

Job (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture Book 6)

Pages: 260

Publisher: IVP Academic (March 19, 2014)

Format: pdf, epub

Language: English

[[DOWNLOAD FULL EBOOK PDF](#)]

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY ON SCRIPTURE OLD TESTAMENT VI JOB EDITED BY MANLIO SIMONETTI AND MARCO CONTI GENERAL EDITOR THOMAS C. ODEN

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY PROJECT RESEARCH TEAM

GENERAL EDITOR

Thomas C. Oden

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Christopher A. Hall

OPERATIONS MANAGER AND TRANSLATIONS PROJECT COORDINATOR

Joel Elowsky

RESEARCH AND ACQUISITIONS DIRECTOR

Michael Glerup

EDITORIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR

Warren Calhoun Robertson

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE VERSION DIRECTOR

Konstantin Gavrilkin

GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Steve Finlan

Vladimir Kharlamov

Grant Gieseke

Kevin M. Lowe

Patricia Ireland

Baek-Yong Sung

Jeffery Wittung

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Judy Cincotta

[CONTENTS](#) [PUBLISHER'S NOTE REGARDING THIS DIGITAL EDITION](#) [GENERAL INTRODUCTION](#) [A GUIDE TO USING THIS COMMENTARY](#) [ABBREVIATIONS](#) [INTRODUCTION TO JOB](#)

[JOB](#)

[The Holiness, Fatherly Love and Wealth of Job Job 1:1-5](#)

[Satan Obtains Leave to Tempt Job Job 1:6-19](#)

[Job Blesses God In His Affliction Job 1:20-22](#)

[Satan Is Allowed to Inflict Sores on Job Job 2:1-8](#)

[Job's Friends Come to Console Him Job 2:9-13](#)

[Job Curses the Day of His Birth Job 3:1-12](#)

[Job Invokes the Rest of Death Job 3:13-26](#)

[Eliphaz Exhorts Job to Be Patient Job 4:1-11](#)

[Eliphaz Relates His Vision and the Words That He Heard Job 4:12-21](#)

[The Fool Incurs Disaster Job 5:1-7](#)
[In Distress We Must Seek God Job 5:8-16](#)
[Happiness After God's Correction Job 5:17-27](#)
[Job Justifies the Bitterness of His Complaints Job 6:1-7](#)
[Job Wishes for Death Job 6:8-14](#)
[Job's Disappointment Over His Friends Job 6:15-30](#)
[Job's Reflections Upon Human Life Job 7:1-10](#)
[Job Appeals to God for Deliverance Job 7:11-21](#)
[Bildad Demonstrates that God Is Just Job 8:1-7](#)
[The Experience of Former Generations Proves that the Godless Shall Perish Job 8:8-22](#)
[Job Is Helpless Before God's Power Job 9:1-13](#)
[Does Job Doubt God's Justice? Job 9:14-35](#)
[Job Wonders What Is God's Purpose in Afflicting Him Job 10:1-17](#)
[Prayer for a Brief Respite Before Death Job 10:18-22](#)
[Only God Can Clearly See Human Sins Job 11:1-12](#)
[The Blessing of Repentance Job 11:13-20](#)
[Job's Ironic Remarks on His Friends' Wisdom Job 12:1-6](#)
[Job Recognizes God's Omnipotence and Reflects on His Justice Job 12:7-25](#)
[Job Criticizes the Words of His Friends Job 13:1-12](#)
[Job Pleads with God to Know His Sins Job 13:13-28](#)
[Human Life Is Frail and Short Job 14:1-6](#)
[Is There Life After Death? Job 14:7-22](#)
[Eliphaz Accuses Job of Impiety Job 15:1-16](#)
[The Anguish of the Wicked Job 15:17-35](#)
[Job Reproves His Friends for Their Unmerciful Attitudes Job 16:1-6](#)
[In His Distress Job Asserts His Innocence Job 16:7-22](#)
[Job Sees His Humiliation Job 17:1-16](#)
[Bildad Reproaches Job for His Conceit Job 18:1-4](#)
[Afflictions Overtake the Wicked Job 18:5-21](#)
[Job's Affliction Before God and Humankind Job 19:1-22](#)
[Job's Hope in God the Redeemer Job 19:23-29](#)
[Zophar Explains That God's Justice Never Fails Job 20:1-29](#)
[Job Considers the Prosperity of the Wicked Job 21:1-16](#)
[The Wicked Often Remain Unpunished in This World Job 21:17-34](#)
[God Punishes Only in the Name of Justice Job 22:1-20](#)
[Eliphaz Exhorts Job to Agree with God Job 22:21-30](#)
[Job Seeks God's Justice Job 23:1-7](#)
[Job Follows God's Path in His Afflictions Job 23:8-17](#)
[Violence and Iniquity Prevail on Earth Job 24:1-25](#)
[How Can A Mortal Be Righteous Before God? Job 25:1-6](#)
[Job Scorns Bildad's Words but Recognizes God's Greatness Job 26:1-14](#)
[Job Confirms His Absolute Sincerity Job 27:1-7](#)
[Job Declares His Abhorrence of Wickedness Job 27:8-23](#)
[Human Beings Have Knowledge of Natural Things Job 28:1-11](#)
[Wisdom Belongs to God Job 28:12-28](#)
[Job Recalls His Former Prosperity Job 29:1-25](#)
[Now Honor Is Turned into Humiliation Job 30:1-13](#)
[Job's Present Afflictions Job 30:14-31](#)
[Job Declares that His Conduct Is Blameless Job 31:1-40](#)
[Elihu's Speech About Wisdom Job 32:1-14](#)
[Elihu's Zeal to Speak Job 32:15-22](#)
[Elihu Invites Job not to Contend with God Job 33:1-13](#)
[God Calls Mortals to Repentance in Different Ways Job 33:14-33](#)

[God the Almighty Never Acts Unjustly Job 34:1-30](#)

[Job's Criticism Is Due to Ignorance Job 34:31-37](#)

[It Is Wrong to Say that Righteousness Is Unavailing Job 35:1-8](#)

[Many Are Not Heard Because of Their Infidelity Job 35:9-16](#)

[God's Just Designs in Human Affliction Job 36:1-21](#)

[God's Greatness and Infinite Wisdom Job 36:22-33](#)

[The Effects of God's Voice on Nature Job 37:1-13](#)

[Job Is Invited to Learn from Nature Job 37:14-24](#)

[God Intervenes and Shows How Job Is Ignorant Job 38:1-41](#)

[Further Demonstrations of Job's Ignorance Job 39:1-30](#)

[God Invites Job to Show His Power Job 40:1-14](#)

[The Behemoth Job 40:15-24](#)

[God's Power Rules the Leviathan and All Creatures Job 41:1-34](#)

[Job Repents Before God Job 42:1-6](#)

[God Rebukes Job's Friends Job 42:7-10](#)

[Job Is Finally Rehabilitated Job 42:11-17](#) [EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS AND THE DOCUMENTS CITED](#)

[BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES & SHORT DESCRIPTIONS OF SELECT ANONYMOUS WORKS](#)

[TIMELINE OF WRITERS OF THE PATRISTIC PERIOD](#) [BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS IN ORIGINAL](#)

[LANGUAGES](#) [BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION](#) [AUTHORS/WRITINGS INDEX](#)

[SUBJECT INDEX](#) [SCRIPTURE INDEX](#) [NOTES](#) [PRAISE FOR THE ANCIENT CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY](#)

[ON SCRIPTURE](#) [ABOUT THE EDITORS](#) [ANCIENT CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY ON SCRIPTURE](#) [MORE](#)

[TITLES FROM INTERVARSITY PRESS](#) [COPYRIGHT PAGE](#)

PUBLISHER'S NOTE REGARDING THIS DIGITAL EDITION

Due to limitations regarding digital rights, the RSV Scripture text is linked to but does not appear in this digital edition of this Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture volume as it does in the print edition. Page numbering has been maintained, however, to match the print edition. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION The Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture (hereafter ACCS) is a twenty-eight volume patristic commentary on Scripture. The patristic period, the time of the fathers of the church, spans the era from Clement of Rome (fl. c. 95) to John of Damascus (c. 645-c. 749). The commentary thus covers seven centuries of biblical interpretation, from the end of the New Testament to the mid-eighth century, including the Venerable Bede. Since the method of inquiry for the ACCS has been developed in close coordination with computer technology, it serves as a potential model of an evolving, promising, technologically pragmatic, theologically integrated method for doing research in the history of exegesis. The purpose of this general introduction to the series is to present this approach and account for its methodological premises. This is a long-delayed assignment in biblical and historical scholarship: reintroducing in a convenient form key texts of early Christian commentary on the whole of Scripture. To that end, historians, translators, digital technicians, and biblical and patristic scholars have collaborated in the task of presenting for the first time in many centuries these texts from the early history of Christian exegesis. Here the interpretive glosses, penetrating reflections, debates, contemplations and deliberations of early Christians are ordered verse by verse from Genesis to Revelation. Also included are patristic comments on the deuterocanonical writings (sometimes called the Apocrypha) that were considered Scripture by the Fathers. This is a full-scale classic commentary on Scripture consisting of selections in modern translation from the ancient Christian writers. The Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture has three goals: the renewal of Christian *preaching* based on classical Christian exegesis, the intensified study of Scripture by *lay* persons who wish to think with the early church about the canonical text, and the stimulation of Christian historical, biblical, theological and pastoral *scholarship* toward further inquiry into the scriptural interpretations of the ancient Christian writers. On each page the Scripture text is accompanied by the most noteworthy remarks of key consensual exegetes of the early Christian centuries. This formal arrangement follows approximately the traditional pattern of the published texts of the Talmud after the invention of printing and of the *glossa ordinaria* that preceded printing. **1**

