boundary-creatures. We find ourselves at the meeting point of transcendent and immanent. Constantly. This is both frightening and attractive. Horror and enchantment. In a single word: mystery.

A brief description of psychological schools is important for two reasons. On the one hand, because it is a component of the hermeneutical three-way, and on the other hand, it can help to update the meaning of Job's misery, with psychology's own toolbox. A kind of psychological criticism is also being made, as behind the findings of the school of psychology, there are *reflexes of interpretation*, that we can also find in the case of Job's friends. We must be aware of all of these if we believe that this is an integral part of the pastoral-psychological reflection. That is why we were most interested in the findings of schools rather than details of their development.

The structure of this chapter begins with imagery of humans of psychology and the development of its formation. That is, from the Cartesian human- and world view, which binds together the only authentic cognition with reason. But, as we have seen, those who have followed this path, sooner or later fell into the trap of reductionism. Not only did they miss the goal, but they also created a scientific and epistemological construct to which they became slaves. Over time, most of the attempts have been made only to keep this construct alive, to confirm it.

All this can be traced in the theological attitude of Job's friends. Humans are no longer important, nor is giving aid, but denying and abandoning reality, keeping a false theological standpoint and system alive. Finally, we find it important because today's psychologists are the ones who most often encounter suffering humans and this is why the findings of this science are perhaps the most important on the level of social discourse on suffering. Ignoring these facts would lead to a faulty and/or less complete conclusions.

The greatest thinkers of philosophy and theology admit that the question of *bad* poses unrivaled questions and challenges for both sciences. This recognition of this issue is not as essential, as the way we face the challenge or even the failure: is it a pretext to think less or to urge us to think more or even differently?

The problem (in this case, the issue of bad and suffering) questions the way of thinking created by the need for logical coherence, that is, a simultaneous pursuit of being free of controversy and total system of thinking. This way of thinking prevails even in Theodicy

experiments, which define the problem in similar ways, even though the different responses they get, for example, consider the following: *How can we say these three things without a contradiction? God is almighty, God is Benevolent, evil and bad exist.*

Theodicy therefore appears as a struggle for the defense of coherence, in response to the objection that only two of these statements are compatible with one another, all three of them never. All this shows that most of your theodicies are in a state of emergency, and, of course, in a controversial situation, since it does not want to give up on any of the three statements, but it also cannot provide a satisfactory answer.

At the same time, philosophy must address the issue of bad, more specifically suffering, as this phenomenon is present in everyday life and gives forth its cry. According to Ricoeur, the conundrum of bad is due to the fact that in the Jewish-Christian tradition, we put in the same boat entirely separate phenomena such as sin, suffering and death. Indeed, the more consistent we are at observing suffering as a reference point, the clearer the separation between sin and guilt get.

It should also be noted that thinking gives different answers for the question of evil and suffering than action. The bad thing for action is above all, something that should not exist (sic!), but still has to be overcome. Therefore, action has a different attitude towards suffering as thought has. Action responds by *looking into the future* and at the same time looking for opportunity *to move, to advance*, thus, it still only answers, but does not solve. Thinking, however, is obliged to ask: Where does suffering come from?

These two give rise to a special tension, but perhaps this is what propels the progress. Our sight gazes into the future, raising the issue of origin awaiting its discovery. Philosophy, through Ricoeur's voice, states that to get rid of the paralyzing effect of suffering we must do otherwise. For example to do as psychological positions may suggest. That is, we do not have to get rid of the paralyzing effects of suffering, thus creating a paradigm of a (more) tolerable suffering, but, to look at the possibilities and actions of the future. This is another perspective and an other kind of emphasis.

Ricoeur Freud refers to his study called „*Mourning and Melancholia*” when he says that the practical response should be complemented by emotional responses. This is related to the feeling that nourishes complaint and cry, which subsequently transforms into the wisdom of philosophical and theological examinations. According to his interpretation, mourning is the process in which we, after losing a loved object, we feel as if we ourselves were lost. This split that Freud calls grief work, frees us for to do new *emotional investments*.

The Book of Job arrives with boldness with an *experienced question*, giving space for authentic realities and questions related to them, formulated by the sufferers themselves. Doing this without knowing or even having an idea about the answer. Because only those can ask questions so ardent, whose questions raises you from the dead, forcing you to answer.

