

The Nose as Organ of Anger in the Book of Job: A Psychoanalytic Understanding

Pieter van der Zwan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6385-0561>

North-West University, South Africa

pvdz1961@gmail.com

Abstract

As an external and more specifically a facial organ, the nose in the Hebrew Bible not only has various physiological functions such as smell and breathing, but also various meanings as metonym and metaphor. It is also one of the body parts attributed to God, mostly serving a metaphorical role. The nose is probably the body part which is most connected to an emotion, to such an extent that this emotion often displaces the bodily organ. This makes the nose an interesting object for psychoanalytic interpretation. The unique way the nose suggests anger in the Hebrew Bible will be explored from a psychoanalytical perspective to propose a phallic-sadistic understanding of this puzzling association with aggression.

Keywords: psychoanalytical interpretation; nose; book of Job; anger

UNISA 
UNIVERSITY
OF SOUTH AFRICA

Journal for Semitics

<https://unisapressjournals.co.za/index.php/JSEM>

Volume 31 | Number 2 | 2022 | #11568 | 15 pages

<https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/11568>

ISSN 2663-6573 (Online), ISSN 1013-8471 (Print)

© Unisa Press 2023



Published by Unisa Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

Introduction

Body parts have different associations in different cultures and languages. In the Hebrew Bible, emotions are often associated with internal organs. As an external organ the nose is, however, so closely linked to anger as to require an explanation, even though anger is fairly universally expressed in the face.

Contrary to the assumption that the nose is metonymically the central sense of anger in the Hebrew mind, this study explores the possibility that the nose represents phallic aggression or even phallic sadism in a metaphorical way.

After mapping the nose on the body in the Hebrew Bible, the role of **אף** in the book of Job is discussed. This is followed by converging even further onto the figurative meanings of this root, and more specifically that of anger before the phallic subtext of the book will be outlined. Finally, psychoanalytical interpretations of the nose will be explored.

The Nose on the Hebrew Bible Body-Map

The nose is one of about 250 body parts explicitly referred to in the Hebrew Bible, and the first human body part being mentioned in the Jewish and Christian canon (Gen 2:7). Yet, it is only in the fifteenth position with regards to its prevalence amongst all the human body parts referred in the Hebrew Bible, and the least mentioned amongst the human facial features.

It is also one of the 27 body parts ascribed to God. Out of the total of 277 instances that mention the nose, 162 (almost 60%) concern God, the highest percentage of the total of any body part ascribed to God in the Hebrew Bible. God's nose seems to be the most conspicuous feature of God's face, if prevalence is an indication of importance. Yet, **אף** is so associated with God's anger that this emotion has virtually replaced the original meaning of a body part, the nose. Grether and Fichtner (1967) believe the original meaning to be snorting as an aspect of anger. The function of God's nose has become almost completely reduced to anger, with its olfactory sensation of fragrant sacrifices only in the background.

As with the case for God, the prevalence of the nose and its meaning of anger is also true in the book of Job, where it ranks sixth amongst the more than 70 body parts mentioned. But, with 22 instances, **אף** is a strong contender for the third position after **עין** (eye) with 46 instances and **פה** (mouth) with 36 instances when the many prepositional uses of **פניו** (lit. face, with 70 instances) and **יד** (lit. hand with 53 instances), and the psychological meanings of **נפש** (with 35 instances, breath, self, life-force) are taken into account, so that one can ignore these three terms as serious competitors. In nine of these 22 instances (roughly 40%), the reference is to God, and God is also the last character to use the noun in 42:7 to refer to God's own anger. Job uses it most, with

seven instances. This suggests that the nose or anger represents the tension but also the link between these two main protagonists.

The nose is also indirectly present in the concept of smells in the book of Job: in 2:8 one can imagine the stench of the dump heap, a tree picking up the רִיחַ (smell) of water in 14:9, בְּאֵשׁ (noisome weeds) in 31:40, the horse נִרְיחַ (smells [the battle=blood?]) in 39:25 and, even more indirectly, רִיחִי זָרָה לְאִשְׁתִּי (my breath is abhorrent to my wife) in 19:17. The fact that the same parts of the brain are involved with smell and emotions (Schacter, Gilbert, and Wegner 2011) is another reason for approaching the nose from a psychoanalytical perspective.

As breathing organ, the nose—and sometimes in parallel with the mouth (cf. Grant 2015)—is mentioned only in 27:3 where it is the bridge between God’s and human breath, and in 4:9 where it is also linked to anger. In 40:24, no function of the behemoth’s nose is mentioned but a subtext might be its power and pride, although Habel (1985) understands this nose as anger being controlled by God as a precedent for God containing Job’s anger. Two verses further, in 40:26, the same is the case for Leviathan. It is as if the nose is the commonality between these two beasts, both because of the proximity of their mention in the text and their similar subtext of proud impenetrability. Irrespective of the realistic identification of these monstrosities, their noses are playfully reminiscent of a rhino(c)-eros (erotic nose), signalling their penetrating power rather than being penetrated.