Retrieval of Neglected Christian Texts There is an emerging felt need among diverse Christian communities that these texts be accurately recovered and studied. Recent biblical scholarship has so focused attention on post-Enlightenment historical and literary methods that it has left this longing largely unattended and unserved. After years of quiet gestation and reflection on the bare idea of a patristic commentary, a feasibility consultation was drawn together at the invitation of Drew University in November 1993 in Washington, D.C. This series emerged from that consultation and its ensuing discussions. Extensive further consultations were undertaken during 1994 and thereafter in Rome, Tübingen, Oxford, Cambridge, Athens, Alexandria and Istanbul, seeking the advice of the most competent international scholars in the history of exegesis. Among distinguished scholars who contributed to the early layers of the consultative process were leading writers on early church history, hermeneutics, homiletics, history of exegesis, systematic theology and pastoral theology. Among leading international authorities consulted early on in the project design were Sir Henry Chadwick of Oxford; Bishops Kallistos Ware of Oxford, Rowan Williams of Monmouth and Stephen Sykes of Ely (all former patristics professors at Oxford or Cambridge); Professors Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer of the Patristic Institute of Rome; and Professors Karlfried Froehlich and Bruce M. Metzger of Princeton. They were exceptionally helpful in shaping our list of volume editors. We are especially indebted to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Bartholomew and Edward Idris Cardinal Cassidy of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, the Vatican, for their blessing, steady support, and wise counsel in developing and advancing the Drew University Patristic Commentary Project. The outcome of these feasibility consultations was general agreement that the project was profoundly needed, accompanied by an unusual eagerness to set out upon the project, validated by a willingness on the part of many to commit valuable time to accomplish it. At the pace of three or four volumes per year, the commentary is targeted for completion within the first decade of the millennium. This series stands unapologetically as a practical homiletic and devotional guide to the earliest layers of classic Christian readings of biblical texts. It intends to be a brief compendium of reflections on particular Septuagint, Old Latin and New Testament texts by their earliest Christian interpreters. Hence it is not a commentary by modern standards, but it is a commentary by the standards of those who anteceded and formed the basis of the modern commentary. Many useful contemporary scholarly efforts are underway and are contributing significantly to the recovery of classic Christian texts. Notable in English among these are the Fathers of the Church series (Catholic University of America Press), Ancient Christian Writers (Paulist), Cistercian Studies (Cistercian Publications), The Church's Bible (Eerdmans), Message of the Fathers of the Church (Michael Glazier, Liturgical Press) and Texts and Studies (Cambridge). In other languages similar efforts are conspicuously found in Sources Chrétiennes, Corpus Christianorum (Series Graeca and Latina), Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Patrologia Orientalis, Patrologia Syriaca, Biblioteca patristica, Les Pères dans la foi, Collana di Testi Patristici, Letture cristiane delle origini, Letture cristiane del primo millennio, Cultura cristiana antica, Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and the Cetedoc series, which offers in digital form the volumes of Corpus Christianorum. The Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture builds on the splendid work of all these studies, but focuses primarily and modestly on the recovery of patristic biblical wisdom for contemporary preaching and lay spiritual formation. **Digital Research Tools and Results** The volume editors have been supported by a digital research team at Drew University which has identified these classic comments by performing global searches of the Greek and Latin patristic corpus. They have searched for these texts in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) digitalized Greek database, the Cetedoc edition of the Latin texts of Corpus Christianorum from the Centre de traitement électronique des documents (Université catholique de Louvain), the Chadwyck-Healey Patrologia Latina Database (Migne) and the Packard Humanities Institute Latin databases. We have also utilized the CD-ROM searchable version of the Early Church Fathers, of which the Drew University project was an early cosponsor along with the Electronic Bible Society. This has resulted in a plethora of raw Greek and Latin textual materials from which the volume editors have made

discriminating choices.² In this way the project office has already supplied to each volume editor³ a substantial read-out of Greek and Latin glosses, explanations, observations and comments on each verse or pericope of Scripture text.⁴ Only a small percentage of this raw material has in fact made the grade of our selection criteria. But such is the poignant work of the catenist, or of any compiler of a compendium for general use. The intent of the exercise is to achieve brevity and economy of expression by exclusion of extraneous material, not to go into critical explanatory detail. Through the use of Boolean key word and phrase searches in these databases, the research team identified the Greek and Latin texts from early Christian writers that refer to specific biblical passages. Where textual variants occur among the Old Latin texts or disputed Greek texts, they executed key word searches with appropriate or expected variables, including allusions and analogies. At this time of writing, the Drew University ACCS research staff has already completed most of these intricate and prodigious computer searches, which would have been unthinkable before computer technology. The employment of these digital resources has yielded unexpected advantages: a huge residual database, a means of identifying comments on texts not previously considered for catena usage, an efficient and cost-effective deployment of human resources, and an abundance of potential material for future studies in the history of exegesis. Most of this was accomplished by a highly talented group of graduate students under the direction of Joel Scandrett, Michael Glerup and Joel Elowsky. Prior to the technology of digital search and storage techniques, this series could hardly have been produced, short of a vast army of researchers working by laborious hand and paper searches in scattered libraries around the world. Future readers of Scripture will increasingly be working with emerging forms of computer technology and interactive hypertext formats that will enable readers to search out quickly in more detail ideas, texts, themes and terms found in the ancient Christian writers. The ACCS provides an embryonic paradigm for how that can be done. Drew University offers the ACCS to serve both as a potential research model and as an outcome of research. We hope that this printed series in traditional book form will in time be supplemented with a larger searchable, digitized version in some stored-memory hypertext format. We continue to work with an astute consortium of computer and research organizations to serve the future needs of both historical scholarship and theological study.

The Surfeit of Materials Brought to Light We now know that there is virtually no portion of Scripture about which the ancient Christian writers had little or nothing useful or meaningful to say. Many of them studied the Bible thoroughly with deep contemplative discernment, comparing text with text, often memorizing large portions of it. All chapters of all sixty-six books of the traditional Protestant canonical corpus have received deliberate or occasional patristic exegetical or homiletic treatment. This series also includes patristic commentary on texts not found in the Jewish canon (often designated the Apocrypha or deuterocanonical writings) but that were included in ancient Greek Bibles (the Septuagint). These texts, although not precisely the same texts in each tradition, remain part of the recognized canons of the Roman Catholic and Orthodox traditions. While some books of the Bible are rich in verse-by-verse patristic commentaries (notably Genesis, Psalms, Song of Solomon, Isaiah, Matthew, John and Romans), there are many others that are lacking in intensive commentaries from this early period. Hence we have not limited our searches to these formal commentaries, but sought allusions, analogies, cross-connections and references to biblical texts in all sorts of patristic literary sources. There are many perceptive insights that have come to us from homilies, letters, poetry, hymns, essays and treatises, that need not be arbitrarily excluded from a catena. We have searched for succinct, discerning and moving passages both from line-by-line commentaries (from authors such as Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyr, John Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine and Bede) and from other literary genres. Out of a surfeit of resulting raw materials, the volume editors have been invited to select the best, wisest and most representative reflections of ancient Christian writers on a given biblical passage.

For Whom Is This Compendium Designed? We have chosen and ordered these selections primarily for a general lay reading audience of nonprofessionals who study the Bible regularly and who earnestly wish to have classic Christian observations on the text readily available to them. In vastly differing cultural settings, contemporary lay readers are asking how they might grasp the meaning of sacred texts under the instruction of the great minds of the

ancient church. Yet in so focusing our attention, we are determined not to neglect the rigorous requirements and needs of academic readers who up to now have had starkly limited resources and compendia in the history of exegesis. The series, which is being translated into the languages of half the world's population, is designed to serve public libraries, universities, crosscultural studies and historical interests worldwide. It unapologetically claims and asserts its due and rightful place as a staple source book for the history of Western literature. Our varied audiences (lay, pastoral and academic) are much broader than the highly technical and specialized scholarly field of patristic studies. They are not limited to university scholars concentrating on the study of the history of the transmission of the text or to those with highly focused interests in textual morphology or historical-critical issues and speculations. Though these remain crucial concerns for specialists, they are not the paramount interest of the editors of the Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. Our work is largely targeted straightaway for a pastoral audience and more generally to a larger audience of laity who want to reflect and meditate with the early church about the plain sense, theological wisdom, and moral and spiritual meaning of particular Scripture texts. There are various legitimate competing visions of how such a patristic commentary should be developed, each of which were carefully pondered in our feasibility study and its follow-up. With high respect to alternative conceptions, there are compelling reasons why the Drew University project has been conceived as a practically usable commentary addressed first of all to informed lay readers and more broadly to pastors of Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox traditions. Only in an ancillary way do we have in mind as our particular audience the guild of patristic academics, although we welcome their critical assessment of our methods. If we succeed in serving lay and pastoral readers practically and well, we expect these texts will also be advantageously used by college and seminary courses in Bible, hermeneutics, church history, historical theology and homiletics, since they are not easily accessible otherwise. The series seeks to offer to Christian laity what the Talmud and Midrashim have long offered to Jewish readers. These foundational sources are finding their way into many public school libraries and into the obligatory book collections of many churches, pastors, teachers and lay persons. It is our intent and the publishers' commitment to keep the whole series in print for many years to come and to make it available on an economically viable subscription basis. There is an emerging awareness among Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox laity that vital biblical preaching and teaching stand in urgent need of some deeper grounding beyond the scope of the historical-critical orientations that have dominated and at times eclipsed biblical studies in our time. Renewing religious communities of prayer and service (crisis ministries, urban and campus ministries, counseling ministries, retreat ministries, monasteries, grief ministries, ministries of compassion, etc.) are being drawn steadily and emphatically toward these biblical and patristic sources for meditation and spiritual formation. These communities are asking for primary source texts of spiritual formation presented in accessible form, well-grounded in reliable scholarship and dedicated to practical use. ***The Premature Discrediting of the Catena Tradition***