Martin Buber considers it a possibility that the Book of Job, is work that shows a reflexive theology. Although the cry can be related to a person, or specifically to Job, somehow it bursts out of this personal frame and becomes a single voice of all people in captivity. In the issues raised by Job it becomes obvious that the question *why*, is articulated differently. The question is not „*Why God allowing me to suffer?*” but rather „*Why is God causing me suffering?*”. It appears to be a strange kind of Theodicy, or not even one.

What is outlined in this book is the acknowledgment of an account that contradicts Job's knowledge of reality. This is the fundamental tension in the debate between Job and his friends.

In order to avoid slipping into any unintentional clarification of any theodicy question, the text itself as the carrier of reality and our knowledge of it, it's worthwhile remaining at the event, which is a language event associated with language in any case. The event is, by all means, a story-telling one. It is not something that has happened to someone, that is, as a passive sufferer, but something that enters into reality and thus changes its obsessive course.

If it's action and by this a story, as God's story, then this also means that Job is involved in it, participates in it. By the encounter, God's narrative is not a narrative about himself, but a narrative of a relationship. The fact that Job himself is so involved in this story gives him the possibility to change, but of course, it is impossible for him not to get involved, for he himself has *forced* it all. This is because he has no other certainty than the certainty that God will come. This is what prophets believe. In this case, suffering, that is, being left without answers and solutions, is the one that calls the opportunity to go forward. That is satisfaction and reconciliation, which is a possibility to *continue*.

But the possibility is not yet a certainty and not a reality in the true sense of existence, only a *hidden being*. Job has to discover something to go further. Going forward, in this case, doesn't mean the end of suffering, but the termination of the totality of suffering as the only authentic expression of existence. The primordial shortage is present when we don't even experience disease or loss. We know today that this shortage exists behind every „healthy” looking life and it is only a matter of time when *everything that was hidden, becomes apparent*.

Job's attitude might be better understood through the Camusian metaphysical rebellion. Job's (last) hope is God, who has to speak up for him, or simply cannot resign on the issue, and

this is how his rebellion is still an open question for philosophy and theology. But it is clear that it is a rebellion. A *metaphysical* one.

The metaphysical rebellion resembles the *movement of ignorance* of Kierkegaard. Both are passionate, which ultimately leads to the outbreak. The crying nature (or even rebellious) of the questions of Job can be found in „What is the transcendence?“, „What am I?“, „What is being?“, „Where does suffering come from?“ etc. These, despite their form, are not questions. They are only themes, which are drawn forth by a particular *presence*, that is, suffering, and the answer to them is not a knowledge but a conviction. Not a simple kind of conviction, but one that remains sole. Because of conviction, it is quite personal, it sticks with you, as suffering itself.

In this reflexivity, as a being-in-a-relationship, as a meeting, as an event, interestingly, not enlightenment is born, but encounter as an authentic relationship. As such, what occurs in suffering is not enlightenment, as many people think so, but the opportunity of encountering is born. It is only in this encounter that experience and conviction that sways us out of the preceding situation, out of nothingness (which is ultimately nothing but suffering, according to Heidegger's thoughts), and only through this way we can some kind of sense out of the *crypt*.

Suffering is a process. It is perceived in time and space, a subjective event whose objective examination only yields partial results, which is not enough. In the Book of Job, we read about suffering and the more or less understandable speech of God through 41 parts. It has a quantitative meaning, which in our opinion, refers to patience, and thus emphasizes timelessness. Suffering is a long-lasting process that seizes all human energy, and thus emphasizes its existential nature.

All human suffering is personal, the greatest thing for an individual. This is why it is difficult to use a general-purpose, all-solving mechanism for each case. At the same time, these mechanisms should not be abandoned, but only be treated flexibly. Our further conclusion is that suffering needs an exterior help. This in theology and philosophy means *the other*, and in psychology, this role is played by an expert. This also emphasizes the problem of suffering as a linguistic event, in the sense that it's empathizing, understanding and resolving is (also) some sort of an act of language.

With this in mind, we have already learned more about suffering, which is not marginal, since in further dialogues on suffering we have to take this into account. The specific scientific identity and self-definition of pastoral psychology is the one that best understands all these effects, and at the same time, it does not hide from them.

