

Πρὸς Στέφανον β'

Διὰ τί ὁ μὲν ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἀρξάμενος κατάγει τὴν γενεαλογίαν· ὁ δὲ κάτωθεν ἄνεισι, καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ἴσταται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ τὸν Θεόν;

1 Τὸ δεύτερον τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ προταθέντων τοῦτο ἦν· ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ κατάγει τὴν γενεαλογίαν, ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς τὴν ἐναντίαν τούτου βαδίσας, ἤρξατο μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, ἀνάγει δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ τὸν Θεόν· δέον, εἶγε σύμφωνα καὶ συνωδὰ ἀλλήλοις ἔγραφον, ἢ τὸν Λουκᾶν ἀνιόντα μέχρι τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ στήναι, ἢ τὸν Ματθαῖον μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ εἰς ὃν κατέληξεν ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἀπάρξασθαι τῆς γενεαλογίας.⁴⁹

2 Ῥαδία δὲ καὶ τούτων ἡ λύσις, καὶ οὐδὲ πολλῆς κατασκευῆς δεομένη· μίαν ἀμφοτέροις ὁδὸν πορευθεῖσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοὺς ἀνάτη καὶ ὄρθιον πορείαν ἀνιόντας, καὶ τοὺς ἔμπαλιν διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς κατιόντας, οὐκ ἂν τις ἐτέραν φαίη βαδίζειν, μιᾶς ἀμφοτέροις ἐγκειμένης, τοῖς τε ἀνιούσι καὶ τοῖς κατιούσι, τρίβου. Τὸν αὐτὸν γοῦν τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν γενῶν διαδοχῆς πάρεστιν· οὗτος δὲ πόρρωθεν Ἑβραίοις φίλος ἦν ὁ τρόπος, καὶ τῶν θείων συνήθης Γραφῶν.

3 Αὐτίκα γοῦν ἐν μὲν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς Ῥούθ, Δαβὶδ ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰούδα γενεαλογεῖται διὰ τούτων· *καὶ αὗται αἱ γενέσεις Φαρὲς· ὁ δὲ ἦν Ἰούδα τοῦ ἀρχιφύλου παῖς· Φαρὲς ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἑσρῶμ· Ἑσρῶμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀράμ· καὶ Ἀράμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμιναδάβ· Ἀμιναδάβ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ναασσών· καὶ Ναασσών ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλμών· Σαλμών ἐγέννησε τὸν Βοόζ· καὶ Βοόζ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰβήδ· καὶ Ἰβήδ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεσσαί· καὶ Ἰεσσαί ἐγέννησε τὸν Δαβίδ.*⁵⁰ Τοῦτον δ' οὖν αὐτὸν τέθειται καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος τὸν τρόπον.

49. Cf. Matt 1.1–16; Luke 3.23–38.

50. Ruth 4.18–22.

TO STEPHANUS 2

Why does one begin the genealogy at the upper end and trace it downwards from Abraham, while the other goes upwards from the lower end and stops, not with Abraham, but with Adam and God?⁸

1. The second question you put forward was: “Matthew traces the descent downwards from Abraham, but Luke goes in the opposite direction, starting from Joseph and taking it up to Adam and God. If their work were mutually harmonious and concordant, either Luke should have gone upwards and stopped at Abraham, or Matthew should have begun his genealogy from Adam, where Luke ended, instead of from Abraham.”

2. This, too, has an easy solution. In fact, it requires no very elaborate explanation: they are both traversing a single road. After all, one would not say that those going straight uphill, and those coming down the same way in the opposite direction, are on different roads: the track they both have to travel on is the same one, whether they are going up it or down it. Well, then, one may also speak of⁹ the steps of a genealogy in the same way. This was the accepted practice from long ago among the Hebrews, and is familiar in the divine scriptures.

3. Take the book of Ruth, for instance. Here is the wording of David’s genealogy in that, tracing his family tree downwards from Judah: “These are the descendants of Pharez”¹⁰ (Pharez being a son of Judah, the founder of the tribe): “Pharez was Esrom’s father, Esrom was Aram’s, Aram was Aminadab’s, Aminadab was Naasson’s, Naasson was Salmon’s, Salmon was Booz’, Booz was Obed’s, Obed was Jesse’s, and Jesse was David’s”. That is the same style of setting it out as Matthew has used.

8. This heading appears to have been inserted by a copyist as a summary of Eusebius’ own wording in the next paragraph. Compare *To Marinus* 4, p. 121, note 24.

9. An infinitive verb meaning something like “speak of”, e.g., εἰπεῖν, appears to be missing from the Greek text here.

10. Here and in the next paragraph the more familiar names have been given in the form found in the Revised Standard Version, while the rest are transliterated from the Greek as they appear in the manuscript.