We gratefully acknowledge our affinity and indebtedness to the spirit and literary form of the early traditions of the catena and *glossa ordinaria* that sought authoritatively to collect salient classic interpretations of ancient exegetes on each biblical text. Our editorial work has benefited by utilizing and adapting those traditions for today's readers. It is regrettable that this distinctive classic approach has been not only shelved but peculiarly misplaced for several centuries. It has been a long time since any attempt has been made to produce this sort of commentary. Under fire from modern critics, the catena approach dwindled to almost nothing by the nineteenth century and has not until now been revitalized in this postcritical situation. Ironically, it is within our own so-called progressive and broad-minded century that these texts have been more systematically hidden away and ignored than in any previous century of Christian scholarship. With all our historical and publishing competencies, these texts have been regrettably denied to hearers of Christian preaching in our time, thus revealing the dogmatic biases of modernity (modern chauvinism, naturalism and autonomous individualism). Nineteenth- and twentieth-century exegesis has frequently displayed a philosophical bias toward naturalistic reductionism. Most of the participants in the ACCS project have lived through dozens of iterations of these cycles of literary and historical criticism, seeking earnestly to expound and interpret the text out of

ever-narrowing empiricist premises. For decades Scripture teachers and pastors have sailed the troubled waters of assorted layers and trends within academic criticism. Preachers have attempted to digest and utilize these approaches, yet have often found the outcomes disappointing. There is an increasing awareness of the speculative excesses and the spiritual and homiletic limitations of much post-Enlightenment criticism. Meanwhile the motifs, methods and approaches of ancient exegetes have remained shockingly unfamiliar not only to ordained clergy but to otherwise highly literate biblical scholars, trained exhaustively in the methods of scientific criticism. Amid the vast exegetical labors of the last two centuries, the ancient Christian exegetes have seldom been revisited, and then only marginally and often tendentiously. We have clear and indisputable evidence of the prevailing modern contempt for classic exegesis, namely that the extensive and once authoritative classic commentaries on Scripture still remain untranslated into modern languages. Even in China this has not happened to classic Buddhist and Confucian commentaries. This systematic modern scholarly neglect is seen not only among Protestants, but also is widespread among Catholics and even Orthodox, where ironically the Fathers are sometimes piously venerated while not being energetically read. So two powerful complementary contemporary forces are at work to draw our lay audience once again toward these texts and to free them from previous limited premises: First, this series is a response to the deep hunger for classical Christian exegesis and for the history of exegesis, partly because it has been so long neglected. Second, there is a growing demoralization in relation to actual useful exegetical outcomes of post-Enlightenment historicist and naturalistic-reductionist criticism. Both of these animating energies are found among lay readers of Roman, Eastern and Protestant traditions. Through the use of the chronological lists and biographical sketches at the back of each volume, readers can locate in time and place the voices displayed in the exegesis of a particular pericope. The chains (catenae) of interpretation of a particular biblical passage thus provide glimpses into the history of the interpretation of a given text. This pattern has venerable antecedents in patristic and medieval exegesis of both Eastern and Western traditions, as well as important expressions in the Reformation tradition. ***The Ecumenical Range and Intent*** Recognition of need for the Fathers' wisdom ranges over many diverse forms of Christianity. This has necessitated the cooperation of scholars of widely diverse Christian communities to accomplish the task fairly and in a balanced way. It has been a major ecumenical undertaking. Under this classic textual umbrella, this series brings together in common spirit Christians who have long distanced themselves from each other through separate and often competing church memories. Under this welcoming umbrella are gathering conservative Protestants with Eastern Orthodox, Baptists with Roman Catholics, Reformed with Arminians and charismatics, Anglicans with Pentecostals, high with low church adherents, and premodern traditionalists with postmodern classicists. How is it that such varied Christians are able to find inspiration and common faith in these texts? Why are these texts and studies so intrinsically ecumenical, so catholic in their cultural range? Because all of these traditions have an equal right to appeal to the early history of Christian exegesis. All of these traditions can, without a sacrifice of intellect, come together to study texts common to them all. These classic texts have decisively shaped the entire subsequent history of exegesis. Protestants have a right to the Fathers. Athanasius is not owned by Copts, nor is Augustine owned by North Africans. These minds are the common possession of the whole church. The Orthodox do not have exclusive rights over Basil, nor do the Romans over Gregory the Great. Christians everywhere have equal claim to these riches and are discovering them and glimpsing their unity in the body of Christ. From many varied Christian traditions this project has enlisted as volume editors a team of leading international scholars in ancient Christian writings and the history of exegesis. Among Eastern Orthodox contributors are Professors Andrew Louth of Durham University in England and George Dragas of Holy Cross (Greek Orthodox) School of Theology in Brookline, Massachusetts. Among Roman Catholic scholars are Benedictine scholar Mark Sheridan of the San Anselmo University of Rome, Jesuit Joseph Lienhard of Fordham University in New York, Cistercian Father Francis Martin of the Catholic University of America, Alberto Ferreiro of Seattle Pacific University, and Sever Voicu of the Eastern European (Romanian) Uniate Catholic tradition, who teaches at the Augustinian Patristic Institute of Rome. The New Testament series is inaugurated with the volume

on Matthew offered by the renowned Catholic authority in the history of exegesis, Manlio Simonetti of the University of Rome. Among Anglican communion contributors are Mark Edwards (Oxford), Bishop Kenneth Stevenson (Fareham, Hampshire, in England), J. Robert Wright (New York), Anders Bergquist (St. Albans), Peter Gorday (Atlanta) and Gerald Bray (Cambridge, England, and Birmingham, Alabama). Among Lutheran contributors are Quentin Wesselschmidt (St. Louis), Philip Krey and Eric Heen (Philadelphia), and Arthur Just, William Weinrich and Dean O. Wenthe (all of Ft. Wayne, Indiana). Among distinguished Protestant Reformed, Baptist and other evangelical scholars are John Sailhamer and Steven McKinion (Wake Forest, North Carolina), Craig Blaising and Carmen Hardin (Louisville, Kentucky), Christopher Hall (St. Davids, Pennsylvania), J. Ligon Duncan III (Jackson, Mississippi), Thomas McCullough (Danville, Kentucky), John R. Franke (Hatfield, Pennsylvania) and Mark Elliott (Hope University Liverpool). The international team of editors was selected in part to reflect this ecumenical range. They were chosen on the premise not only that they were competent to select fairly those passages that best convey the consensual tradition of early Christian exegesis, but also that they would not omit significant voices within it. They have searched insofar as possible for those comments that self-evidently would be most widely received generally by the whole church of all generations, East and West. This is not to suggest or imply that all patristic writers agree. One will immediately see upon reading these selections that within the boundaries of orthodoxy, that is, excluding outright denials of ecumenically received teaching, there are many views possible about a given text or idea and that these different views may be strongly affected by wide varieties of social environments and contexts. The Drew University project has been meticulous about commissioning volume editors. We have sought out world-class scholars, preeminent in international biblical and patristic scholarship, and wise in the history of exegesis. We have not been disappointed. We have enlisted a diverse team of editors, fitting for a global audience that bridges the major communions of Christianity. The project editors have striven for a high level of consistency and literary quality over the course of this series. As with most projects of this sort, the editorial vision and procedures are progressively being refined and sharpened and fed back into the editorial process. ***Honoring Theological Reasoning*** Since it stands in the service of the worshiping community, the ACCS unabashedly embraces crucial ecumenical premises as the foundation for its method of editorial selections: revelation in history, trinitarian coherence, divine providence in history, the Christian *kerygma*, *regula fidei et caritatis* ("the rule of faith and love"), the converting work of the Holy Spirit. These are common assumptions of the living communities of worship that are served by the commentary. It is common in this transgenerational community of faith to assume that the early consensual ecumenical teachers were led by the Spirit in their interpretive efforts and in their transmitting of Christian truth amid the hazards of history. These texts assume some level of unity and continuity of ecumenical consensus in the mind of the believing church, a consensus more clearly grasped in the patristic period than later. We would be less than true to the sacred text if we allowed modern assumptions to overrun these premises. An extended project such as this requires a well-defined objective that serves constantly as the organizing principle and determines which approaches take priority in what sort of balance. This objective informs the way in which tensions inherent in its complexity are managed. This objective has already been summarized in the three goals mentioned at the beginning of this introduction. To alter any one of these goals would significantly alter the character of the whole task. We view our work not only as an academic exercise with legitimate peer review in the academic community, but also as a vocation, a task primarily undertaken *coram Deo* ("before God") and not only *coram hominibus* ("before humanity"). We have been astonished that we have been led far beyond our original intention into a Chinese translation and other translations into major world languages. This effort is grounded in a deep respect for a distinctively theological reading of Scripture that cannot be reduced to historical, philosophical, scientific or sociological insights or methods. It takes seriously the venerable tradition of ecumenical reflection concerning the premises of revelation, apostolicity, canon and consensuality. A high priority is granted here, contrary to modern assumptions, to theological, christological and triune reasoning as the distinguishing premises of classic Christian thought. This approach does not pit theology against critical theory; instead, it incorporates critical methods and brings them