On the other hand, our conclusion also states that language, sooner or later, becomes the language of *power*. It is a technically-engineered language that only speaks in this language and creates such a paradigm of reality interpretation, in which the discourse about reality is faded in the background and becomes a means of exercising power. Whether it comes from the nature of science, or from the person who of science, is still waiting for a response. Perhaps these two are so closely related that it belongs to both.

All this is a phenomenon that guides us towards the humility of Socratic *ignorance*, since Job himself is also in such a Socratic situation (or Socrates in Job's situation) when he debates with his friends, but there are still many sufferers in the same situation, when they find no understanding, but a paradigm in which a person who runs in their aid actually exercises authority over them.

The Book of Job as such goes far beyond the (more) simple discourse of suffering and shouts all the things that point to injustice to the people who live on borrowed time. The question is, who is receptive to his voice? Which science is willing to take a more serious stand beside the interdisciplinary or holistic approach, that can provide more comprehensive assistance to the suffering of human.

Our statements in the language of philosophy point out the multifaceted problem that exists in the case of suffering, which becomes clear in the Book of Job. The metaphor of metaphysical rebellion, knowledge of this already gives a wider reading to Job's book, but also about the *reading* of suffering. However, what we are trying to interpret along the terms of satisfaction and fulfillment is going to be discussed below. We are aware, however, that a process can not be fully mapped along a few concepts, by capturing this process in its existence. We can point to only a few *stations*, where the text takes a rest or is actually coming up vigorously.

The masked nature of the words of God, the nature of this speech can be captured by the philosophical endeavor that deals with secret and the questions of it. Not only does it become evident that suffering is a philosophical question, but also that we can rely on the philosophical approach, we can operate with it without giving up our own theological, pastoral psychological standpoint.

On the other hand, we also point out to philosophy that, where appropriate, it is worthwhile to cooperate when existence itself requires it. This cooperation is also a moment of reflection, not only to reflect on the other, but also for self-reflection. We are convinced that it is increasingly necessary to move towards this common perspective attitude, that is manifested in the situations of human existence, as much as it permits it and requires it. Of course, this is

not a new paradigm for the scientific viewpoint, as it has been repeated several times in history, however, extensively committing to it and applying it is still far away.

Creation is perhaps an ideal metanarrative, with which one can picture the possibility a restart. Christian tradition makes ample use of it, as we encounter it throughout the Scriptural tradition (for example, New Earth). About the Book of Job, we can also add that we witness the beginning of a new theology. The theology of the friends is no longer the *theology*, but the one that draws from this event, and even tries to continue to be an event, as a continuous action, as a *follow-up*, as an *imitation*. The moment of Job's reconciliation and satisfaction are present as a process at the level of the text. What we can say about this reality is the concrete manifestation of the possibility of going forward as Job's life continues. At the same time, reconciliation does not mean that his suffering has completely ceased, but that looking forward to the future, besides God, who stands beside him, makes salvation and going forward possible. This change/shift/salvation is obviously manifested on an existential level, so it is hard to grasp. Perhaps we can only see the traces of it, just as the presence of God is seen by Moses, leaving in front of him (from the back).

Contentment and reconciliation are concepts not used as synonyms, but for the absorption of the same process, as complementary concept. contentment indicates that the lack of something/someone has disappeared. This is clearly the case of Job since he has God besides himself. At the same time, reconciliation shows the possibility of going forward. Therefore, it is not a renunciation, not a resignation, but rather the contrary.

How much this progress and hoped future is real, becomes apparent in the text. „*So Job died, being old and full of days.*” (Job 42:17) This book ends with this satisfaction. The Bible does not only speak of Job this way, but of Abraham as well: „*Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people.*” (Gen 25:8)

In addition to Abraham's example, Job's case certainly helps us to have a better understanding, that is, our worldview, our image of God is strictly related to how we relate to our sufferings, to life, to our **full** or **past** life. The fulfilled life of Job is not only due to an intuitive approach to the text, but also what the author of the *epilogue* itself says, even tries to prove. The *prologue* and the *epilogue*, the prose parts that straddle the lyrical narrative, face each other as a mirror in the text, but not in the form of duplicates or mirror images, but as a process. At the same time, in this process, there is the quality shift that takes place regarding the existence of Job.