Figurative Meanings of אָף

A figurative sense can be expressed by either a metaphor or a metonym. Even when both figures of speech are culturally conditioned, they are not as arbitrary as the usual relation between the signifier and a signified. Schellenberg (2016), however, regards both the literal and figurative meanings to be constantly retained at the same time, although she contradicts this later (123n94 [last sentence]) using 9:5 (wrath expressed by overturning mountains) and 18:4 (wrath expressed by tearing oneself, that is, Job) as proof.

Where אָף means face, as in the dual form אִפִּים, perhaps referring to the two nostrils, the nose is a metonym. The face seems to be reduced to its essence; the whole is condensed to a part (*pars pro toto*). Generalising the nose to the face is clear for Leviathan in 41:10–13. When the nose refers to the face it can even represent the whole person because it connotes pride which is surrendered by prostration and abbreviated but still explicitly referred to as כְּגִבְהַ אָפוֹ (in the pride of his countenance) in Psalm 10:4. That is why the nose is pierced with a snare and ringed like that of an animal in 40:24, 26 respectively, as a sign of dominance, punishing the sinning organ. The nose thus expresses phallic pride and narcissism which takes revenge when it is wounded. This is even projected onto Leviathan here, as if it were a human being, and also onto the Divine.

When these figurative senses signify emotions, the latter may be cathected to specific body parts. As Hupka et al. (1996, 245) state, “Metaphors in emotion words similarly may identify particular corporeal sites and body processes.”

That the nose (the vehicle of the metaphor) must have something in common with anger (the tenor of the metaphor) may surprise modern readers, even though it is not altogether unknown in some non-Western cultures. Also, the connection of anger to heat is probably one way in which the body shapes the mind, to play on the title of a 2005 book by Gallagher (*How the Body Shapes the Mind*). Lakoff and Kövecses (1987) recognised that conceptual metaphors for anger in American English often reflect the perception of increased body heat and increased internal pressure (blood pressure, muscular pressure).

That metaphors are often culturally conditioned implies that they function to serve an implicit ideology. In the case of the ancient Hebrews, this ideology is imbedded in their anthropology and theology. Kotzé (2004) claims that classical Hebrew is the only Semitic language where the meanings of nose and anger converge in the root radicals אף.

The metaphorical sense of anger is always connected to heat, often explicitly expressed by the verb חרה (kindle, burn) as in 19:11, 20:23 (with the noun חֲרוֹן [burning]) and 32:2, 3, 5, and thus by fire which, just as the mouth in Isaiah 30:27, is also devouring and consuming but then only in the case of the Divine, as Grant (2015) points out. If Deuteronomy 32:22 where God’s anger burns deep down in Sheol is taken into account, a volcanic image is suggested. Fire to appease God’s possible anger occurs implicitly already in 1:5: וְהִעָּלָה עֹלֹת (and he offered burnt offerings).

This reminds one of אֶהְבֶּה (love) in Song of Songs 8:6, where it is also imagined as הִנֵּה שִׁלְהֶבֶתַי אֵשׁ רִשְׁפֵיהָ--רִשְׁפֵיהָ (its flashes are flashes of fire, a very flame of the LORD, a very intense flame), similar to שִׁלְהֶבֶת (flame) in Job 15:30 where it refers to God’s anger (cf. the relation between love and anger in Van Wolde 2003). Just as in the Song where it is connected with intense love, קִנְיָא (jealousy) also occurs in Job 5:2 but is here a synonymous parallel to כַּעַשׁ (anger, cf. 10:17), the usual reason for phallic aggression resulting from the difficulties of the oedipal conflict. Both anger and love are therefore expressed as fire. In psychoanalytical terms, one could say that both *thanatos* and *eros* are expressed as fire. Perhaps the love in the Song is more phallic than romantic-abstract and thus refers to the penis which loves in a fiery, even aggressive way.

Compared to other body parts and the emotions associated with them, the nose has, however, been relatively neglected by researchers. It is only recently that Amzallag (2018) has brought renewed interest to this link between the nose and anger in the Hebrew Bible, but he does not avoid the obvious question of how the metallurgical explanation which he applies to God fits humans and even Leviathan in 41:12: מִן־הַחֲרוֹתָיו יֵצֵא עָשָׁן--כְּדוֹד נִפְוֶה וְאֵגְמֹן (out of his nostrils goes smoke, as out of a seething pot and burning rushes), the latter which indeed reminds one of God’s face in Psalm 18:8–16.