into coordinate accountability within its overarching homiletic-theological-pastoral purposes. Such an endeavor does not cater to any cadre of modern ide-ological advocacy. ***Why Evangelicals Are Increasingly Drawn Toward Patristic Exegesis*** Surprising to some, the most extensive new emergent audience for patristic exegesis is found among the expanding worldwide audience of evangelical readers who are now burgeoning from a history of revivalism that has often been thought to be historically unaware. This is a tradition that has often been caricatured as critically backward and hermeneutically challenged. Now Baptist and Pentecostal laity are rediscovering the history of the Holy Spirit. This itself is arguably a work of the Holy Spirit. As those in these traditions continue to mature, they recognize their need for biblical resources that go far beyond those that have been made available to them in both the pietistic and historical-critical traditions. Both pietism and the Enlightenment were largely agreed in expressing disdain for patristic and classic forms of exegesis. Vital preaching and exegesis must now venture beyond the constrictions of historical-critical work of the century following Schweitzer and beyond the personal existential story-telling of pietism. During the time I have served as senior editor and executive editor of *Christianity Today*, I have been privileged to surf in these volatile and exciting waves. It has been for me (as a theologian of a liberal mainline communion) like an ongoing seminar in learning to empathize with the tensions, necessities and hungers of the vast heterogeneous evangelical audience. But why just now is this need for patristic wisdom felt particularly by evangelical leaders and laity? Why are worldwide evangelicals increasingly drawn toward ancient exegesis? What accounts for this rapid and basic reversal of mood among the inheritors of the traditions of Protestant revivalism? It is partly because the evangelical tradition has been long deprived of any vital contact with these patristic sources since the days of Luther, Calvin and Wesley, who knew them well. This commentary is dedicated to allowing ancient Christian exegetes to speak for themselves. It will not become fixated unilaterally on contemporary criticism. It will provide new textual resources for the lay reader, teacher and pastor that have lain inaccessible during the last two centuries. Without avoiding historical-critical issues that have already received extensive exploration in our time, it will seek to make available to our present-day audience the multicultural, transgenerational, multilingual resources of the ancient ecumenical Christian tradition. It is an awakening, growing, hungry and robust audience. Such an endeavor is especially poignant and timely now because increasing numbers of evangelical Protestants are newly discovering rich dimensions of dialogue and widening areas of consensus with Orthodox and Catholics on divisive issues long thought irreparable. The study of the Fathers on Scripture promises to further significant interactions between Protestants and Catholics on issues that have plagued them for centuries: justification, authority, Christology, sanctification and eschatology. Why? Because they can find in pre-Reformation texts a common faith to which Christians can appeal. And this is an arena in which Protestants distinctively feel at home: biblical authority and interpretation. A profound yearning broods within the heart of evangelicals for the recovery of the history of exegesis as a basis for the renewal of preaching. This series offers resources for that renewal. ***Steps Toward Selections*** In moving from raw data to making selections, the volume editors have been encouraged to move judiciously through three steps: Step 1: *Reviewing extant Greek and Latin commentaries*. The volume editors have been responsible for examining the line-by-line commentaries and homilies on the texts their volume covers. Much of this material remains untranslated into English and some of it into any modern language. Step 2: *Reviewing digital searches*. The volume editors have been responsible for examining the results of digital searches into the Greek and Latin databases. To get the gist of the context of the passage, ordinarily about ten lines above the raw digital reference and ten lines after the reference have been downloaded for printed output. *Biblia Patristica* has been consulted as needed, especially in cases where the results of the digital searches have been thin. Then the volume editors have determined from these potential digital hits and from published texts those that should be regarded as more serious possibilities for inclusion. Step 3. *Making selections*. Having assembled verse-by-verse comments from the Greek and Latin digital databases, from extant commentaries, and from already translated English sources, either on disk or in paper printouts, the volume editors have then selected the best comments and reflections of ancient Christian writers on a

given biblical text, following agreed upon criteria. The intent is to set apart those few sentences or paragraphs of patristic comment that best reflect the mind of the believing church on that pericope. ***The Method of Making Selections*** It is useful to provide an explicit account of precisely how we made these selections. We invite others to attempt similar procedures and compare outcomes on particular passages.⁵ We welcome the counsel of others who might review our choices and suggest how they might have been better made. We have sought to avoid unconsciously biasing our selections, and we have solicited counsel to help us achieve this end. In order that the whole project might remain cohesive, the protocols for making commentary selections have been jointly agreed upon and stated clearly in advance by the editors, publishers, translators and research teams of the ACCS. What follows is our checklist in assembling these extracts. *The following principles of selection* have been mutually agreed upon to guide the editors in making spare, wise, meaningful catena selections from the vast patristic corpus: 1. From our huge database with its profuse array of possible comments, we have preferred those passages that have enduring relevance, penetrating significance, crosscultural applicability and practical applicability. 2. The volume editors have sought to identify patristic selections that display trenchant rhetorical strength and self-evident persuasive power, so as not to require extensive secondary explanation. The editorial challenge has been to identify the most vivid comments and bring them to accurate translation. We hope that in most cases selections will be pungent, memorable, quotable, aphoristic and short (often a few sentences or a single paragraph) rather than extensive technical homilies or detailed expositions, and that many will have some narrative interest and illuminative power. This criterion follows in the train of much Talmudic, Midrashic and rabbinic exegesis. In some cases, however, detailed comments and longer sections of homilies have been considered worthy of inclusion. 3. We seek the most representative comments that best reflect the mind of the believing church (of all times and cultures). Selections focus more on the attempt to identify consensual strains of exegesis than sheer speculative brilliance or erratic innovation. The thought or interpretation can emerge out of individual creativity, but it must not be inconsistent with what the apostolic tradition teaches and what the church believes. What the consensual tradition trusts least is individualistic innovation that has not yet subtly learned what the worshiping community already knows. Hence we are less interested in idiosyncratic interpretations of a given text than we are in those texts that fairly represent the central flow of ecumenical consensual exegesis. Just what is central is left for the fair professional judgment of our ecumenically distinguished Orthodox, Protestant and Catholic volume editors to discern. We have included, for example, many selections from among the best comments of Origen and Tertullian, but not those authors' peculiar eccentricities that have been widely distrusted by the ancient ecumenical tradition. 4. We have especially sought out for inclusion those consensus-bearing authors who have been relatively disregarded, often due to their social location or language or nationality, insofar as their work is resonant with the mainstream of ancient consensual exegesis. This is why we have sought out special consultants in Syriac, Coptic and Armenian. 5. We have sought to cull out annoying, coarse, graceless, absurdly allegorical⁶ or racially offensive interpretations. But where our selections may have some of those edges, we have supplied footnotes to assist readers better to understand the context and intent of the text. 6. We have constantly sought an appropriate balance of Eastern, Western and African traditions. We have intentionally attempted to include Alexandrian, Antiochene, Roman, Syriac, Coptic and Armenian traditions of interpretation. Above all, we want to provide sound, stimulating, reliable exegesis and illuminating exposition of the text by the whole spectrum of classic Christian writers. 7. We have made a special effort where possible to include the voices of women⁷ such as Macrina,⁸ Eudoxia, Egeria, Faltonia Betitia Proba, the Sayings of the Desert Mothers and others who report the biblical interpretations of women of the ancient Christian tradition. 8. In order to anchor the commentary solidly in primary sources so as to allow the ancient Christian writers to address us on their own terms, the focus is on the texts of the ancient Christian writers themselves, not on modern commentators' views or opinions of the ancient writers. We have looked for those comments on Scripture that will assist the contemporary reader to encounter the deepest level of penetration of the text that has been reached by its best interpreters living amid highly divergent early Christian social settings. Our purpose is not to