If we analyze the frame story, we see that before the suffering of Job he had seven thousand sheep, three thousand camels, five hundred oxen, and five hundred donkeys. At the end of the story, he gets the double of them (back). This is not only a qualitative change but a quantitative one too. The Book of Job expresses the fact that an authentic encounter with God brings quality to mankind, and thereby a quantitative change in human life.

According to the majority of commentaries, the names of Job's daughters are Jemima, Keziah and Keren-Happuch, mean Dove, Cinnamon Flower and Etui (or some kind of black powder that they used as a beautifier, mostly for beautifying the contours of the eye). There are different speculative explanations, but most likely, and closest to the content of the text, is the cult of a sacrifice presented to God. All of these, like the *requisites* for the practice of the cult, appear in the history of Israel, and at the same time indicate the act of rehabilitation, in the sense that Job is again part of society and every aspect of it. as such he has the opportunity to officiate again.

What's more, his wealth is not (necessarily) due to the fact that he is *irreproachable and honest*, that is, according to the old theology a due to him, he is now giving his daughters an inheritance too. Job with God, are in an authentic relationship and as a consequence, has a divine blessing, being repossessed with his wealth, so it is only natural to share this.

There is an interpretation of this passage that calls Job the first feminist. In our view, looking at the whole text and its message, Rohr's interpretation is theoretically possible but is less likely and slightly forced.

Job died, being old and full of days. The last sentence of the book suggests not only comfort but also the kind of hope that one needs. In our opinion, the book of Job is (one of) the most excellent book(s) of the Old Testament literature.

The story of suffering people is as old as humanity itself and, of course, coping with suffering as well. In all historical times, overcoming suffering as a healing process and also as a recognized personality-forming force, occupied a central position. The ancient man of religious history sought the causes of his physical and psychological suffering in superhuman powers and their anger. Aid-giving for thousands of years belonged to the so-called sacred persons, the official representatives of religions (perhaps this is the reason why Job's friends considered it important to come to his aid).

These sacred persons also had the task of identifying the transcendental power whose anger gave rise to suffering, whose anger could be quenched only with proper atonement and ritual action. To do this best, it is clear that the transcendent (God, gods) and the immanent (people) worlds had to be known very well. Thus, they became the meeting point of *divinum*



and humanum. This approach continued through the Middle Ages, and the origins of some diseases were perceived as „sacred”, while others the result of „sorcery”, depending on the age. For example, epilepsy was called „morbus sacer”, that is sacred disease.

In the course of history, the formal and practical unity of priesthood has been disrupted during the disaggregation of sciences. The theologian was responsible for things of the soul and the doctor for the body. Humans created by the unbounded unity of creation were „scattered” by sciences since humans were made the subject of all scientific examinations. But over time, scientists had to recognize that the use of this method, does not allow the full understanding of human's full spectrum. As a consequence, psychosomatic approaches started gaining ground within the medical sciences. They became aware that the patient’s illness must be understood in the context of body-soul-spiritual and social inseparable reality.

At the same time, one of the basic tasks of pastoral psychology, concerning behavior and attitudes, is to take reality, the person, the things that happened to him/her as seriously as possible, approaching him without prejudices. Seeing the *big picture* is not only important for the examination of human existence and other entities but according to us, it should be a scientific *habit*, which goes beyond a scientific endeavor to synthesize. We could also say that man is always more than just *parts of a whole*. But by saying this, we only point out that people are creatures living on the transcendental boundary, who want to enter into transcendence, that is, a boundary-creature, and this is precisely why an adequate approach is needed to examine them.

For theology, this is all *obvious* (?), since if you call humans a creature, you also state that there is a Creator, as these concepts are related and one presumes the other. At the same time, theology as science, concerned (also) about human being, is limited in a sense, since it is bounded to *Scripture*.

The question is whether it is necessary to give up the *desire* to have a science that has a fuller understanding (not necessarily science) when approaching all the mysteries that humans and their existence imply? Or this (eternal) desire shouldn’t be abandoned, just as theology can not dismiss (in spite of having already seemingly failed) attempts at Theodicy?

In our opinion, it is precisely the pastoral psychology that keeps in mind the continuous development of humans, their *otherness*, knowing that it too, as science, must constantly evolve and change. We say this univocally, that *wholesomeness*, as vision and envisioning, is fully an illusion.