His volcanic explanation could, however, easily be a reflection of Freud's mechanistic view of emotions and the libido (Freud 1944). God's nose blowing fire to melt God's people like metal in order to refine them could be a background idea (cf. Grant 2015, 149n38).

On the other hand, God's anger in the form of war in non-military contexts, such as in chapters 19–20, is expressed through weapons such as arrows (*vide infra*) and swords (Grant 2008). While not denying the psychological dimension, Amzallag (2018) wants to go beyond this—only human meaning (according to him)—to something unique to the divine. He refers to Psalm 69:25 where this divine anger is something poured out, as if it were a liquid, and supposedly only takes the psychological meaning as a later superimposition to something originally different. Anger as human emotion would therefore have been anthropomorphically projected onto God to merge with the original meaning of God as an erupting volcano. God as phenomenon in nature is thus humanised through personification. However, it could just as well be the other way around, so that what Amzallag describes as volcano is rather the outward projection of human bodily experience. Even if Amzallag is right and that the psychological meaning is supplementary, then the significance of the nose chosen to serve as metaphor for a natural or cultural, professional phenomenon which is reminiscent of a specific body part, is still underlined.

For the present study this chronology, for which there is no proof provided by Amzallag, is irrelevant. The fiery liquid can be interpreted as phallic ejaculation exploding from intense emotional—and therefore bodily—experiences.

Anger and Aggression in the Book of Job

In this section anger and aggression will be closely connected as emotion and behaviour, respectively. Anger is, however, only one possible emotion which could lead to aggression, others being dominance and even pleasure (cf. Wahl 2013).

Anger is a dominant emotion in the book of Job. Not only are Job and his wife angry about his seemingly unfair fate, and his first three human interlocutors angry about his seeming arrogance, but Elihu emphasises his anger against both Job and the other three human interlocutors in 32:2–3, almost repeating *נִיחָר אָף* (then was kindled the wrath) twice with *... הָרָה אָפוֹ* (his wrath was kindled) and even a third time with *נִיחָר אָפוֹ* (his wrath was kindled) in 32:5.

God speaks about angry animals and suddenly surprises in a rather angry tone opening the epilogue in 42:7: *הָרָה אָפִי בָךְ וּבִשְׁנֵי רֵעֶיךָ* (My wrath has been kindled against you, and against your two friends). It is the only time God is openly angry in the book (Clines 2011) and the only time in the Hebrew Bible that God does not act on God's anger (Grant 2008, 488n544). This anger is exactly what Job fears as early as 1:5 when he sacrifices on behalf of his possibly transgressive children to appease God's anger, which

breaks loose anyway (1:13–19). However, in the end it is clear that God is not angry at Job as expected but ironically turns the tables against the angry accusers. In fact, God is so angry that God needs Job's intervention to control God's anger. In 40:11, God has challenged Job to pour out Job's own anger on the wicked, which Job has been doing verbally already.

One can assume that the *אש לא-נפח* (fire not blown [by man]) in 20:26 must be from God, as *אש אלהים* (fire of God) explicitly states in 1:16, the only instance in the book where the verb *בער* (burn) is used. It is conspicuous that fire is mentioned several times and expressed with a variety of words in the book, even when it does not refer literally to this phenomenon. In 18:5 *שְׂרֵיב אִשׁוֹ* (the spark of his fire; the Aramaic *שְׂרֵיב* being a *hapax legomenon*), however, has a positive sense as it is in a synonymous parallelism with *אור* (light), which could hint at *אור* (flame). The noun *להב* (flame) appears twice and in both instances in connection with the animals: in 39:23 where a flaming spear (that is, the point of the spear in the form of a flame) would not intimidate the horse, and in 41:13 referring to a flame exhaled from the mouth of Leviathan. In the first part of this last-mentioned verse *נִפְשׁוּ גְהָלִים תְּלֵהֵט* (his breath kindles coals) explains this flame, the ignitor being the breath, which would then flow through the nose which shows the angry energy. This noun *להב* is related to *שְׁלֵהֶבֶת* (flame) in 15:30 where Eliphaz mentions it in the same sentence as *רוּחַ פִּי* (the breath of his mouth), referring to God who would cause the death of the wicked. This noun *שְׁלֵהֶבֶת* (flame) is the same one that is used with the enclitic *-יה* to intensify it, resulting in *שְׁלֵהֶבֶתֶיהָ* in Song 8:6 in connection with jealous, demanding love.