engage in critical speculations on textual variants or stemma of the text, or extensive deliberations on its cultural context or social location, however useful those exercises may be, but to present the most discerning comments of the ancient Christian writers with a minimum of distraction. This project would be entirely misconceived if thought of as a modern commentary on patristic commentaries. 9. We have intentionally sought out and gathered comments that will aid effective preaching, comments that give us a firmer grasp of the plain sense of the text, its authorial intent, and its spiritual meaning for the worshiping community. We want to help Bible readers and teachers gain ready access to the deepest reflection of the ancient Christian community of faith on any particular text of Scripture. It would have inordinately increased the word count and cost if our intention had been to amass exhaustively all that had ever been said about a Scripture text by every ancient Christian writer. Rather we have deliberately selected out of this immense data stream the strongest patristic interpretive reflections on the text and sought to deliver them in accurate English translation. To refine and develop these guidelines, we have sought to select as volume editors either patristic scholars who understand the nature of preaching and the history of exegesis, or biblical scholars who are at ease working with classical Greek and Latin sources. We have preferred editors who are sympathetic to the needs of lay persons and pastors alike, who are generally familiar with the patristic corpus in its full range, and who intuitively understand the dilemma of preaching today. The international and ecclesiastically diverse character of this team of editors corresponds with the global range of our task and audience, which bridge all major communions of Christianity. ***Is the ACCS a Commentary?*** We have chosen to call our work a commentary, and with good reason. A commentary, in its plain sense definition, is “a series of illustrative or explanatory notes on any important work, as on the Scriptures.”⁹ *Commentary* is an Anglicized form of the Latin *commentarius* (an “annotation” or “memoranda” on a subject or text or series of events). In its theological meaning it is a work that explains, analyzes or expounds a portion of Scripture. In antiquity it was a book of notes explaining some earlier work such as Julius Hyginus’s commentaries on Virgil in the first century. Jerome mentions many commentators on secular texts before his time. The commentary is typically preceded by a proem in which the questions are asked: who wrote it? why? when? to whom? etc. Comments may deal with grammatical or lexical problems in the text. An attempt is made to provide the gist of the author’s thought or motivation, and perhaps to deal with sociocultural influences at work in the text or philological nuances. A commentary usually takes a section of a classical text and seeks to make its meaning clear to readers today, or proximately clearer, in line with the intent of the author. The Western literary genre of commentary is definitively shaped by the history of early Christian commentaries on Scripture, from Origen and Hilary through John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria to Thomas Aquinas and Nicolas of Lyra. It leaves too much unsaid simply to assume that the Christian biblical commentary took a previously extant literary genre and reshaped it for Christian texts. Rather it is more accurate to say that the Western literary genre of the commentary (and especially the biblical commentary) has patristic commentaries as its decisive pattern and prototype, and those commentaries have strongly influenced the whole Western conception of the genre of commentary. Only in the last two centuries, since the development of modern historicist methods of criticism, have some scholars sought to delimit the definition of a commentary more strictly so as to include only historicist interests—philological and grammatical insights, inquiries into author, date and setting, or into sociopolitical or economic circumstances, or literary analyses of genre, structure and function of the text, or questions of textual criticism and reliability. The ACCS editors do not feel apologetic about calling this work a commentary in its classic sense. Many astute readers of modern commentaries are acutely aware of one of their most persistent habits of mind: control of the text by the interpreter, whereby the ancient text comes under the power (values, assumptions, predispositions, ideological biases) of the modern interpreter. This habit is based upon a larger pattern of modern chauvinism that views later critical sources as more worthy than earlier. This prejudice tends to view the biblical text primarily or sometimes exclusively through historical-critical lenses accommodative to modernity. Although we respect these views and our volume editors are thoroughly familiar with contemporary biblical criticism, the ACCS editors freely take the assumption that the Christian canon is to be respected as the church’s

sacred text. The text's assumptions about itself cannot be made less important than modern assumptions about it. The reading and preaching of Scripture are vital to the church's life. The central hope of the ACCS endeavor is that it might contribute in some small way to the revitalization of that life through a renewed discovery of the earliest readings of the church's Scriptures. ***A Gentle Caveat for Those Who Expect Ancient Writers to Conform to Modern Assumptions*** If one begins by assuming as normative for a commentary the typical modern expression of what a commentary is and the preemptive truthfulness of modern critical methods, the classic Christian exegetes are by definition always going to appear as dated, quaint, premodern, hence inadequate, and in some instances comic or even mean-spirited, prejudiced, unjust and oppressive. So in the interest of hermeneutic fairness, it is recommended that the modern reader not impose on ancient Christian exegetes lately achieved modern assumptions about the valid reading of Scripture. The ancient Christian writers constantly challenge what were later to become these unspoken, hidden and often indeed camouflaged modern assumptions. This series does not seek to resolve the debate between the merits of ancient and modern exegesis in each text examined. Rather it seeks merely to present the excerpted comments of the ancient interpreters with as few distractions as possible. We will leave it to others to discuss the merits of ancient versus modern methods of exegesis. But even this cannot be done adequately without extensively examining the texts of ancient exegesis. And until now biblical scholars have not had easy access to many of these texts. This is what this series is for. The purpose of exegesis in the patristic period was humbly to seek the revealed truth the Scriptures convey. Often it was not even offered to those who were as yet unready to put it into practice. In these respects much modern exegesis is entirely different: It does not assume the truth of Scripture as revelation, nor does it submit personally to the categorical moral requirement of the revealed text: that it be taken seriously as divine address. Yet we are here dealing with patristic writers who assumed that readers would not even approach an elementary discernment of the meaning of the text if they were not ready to live in terms of its revelation, i.e., to practice it in order to hear it, as was recommended so often in the classic tradition. The patristic models of exegesis often do not conform to modern commentary assumptions that tend to resist or rule out chains of scriptural reference. These are often demeaned as deplorable proof-texting. But among the ancient Christian writers such chains of biblical reference were very important in thinking about the text in relation to the whole testimony of sacred Scripture by the analogy of faith, comparing text with text, on the premise that *scripturam ex scriptura explicandam esse* ("Scripture is best explained from Scripture"). We beg readers not to force the assumptions of twentieth-century fundamentalism on the ancient Christian writers, who themselves knew nothing of what we now call fundamentalism. It is uncritical to conclude that they were simple fundamentalists in the modern sense. Patristic exegesis was not fundamentalist, because the Fathers were not reacting against modern naturalistic reductionism. They were constantly protesting a merely literal or plain-sense view of the text, always looking for its spiritual and moral and typological nuances. Modern fundamentalism oppositely is a defensive response branching out and away from modern historicism, which looks far more like modern historicism than ancient typological reasoning. Ironically, this makes both liberal and fundamentalist exegesis much more like each other than either are like the ancient Christian exegesis, because they both tend to appeal to rationalistic and historicist assumptions raised to the forefront by the Enlightenment. Since the principle prevails in ancient Christian exegesis that each text is illumined by other texts and by the whole of the history of revelation, we find in patristic comments on a given text many other subtexts interwoven in order to illumine that text. When ancient exegesis weaves many Scriptures together, it does not limit its focus to a single text as much modern exegesis prefers, but constantly relates it to other texts by analogy, intensively using typological reasoning as did the rabbinic tradition. The attempt to read the New Testament while ruling out all theological and moral, to say nothing of ecclesiastical, sacramental and dogmatic assumptions that have prevailed generally in the community of faith that wrote it, seems to many who participate in that community today a very thin enterprise indeed. When we try to make sense of the New Testament while ruling out the plausibility of the incarnation and resurrection, the effort appears arrogant and distorted. One

who tendentiously reads one page of patristic exegesis, gasps and tosses it away because it does not conform adequately to the canons of modern exegesis and historicist commentary is surely no model of critical effort. **On Misogyny and Anti-Semitism** The questions of anti-Semitism and misogyny require circumspect comment. The patristic writers are perceived by some to be incurably anti-Semitic or misogynous or both. I would like to briefly attempt a cautious apologia for the ancient Christian writers, leaving details to others more deliberate efforts. I know how hazardous this is, especially when done briefly. But it has become such a stumbling block to some of our readers that it prevents them even from listening to the ancient ecumenical teachers. The issue deserves some reframing and careful argumentation. Although these are challengeable assumptions and highly controverted, it is my view that modern racial anti-Semitism was not in the minds of the ancient Christian writers. Their arguments were not framed in regard to the hatred of a race, but rather the place of the elect people of God, the Jews, in the history of the divine-human covenant that is fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Patristic arguments may have had the unintended effect of being unfair to women according to modern standards, but their intention was to understand the role of women according to apostolic teaching. This does not solve all of the tangled moral questions regarding the roles of Christians in the histories of anti-Semitism and misogyny, which require continuing fair-minded study and clarification. Whether John Chrysostom or Justin Martyr were anti-Semitic depends on whether the term *anti-Semitic* has a racial or religious-typological definition. In my view, the patristic texts that appear to modern readers to be anti-Semitic in most cases have a typological reference and are based on a specific approach to the interpretation of Scripture—the analogy of faith—which assesses each particular text in relation to the whole trend of the history of revelation and which views the difference between Jew and Gentile under christological assumptions and not merely as a matter of genetics or race. Even in their harshest strictures against Judaizing threats to the gospel, they did not consider Jews as racially or genetically inferior people, as modern anti-Semites are prone to do. Even in their comments on Paul's strictures against women teaching, they showed little or no animus against the female gender as such, but rather exalted women as "the glory of man." Compare the writings of Rosemary Radford Ruether and David C. Ford¹⁰ on these perplexing issues. Ruether steadily applies modern criteria of justice to judge the inadequacies of the ancient Christian writers. Ford seeks to understand the ancient Christian writers empathically from within their own historical assumptions, limitations, scriptural interpretations and deeper intentions. While both treatments are illuminating, Ford's treatment comes closer to a fair-minded assessment of patristic intent.