It would be completely wrong to follow this as a goal, as a ghost or utopia. But that is not the goal. The is not the creation of a not so perfect (sterile, self-seeking, rejectant of all

kinds of reductionisms, self-declarant of being much more) science that drives us as a force and scientific credo. Instead of this, it must be more authentic, it has to want to understand people, but above all, it has to be a scientific approach, then a method, and ultimately a quest for science. Because there are cases in which nobody speaks up (Auschwitz), and cases where not even God speaks up (Job). But who can point out the meaning of silence(s) (?), while seeing, knowing and feeling the insecurity of self and God of a sufferer? At the time of *God's Eclipse*, who is the one who can *speak up, communicate and signal* with his/her presence and not necessarily with words, to create hope? To tell people that this *eclipse* is temporary? Theology can always have this role for you. But reality can not be libelous. It may be ignored, but sooner or later the whirlwind sounds.

But this is all does not want to put theology aside, although there have been several attempts in the past centuries. But according to „*Revision of Ourselves*”, it is the kind of critical work that must be subjected not only to theology but to all other sciences. It is a fact, that it is *impossible* to speak of the *Eternal, of the never-changing, of whoever is the Truth*. And yet, the sounds of the *folly* of Paul the Apostle and Galilei's *Eppur si muove* are combined. But it is enough to think about Job's persistence. As such, pastoral psychology does not want to replace theology, psychology or anything else. But whatever it can see at the border, it has to recognize it as such and see through it. The position of pastoral psychology can be considered comfortable. All this is possible because it is not necessarily bound by scientific canon or dogmatism. But this particular situation is also a hard duty, as it must take the canon and the dogmatical system seriously. In this sense, it also doesn't have any choice. It does not want to do the criticism of theology or psychology, but that does not mean that it can not be critical.

The situation of the pastoral psychology is clarified (in part, of course), if you take into account the tradition, i.e. tradition of the scripture, as a canon-enclosed text, and the tradition of interpreting the text. In fact, even though it sees it from the border, it sees it in the inside as well. Tradition has to be learned from the inside, but at the same time you have to recognise it in yourself, says Béla Hamvas.

Ricoeur says that tradition can be approached in two ways. On one hand, by permitting the compelling power of tradition, which basically means living the eternal past in the present, with the risk that all articulation and change from the present will be perceived as an external threat to the tradition. This can end in a rigid traditionalism, which is partly a betrayal of tradition.

On the other hand, tradition is nothing more than a source from which we can draw on again and again; where one can return (see Reformation) to interpret the present in a better way,

since the past and the present are connected by time. This interconnectedness and interdependence is a chain of events in time, their interconnection, in one word, history.

A border is a *place* where at a sufficient distance the opportunity for reflection arises. Hence the possibility of *whole-sightedness*. To be on the ridge is not only the encounter of Me and You but also the opportunity to be attentive as a third, to even be inside it. Thus, for pastoral psychology, Freud is not only the method of psychoanalysis but also many more similarities. Similarity between methods and also between insights. Because looking in the past of someone to find the keys to the present, is like sorting out the past, it's not much different than looking for a text's „sitz im Leben” and revealing its relevance today.

Erikson's studies about personality development, the tension expressed in them and seen as dynamism (if we see one *page*), being aware of the doubts and paradoxes in the history of Israel (if we see the other page) is not a state of dissociation but the key to interpreting human existence. In addition, to understand the motive of Camus' metaphysical rebellion and at the same time to take note of Job's persistence near God, to see these two next to each other, is one of the most exciting processes of understanding. We stress out once again, that this is not a valid method for everything and everyone, and above all, habitus, vision.

Neither theology nor philosophy or psychology needs to be aware of all of these, each of them can follow their own path. But exactly this *not acknowledging each other* is the reason why pastoral psychology has the opportunity to appear. This is how this triad, psychology, philosophy, and theology, creates a hermeneutic circle for pastoral psychology with which it can approach the Book of Job (and also other Scriptures).

Another challenge for pastoral psychology is to never forget the fact that it is a borderline science. It does not want to be a specific psychology or a specific theology. At the same time, since it looks at practicalities, it insists on his own habits, becoming a true *attendant* of people. Because it knows about *this* and it knows about *that*. It knows about *this* (the toolbox of psychology), and also about its limitations, and also about *that* (the *manifestation* of the text), as relation and relationship, as the existential deficit.