The verb *נפח* (breathe, blow), appears four times: in 11:20 for the exhaled or drooping *נפש* (*nephesh*), in 20:26 about a non-human fire being blown, in 31:39 again used with *נפש* (*nephesh*) to suggest disappointment or exhaustion, and in 41:12 in a four-verse cluster of fiery details about Leviathan, referring to its seething insides being *כְּדוּד* (like a pot). Within this cluster *עָטִישְׁתִּי* (his sneezing; onomatopoeic [Clines 2011]; in a collective plural form) is a *hapax legomenon* and as such suggests something special about Leviathan's nose. As in 18:5, fire is here also flashing light, followed by a reference to its eyes shining like the first sunrays of dawn. Its mouth is also fiery, projecting *לְפִידִים* (burning torches; cf. 12:5) in parallel with *אִשׁ* (sparks of fire). In v. 12 *עָשָׁן* (smoke, instead or as a form of breath) goes *מִגְהִירָיו* (out of its nostrils), resembling a burning bulrush, that is, long strings as if from a burning body. The similarity with Job's burning body seems obvious, but here it is something positive and powerful. The whole face of Leviathan therefore lights up, implying something positive as well.

Once again, just as in Song 8:6, the noun *רֶשֶׁף* (flame), also appears in 5:7 but then with connotations of inevitability and negativity because of *עִמְלָה* ([life's] trouble) in the first stich with which it is in a synthetic parallelism. The Phoenician God, Resheph, was also deity of the arrow (Clines 1989), and as such an aggressive weapon but also phallic. This might imply that anger is like a flaming arrow piercing Job's skin and penetrating

his body. In fact, Job complains that *הַצֵּי הַשָּׁדִי* (God's arrows, cf. *הַצֵּי* [my arrow or wound] in 34:6 and God's archers in 16:13) have gored him. Zophar adds the aspect of an asp's *מְרוּרַת* (gall, poison) in 20:14 and *רֵאשׁ* (poison) in 20:16 as similar to iron arrows in 20:24–25. In 39:23, these kinds of penetrating weapons are lumped together as *אֶשְׁפָּה* (a quiver, holding arrows), *הַנֵּיָה* (a spear) and *וְכִידוֹן* (and a javelin), all forms of phallic aggression to which the horse is immune and therefore a model for Job. Even *בָּרֶק* (glittering point) in 20:25 (*vide supra*) and *בְּרָקִים* (lightnings) in 38:35 can be associated with this. Finally, Job's body and especially his skin feels like it is on fire according to 30:30 where the two extremes of skin and bones could be a merism for the whole body. This makes him feel as if his clothes burn him like a hot south wind in 37:17.

Job recognises God's anger also in 4:9, 9:5, 13, 14:13, 16:9, 19:11, and 30:21. In 20:28 Zophar recognises anger in the wicked, risking, of course, the similarity to God. Only Satan seems to be more playful and mischievous than angry, unless that is a cover-up for provocative anger against God and Job.

While Satan, the Accuser, does not question Job's piety but the motives driving it and thus its authenticity, the first three human interlocutors do actually deny his righteousness and even raise concrete failures in 22:6–9, for instance. However, anger cannot count amongst these failures as God shows the same emotions.

Phallic Traces in the Book of Job

Although Song of Songs could be said to be about *Eros* and the book of Job about *Thanatos*, Job contains subtle traces of sexuality: the first chapter already recounts risqué parties held by Job's children who then die during such a feast due to an angry wind—perhaps from God's nose.

However, apart from oral aggression and even oral sadism—explicitly stated in 16:9 (cf. Van der Zwan, forthcoming a) but more subtly expressed in the barely hidden *schadenfreude* of the three counsellors—revealed not only in the dialogue but also in the prologue and even epilogue, Job's speeches are framed by aggressive, or at least negative, references to women in chapters 3 and 31. In fact, he is judgmental and condescending towards his wife in 2:10. It is particularly in his first speech where he starts immediately by regretting his birth and by implication having had a mother who is not even once explicitly mentioned. Where one would have expected such a mention in 3:10, Job pretends through an ellipse to possess the womb of his mother himself, possibly due to his own womb-envy (Horney 1926), and so wants to subtly justify body-ownership of his mother. It could, of course, be that he implies that he actually owns his (whole) mother by abbreviating her to *his* womb which he metonymically regards as her essence. The infant regards the body of the mother as its own; if this is Job's psychic regression to regain lost control, it would be typical of traumatic experiences. In chapter 10, when he speaks more positively about the womb where he was miraculously formed by God, he does not honour or even mention his mother. The passage about a mine

holding all sorts of treasures in 28:1–28 could well be an unconscious idealisation of and longing for the womb with all its sexual connotations (cf. Ferenczi 1924), disguised in this image because behind Job's struggle with the womb (cf. Van der Zwan 2015, 2019) is his deep nostalgia for it and so he is mourning in his unconscious the loss of a body which once belonged to him.