ζ'. Εὐσεβίου ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Μαρίνον.

Τρεῖς γοῦν τὰς πάσας Μαρίας τῷ πάθει τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν εὐρίσκομεν· πρώτην μὲν Θεοτόκον, δευτέραν δὲ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς Μαρίαν τὴν τοῦ Κλεωπᾶ, καὶ¹ τρίτην τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν· τινὲς δὲ φασιν ἐξ αὐτῶν δύο εἶναι Μαγδαληνάς· μίαν μὲν, τὴν ὅψὲ Σαββάτων παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ, ἑτέραν δὲ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ πρωίας ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἐλθοῦσαν, ταύτην δὲ εἶναι τὴν καὶ Μάρκῳ δηλουμένην, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια· ὡς γὰρ οὔσης καὶ ἑτέρας, φησὶν, οὐ τοιαύτης Μαγδαληνῆς, ἐτήρησεν ὁ Μάρκος τοῦτο εἰπών· “Ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν Σαββάτων ἐφάνη Μαρία πρῶτον τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια.” Καὶ ταύτην ἴσως εἶναι τὴν ἀκούσασαν, Μὴ μου ἄπτου, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα κάκεινη ἀπὸ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ὠρμάτο, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ ὅμοια καὶ αὐτῆς ἢ θεία κατηγορεῖ Γραφή· εἰ δὲ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν Μαγδαληνὴν φήσειεν τις, καὶ οὕτως ἀληθεῖοι ἂν τὰ ἱερά Εὐαγγέλια, κατ' οὐδένα λόγον διαφωνοῦντα· τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ Μαρίαν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν εἰσάγονται μὴ ἄπτομένην πρότερον τοῦ Κυρίου, ὅτε ἔκλαιε καὶ ἠπίστει· καὶ ἄπτομένην αὐτοῦ, ὅτε χαίρειν μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κελεύεται· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὡς Θεὸν αὐτὸν προσεκύνησεν ἔσχατον, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπον, ὡς πρότερον ὅτε ἔκλαιε καὶ ἠπίστει.

1. The word τὴν must be inserted here.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 7. Anastasius of Sinai, Question 153

Mai², pp. 300–301;⁴⁸ Migne, PG 22:1012. “From Anastasius of Sinai *Question 153*”⁴⁹ Cf. *To Marinus* 2.6, 8.

From Eusebius’ work *To Marinus*.

So we find three Marys in all at Christ’s passion, among the other women: the first is the Mother of God;⁵⁰ the second is her sister, Cleopas’ Mary; and the third is the Magdalene. Some, though, say that there were two of them from Magdala: one, the one in Matthew, “late on sabbath”; the other, the one in John who came to the tomb early in the morning—that being also the one mentioned in Mark, from whom he had cast out seven devils; he says that the reason Mark took care to put that in was that there was also another from Magdala, not the same one. After the resurrection “early in the morning on the first day of the week” he first appeared⁵¹ to the Mary of Magdala from whom he had cast out seven devils—and this, he says, is perhaps the one who was told “Do not touch me”, not the one in Matthew. Even if that one did also come from Magdala, the divine scripture does not say the same derogatory things about her as well. However, if one were to say that this was one and the same woman,⁵² the holy gospels would still be telling the truth even so, and not be in any way discordant: they present the same Mary of Magdala as not touching the Lord at first, when she was weeping and in disbelief, and as touching him, when, with the other Mary, she is greeted by him. That was when she finally worshipped him as God, not as a human being as before, when she was weeping and in disbelief.

48. Mai², p. 300 n. 1: “I have collated this little *Problem* also against a MS from Colonna, now in the Vatican”.

49. There is a critical edition of this work, Marcel Richard and Joseph Munitiz, eds., *Anastasii Sinaitae: Quaestiones et responsiones*. Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 59. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006. This contains only the first 103 questions of the collection of 154 printed by Migne. See Richard and Munitiz, table 7, pp. lviii–lix. The other questions are not considered authentic by the editors, so the older editions remain the only source.*

50. Θεοτόκον. The abridged selection also uses this fifth-century term here.*

51. This part of the sentence has been left unpunctuated, in order not to prejudice the question of whether this epitomator had in mind the issue of where to put the pause, considered in *To Marinus* 1.3.

52. Not accepting Mai’s insertion of Μαγδαληνήν.

Fr.Syr. 1

Text and translation printed in Beyer, p. 32. This fragment corresponds to QSt 5 and Fr.St. 9.

From Eusebius of Caesarea, from the book on the Gospel Problems, a commentary concerning these things below, about why Matthew begins from David, while Abraham was first.