Finally, if it can be said, the task of pastoral psychology is not to match some of the concepts of different sciences to one another. But it does not want to deny the obvious correspondence either. In addition *to seeing the big picture*, *co-vision* is like being able to see both sides of the coin. The coincidences are visible, but it knows about his own field as well.

That is why it does not want to compulsively combine these concepts of *shortage* and *loss*, nor Job's position with the coping strategy, not healing with the prospect of going forward

and satisfaction. At the same time, it cannot ignore the referral to each other in an existential situation, nor the reference to the same thing.

And besides that (referring again to the Book of Job), the network of contexts that speak of the same thing, but from a different perspective, is traced out. This already has the potential of understanding the reality that is offered by the *broader* horizon, namely the (common) horizon seen from the ridge. The similarity between Job's metaphysical rebellion, prophetic faith and his coping mechanism may seem very distant, even incomprehensible to the aforementioned sciences. But for pastoral psychology, this all is most natural.

Pastoral psychology does not use this triple hermeneutic circle arbitrarily, but knows what Gadamer's observation, that this attitude puts interpretative behavior in the center of existence and cognition, because for us, for humans, there is nothing beyond the hermeneutic situation: everything that exists, exists only when interpreted and only after interpretation does it become, what it is. So for him, on the border, on the ridge, through the story of Job's suffering, the reality of satisfaction and reconciliation stands out.

This conclusion is related to the fact that there is also suffering in the center of the Christian faith. The story of *Someone* whose actions can not be perceived by humans, that can only be said as such: „*For God so loved the world that...*” (John 3:16). However, we can not give up the task (even solving it does not guarantee that it will lead to a complete understanding) of looking for the meaning of His suffering, because perhaps we may get closer to understanding our own sufferings.

This statement or work hypothesis, given or not, can be found in the writings of theologians, authors, as an epistemological method, trying to understand and decipher the question of suffering within this theological field, driven by some kind of compulsion. At the same time, the understanding of suffering, which can be imagined as a starting and continuation of a healthy, constructive dialogue, is not only necessary in today's welfare society, but also an urgent necessity. Although it would seem that the Church, as the one who must inevitably address the history of Christ's suffering, and as the one who has long since begun and has been continuing the conversation or the talk, the discourse about suffering, has failed to have a breakthrough, to make this approach widely accepted.

The question is whether the Church's discourse on suffering was not able to make a breakthrough because in this discourse eschatology should have an ample space, which is about a fulfillment „from some time before”? Or was it a result of a misconstrued and ill-understood eschatology? Or did the church misbehave with the opportunities provided by the story? Perhaps all of them, and maybe even more.

Whatever is the reason, the result is still the same and we have to face it. The suffering of a person in the 21st century is clearly influenced by his/her specific vision of the world. Beyond all the rhetoric about welfare society, we must also see that this worldview has serious bioethical, legal and constitutional implications. In fact, the specific treatments of certain existential situations, as their understanding, have to be raised to a general level. Why is it possible for different kinds of theological anthropologies, to speak about improving the quality of life without any foundation, or even raising this approach to the level of (pseudo) sciences?

Of course, this is not the end of it, because we can talk about helping the mourners, the concepts behind the new funeral ceremonies, and so on. Perhaps today it is not enough only to agree with Johann Baptist Metz's statement that „*the forming of theology is a kind of continuous correction, namely, the correcting of the theology which ignores the concrete situations of all times, and which idealistically locks itself inside of itself over and over again.*” There should be more and more space given for this kind of „correcting”, provided that humanity on the stage of life is struck again and again by the same existential reality that we call suffering.

But how should this „correction” happen? Does it make any sense if it turns out that this was just an experiment which keeps itself closed off? Yes, this has to be constantly taken into account, but we still have to try. If this was not the case, The Book of Job had not been written, or even if it was, it might have been left out of the canon.

One of the constructors of this endeavor is pastoral psychology. And what it can try to do is, among other things, is the re-discovered approach that focuses on great narratives. In the history of Christianity we can continuously find many examples for this kind of narrative thinking structure, moreover, the language of our Christian religion itself is inherently narrative. The system of values, the worldview and the belief systems have all been founded upon narrative structures since the hoped action that will be taken is nothing else than re-telling them.