In 14:1 he could not have been more outspoken against women whom he directly associates with life's troubles. He opens the final chapter of his speeches making reference to a *בְּתוּלָה* (virgin) whom he could desire with his eyes but probably monopolise as first owner. His judgment of such desire sounds like reaction formation because the fact that these hypothetical thoughts are even on his mind betrays his sexual appetite even in the midst of his adversities and his alleged piety (31:23 could refer to these shameful sexual sins, according to Habel [1985]). He imagines his wife being penetrated by *אֲחֵרִיךָ* (others, that is, plural and anonymous, possibly even strangers) in 31:10, the only other time when he refers to his wife, but then ironically as the one sexually punished for Job's hypothetical sexual sins, even when in v. 31 the servants of the master might even take sexual advantage of him (cf. 19:22; Habel 1985).

It is in this last speech by Job that he mentions the womb thrice (twice in v. 15, and once in v. 18) and this time even explicitly his mother in 31:18. The only other times when Job explicitly mentions her is in 1:21 (again in connection with her womb) and 17:14 (together with his sister; also see 42:11). It seems significant that in Job's last speech both his wife and his mother are explicitly mentioned for the first time after the prologue, with the exception of 17:14. The womb of his mother is therefore mentioned more often than the mother herself. She has been reduced to a body part.

Twice (in 3:12 and 24:9) he mentions breasts, though both negatively connoted. That is why feminist critique such as Meade (1997) has focused on Job's sexism, most probably supported by patriarchal culture as evidenced by Bildad's words in 25:4.

Against this background of misogyny the treatment of his (new?) daughters in the last chapter (cf. Van der Zwan forthcoming b) comes as a sudden surprise in 42:14–15, even when their mother is still not acknowledged anywhere and possibly explaining this only instance in the Hebrew Bible (Clines 2011), where a father names his children, a privilege otherwise always left to the mother in the culture at the time (cf. e.g., 1 Samuel 1:20). This might, of course, be the traces left by the narrator instead, as Job does not speak again after 42:6.

Whereas God is (still) angry in this chapter, Job has calmed down and celebrates the sensualities of his daughters through their exceptional names referring to sight, sound, and taste-and-smell (Clines 2011). In fact, the second-last proper name mentioned in the book, *קִצְיָה* (Keziah, cassia, a perfume made from the bark of the cassia tree), in 42:14 is a celebration of the olfactory sense experienced in the nose. It is as if Job has

become sensually alive by introjecting the libido again and recognises his daughters as feminine carriers of bodily delights.

According to Wolfers (1990), God's description of the behemoth in the second divine speech contains some sexual and, more specifically, some phallic references. The behemoth would then represent the beast in man (*sic*; Pope 1965, 323n3). In 40:16, מְתַנְּיוֹ (his loins) echoes 12:18 and resonates with הֶלְצִים in 31:20, 38:3, and 40:7 (especially the latter two instances where girding up the loins is encouraged) and with כָּסֶל in 15:27. Wolfers (1990) argues for translating שָׂרִיר, a *hapax legomenon* (although שָׂרִיר appears in Song 7:3), in the second stich of the verse with pudenda as synonymous parallel to מְתַנְּיוֹ (his loins) in the first stich. Intertextually with Gen 49:3 and Deut 21:17, the noun אֵוִנוֹ ([virile] energy), in the same second stich would refer to its virility as well. In the next verse זָנְבוֹ (his tail) could be a euphemism for the virile member (the Vulgate has *caudam* [penis]; Pope 1965; Habel 1985; Alter 2010, 170n17; contested, however, by Ansell [2017:107n56] as merely suggestive instead)¹ and the hyperbolic אֲרָז (cedar), well-known for its erect stiffness, clearly has a phallic connotation. The verb נִהְפֵּץ (delights, according to Wolfers 1990), and פָּהָדוֹ (his thighs, as yet another possible euphemism for penis; the Vulgate understands it as “his testicles”) would then strengthen this excessive preoccupation with sex. Ansell (2017) relates this erection to the phallic aggression of the enemies of Israel explicitly expressed in Ezekiel 16:26 and 23:20. With this model for Job who has been facing backwards to the womb, God re-orientates him with a phallic focus forward so that he can be a גִּבֹר ([phallic] man), occurring 15 times in the book, again.

Wolfers (1995) also interprets זְכוֹרֹן (memorial) and גֹּב (eminence) as phallic cultic objects in 13:12, although he is critiqued for doing so by drawing inferences from unrelated texts in other biblical books (Noegel 1997). Other body parts such as the feet and hands may sometimes also be interpreted as euphemisms with phallic hints but this is left for another study.