A Note on Pelagius The selection criteria do not rule out passages from Pelagius's commentaries at those points at which they provide good exegesis. This requires special explanation, if we are to hold fast to our criterion of consensuality. The literary corpus of Pelagius remains highly controverted. Though Pelagius was by general consent the arch-heretic of the early fifth century, Pelagius's edited commentaries, as we now have them highly worked over by later orthodox writers, were widely read and preserved for future generations under other names. So Pelagius presents us with a textual dilemma. Until 1934 all we had was a corrupted text of his Pauline commentary and fragments quoted by Augustine. Since then his works have been much studied and debated, and we now know that the Pelagian corpus has been so warped by a history of later redactors that we might be tempted not to quote it at all. But it does remain a significant source of fifth-century comment on Paul. So we cannot simply ignore it. My suggestion is that the reader is well advised not to equate the fifth-century Pelagius too easily with later standard stereotypes of the arch-heresy of Pelagianism.¹¹ It has to be remembered that the text of Pelagius on Paul as we now have it was preserved in the corpus of Jerome and probably reworked in the sixth century by either Primasius or Cassiodorus or both. These commentaries were repeatedly recycled and redacted, so what we have today may be regarded as consonant with much standard later patristic thought and exegesis, excluding, of course, that which is ecumenically censured as "Pelagianism." Pelagius's original text was in specific ways presumably explicitly heretical, but what we have now is largely unexceptional, even if it is still possible to detect points of disagreement with Augustine. We may have been ill-advised to quote this material as "Pelagius" and perhaps might have quoted it as "Pseudo-Pelagius" or "Anonymous," but here we follow contemporary reference practice.

What to Expect from the Introductions, Overviews and the Design of the Commentary In writing the introduction for a particular volume, the volume editor typically discusses the opinion of the Fathers regarding authorship of the text, the importance of the biblical book for patristic interpreters, the availability or paucity of patristic comment, any salient points of debate between the Fathers, and any particular challenges involved in editing that particular volume. The introduction affords the opportunity to frame the entire commentary in a manner that will help the general reader understand the nature and significance of patristic comment on the biblical texts under consideration, and to help readers find their bearings and use the commentary in an informed way. The purpose of the *overview* is to give readers a brief glimpse into the cumulative argument of the pericope, identifying its major patristic contributors. This is a task of summarizing. We here seek to render a service to readers by stating the gist of patristic argument on a series of verses. Ideally the overview should track a reasonably cohesive thread of argument among patristic comments on the pericope, even though they are derived from diverse sources and times. The design of the overview may vary somewhat from volume to volume of this series, depending on the requirements of the specific book of Scripture. The purpose of the selection *heading* is to introduce readers quickly into the subject matter of that selection. In this way readers can quickly grasp what is coming by glancing over the headings and overview. Usually it is evident upon examination that some phrase in the selection naturally defines the subject of the heading. Several verses may be linked together for comment. Since biographical information on each ancient Christian writer is in abundant supply in various general reference works, dictionaries and encyclopedias, the ACCS has no reason to duplicate these efforts. But we have provided in each volume a simple chronological list of those quoted in that volume, and an alphabetical set of biographical sketches with minimal ecclesiastical, jurisdictional and place identifications. Each passage of Scripture presents its own distinct set of problems concerning both selection and translation. The sheer quantity of textual materials that has been searched out, assessed and reviewed varies widely from book to book. There are also wide variations in the depth of patristic insight into texts, the complexity of culturally shaped allusions and the modern relevance of the materials examined. It has been a challenge to each volume editor to draw together and develop a reasonably cohesive sequence of textual interpretations from all of this diversity. The footnotes intend to assist readers with obscurities and potential confusions. In the annotations we have identified many of the Scripture allusions and historical references embedded within the texts. The aim of our editing is to help readers move easily from text to text through a deliberate editorial linking process that is seen in the overviews, headings and annotations. We have limited the footnotes to roughly less than a one in ten ratio to the patristic texts themselves. Abbreviations are used in the footnotes, and a list of abbreviations is included in each volume. We found that the task of editorial linkage need not be forced into a single pattern for all biblical books but must be molded by that particular book.

The Complementarity of Interdisciplinary Research Methods in This Investigation The ACCS is intrinsically an interdisciplinary research endeavor. It conjointly employs several diverse but interrelated methods of research, each of which is a distinct field of inquiry in its own right. Principal among these methods are the following: *Textual criticism*. No literature is ever transmitted by handwritten manuscripts without the risk of some variations in the text creeping in. Because we are working with ancient texts, frequently recopied, we are obliged to employ all methods of inquiry appropriate to the study of ancient texts. To that end, we have depended heavily on the most reliable text-critical scholarship employed in both biblical and patristic studies. The work of textual critics in these fields has been invaluable in providing us with the most authoritative and reliable versions of ancient texts currently available. We have gratefully employed the extensive critical analyses used in creating the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and Cetedoc databases. In respect to the biblical texts, our database researchers and volume editors have often been faced with the challenge of considering which variants within the biblical text itself are assumed in a particular selection. It is not always self-evident which translation or stemma of the biblical text is being employed by the ancient commentator. We have supplied explanatory footnotes in some cases where these various textual challenges may raise potential concerns for readers. *Social-historical contextualization*. Our volume editors have sought to

understand the historical, social, economic and political contexts of the selections taken from these ancient texts. This understanding is often vital to the process of discerning what a given comment means or intends and which comments are most appropriate to the biblical passage at hand. However, our mission is not primarily to discuss these contexts extensively or to display them in the references. We are not primarily interested in the social location of the text or the philological history of particular words or in the societal consequences of the text, however interesting or evocative these may be. Some of these questions, however, can be treated briefly in the footnotes wherever the volume editors deem necessary. Though some modest contextualization of patristic texts is at times useful and required, our purpose is not to provide a detailed social-historical placement of each patristic text. That would require volumes ten times this size. We know there are certain texts that need only slight contextualization, others that require a great deal more. Meanwhile, other texts stand on their own easily and brilliantly, in some cases aphoristically, without the need of extensive contextualization. These are the texts we have most sought to identify and include. We are least interested in those texts that obviously require a lot of convoluted explanation for a modern audience. We are particularly inclined to rule out those blatantly offensive texts (apparently anti-Semitic, morally repugnant, glaringly chauvinistic) and those that are intrinsically ambiguous or those that would simply be self-evidently alienating to the modern audience. *Exegesis*. If the practice of social-historical contextualization is secondary to the purpose of the ACCS, the emphasis on thoughtful patristic exegesis of the biblical text is primary. The intention of our volume editors is to search for selections that define, discuss and explain the meanings that patristic commentators have discovered in the biblical text. Our purpose is not to provide an inoffensive or extensively demythologized, aseptic modern interpretation of the ancient commentators on each Scripture text but to allow their comments to speak for themselves from within their own worldview. In this series the term *exegesis* is used more often in its classic than in its modern sense. In its classic sense, exegesis includes efforts to explain, interpret and comment on a text, its meaning, its sources, its connections with other texts. It implies a close reading of the text, using whatever linguistic, historical, literary or theological resources are available to explain the text. It is contrasted with *eisegesis*, which implies that the interpreter has imposed his or her own personal opinions or assumptions on the text. The patristic writers actively practiced *intra* textual exegesis, which seeks to define and identify the exact wording of the text, its grammatical structure and the interconnectedness of its parts. They also practiced *extratextual* exegesis, seeking to discern the geographical, historical or cultural context in which the text was written. Most important, they were also very well-practiced in *intertextual* exegesis, seeking to discern the meaning of a text by comparing it with other texts. *Hermeneutics*. We are especially attentive to the ways in which the ancient Christian writers described their own interpreting processes. This hermeneutic self-analysis is especially rich in the reflections of Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine and Vincent of Lérins.¹² Although most of our volume editors are thoroughly familiar with contemporary critical discussions of hermeneutical and literary methods, it is not the purpose of ACCS to engage these issues directly. Instead, we are concerned to display and reveal the various hermeneutic assumptions that inform the patristic reading of Scripture, chiefly by letting the writers speak in their own terms. *Homiletics*. One of the practical goals of the ACCS is the renewal of contemporary preaching in the light of the wisdom of ancient Christian preaching. With this goal in mind, many of the most trenchant and illuminating comments included are selected not from formal commentaries but from the homilies of the ancient Christian writers. It comes as no surprise that the most renowned among these early preachers were also those most actively engaged in the task of preaching. The prototypical Fathers who are most astute at describing their own homiletic assumptions and methods are Gregory the Great, Leo the Great, Augustine, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Peter Chrysologus and Caesarius of Arles. *Pastoral care*. Another intensely practical goal of the ACCS is to renew our readers' awareness of the ancient tradition of pastoral care and ministry to persons. Among the leading Fathers who excel in pastoral wisdom and in application of the Bible to the work of ministry are Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. Our editors have presented this monumental pastoral wisdom in a guileless way that is not inundated by the premises of contemporary psychotherapy, sociology

and naturalistic reductionism. *Translation theory*. Each volume is composed of direct quotations in dynamic equivalent English translation of ancient Christian writers, translated from the original language in its best received text. The adequacy of a given attempt at translation is always challengeable. The task of translation is intrinsically debatable. We have sought dynamic equivalency¹³ without lapsing into paraphrase, and a literary translation without lapsing into wooden literalism. We have tried consistently to make accessible to contemporary readers the vital nuances and energies of the languages of antiquity. Whenever possible we have opted for metaphors and terms that are normally used by communicators today. ***What Have We Achieved?*** We have designed the first full-scale early Christian commentary on Scripture in the last five hundred years. Any future attempts at a Christian Talmud or patristic commentary on Scripture will either follow much of our design or stand in some significant response to it. We have successfully brought together a distinguished international network of Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox scholars, editors and translators of the highest quality and reputation to accomplish this design. This brilliant network of scholars, editors, publishers, technicians and translators, which constitutes an amazing *novum* and a distinct new ecumenical reality in itself, has jointly brought into formulation the basic pattern and direction of the project, gradually amending and correcting it as needed. We have provided an interdisciplinary experimental research model for the integration of digital search techniques with the study of the history of exegesis. At this time of writing, we are approximately halfway through the actual production of the series and about halfway through the time frame of the project, having developed the design to a point where it is not likely to change significantly. We have made time-dated contracts with all volume editors for the remainder of the volumes. We are thus well on our way toward bringing the English ACCS to completion. We have extended and enhanced our international network to a point where we are now poised to proceed into modern non-English language versions of ACCS. We already have inaugurated editions in Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Russian and Italian, and are preparing for editions in Arabic and German, with several more languages under consideration. We have received the full cooperation and support of Drew University as academic sponsor of the project—a distinguished university that has a remarkable record of supporting major international publication projects that have remained in print for long periods of time, in many cases over one-hundred years. The most widely used Bible concordance and biblical word-reference system in the world today was composed by Drew professor James Strong. It was the very room once occupied by Professor Strong, where the concordance research was done in the 1880s, that for many years was my office at Drew and coincidentally the place where this series was conceived. Today *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* rests on the shelves of most pastoral libraries in the English-speaking world over a hundred years after its first publication. Similarly the *New York Times's* Arno Press has kept in print the major multivolume Drew University work of John M'Clintock and James Strong, *Theological and Exegetical Encyclopedia*. The major edition of Christian classics in Chinese was done at Drew University fifty years ago and is still in print. Drew University has supplied much of the leadership, space, library, work-study assistance and services that have enabled these durable international scholarly projects to be undertaken. Our selfless benefactors have preferred to remain anonymous. They have been well-informed, active partners in its conceptualization and development, and unflagging advocates and counselors in the support of this lengthy and costly effort. The series has been blessed by steady and generous support, and accompanied by innumerable gifts of providence.

Thomas C. Oden

Henry Anson Buttz Professor of Theology, Drew University

General Editor, ACCS

AA GUIDE TO A USING THIS COMMENTARY Several features have been incorporated into the design of this commentary. The following comments are intended to assist readers in making full use of this volume. ***Pericopes of Scripture*** The scriptural text has been divided into pericopes, or passages, usually several verses in length. Each of these pericopes is given a heading, which appears at the beginning of the pericope. For example, the first pericope in the commentary on Job is "The Holiness, Fatherly Love and Wealth of Job Job 1:1-5." ***Overviews*** Following each

pericope of text is an overview of the patristic comments on that pericope. The format of this overview varies within the volumes of this series, depending on the requirements of the specific book of Scripture. The function of the overview is to provide a brief summary of all the comments to follow. It tracks a reasonably cohesive thread of argument among patristic comments, even though they are derived from diverse sources and generations. Thus the summaries do not proceed chronologically or by verse sequence. Rather they seek to rehearse the overall course of the patristic comment on that pericope. We do not assume that the commentators themselves anticipated or expressed a formally received cohesive argument but rather that the various arguments tend to flow in a plausible, recognizable pattern. Modern readers can thus glimpse aspects of continuity in the flow of diverse exegetical traditions representing various generations and geographical locations. **Topical Headings** An abundance of varied patristic comment is available for each pericope of these letters. For this reason we have broken the pericopes into two levels. First is the verse with its topical heading. The patristic comments are then focused on aspects of each verse, with topical headings summarizing the essence of the patristic comment by evoking a key phrase, metaphor or idea. This feature provides a bridge by which modern readers can enter into the heart of the patristic comment. **Identifying the Patristic Texts** Following the topical heading of each section of comment, the name of the patristic commentator is given. An English translation of the patristic comment is then provided. This is immediately followed by the title of the patristic work and the textual reference—either by book, section and subsection or by book-and-verse references. **The Footnotes** Readers who wish to pursue a deeper investigation of the patristic works cited in this commentary will find the footnotes especially valuable. A footnote number directs the reader to the notes at the bottom of the right-hand column, where in addition to other notations (clarifications or biblical cross references) one will find information on English translations (where available) and standard original-language editions of the work cited. An abbreviated citation (normally citing the book, volume and page number) of the work is provided. A key to the abbreviations is provided on page xv. Where there is any serious ambiguity or textual problem in the selection, we have tried to reflect the best available textual tradition. Where original language texts have remained untranslated into English, we provide new translations. Wherever current English translations are already well rendered, they are utilized, but where necessary they are stylistically updated. A single asterisk (*) indicates that a previous English translation has been updated to modern English or amended for easier reading. The double asterisk (**) indicates either that a new translation has been provided or that some extant translation has been significantly amended. We have standardized spellings and made grammatical variables uniform so that our English references will not reflect the odd spelling variables of the older English translations. For ease of reading we have in some cases edited out superfluous conjunctions. For the convenience of computer database users the digital database references are provided to either the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (Greek texts) or to the Cetedoc (Latin texts) in the appendix found on pages 223-24.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANF A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 vols. Buffalo, N.Y.: Christian Literature, 1885-1896. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1951-1956; Reprint, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

CCL *Corpus Christianorum*. Series Latina. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1953-.

CSCO *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*. Louvain, Belgium, 1903-.

CSEL *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Vienna, 1866-.

ESOO J. S. Assemani, ed. *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*. Rome, 1737.

LF A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church Anterior to the Division of the East and West. Translated by members of the English Church. 44 vols. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1800-1881.

NPNF P. Schaff et al., eds. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. 2 series (14 vols. each). Buffalo, N.Y.: Christian Literature, 1887-1894; Reprint, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1952-1956; Reprint, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

PG J.-P. Migne, ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus*. Series Graeca. 166 vols. Paris: Migne, 1857-1886.

PL J.-P. Migne, ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*. 221 vols. Paris: Migne, 1844-1864.

PO *Patrologia Orientalis*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1903-.

PTA Dieter Hagedorn, Rudolf Kassel, Ludwig Koenen and Reinhold Merkelbach, eds.

Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen. Bonn: Habelt, 1968-.

PTS *Patristische Texte und Studien*. New York: de Gruyter, 1964-.

SC H. de Lubac, J. Daniélou et al., eds. *Sources Chrétiennes*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1941-.

INTRODUCTION TO A JOB The book of Job presents the drama of a righteous man who, after being struck by calamity, is conscious of the fact that he did not deserve it. Even though Job does not lose his hope and does not curse God, he wonders why he had to suffer such calamity. Job does not receive an answer. In fact, according to the legendary plot of the story, the devil obtains from God the permission to tempt Job so that the righteous man after successfully passing through his trials is abundantly rewarded by God. In spite of the book's happy ending, God does not ever answer Job's question. God, who intervenes by speaking directly, extols the magnificence of his creation and his immeasurable superiority to humanity, even to the righteous man, and in this manner avoids clarifying his reasons for the actions that Job had not been able to understand. This is the problem of the incommensurable relationship between God and humankind when it is considered from the point of view of simple reciprocity. The unknown author of the book of Job cannot offer any other answer but the invitation to others to accept humbly and bravely all that God decides even if the reason for God's behavior appears incomprehensible. Scholars suggest that the book dates from a period extending from the fifth to the third century B.C. and regard it as a sign of a period of uncertainty and disorientation in the history of the Jews. In fact, after they had lost the concept of the collective responsibility of the entire people in the relationship with God, there appeared in their culture the prevalence (already from the time of Isaiah and Ezekiel) of a concept of individual responsibility. Each person was called to give reason for only his or her actions. This certainly created a series of difficulties deriving from this new concept of the relationship between the individual human being and God. From this point of view, the questions proposed by the book of Job are addressed, without distinction, to men and women from any time and any place. This also explains, even today, the reason for the great interest raised by this work in moments of tension in the religious context and the culture of western civilization. The interest in the book of Job, however, was not strong in the first Christian generations that experienced the privileged relationship between them and God in a different way through the redeeming mediation of Christ. Therefore, we find only a few isolated allusions to Job in the books of the New Testament. When they are found, they are concerned with the maxims that abound in this work. For example, the words of Jesus, "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible" (Mt 19:26) follow the model of Job 42:2; "He has put down the mighty from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree" (Lk 1:52) contains an echo of Job 12:19. First Corinthians 3:19 plainly quotes Job 5:13, "He catches the wise in their craftiness." Around the end of the first century, we find several hints of Job in the letter of Clement of Rome to the Christians of Corinth, where in 17:3-4, Job is defined as a model of the righteous and blameless man, who nevertheless confesses that nobody is clean from impurity if he has lived a single day (Job 14:4-5). This quotation was often cited, especially by Origen. Job, together with Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is mentioned in Justin Martyr as a righteous man.¹ This Christian image of Job's righteousness is in perfect harmony with the presentation of the character of Job in the holy Scriptures, and remains predominant in the whole arena of Christian exegesis. Clement of Alexandria in *Stromateis* 3.100.4 makes reference to the already mentioned passage Job 14:4-5 and presents him in another passage as a model of the perfect Christian, whom he usually defines as "Gnostic." Job, who in his extraordinary temperance and celebrated faith became poor from rich, despised from illustrious, ugly from attractive, ill from healthy, is proposed to us as a model of patient faith. "He caused the tempter to blush, blessed the Creator, acted in his calamities as he had done before, and in so doing taught us in the best way how the 'Gnostic' is able to adjust easily to any circumstance."² In the reference to Job made by Cyprian in *De Opere et Eleemosynis* 18, the quotation (Job 14:4-5) is organically connected to the presentation of the righteous conduct of Job, who is also proposed here as a model for rich Christians. Job was aware of the fact that it is impossible not to sin *cotidie*³

before God, and he was diligent in offering *sacrificia cotidiana*⁴ to him. The first author for whom we have evidence of a systematic interpretation of the book of Job is Origen, who wrote a cycle of twenty-two homilies.⁵ As we learn from Jerome, Hilary of Poitiers translated these homilies into Latin.⁶ Both the original text and the translation are lost. Only an extremely small amount of Hilary's text has been transmitted to us through indirect tradition. We have a larger quantity of the original text of Origen preserved in the catenae. Yet, even in this case we possess only fragments. Each of them is important for the exegetical detail they give us, but in general they are not sufficient to inform us about the principles of interpretation followed by Origen. In addition, the fragments are not uniformly distributed along the entire book of Job but are gathered in groups. For instance, after an isolated fragment on Job 1, there is a jump to fragments concerning Job 19—22, then to Job 27, and so on. For this reason, it can be conjectured that the *excerptor*⁷ who selected the passages from the twenty-two homilies of Origen to be included in the catena had only a few of them at his disposal. From the scarce material transmitted to us, we gather that Origen considered Job to be a prototype of the Christian martyr and symbol of the righteous person who submitted to tribulations. It seems that his exegesis, also in this case, was open to an allegorical interpretation but not in a systematic way. Indeed the content of this biblical book was suitable for a moral, present-day interpretation without exceeding the literal sense of the text. For a long time, Origen had no followers in his interest in the book of Job. Only in the second half of the fourth century do we find the already mentioned translations of his homilies by Hilary of Poitiers. After a few more years, between the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth, we see a sudden and intense rise of interest in Job both in the east and in the west. We also notice a real flourishing of works that take the experience of Job as a model and comment on his book extensively. This flourishing cannot be considered without cause. The Roman Empire at that time, especially in its western part, but also to a lesser extent in the eastern part,⁸ faced many difficulties. In times of profound crisis and intense religiosity, a human being inevitably speculates about the judgment of God on the world, on humankind, and on oneself. In such circumstances the book of Job could appear to be particularly suitable for promoting and expanding reflections on this subject, since it presents a righteous man struck by calamities and afflictions. He cannot find a reason for his destiny and wonders why misfortune has tried him so unremittingly. In addition, and more particularly, it must be noticed that Arian exegetes compiled two of the commentaries on Job that were preserved and have reached us. If we consider the scarcity of the extant Arian exegetical literature, the interest in Job appears to be significant. Therefore, it is not illogical to assume that such interest was due to the fact that the situation of these heretics was quite difficult at the end of the fourth century, for they had become the target of many harsh legal measures against them. In such a situation, the figure of Job was most suitable to be proposed as a model of firmness and resignation amid different calamities. We begin to see in these post-Origen sources a hint of the direction that exegesis would take. In general, we notice that all the works on Job were composed when there existed a contrast between the Alexandrian trend, which interpreted the texts of the Bible by making a large use of allegory, and the Antiochian trend, which gave preference to a literal interpretation. The book of Job, on which a wholesome lecture on morals could be based, favored the literalist trend. This trend dominates even though, as we will see more fully in the next sections of this introduction, the allegorical interpretation is not completely absent. The text raised difficult questions for the exegetes especially in those passages where the tormented Job bursts into assertions that may appear to be sacrilegious or even blasphemous, as when he curses the day of his birth (Job 3:3). All the exegetes whom we will introduce were extremely careful in interpreting these kinds of passages by adjusting them to their current Christian theodicy so that they might moderate those aspects that could cause scandal. Of the two Arian commentaries that we mentioned, the first is in Greek and has been recently attributed to an Arian author named Julian.⁹ His Arian faith, even though it is disclosed discreetly, is undoubted, and the author who is unknown for the rest must be identified with the Arian author of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*. The date of the commentary is uncertain but should be later than the middle of the fourth century, probably later for reasons we have explained. Julian, who attributed the authorship of the book of Job to Moses, notices, in the first place, the value that can

be derived from its literal interpretation, for the book shows us God's providence which is for all human beings and presents Job as a model of virtue to be imitated. Consequently, Julian's commentary is rigorously literal and like all the other commentaries in Greek follows the official biblical translation of the church, namely, the so-called Septuagint (LXX). The commentary is concise and explains the entire book of Job with a well-measured amount of exegesis. The author is very careful in conveniently explaining the scenes that present the dialogue between God and the devil in a decidedly anthropomorphic form that might be read as sacrilegious expressions. This generally concise text contains a large digression that criticizes the use of astrology,¹⁰ demonstrates the author's knowledge of pagan literature and is rife with quotations from pagan poets.

The book of Job presents its readers with a profound drama concerning innocent suffering. Such honest, forthright wrestling with evil and the silence of God has intrigued a wide range of readers, both religious and nonreligious.

Surprisingly, the earliest fathers showed little interest in the book of Job. Not until Origen in the early third century is there much evidence of any systematic treatment of the book, and most of Origen's treatment is known to us only from the catenae. More intense interest came at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth.

The excerpts in this collection focus on systematic treatment. Among Greek texts are those from Origen, Didymus the Blind, Julian the Arian, John Chrysostom, Hesychius of Jerusalem and Olympiodorus. Among Latin sources we find Julian of Eclanum, Philip the Priest and Gregory the Great. Among Syriac sources we find Ephrem the Syrian and Isho'ad of Merv, some of whose work is made available here for the first time in English.

In store for readers of this volume is once again a great feast of wisdom from the ancient resources of the church.

Ignatius Catholic Study Bible - Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen Job. C. L. Seow Several ongoing projects signal a sharp rise in interest among the Church's Bible;³ the Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture;⁴ and the whose The Book of Exodus was published in 1974.⁷ Until recently, efforts to Canonical Books - The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church - Logos reads all your books instantly, delivering just what you need at each step in PDF Bible Downloads " KJV, ERV, WTT, GNV, TIS 6 years ago Editor Here you A translation of the Bible with Commentaries and Bible Studies - all written in Bible Art, Biblical History Topics and Study, and ancient Bible maps of Rome, 2 Chronicles 20 Commentary - Kinderzirkus Sulzgries - Ancient and Classic Theological Works . A Multivolume Commentary on a Single Biblical Book..... 39... bibliography style described in The SBL Handbook of Style, chapter 6. " In the

following pages... 1 David J. A. Clines, Job 38â€“42, Word Biblical Commentary 18B (Nashville,. TN: Thomas "Hey, you! Job! Listen up." Elihu's Use of Job's Name and its - Logos reads all your books instantly, delivering just what you need at each step in PDF Bible Downloads â€“ KJV, ERV, WTT, GNV, TIS 6 years ago Editor Here you A translation of the Bible with Commentaries and Bible Studies - all written in Bible Art, Biblical History Topics and Study, and ancient Bible maps of Rome, 280 Biblical Meaning - Felix Meier - Surprisingly, the earliest fathers showed little interest in the book of Job. Not until Job: Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament, Volume VI. The SBL Handbook of Style - WordPress.com - The Book of Job, book of Hebrew scripture that is often counted among the In this article, Susan Rowland pronounces Paul Bishop s Jung s Answer to Job: A Commentary as a remarkable and scholarly book that. This is supported by the Biblical text and ancient history. We have. His feast day is celebrated on May 6. Book Of Job - This Wisdom Book of Hebrew poetry portrays the suffering of Job, his patience, the Greek Septuagint, Latin Vulgate, and the Christian Old Testament of the Bible. an authoritative translation of the Bible from the ancient languages and other 6 And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life. The World Before Man: The Biblical Explanation - Reformed Books Online Luke 9 Bible Hub - A Commentary on the Book of Revelation Anthony Charles Garland demons ('sons of God'; the same Hebrew phrase refers to angels in Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; 25 Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian 27 Jerome Smith, The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge (Nashville, TN: THE HOLY BIBLE - A Devotional Commentary on the Book of 2 Peter 2 Peter 1:3 "seeing that His divine 1-6 funeral sermon This sermon was written during a study week on death, dying, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther Job Proverbs Ecclesiastes Isaiah Gospel of Matthew. Bible Commentary Early Church Fathers Medieval Patristic 1 John. Job 1:6 Commentaries: Now there was a day - Bible Hub - The canon of the Ethiopic Bible differs both in the Old and New Testament from that of The Ethiopian Orthodox Church has 46 books of the Old Testament and 35 Job 23. Psalms 24. Proverbs 25. Tegsats (Reproof) 26. Metsihafe Tibeb (the on various points during the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era.

Relevant Books

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Online Sketches New and Old pdf

[DOWNLOAD]

- Read Governance of Teaching Hospitals: Turmoil at Penn and Hopkins free pdf, epub

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Architecture and Design of Molecule Logic Gates and Atom Circuits: Proceedings of the 2nd AtMol European Workshop (Advances in Atom and Single Molecule Machines)

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - 33 Quick and Healthy Recipes for the Working Mom: A quick and easy recipe every day for mothers on the run

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Succes and Understanding pdf, epub