Now, the promise of Holy Scripture first declared that the Messiah would arise from David, and it is repeated in everyone's mouth that the Saviour arises from David. And in confirmation of the oaths,¹ it was declared that he arises from David. For it is written in the Psalms: "the Lord swore to David, and he will not turn back from it, 'I will set up one of your descendants'";² and also, "A covenant have I established with my Chosen One, and I swore to David my Servant";³ etc. Further, it is written in Isaiah, "A rod shall go out from the stump⁴ of Jesse";⁵ who was the father of David, and "The root of Jesse will be the one standing as Chief for the peoples; the peoples shall place their hope in him".⁶ And in the book of Chronicles it is written, "I shall raise up your seed after you", "I shall establish the throne of his kingdom forever";⁷ and "I will be⁸ for him a Father, and he will be for me a Son". And it is known that these things are not done with respect to his son Solomon, for neither his throne nor his kingdom remained forever. Not even "I will be for him a Father", nor did the peoples place their hope in him, but these things are fulfilled with respect to him who has arisen from David in human form.

As I said, because of his greatness and his kingdom and the nearness⁹ of his time, as the narrative about David is recent and not old, and as it

1. The promises made by God to David.*

2. Manuscript ܐܠܗܝܢ should read ܐܠܗܝ (Beyer). Ps 131.11 [132.11].

3. Ps 88.4 [89.3].

4. Misprint: ܚܘܨܘܬܐ for ܚܘܨܘܬܐ.

5. Isa 11.1.

6. Isa 11.10 (LXX).

7. 1Chr 17.11, 12.

8. 1Chr 17.13. Beyer gives "I am", but this is perhaps an error for "I will be" (a difference of just one letter in Syriac), which is what both the LXX and Peshitta read, but see also the same quotation a few lines below.

9. Lit. "nonremoteness".

ιακωβ δε αρχφο ηιωσνηφ πρλι μιμαρια. ευσεβιος. εθβε ου ματθεος ερσνεαλδουτη ηιωσνηφ ρωσ κε πωρη ηιακωβ πε, ουορ λογκασ δε ρωφ κε ηλι; μη γαρ εντφεθουνη ερρεν πογέρνοφ ηχε πιεγαστελιςτης; ηπεσωωπι. αλλα επιλη ηλι αφθι παφ ηθμαγ ηιωσνηφ ευρζιμι, ουορ αφμου μιπερχα σπερμα, ουορ ιακωβ δε περσον αφθι ητερερζιμι κατα πινομοσ, αφτουνηοσ ουχροχ μιπερσον, ιωσνηφ κε ουνη πωρη ηιακωβ πε, κατα φγσις, ουορ πωρη ηηλι πε, κατα πινομοσ.

β¹ πχιμμιςι δε ηιησογς πχριστοσ πε ουπαρητ πε. εταγωπ ησα τερμαγ μαρια ηιωσνηφ, ουορ μιπατογσογεν πογέρνοφ, αυχεμς εσμβοκι εβολθεν ουπνεγμα εφογав. ουορ κε μιπερσογωησ, ωατεσμιςι μιπιδλου.² ...

ευσεβιος ρωφ χω μιμοσ. λικεωσ ουνη μιπερσογωησ κε θαι τε τπαρθενοσ ετε ησαιδσ σαχι εθβητς κε ρηππε ις τπαρθενοσ εσεερβοκι, ητεσμιςι ηογωρηι, ουορ ησεμoyτ επεφραν κε εμμαπογνηλ, εβηλ ετασμιςι μιπιδλου: ροτε δε ετασμιςι ηχε τπαρθενοσ, ουορ φεν πχιμπερεφ παγ επιμανεσωον, ευρζιωγυ μίφη ετα τπαρθενοσ μασφ κε ηθοφ πε πχριστοσ πδωις, κατα τθε μαλιςτα εταγσωτεμ ητοτογ

1. The numerical β indicates that this is the second scripture passage discussed in the catena. Note that not all the passages are clearly referenced in the remains of the defective manuscript.

2. The gospel passage is de Lagarde, ll. 1–4. It is followed by a comment first from J. C. which more fully elucidates the word play on δικαιοσ/δικαίωσ mentioned below in nn. 10 and 11, and then from Eusebius on l. 28.

Fr.Copt. 1

On Matt 1.16. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 2, ll. 30–37. Cf. Fr.Ar. 1, QSt4.

“But Jacob fathered Joseph the husband of Mary”. Eusebius. Why does Matthew say in his genealogy that Joseph was the son of Jacob while Luke¹ says that he was the son of Eli [*sic*]? Surely the evangelists are not disagreeing with one another? That could never be. But since Eli took to himself the mother of Joseph as his wife, and died without producing offspring, and Jacob his brother took his² wife according to the law, and produced a child for his brother, Joseph was therefore the child of Jacob according to nature, but the child of Eli according to the law.

Fr.Copt. 2

On Matt 1.18–25. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 3, l. 28–p. 4, l. 3. Cf. Fr.Ar. 2.

“Now the birth of Jesus Christ was in this way: after his mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph, and before they knew one another, she was found with child of the³ Holy Spirit” and “he did not know her until she brought forth the child”. ...

Eusebius also says this: it was rightly,⁴ then, that “he did not know her”, because this was the maiden of whom Isaiah says, “Lo, the maiden shall conceive, and shall give birth to a child, and he shall be called Emmanuel” ...⁵ “except when⁶ she brought forth the child⁷”: but when the maiden had given birth and because of his sight of⁸ the shepherds when they proclaimed, “This one to whom the Virgin has given birth, (he) is Christ the Lord”, just as they had heard from the angels, and also because of the sight

1. Luke 3.23.

2. That is, Eli’s.

3. Literally “a”.

4. Or “justly”; the Coptic is $\Delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\omega\varsigma$.

5. Isa 7.14. Lagarde places a comma after Emmanuel, but this is misleading; the following text has to be seen as a resumption of the quotation from after “he did not know her”.

6. RSV = “until”.

7. Matt 1.25. The standard Bohairic New Testament text says $\omega\lambda\tau\epsilon\varsigma\omega\mu\iota$ rather than the $\epsilon\beta\eta\lambda\ \epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\omega\mu\iota$ of the fragment.

8. Or “from his seeing”.

فاما يعقوب فانه ولد يوسف

اوسابيوس يفسر

لم قال مثنى وذكر نسية يوسف انه ولد يعقوب ولوقا قال انه ولد هالي هل يتضاد الانجيلان بعض لبعض معاذ الله ولكن من اجل ان هالي تزوج بامرأة ومات عنها ولم يخلف ولدا فتزوجها يعقوب اخوه على حكم التوراة ليقيم زرعاً لآخيه واولدها يوسف فيوسف الان هو ولد يعقوب بالطبيعة وهو ولد هالي على الناموس

اوسابيوس القيسراني يفسر

بالحقيقة ما عرفها انها العدرى التي تكلم شعيا النبي من اجلها وقال هذه العدرى تحبل وتلد ابنا ويسمى عمانويل حتى ولدت الغلام فعرف انها تلك وذلك لما ولدت العدرى ونظر الى الرعاة وهم يبشرون بالذي ولدته العدرى انه المسيح الرب وبافضل من ذلك لما سمع تسبيح الملائكة ومشاهدة المجوس وقد اتوا بالقرابين مثل اله وملك ومعطي الحياة الذي مات من اجلنا كما قال له الملاك في المنام لا تخف يا يوسف ان تاخذ مريم خليلتك فان المولود منها قدوس وهو من روح القدس فمن

Fr.Ar. 1

Printed by Iturbe, p. 8 (9). On Matt 1.16. Cf. Fr.Copt. 1, de Lagarde p. 2, ll. 31–37.

“Jacob was the father of Joseph”,¹ Eusebius interprets it as follows:² Why did Matthew say, mentioning the kinship of Joseph, that Jacob was his father, while Luke³ said that Heli was his father? Are the evangelists opposed to each other? God forbid! Rather, it was because Heli had married a woman and died without leaving any descendants. Then Jacob his brother married her according to the regulation of the Law⁴ in order to raise up descendants for his brother, and she had Joseph by him. So, then, Jacob was Joseph’s father according to nature, but Heli was his father according to the Law⁵.

Fr.Ar. 2

Printed by Iturbe, pp. 9–10 (11). On Matt 1.25. Fr.Copt. 2, de Lagarde p. 3, l. 28–p. 4, l. 3.

Eusebius of Caesarea interprets as follows: Truly, he did not know her—the Virgin whom Isaiah the prophet talked about, saying, “The Virgin will conceive and bear a son, and he will be called Emmanuel”⁶—until she had given birth to the boy, and then he knew that she was the one. That was when the Virgin gave birth and he saw the shepherds giving the good news about the one the Virgin had given birth to and saying that he was Christ the Lord, and what is more, when he heard the angels’ praise and the witness of the Magi, who had brought gifts, as to God, a king, and the giver of life who died for us, as the angel had told him in a dream, “Don’t be afraid, Joseph, to take Mary as your wife,⁷ for the child born from her is holy, and from the Holy Spirit”⁸ From this and other things he knew that she was the

1. Matt 1.16.

2. Cf. QSt. 4.

3. Luke 3.23.

4. *al-tawrāt*.

5. *al-nāmūs*.

6. Isa 7.14.

7. There is also a variant *ḥaṭībah*, “fiancée”.

8. Matt 1.20.