Possible Psychoanalytical Interpretations of אָף

Physiologically, the nose is the olfactory orifice but also closely linked to the sense of taste which depends on it, with the vocabularies for both often overlapping in some languages. In fact, the sacrifices of the Hebrew Bible were probably meant to please both these senses of the Divine, who is different from the idols in Psalm 115:6 which have noses but cannot smell. This function of the nose is, however, implied and specifically related to God in the book of Job. In 1:5, Job sacrifices on behalf of his potentially sinful children to appease God through the fragrant smells of the burning offerings, as the three counsellors are doing in in 42:8–9. This is, therefore, the first and

1 Ansell (2017) prefers a connotative rather than a denotative or euphemistic sense, especially because the behemoth is portrayed as a horizontal body.

last body part or organ of God implicitly referred to in the book. God's nose as metonymic for God's smell is therefore ironically the first and last contact of pleasure for God, which, when not satisfied, remains in its opposite of displeasure and anger. With that principal (facial) feature of God, humans originally imagined God as largely olfactory, just like animals, even when God created through speaking (supposedly with a mouth), rather than using hands, אָרַן and looked at (supposedly with eyes) creation, finding it very good, according to Genesis 1:31.

However, Freud (1961) regarded the nose as a substitute for, or rather reminder of, the penis, with the accompanying hair at both body parts strengthening the association. Hirschfeld (1917) confirmed this when he found that nose fetishism often has an unconscious phallic cult connected to it. He also referred to the (erroneous) folk belief that the two body parts reflect each other in size. The relatively similar shape of the two organs is obvious and one can imagine that the nose can be a euphemism for the male genital, even when the hands or feet are usually known to have this possible secondary meaning, perhaps also because of the shape of the fingers and toes, or perhaps because of their similarly aligned positions when a male looks down. To test this, the question is, of course, if the displacement from the nose to anger also applies to women who get angry: this is never the case in the Hebrew Bible! Perhaps women are never described as angry because they simply do not have this angry organ to express it, even when there are other words for anger in the Hebrew Bible. A second reason apart from shape which supports at least the erotic nature of the nose is that the nose as orifice, between inside and outside, carries with it erogenous potential. A third reason is that the abject (as constituted by mucus) marks bodily sites which will later become erotogenic zones such as the mouth, eyes, anus, nose, and genitals. Fourthly, the sexologist Iwan Bloch claims that smell as emanation from the body is the physiological function most fetishized (Bloch 1907). Freud confirmed this in a footnote added in 1910 in his *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Three essays on the theory of sexuality) of 1905: foot fetishism develops when the olfactory pleasure of stinking feet has been repressed. Someone who influenced Freud was Alfred Binet who pointed out the strong link between smell and love in biblical and ethnographic sources and who distinguished between grand *fétichisme* (a fascination with big noses) and *petit fétichisme* (lovers who are attracted because of olfactive sympathy).

It is possible that Freud and another Jewish influence on him, Wilhelm Fliess, who even tried to establish a physiological connection between the nose and the female genitals, exaggerated the significance of the nose because of their own personal issue with the *Judennase* (Jewish nose) as stigma of decadent hypervirility (cf. Geller 1992), perhaps evoking Leviticus 21:18 (cf. Gilman 1987). Psychoanalytically (Freud 1961) the nose is, however, a classic example of displacement (*Verlegung* or *Verschiebung*, and so a metaphor!) from a lower to an upper body part in dream symbols and as neurotic symptom.

The obviously—or at least predominantly—male God of the Hebrew Bible does not allow speech about his penis, because the only allowance to see God is either from the back as in Exodus 33:21–23, or face to face, even when this is risking one's life. Alternatively, only God's feet are visible or what is underneath them when God sits enthroned. However, both God's face and feet, apart from God's ever active hand, can ironically be interpreted euphemistically to reveal God's penis. Eilberg-Schwartz (1994) has already teased out all the dangerous implications were God unilaterally identified as solely male, because that would either homosexualise a mainly male religion, or effeminate its adherents, submitting themselves by being symbolically castrated in circumcision, the blood of which perhaps also imitated that of menstruation. However, in their myths the Israelites hid the parts of God's body which would have revealed his sexual identity, rendering God first genderless and then bodiless, later resulting in the aniconic nature of their monotheistic religion which could not accommodate a separate goddess with whom the male God could have sexual intercourse, as in Israel's neighbouring religions.

For that reason, silence reigns about God's penis, even when it is visual in many other ways. Freud (1946) explains this aniconic depiction as being a repression of and compensation for the drive to look at the genitals (*Schautrieb*). This kind of depiction was to avert the gaze from his genitals, either out of shame or out of modesty and respect.

Freud (1940; 1948, 449n1; 1950) also takes a phallic view of flames as erections as they leap upwards. The fact that fire is followed by flooding in Song 8:6b–7a reminds one of his theory that extinguishing a fire by micturition is an ancient male desire, not only as homosexual competition, but also symbolically suggesting the taming of nature in his wild phallic desires.

In classical psychoanalytical theory, phallic sadism is attributed to the death drive and associated with the phallic stage when the child interprets the primal scene as a violent attack by the father's penis on the mother. It results in castration anxiety for a boy, something circumcision may attempt to pre-empt and so prevent, while being itself a sublimation of anger and violent aggression to avoid cutting off one's nose to spite one's face. Fromm (1941) regarded sadism as the alternative to love, both being forms of trying to know other people. Phallic anger can also be associated with envy and possessiveness when there is a threat of losing the love-object, often the case for God confronting a wayward partner.

The narcissistic parade of the penis-posturing boy is more than self-assertion and a form of aggression-discharge. Phallic aggression is not manifest as much in girls as in boys, according to Parens (2008). In the unconscious of phallic-narcissistic men the pride in the penis has to do with aggression, not love, according to Reich (1970).

When the angry, flaming nose as metaphor for repressed phallic aggression is projected even onto God, a double avoidance mechanism takes place, as humans rather interpret adversities as God's punishment than consciously face their own aggression towards God for their suffering.

Conclusion

That the nose is unconsciously linked to anger is not arbitrary. As metonym, the nose represents the face, where anger is psychosomatically expressed.

As metaphor it is a euphemism for a psychic defence against both the sexuality and the aggression incarnated by the penis, representing ambiguously both the life and the death drive. As such it is the unconscious product of a combination of smell as erotic trigger, visual shape resembling the penis, and emotional cathexis relating the intensity of fiery anger and fiery sexual love. This means that the smoky anger associated with the nose and sublimated in the sacrifice is not altogether negative as the same organ can also be seduced by fragrant offerings (cf. Ngwa 2009).

References

- Alter, R. 2010. *The Wisdom Books: Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes: A Translation with Commentary*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Amzallag, G. N. 2018. "Beyond Nose and Anger: A Reinterpretation of 'ap In YHWH's Context." *Revue biblique* 125 (1): 5–28.
- Ansell, N. 2017. "Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find The(ir Wisdo)m. Behemoth and Leviathan in the Book of Job." In *Playing with Leviathan: Interpretation and Reception of Monsters from the Biblical World*, edited by K. Bekkum, J. Dekker, H. R. van den Kamp, and E. Peels, 90–114. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004337961_007
- Binet, A. 1887. Le fétichisme dans l'amour. *Revue philosophique* 24: 143–274.
- Bloch, I. 1907. *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seinen Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur*. Berlin: Louis Marcus Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Clines, D. J. A. 1989. *Job 1–20*. Dallas: Word Books.
- Clines, D. J. A. 2011. *Job 38–42*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Eilberg-Schwartz, H. 1994. *God's Phallus and Other Problems for Men and Monotheism*. Boston: Beacon.
- Ferenczi, S. 1924. *Versuch einer Genitaltheorie*. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytiker Verlag.

- Fliess, W. 1897. *Die Beziehungen zwischen Nase und weiblichen Geschlechtsorganen: In ihrer biologischen Bedeutung dargestellt*. Leipzig/Vienna: Franz Deuticke.
- Freud, S. 1905. *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Freud, S. 1940. "X: Vorlesung: Die Symbolik in Traum." In *Gesammelte Werk chronologisch geordnet, Band XI: Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, edited by A. E. Freud, E. B. W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower, 150–72. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Freud, S. 1944. "XXIX. Vorlesung: Traumlehre." In *Gesammelte Werk chronologisch geordnet. Band XV: Neue Folge der Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, edited by A. E. Freud, E. B. W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower, 6–31. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Freud, S. 1946. "Triebe und Tribschicksale." In *Gesammelte Werke chronologisch geordnet. Band X: Werke aus den Jahren 1913–1917* edited by A. E. Freud, E. B. W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower, 210–32. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Freud, S. 1948. "Das Unbehagen in der Kultur." In *Gesammelte Werke chronologisch geordnet, Band XIV: Werke aus den Jahren 1925–1931 mit drei Kunstbeilagen*, edited by A. E. Freud, E. B. W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower, 419–560. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Freud, S. 1950. "Zur Gewinnung des Feuers." In *Gesammelte Werk chronologisch geordnet. Band XVI: Werke aus den Jahren 1932–1939*, edited by A. E. Freud, E. B. W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower, 1–9. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Freud, S. 1961. "VI: Die Traumarbeit." In *Gesammelte Werk chronologisch geordnet. Band II/III: Die Traumdeutung. Über den Traum*, edited by A. E. Freud, E. B. W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower, 283–512. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Fromm, E. 1941. *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston, 1941.
- Gallagher, S. 2005. *How the Body Shapes the Mind*. Oxford: University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/0199271941.001.0001>
- Geller, J. 1992. "'A Glance at the Nose': Freud's Inscription of Jewish Difference." *American Imago* 49 (4): 427–44.
- Gilman, S. L. 1987. "The Struggle of Psychiatry with Psychoanalysis: Who Won?" *Critical Inquiry* 13 (2): 293–313. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448391>
- Grant, D. 2008. "Divine Anger in Biblical Literature." PhD diss., New York University.
- Grant, D. E. 2015. "Fire and the Body of YHWH." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 40 (2):139–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309089215621240>

- Grether, O., and J. Fichtner. 1967. "Ὀργή." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, 392–96. Vol. V. Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans.
- Habel, N. C. 1985. *The Book of Job: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hirschfeld, M. 1917. *Sexualpathologie. Ein Lehrbuch für Ärzte und Studierende. Band I: Geschlechtliche Entwicklungsstörungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Onanie*. Bonn: Marcus & Weber.
- Horney, K. 1926. "The Flight from Womanhood: The Masculinity-Complex in Women as Viewed by Men and by Women." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 7: 324–39.
- Hupka, R. B., Z. Zaleski, J. Otto, L., Reidl, and N. V. Tarabrina. 1996. "Anger, Envy, Fear, and Jealousy as felt in the Body: A Five-Nation Study." *Cross-Cultural Research* 30 (3): 243–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106939719603000302>
- Kotzé, Z. 2004. "The Conceptualisation of Anger in the Hebrew Bible." PhD diss., Stellenbosch University.
- Lakoff, G., and Z. Kövecses. 1987. "The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English." In *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, edited by D. H. Herring, 195–221. Cambridge: University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607660.009>
- Meade, S. R. 1997. "Bless God and Die: An Examination of the Role of Job's Wife in the Masoretic Text of Job." PhD diss., Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Ngwa, K. 2009. "Did Job Suffer for Nothing? The Ethics of Piety, Presumption and the Reception of Disaster in the Prologue of Job." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33 (3): 359–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309089209102502>
- Noegel, S. B. 1997. "David Wolfers. Deep Things Out of Darkness: The Book of Job; Essays and a New English Translation. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing, 1995. 549pp." *AJS Review* 22 (2): 243–48. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009400009612>
- Parens, H. 2008. *The Development of Aggression in Early Childhood*. Lanham: Jason Aronson.
- Pope, M. H. 1965. *Job: Translated with an Introduction and Notes*. New York: Doubleday.
- Reich, W. 1970. *Charakteranalyse*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- Schacter, D., D. Gilbert, and D. Wegner. 2011. "Sensation and Perception." In *Psychology*, edited by C. Linsmeiser 166–71. New York: Macmillan.

- Schellenberg, A. 2016. “‘Mein Fleisch ist gekleidet in Maden und Schorf’ (Hi 7,5). Zur Bedeutung des Körpers im Hiobbuch.” In *Verkörperung als Paradigma theologischer Anthropologie*, edited by G. Etzelmüller and A. Weissenrieder, 95–126. Berlin: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110421798-005>
- Van der Zwan, P. 2015. “Bedeutungen und Bilder der Gebärmutter in der Hebräischen Bibel.” *Journal for Semitics* 24 (1):169–97. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1013-8471/3443>
- Van der Zwan, P. 2019. “Job’s Emotional Struggle with the Womb: Some Psychoanalytic Interpretations.” *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2):1–21. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/5910>
- Van der Zwan, P. Forthcoming a. “The Possible Psychoanalytical Meanings of the Mouth for Mourning in the Book of Job.”
- Van der Zwan, P. Forthcoming b. “Body-exchanges in the book of Job: A Transactional-Analytical Perspective.”
- Van Wolde, E. 2008. “Sentiments as Culturally Constructed Emotions: Anger and Love in the Hebrew Bible.” *Biblical interpretation* 16 (1): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851508X247602>
- Wahl, K. 2013. *Aggression und Gewalt: Ein biologischer, psychologischer und sozialwissenschaftlicher Überblick*. Heidelberg: Spektrum Akademischer Verlag.
- Wolfers, D. 1990. “The Lord’s Second Speech in the Book of Job.” *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (4): 474–99. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853390X00163>
- Wolfers, D. 1995. *Deep Things Out of Darkness: The Book of Job; Essays and a New English Translation*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing.