

# EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

## *Gospel Problems and Solutions*







EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA  
GOSPEL PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

ANCIENT TEXTS IN TRANSLATION 1

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA,  
GOSPEL PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

QUAESTIONES AD STEPHANUM ET MARINUM  
(CPG 3470)

*Edited by*

Roger Pearse

*Translated by*

David J. D. Miller (Greek, Latin)

Adam C. McCollum (Syriac, Arabic)

Carol Downer (Coptic)

and others

Chieftain Publishing · Ipswich  
2010

First published 2010 by  
Chieftain Publishing Ltd

Greek text of the Abridged Selection reproduced by permission from  
*Eusebe de Césarée: Questions Évangéliques* © Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008.

Copyright © Roger Pearse 2010

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form  
without permission in writing from the publishers, except by a reviewer in  
connection with a review for inclusion in a magazine or newspaper.

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A British Library CIP record is available.  
ISBN: 978-0-9566540-0-7 (Hardback)  
ISBN: 978-0-9566540-1-4 (Paperback)

Syriac font typeset using Serto Urhoy, part of the Meltho package. Bohairic  
text typeset using Alphabetum.

## CONTENTS

Editor's Introduction.....	ix
Translator's Preface.....	xiii
The Greek Abridged Selection .....	1
To Stephanus.....	5
To Marinus .....	95
The Greek Fragments.....	131
To Stephanus.....	131
To Marinus .....	177
The Latin Fragments .....	255
Ambrose .....	258
Jerome .....	294
The Syriac Fragments.....	303
The Coptic Fragments.....	351
The Arabic Fragments.....	385
The Letter of Latino Latini .....	395
Table of Editions .....	405
Index of Biblical Passages .....	412
About the Translators.....	413



## EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

This volume is an experiment. If it is a success, more will follow. Several excellent series of academic English translations of patristic texts already exist. These invariably feature both a translation and a commentary. The system of research funding and the need to publish research mean that it is difficult for any scholar to publish a translation without commentary and without a critical text. For some texts, therefore, the choice of “all-or-nothing” can only mean “nothing”.

This leaves a very large number of texts that have never received translations into any modern language. Many of these texts are of wide interest.

A commercial company can do things differently. We believe that there is room for another series of academic-quality translations with minimal notes, in order to facilitate access to some of these texts. The plan is to provide a translation, with minimal ancillary material. The text translated will be included, in response to feedback from potential purchasers.

The fragments of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Gospel Problems and Solutions*<sup>1</sup> have never been critically edited, since their first publication nearly two centuries ago. Nor will such an edition appear soon.<sup>2</sup> An editor will require deep pockets merely to purchase copies of the forty or more Greek manuscripts in which fragments may be found. He will also need to be competent in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Christian Arabic, at a minimum. Such was the interest of the book in antiquity that portions of it may be found in all those languages, and probably in Armenian, Geor-

---

1. Clavis Patrum Graecorum 3470.

2. Claudio Zamagni has begun by publishing a critical text of the Abridged Selection, with French translation, in the Sources Chrétiennes series. It is to be hoped that he will edit the fragments also.

gian, Ethiopic, and Old Slavonic, too.<sup>3</sup> Few of the texts that contain the fragments have themselves been critically edited.

We have decided to publish an English translation of this very interesting text, based on existing printed sources. This should make the text much more widely accessible. The hope is that thereby a “virtuous circle” of interest and research work may be encouraged.

At various points the translators have made suggestions for textual emendation. These are based on the available printed sources rather than a fresh study of the manuscripts.<sup>4</sup>

We hope that the volume is useful, and welcome suggestions for improvement.

The reader is directed to Zamagni’s excellent edition for a discussion of the sources for this work, but a few remarks here may assist the general reader. The complete text of this work of Eusebius is lost, but it comprised three books. Two were addressed to a certain Stephanus and concerned divergences in the opening sections of the gospels. The other was addressed to an equally unknown Marinus and was concerned with divergences in the endings of the gospels. The most important survival of this is an abridged selection of sixteen questions and abbreviated answers, preserved in a Vatican manuscript once at Heidelberg.

A work of this kind could not fail to be used by medieval excerptors. Substantial quotations from the full text are preserved in the catena of Nicetas, and smaller portions throughout other catenas on the gospels. These supply material not preserved in the abridged selection. It is unfortunate that no critical editions exist of any of these catenas.

A now lost Greek catena was translated into Coptic, and this furnishes us with material in that language; the Coptic itself was translated into Arabic, and this gives us material now lost in the mutilated Coptic text.

---

3. An attempt was made to determine whether material in Armenian existed. Unfortunately, it proved impossible to obtain a response to an enquiry from any of the Armeniologists approached. Without knowledge of Armenian, attempts to consult catalogues likewise proved fruitless. No attempt was made to investigate sources in Georgian or Old Slavonic. The discovery, late in the project, that material existed in Arabic raised the question of whether catena material was transmitted into Ethiopia, but there was no more time to investigate this.

4. The *Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana* closed to readers shortly before the book was commissioned, although microfilms did become available once again much later.

The thirteenth-century list of literature in Syriac by Abdisho' bar Brika<sup>5</sup> mentions “a book solving the contradictions contained in the gospels” by Eusebius.<sup>6</sup> This suggests that the complete text may have been translated into Syriac, like so many of the works of Eusebius. If so, the translation is no longer extant, but the Syriac catena of Severus of Edessa gives us another twelve fragments of the text of *To Stephanus*, and both Severus of Antioch and Ishodad of Merv quote a passage from *To Marinus*.

Inevitably, there are further passages that seem to be influenced by Eusebius but are not exact quotations. Considerations of space and time mean that these have been excluded.<sup>7</sup>

The complete text of the work was extant as late as the sixteenth century in a manuscript in Sicily. A letter from Latino Latini to Andreas Masius reveals the important detail that it was discovered in connection with a manuscript of Pseudo-Eustathius of Antioch. The text of the complete letter with a translation is included, as Mai's often reprinted quotation of it is somewhat misleading.

Most footnotes are by the translator or editor of the material against which they appear. Editorial additions are marked with an asterisk and consist mainly of a limited amount of bibliography.

---

5. Better known in older literature as Ebed-Jesu. The Syriac text of the *Catalogus Librorum* was published by Giuseppe Simone Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana* (3 vols.; Rome: Typis Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1719–1728), vol. 3.1.

6. Translated into English by George Percy Badger, *The Nestorians and Their Rituals* (2 vols.; London: Masters, 1852), 2:361–79.

7. This includes but is not limited to the material in Jerome, *Letter 131, Ad Hediham*, and the East Syriac material published by G. Beyer together with the fragments from Severus of Edessa.



## PREFACE

The full title of the largest surviving part of the work is “*Gospel Problems and Solutions, To Stephanus*: An Abridged Selection”. In the original version of what Eusebius himself wrote, there would have been a similar title for the separate book of *Gospel Problems and Solutions, To Marinus*, but in the only known manuscript, the four *Problems to Marinus* follow directly after the sixteen *Problems to Stephanus*, although with a separate dedication. We refer to this version of twenty Problems as the “abridged selection”.

It follows that all we have in that manuscript, found by Mai in the Vatican in the nineteenth century, is a selection of parts of the books by Eusebius, and that even those parts have themselves been abridged. Certainly the original book *To Marinus*, at least, was much longer. What we have is thus neither the whole work by Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (†A.D. 339), nor necessarily always his actual words. If the sixteenth-century letter of Latino Latini (see below) is to be believed, there was then in existence a manuscript containing all three books of Eusebius on the subject.

As well as the main body of the work that he found in the Vatican manuscript, Mai, followed by Migne, printed the Greek text of a number of extracts, or fragments, culled from a catena (collection of illustrative comments on biblical passages, by various authors); these gave more of *To Stephanus*, including two in Syriac, and much more of *To Marinus*. He also added some smaller fragments from other sources. He accompanied all this by a translation into Latin, and he included passages from Latin commentaries, by Ambrose and Jerome, that show signs of being derived from Eusebius, though they do not mention him.

What this edition presents is new in two respects: Roger Pearse, by further search, has been able to include various other fragments from several sources, in Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Coptic; and he has commissioned the translations.

Here, then, is a complete collection of the text of all known parts of this work of Eusebius, and all are accompanied by what is believed to be their first-ever translation into English.

The rest of this preface concerns only the parts of the book that are translated from Greek; that was the original language, and it forms the great bulk of what survives.

My translation aims to convey the sense of the Greek accurately, in English that will read as naturally as possible, given the author's style, which is often prolix and rhetorical, even in abridgement. It has not been thought necessary to render each individual Greek word by a literally corresponding English one nor to preserve Greek idioms or the Greek order of words or clauses, when it seemed that clarity would be better served by greater freedom. Biblical quotations, in which the text of this work often varies slightly from the received texts of the Septuagint and the New Testament, as well as between its own quotations of the same text, have been translated without much reference to published versions; when required, the one preferred was the New Revised Standard Version, with a certain tang of the Authorised at times when it was useful to give some flavour of the original language.

The translation of *To Stephanus* 1 has had the great benefit of Professor Stuart Hall's detailed comments and corrections. Though he and I differ in the degree of freedom we regard as desirable, I have gratefully accepted his corrections and the great majority of his suggestions, and only wish that the rest of the work could also have been subjected to the same close and valuable scrutiny from him. However, it will all at least have benefited by my finding out, from his meticulous work, how much more care was needed in checking my version for mistakes, omissions, and infelicities than I had at first thought. I sincerely hope that any reader who discovers any that remain will have the kindness to communicate them to me at 38 Henley Grove, Bristol BS9 4EG, United Kingdom.

The text used as a basis was that of Claudio Zamagni, originally available on the Internet as his doctoral dissertation but now published as *Eusèbe de Césarée: Questions Évangéliques* (SC 523; Paris: Cerf, 2008), with French translation and notes. Zamagni's critical notes, much fuller than anything hitherto available on this work, allow comparison with the readings of the manuscript Vaticanus Palatinus Gr. 220, discovered and first published by A. Mai. Mai's second edition, in *Bibliotheca Nova Patrum* vol. 4, 1847, was reprinted in the 1857 edition of J. P. Migne's PG 22, columns 879 and following. All significant departures from Zamagni's

text, which include a number of emendations of my own in places where corruption has hitherto been unsuspected, are recorded in footnotes. Other footnotes are attempts to clarify the few places where the author's meaning is not immediately obvious.

Our grateful acknowledgement is due to Zamagni's work, which we have found indispensable; the reader is referred to it for detailed discussion on all points. The references (mainly biblical) in the footnotes for *To Stephanus* 1–16 and *To Marinus* 1–4 are his; some Psalms references differ in numbering from English Bibles.

Unlike Zamagni's edition, this translation includes all the known fragments of the same work of Eusebius, from Mai and various other sources. Passages in these which correspond closely with parts of the main text are printed in bold, to aid comparison. Some of them evidently come from a different recension of the original work; occasionally they help to correct the main text's readings.

The text of the Greek fragments has been given from Mai's second edition plus the other sources indicated in footnotes, all of them now in the public domain. Obvious misprints have been tacitly corrected. No attempt has been made to impose consistency in punctuation and capitalisation, but, again, significant departures from the printed text are detailed in the footnotes. The Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic texts have been re-entered from the editions indicated. The Syriac as originally printed was unvocalised, but vowels have been added to this text for the convenience of readers.

In the main Greek text, the numbering of paragraphs follows that of Zamagni, with Mai's (turned into numerals instead of Greek letters) added, when they differ, in square brackets. The fragments are numbered as in Mai.

David J. D. Miller



THE GREEK ABRIDGED SELECTION (*ECLOGE IN EPITOME*)  
FROM VATICAN MANUSCRIPT PALATINUS GRAECUS 220

Translated by David J. D. Miller

## CONTENTS

To Stephanus 1: Why do the evangelists trace Joseph's descent, not Mary's? .....	6
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? .....	24
To Stephanus 3: How is it that Matthew takes the line of succession from David and Solomon down to Jacob and Joseph, whereas Luke takes a line opposed to Matthew's, from David and Nathan through Nathan's sons to Eli and Joseph? .....	28
To Stephanus 4: On the genealogy in the holy gospels: from Africanus.....	34
To Stephanus 5: Why does Matthew give David precedence over Abraham in the genealogy of Christ, in the words: "The book of the birth of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham?" .....	38
To Stephanus 6: After David, why does he not take the descent down through the successive generations, instead of jumping back to Abraham—but not to Adam or to any other of the men of old who were loved by God? .....	42
To Stephanus 7: Why did Matthew mention Tamar? And why not also some other woman, one whose exploits are attested as being good ones? .....	44
To Stephanus 8: Why does the evangelist mention Uriah's wife in the genealogy? .....	54
To Stephanus 9: Why did the evangelist mention Ruth? .....	60
To Stephanus 10: Why does the evangelist call Jehoiachim 'Jeconiah'? .....	64
To Stephanus 11: Why has he used subdivisions in the genealogy, not combining the forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ together, but separating the successive generations into the distinct groups he has set out? .....	68
To Stephanus 12: Given that there were seventeen kings from David's time to Jeconiah and the Babylonian captivity, why does the evangelist say there are fourteen generations? .....	70

To Stephanus 13: Given that there are twelve names in the genealogy from Jeconiah to Joseph, why, again, does the evangelist say that there were fourteen?.....	74
To Stephanus 14: Why was our Saviour known as “the carpenter’s son”, not as the son of some famous and distinguished man? .....	78
To Stephanus 15: In what sense is he said to have sat “on the throne of David”? .....	80
To Stephanus 16: How is it that Matthew records that Jesus was taken from Bethlehem to Egypt, but Luke that he was taken to Jerusalem, and from there to his parents’ home at Nazareth? .....	88
To Marinus 1: How is it that the Saviour’s resurrection evidently took place, in Matthew, “late on the Sabbath”, but in Mark “early in the morning on the first day of the week”?.....	96
To Marinus 2: How is it that the Magdalene, who according to Matthew had witnessed the resurrection “late on the sabbath”, is, according to John, the very person who stands at the tomb in tears “on the first day of the week”? .....	100
To Marinus 3: How is it that the same Magdalene who has, according to Matthew, touched the Saviour’s feet with the other Mary, late on the sabbath, is told “Do not touch me” early in the morning on the first day of the week, according to John?.....	114
To Marinus 4: How is it that in Matthew Mary of Magdala, with the other Mary, has seen the one angel outside the tomb, sitting on the stone of the tomb, and how, according to John, does Mary of Magdala see two angels, sitting inside the tomb; but according to Luke it was two men who appeared to the women, and according to Mark it was a young man that was seen by them—Mary of Magdala, James’ Mary, and Salome—sitting to the right of the tomb?.....	120

The Greek text of the Abridged Selection is given from the edition by Claudio Zamagni, *Eusèbe de Césarée: Questions Évangéliques* (SC 523; Paris: Cerf, 2008).



To STEPHANUS

Translated by David J. D. Miller

Ἐκλογὴ ἐν συντόμῳ ἐκ τῶν συντεθέντων ὑπὸ<sup>1</sup>  
Εὐσεβίου πρὸς Στέφανον περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς  
εὐαγγελίοις ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον α'

Διὰ τί τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν Μαρίαν οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ γενεαλογοῦσιν;<sup>2</sup>

1 Πόθεν τὸν Χριστὸν ὡς υἱὸν Δαβὶδ γενεαλογοῦσι; Πάντως ὅτι διὰ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἐκ Δαβὶδ γεγονότα· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ Μαρίας ὡς φησιν ἡ γραφή· ἔχρην τοίνυν τὴν Μαρίαν γενεαλογεῖν, εἰπερ τὸν Χριστὸν γενεαλογεῖν ἐβούλοντο ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ, φημὲν προσήκων τυγχάνει κατὰ σάρκα ὁ Χριστός, μὴ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένος· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει ὃν ἀλλ' ἐκ μόνης τῆς Μαρίας, οὐκ ἄν εἴη ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν Μαρίαν οὐδεὶς λόγος ἀποδείκνυσιν ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ γενομένην, μάτην ἅρα τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ θρυλλοῦσι, μήτε τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ὄντα υἱόν, μήτε τῆς Μαρίας ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ γενεαλογούμενης.

τοιαῦτα μέν τινα τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ἡπορημένων περιεῖχε· λύσις δ' ἄν εἴη αὐτῷ ἥδε.

2 [1] Τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πράξεων, τὰ μὲν σιωπᾶσθαι ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῖς τότε, τὰ δὲ εἰς πολλῶν ἀκοὰς διεδίδοτο, ὅσα πρὸς ὡφέλειαν ἤμελλε συμβάλλεσθαι τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις. οἷον ὡς ἐπὶ παραδείγματος, τριακοστὸν ἄγων τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἡλικίας ἔτος,<sup>2</sup>

1. Cf. Matt 1.1–25; Luke 1.26–38; 3.23–38.

2. Cf. Luke 3.23.

**GOSPEL PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS,  
TO STEPHANUS; AN ABRIDGED  
SELECTION FROM EUSEBIUS' WORK**

**TO STEPHANUS 1**

Why do the evangelists trace Joseph's descent, not Mary's?

1. "How can they trace Christ's ancestry as 'a son of David'? It must be because of Joseph's descent from David. Yet Christ was not the son of Joseph, but of the Holy Spirit and Mary, as the scripture says; so, if they wanted to trace the descent of Christ, it was Mary's descent they should have traced, not Joseph's. Christ was not in fact fathered by Joseph, and has no physical connection with him; and if he is not actually Joseph's son, but only Mary's, he would not be descended from David, as there is no account showing David as Mary's ancestor. So, given that Christ is not Joseph's son and that Mary has no genealogical connection with David, to talk about him as 'from the seed of David' is simply futile."

That is the sort of thing that presented the first of our problems. Its solution would be as follows.

2. [1] There were some of our Saviour Jesus Christ's actions about which his contemporaries had to say nothing, and others—those that would tend to the hearers' benefit—which were disseminated for numbers

πάρεισιν ἐπὶ τὸ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ βάπτισμα.<sup>3</sup> καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀπάρχεται τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ τῶν τεραστίων ἔργων, τίνα δὲ τὰ πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐντὸς ὅλων ἐτῶν τριάκοντα πραχθέντα αὐτῷ οὐδεμίᾳ ἴστορίᾳ δηλοῖ, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἀπό τινος θείας γραφῆς τὸν πρὸ τούτου καταμαθεῖν αὐτοῦ βίον. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔξ οὗπερ εἰς πάντας ἐγγνώσθη, τὰ μὲν εἰς ἀκοὰς πάντων ἐκήρυττε τὰ δὲ μόνους τοὺς αὐτοῦ μαθητὰς ἐμυσταγώγει.<sup>4</sup> καὶ ποτὲ μὲν παραδοξοποιῶν παρήνει μηδενὶ λέγειν,<sup>5</sup> ποτὲ δὲ ἄνευ τῆς τοιᾶσδε παραινέσεως τὰ θαυμάσια κατειργάζετο.<sup>6</sup> "Ἐν δὴ οὖν μάλιστα τῶν σεσιγῆσθαι δεδογμένων, τὸ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ θαῦμα ἦν· οὐδενὸς τῶν καθ' ὅν ἐνηνθρώπησε χρόνον, ὀλίγων ἐκτός, τούτου γνῶσιν κεκτημένου.

**3 [2]** Φησὶ δέ που ὁ ἀγιος ἀνήρ, Ἰγνάτιος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, τῆς Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίας δεύτερος γεγονώς μετὰ τοὺς ἀπόστολους ἐπίσκοπος, ὡς ἄρα καὶ τὸν ἀρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔλαθεν ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἔξ αὐτῆς γένεσις· λέγει δὲ οὕτως· καὶ ἔλαθε τὸν ἀρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας, καὶ ὁ τοκετὸς αὐτῆς ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς, ἀτινα ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ Θεοῦ ἐπράχθη." Εστι δὲ καὶ λογισμῷ λαβεῖν ὅτι μὴ πάντων ἦν τῶν ἐν σαρκὶ βιούντων, τὸν Χριστὸν Θεοῦ καὶ σὺν ἀνθρώποις ἀναστραφέντα οἴα κοινὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄρώντων, τὸ δύνασθαι πιστεύειν ἔξ ἀπειρογάμου κόρης αὐτὸν δίχα πατρὸς γεγονέναι.

**4** Οὐδὲ εἰς πολλοὺς ἐκφέρειν ὅτι μὴ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἡ Μαρία συλλαβοῦσα τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐγέννα λυσιτελὲς ἦν· ἢ γὰρ ἄν καὶ δίκην κατὰ τὸν Μωυσέως νόμον ἡ παρθένος ὑπέσχεν ὡς πρὸ ὥρας γάμου διαφθαρεῖσα τὴν παρθενίαν.<sup>7</sup> διόπερ εἰκότως ἐπισημαίνεται ἀκριβῶς φήσασα ἡ γραφή, πρὶν ἡ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.<sup>8</sup> μονονουχὶ διδάσκουσα ὅτι μὴ πρὸ γάμου συνείληφε· μὴ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ παρὰ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐλθεῖν· μετὰ δὲ τὸ συναφθῆναι τὸν Ἰωσὴφ καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ γενέσθαι, παρὰ πᾶσι τε γυναικα αὐτοῦ χρηματίσαι, συνόντων ἀλλήλοις, καὶ τῆς γαμικῆς ὄμιλίας ἀπεσθαι ἥδη γοῦν μελλόντων αὐτῆς ὡς εἰπεῖν ὥρας πρὶν ἡ συνελθεῖν

3. Cf. Matt 3.13–17; Mark 1.9–13; Luke 3.21–22.

4. Cf. Matt 13.10–17, 34; Mark 4.10–12, 34; Luke 8.9–10.

5. Cf. Matt 8.4; 9.30; 17.9; Mark 1.44; 5.43; 7.24; 8.26; 9.9; Luke 4.41; 5.14; 8.56.

6. Cf. Matt 8.5–17; 9.2–8, 18–26, 32–34; 12.10–13; 14.14–36; 15.22–38; 17.14–18.

7. Cf. Deut 22.20–21.

8. Matt 1.18.

of people to hear. So, to take an example, it is in the thirtieth year of his bodily life that he presents himself for John's baptism; and it is from that time that his teaching and miracles begin. No account reveals what he did during all those thirty years before the baptism, nor is it possible from any holy scripture to discover his previous life. Even after his public recognition, there were some things that he proclaimed for everyone to hear, and others that he treated as secrets, for his disciples alone; and in performing his miracles he sometimes gave orders not to tell anyone, but sometimes did his marvellous acts without any such prohibition. The miracle of his birth, then, was just one particular example of the matters he had decided not to divulge, and, with few exceptions, no-one at the time of his incarnate life gained any knowledge of it.

3. [2] The holy man named Ignatius, who became the next bishop of Antioch after the apostles, says somewhere that in fact even the ruler of this world did not know of Mary's virginity and the Saviour's birth from her. His words are: "And the ruler of this world did not know of Mary's virginity, or of her giving birth, or, similarly, of Christ's death—three resounding miracles, which were accomplished in the stillness of God".<sup>1</sup> It stands to reason that not all those living in the flesh, who saw God's Christ living a life among mankind as an ordinary person, were capable of believing that he was born without a father, of an unmarried girl.

4. Nor was it profitable to reveal publicly that Jesus' conception and birth from Mary were not Joseph's doing, because surely the Virgin would then have actually undergone prosecution, under the law of Moses, for losing her virginity prior to her wedding. That is why the Scripture rightly indicates, with precision, that "before they came together, she was found to be pregnant." This tells us, more or less explicitly, that her conception was not prenuptial, or prior to her moving in with her husband, but took place after she had married Joseph, moved in with him, and been publicly recognised as his wife. It was when they were together, just about to have conjugal intercourse, that at the very moment "before they came together, she was found to be pregnant by the Holy Spirit". Now that was a wholly practical dispensation to avoid its becoming generally known.

---

1. Ignatius of Antioch, *Ephesians* 19.1.\*

αὐτούς, εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἀγίου.<sup>9</sup> Καὶ τοῦτό γε παγχρησίμως εἰς τὸ λαθεῖν τοὺς πολλοὺς φέρει.

**5** Εἰ γὰρ δὴ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτῆς γονεῦσιν οὗσαν ἔτι συνέβη κατὰ γαστρὸς λαβεῖν, κανὸν εἰκὸς ἦν βοηθῆναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ὅτι μὴ ἐκ προδήλου ἀνδρὸς ἐκυοφορήθη, θάττον δ’ ἄν καὶ ἀνήρητο κατὰ τὸν νόμον.<sup>10</sup> ἦν εἰ μὴ τοῦτο, αἰσχρᾶς δ’ οὐν οὐκ ἂν ἡλευθέρωτο ὑβρεως.<sup>11</sup> οὐ γὰρ δήπου μάρτυς αὐτῇ ἑαυτῆς καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτῇ πεπραγμένων ἀξιόπιστος ἦν· οὐδὲ ἂν ἐπείσθη τις ἡ ἀγγέλου ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ τὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἰρημένα πρὸς τοῦ Γαβριὴλ αὐτῇ διηγουμένη· οὐδὲ ἂν κύουσαν ἥδη προσήκατο εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον Ἰωσήφ, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος εἶναι μεμαρτυρημένος· διόπερ εἰκότως οὐ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτῆς γονεῦσιν, ἀλλ’ ἥδη παρ’ αὐτῷ γενομένη ἐγκύμων σὺν αὐτῷ γενομένη, παρ’ αὐτὴν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὴν τοῦ γάμου τάξιν· πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, ὡς ἡ γραφὴ μαρτυρεῖ, εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.<sup>12</sup>

**6 [3]** Τίνι δ’ ἄρα εὑρέθη, ἀλλ’ ἡ τῷ Ἰωσήφ; Πῶς δὲ καὶ τίνα τρόπον εὕρηται τοῦτο τῷ Ἰωσήφ, ὁ λόγος διδάξει, φὰς ἐκ πνεύματος ἀγίου γνωστὸν γέγονεν, οὕτω καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ,<sup>13</sup> δίκαιος γὰρ ἦν· δίκαιος δὲ τυγχάνων, οὐ θαυμαστὸν εὶς καὶ θείου πνεύματος ἡξίωτο πρὸς τὸ συνεῖναι μὲν τὴν τῆς μελλούσης γαμετῆς κύησιν, ἐπισχεῖν δὲ τὴν κατὰ ἄνδρα κοινωνίαν. Αὐτίκα συνεῖς καὶ καταπλαγεὶς ἐβούληθη λάθρα ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν,<sup>14</sup> μείζονα ἡ κατὰ τὴν σὺν αὐτῷ διατριβὴν τὰ πεπραγμένα εἶναι λογισάμενος· καὶ τοῦτο ἄρα ἦν τὸ αἴτιον, διὸ δίκαιος ὅν, οὐκ ἔκρινε μὲν δίκαιοιν εἶναι δειγματίσαι αὐτήν, ἐβούληθη δὲ λάθρα ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν.<sup>15</sup> καὶ μὴν εὶς μὴ ἔξ ἀγίου πνεύματος πέπειστο αὐτὴν συνειληφέναι, ἀκριβῶς εἰδὼς ὅτι μὴ δὲ ἔξ αὐτοῦ τὸ κατὰ γαστρὸς ἔφερε, τί δῆτα δίκαιος ὅν ὁ ἀνὴρ οὐκ εἰς πάντας ἔξαγων τὴν διαφθαρεῖσαν πρὸ γάμου τὴν ὥραν τοῖς

9. Matt 1.18.

10. Cf. Deut 22.23–24.

11. Cf. Deut 22.25–26.

12. Matt 1.18.

13. Cf. Matt 1.19–21.

14. Matt 1.19.

15. Matt 1.19.

5. If her pregnancy had occurred while she was still with her parents, it would quite probably have been bruited about that she had been impregnated by some unknown man, and she would even have been summarily put to death under the law—or, short of that, she would in any case never have been free from disgrace and slander. As her own witness to her character, and to what had happened to her, she would obviously have carried no conviction. If she told them about the angel's appearance and Gabriel's message to her, no-one would have been convinced; nor, if she had already been pregnant, would Joseph, who, we are told, was “an upright man”, ever have taken her into his house. That is why, with good reason, she became pregnant at the time when she was in his house with him, virtually in the married state itself, and not with her parents; it was “before they came together,” as the scripture testifies, that “she was found to be pregnant”.

6. [3] And who was it but Joseph who found her so? How it came about, and in what way Joseph discovered it, the account will tell us, in the words “by the Holy Spirit”;<sup>2</sup> that is also how it became known to Joseph. He was an upright man, and, as such, it is no wonder that he was also found worthy of the Divine Spirit, both to understand about the pregnancy of the woman who was going to be his wife, and to refrain from conjugal intimacy with her. For the moment he was shaken by this knowledge, and “wanted to divorce her privately”, reckoning that what had happened was too significant for her to live with him. That, then, was why, as an upright man, he did not judge it right to expose her, but instead wanted to divorce

2. Professor Stuart Hall has pointed out a difficulty in the Greek text here. He suggests solving it by emending εύρηται to εύρεθη, καὶ... and repunctuating, to give the sense “How and why [she was made pregnant], this was also made known to Joseph. The account...”—thus making the words “by the Holy Spirit” refer to the pregnancy, not to the making known to Joseph. As the next sentence (as well as “Joseph realised, through the Holy Spirit”, below) implies that the Holy Spirit was also responsible for the making known to Joseph, I would prefer a smaller emendation, differently repunctuated, “...άγιου. γνωστὸν <δὲ> γέγονεν...”, which is the reading represented in the translation. The fragment from Possinus’ catena, Fr.St.13, confirms that Eusebius explicitly stated that the Holy Spirit was also responsible for Joseph’s knowing about the pregnancy; and another fragment (Cramer’s *Catena on Matthew* p.10, Fr.St.21) conclusively retains a part of the sentence that was omitted in this abridgement: ὡς γὰρ τῇ Ἐλισάβετ ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἅγιου γνωστὸν γέγονε, οὕτω καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ. (“just as it became known to Elisabeth by the Holy Spirit, that is how it became known to Joseph, also”).

τὰ τοιαῦτα κρίνειν παρεδίδουν δράσασαν δειγματίσαι;<sup>16</sup> Πῶς δὲ δίκαιος ὁ τὴν παράνομον πρᾶξιν ἐπισκιάζειν καὶ ἐπικρύπτειν προθυμούμενος;<sup>17</sup> Ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰκὸς τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν δίκαιον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τούτοις φάναι· ἀλλὰ γάρ συναισθόμενον διὰ ἀγίου πνεύματος τὴν θειοτέραν τῆς παρθένου γεγονέναι κύησιν, καὶ κρείττονα τῆς σὺν αὐτῷ διατριβῆς ἡγησάμενον εἶναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν, εἰκότως φησὶν αὐτὸν διανενοήσθαι λάθρα ἀπολῆσαι αὐτὴν<sup>18</sup> μὴ δειγματισθεῖσαν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, μὴ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς φανερὰν γενομένην· εὖ γ’ οὖν καὶ τὸ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι<sup>19</sup> εἰρῆσθαι δοκεῖ ὑπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ· οὐ γάρ ἔφησε μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν παραδειγματίσαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ δειγματίσαι θέλων· πολλῆς οὕστης ἐν τούτοις διαφορᾶς· ὡς γὰρ οὐ ταυτὸν σημαίνει τὸ γράψαι καὶ παραγράψαι, καὶ τὸ λογίσασθαι καὶ παραλογίσασθαι, καὶ ψηφίσαι καὶ παραψηφίσαι· οὕτως οὐδὲ τὸ δειγματίσαι καὶ παραδειγματίσαι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ παραδειγματίσαι, τὴν ἐπὶ κακῶς πράξαντι εἰς πάντας φανέρωσίν τε καὶ διαβολὴν ὑποβάλλει νοεῖν· τὸ δὲ δειγματίσαι, τὸ φανερὸν ἀπλῶς ποιῆσαι.

7 [4] Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τούτου γενομένου εὶ καὶ λάθρα αὐτὴν ἀπολελύκει, μεῖζον ἦν τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἢ κατὰ τὸ λαθεῖν τοὺς πολλούς, εἰκότως ἐπιστὰς ὅναρ ὁ ἄγγελος ἔφη τῷ Ἰωσήφ· Ἰωσήφ Ἰωσήφ νιὸς Δαβὶδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς

---

16. Cf. Deut 22.20–21.

17. Cf. Lev 5.1.

18. Matt 1.19.

19. Matt 1.19.

her privately. Surely, if he had not been convinced that her conception was by the Holy Spirit, why ever would he not, as an upright man, and knowing for certain that her conception was not by him, have brought her out before everyone as a woman who had lost her virginity before marriage? Would he not have handed her over to the usual judges of such cases,<sup>3</sup> for them to expose her as having done that? How could anyone eager to disguise illegal conduct, and keep it under cover, be called “upright”? No, it is implausible that the evangelist could have called him “upright” in such circumstances. In fact, though, Joseph realised, through the Holy Spirit, that the Virgin’s pregnancy was of divine rather than human origin. He regarded this dispensation as being a matter of too great significance to allow her to live with him, and so the evangelist says that his understandable intention was to divorce her privately, without exposing her or letting her be exposed to public view. The evangelist’s use of the words “not wishing to expose her” seems appropriate: he did not say “not wishing to make an example of her (*paradeigmatisai*)”, but “not wishing to expose her (*deigmatisai*<sup>4</sup>)”, and there is a considerable difference between them, just as *grapsai* (to write) does not mean the same thing as *paragrapsci* (to write in addition, to subjoin, to interpolate), or *logisasthai* (to reckon) as *paralogisasthai* (to reckon falsely or deceptively), or *psephisasthai* (to vote) as *parapsephisasthai* (to cheat). *Deigmatisai* and *paradeigmatisai* have that same sort of distinction: *paradeigmatisai* is pejorative, implying “to make a public example of a wrongdoer”, whereas *deigmatisai* is simply “to expose”.<sup>5</sup>

7. [4] In this situation, it would have been too significant a matter to escape public notice even if he had divorced her privately. That is why it is understandable for the angel to appear to Joseph in a dream and say:

3. There appears to be something such as ειωθόσιν (“accustomed to”) missing from the text here for τοῖς to agree with and to govern the infinitive κρινεῖν, but the overall sense is clear.

4. This is early evidence for the reading δειγματίσαι in the text of Matt 1.19. That is found in the Vatican MS but in so few others that it is ignored by Souter, who follows the received text παραδειγματίσαι, the reading that gave rise to the Authorised Version’s “not wishing to make an example of her”. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English-Lexicon*, accepts δειγματίσαι as the true reading.

5. This distinction is untenable: both δεῖγμα and παράδειγμα are used to mean “example”, and their associated verbs cannot be separated—hence their interchangeability in the manuscript tradition of Matthew—despite the admittedly pejorative sense of the prefix παρά- in some other compounds.

παραλαβεῖν Μαριὰμ τὴν γυναικά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγίου.<sup>20</sup> καὶ θέα γε ὡς πρῶτον υἱὸν Δαβὶδ ἀνακαλεῖ, ἀναπέμπων ἐπὶ τὸν προπάτορα, διὰ τὸν ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ τοῖς πᾶσι προσδοκώμενον· ἐπεὶ διὰ τί μὴ υἱὸν αὐτὸν ἔφησεν Ἰακὼβ; Οὗτος γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῦ κατὰ σάρκα πατήρ ὡς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ εὐαγγελιστής· Ματθὰν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακὼβ· Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσῆφ<sup>21</sup> νῦν δὲ παρεὶς τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν μνήμην, τοῦ προπάτορος ὑπομνήσκει· μονονουχὶ σημαίνων ὡς ἄρα ὁ ἐπηγγελμένος τῷ Δαβὶδ, οὗτος ἦν ὁ παραδόξως ὁ μὴ ἔξ αὐτοῦ, ἐκ πνεύματος δὲ ἀγίου ὑπὸ τῆς Μαρίας κυούμενος· ἔπειτα δὲ αὐτῷ θαρσεῖν παρακελεύεται δι’ ὃν εἶχεν φόβον· οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν γὰρ φόβος ἦν αὐτῷ συναισθομένῳ μὴ ἔξ ἀνδρὸς κεκυηκέναι τὴν Μαρίαν· κἀπειτα αὐτὸν διδάσκει οὐχ ὁ μὴ ἥγνόει, ἀλλὰ τοῦ καὶ πρότερον γιγνωσκομένου τὴν αἰτίαν· λέγει δ’ οὖν· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν, ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγίου.<sup>22</sup>

8 [5] Τοιαύτη τις καὶ τοσαύτη γενέσθαι οἰκονομία ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαθεῖν τὴν τῆς παρθένου κύησιν τοὺς ἀπίστους ἐκ τῆς θείας ὑποφαίνεται μοι γραφῆς· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἄν ἐπιστεύθη ῥᾳδίως ὁ λόγος παρὰ τοῖς τοῦτο ἀκούουσιν, ἄνδρα τε αὐτὸν ἡμῖν ὁμοιοπαθῆ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ κατ’ οὐδὲν τὴν θνητὴν φύσιν παραλλάττοντα θεωμένοις· τί γὰρ εἴ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα παραδοξοποιῶν καὶ τὰς ἐνθέους εὐεργεσίας εἰς πολλοὺς ἐκτείνων ἔξεπληττε τοὺς ὄρῶντας; Οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ Μωσῆς πολλὰ θαυματουργήσας, τῆς κοινῆς ὅμως γενέσεως οὐκ ἡμοίρει; Ἡλίας τε καὶ Ἐλισσαῖος, καὶ ὁ καθεῖς τῶν προφητῶν; Οὐδὲν οὖν πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἔξ ἀνδρὸς νομίζεσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἡ τῶν τεραστίων ἔργων ἐπίδειξις αὐτῷ συνεβάλλετο· αὐτίκα οἱ κατ’ αὐτὸν οὐδ’ ἄλλο τι περὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ φανταζόμενοι καίπερ τὰ δρώμενα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ὄρῶντες, ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· πόθεν τούτῳ πᾶσα ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις; Οὐχ οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος νιός; Οὐχὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαρία; Καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσῆφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας; Καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς;<sup>23</sup> Καὶ ἄλλοτε πάλιν τῆς μητρὸς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐστώτων ἔξω καὶ ζητούντων λαλῆσαι αὐτῷ, εἶπε τις αὐτῷ· ίδού ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκασιν ἔξω ιδεῖν σε θέλοντες.<sup>24</sup> Καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν ὅτε καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἀπόστολοι ἐρωτηθέντες τίνα με, φησίν, οἱ ἀνθρωποι λέγουσιν; Ἀπεκρίναντο, ὡς ἄρα οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην αὐτὸν εἶναι ἥγούνται, οἱ δὲ Ἡλίαν, οἱ

20. Matt 1.20.

21. Matt 1.15–16.

22. Matt 1.20.

23. Matt 13.54–56.

24. Matt 12.46–47; cf. Luke 8.19–20.

"Joseph, Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to accept your wife Mary. What is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit". Now, observe that he begins by calling Joseph "son of David", linking him back to his ancestor, because it was the one "from David's seed" that everyone was expecting. After all, why did he not address him as "son of Jacob"? It was Jacob who was physically Joseph's father, as the evangelist tells us: "Matthan was Jacob's father, and Jacob was Joseph's father". As it is, omitting any mention of his father, the angel reminds him of his ancestor, more or less explicitly indicating that the one proclaimed as David's descendant was in fact, surprisingly, the One conceived by Mary, not from him but from the Holy Spirit. Next, because of Joseph's misgivings, the angel tells him to have no hesitation; misgivings he certainly did have, and no slight ones, when he realised that Mary was not pregnant by a man. What the angel then tells him is not the fact (of which he was not unaware, having found it out previously), but the reason behind it. That is why his words are: "That which is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit".

8. [5] Such, as I find it emerges from the Holy Scripture, and so great, was the dispensation made to ensure that those without faith should not know about the Virgin's pregnancy. After all, the story would not have been easy for hearers to believe, when they could see that the man himself was physically like us, had the same feelings as ours, and differed in no way from mortal nature. What if he did, later, astound onlookers by his wonder-working, and by extending his acts of divine goodness to many people? Did not Moses, too, perform many miracles, without putting himself outside the normal birth-process? And Elijah, and Elisha, and every one of the prophets? So in Jesus' case, too, his performance of miraculous acts gave no ground for belief that his birth was superhuman. For one thing, his own circle, despite seeing what he was doing, had no inkling of anything at all exceptional about his birth when they said to each other: "Where does all this wisdom of his come from, and his acts of power? Isn't this the carpenter's son? Isn't his mother called Mary, and his brothers Jacob, Joseph, Simon, and Jude? Aren't his sisters all with us?" Then, again, there was the time when his mother and brothers were standing outside, asking to talk to him, and someone said to him: "Look, your mother and your brothers are standing outside; they want to see you". What wonder is it that, when even his disciples and apostles were asked: "Who do people say that I am?", they replied that as a matter of fact some thought he was John, others Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the other prophets; and when

δὲ Ἱερεμίαν, οἱ δὲ ἔτερόν τινα τῶν προφητῶν<sup>25</sup> ἐρωτώμενοι δὲ τίνα ποτὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ δόξαν ἔχουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ, οἱ πάντες ἀπεσιώπησαν ὡς οὐκ ἔχοντες εἰπεῖν· μόνου δὲ Πέτρου φήσαντος ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸς εἶη ὁ Χριστός, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος,<sup>26</sup> ἅτε μόνῳ αὐτῷ τούτῳ γνωσθέντι ἐπιφέρει λέγων· μακάριος εἶ Σίμων βάπτα Ιάνα, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψε σοι, ἀλλ’ ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.<sup>27</sup> Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ Μαρία βαθεῖ λογισμῷ παρ’ ἑαυτῇ κατέχειν τὰ γεγενημένα· φησὶ γοῦν ἡ γραφή· ἡ δὲ Μαρία πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ρήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς.<sup>28</sup>

**9 [6]** Οὐκοῦν ἀποδέδεικται ὅτι χρησίμως κατ’ ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ, ἡ μὲν ἐξ ἀγίου πνεύματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γένεσις παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀπεσιωπάτο, ὁ δὲ Ἰωσὴφ ἐν χώρᾳ πατρὸς παρελαμβάνετο· εἰκότως οὖν ὡς πατὴρ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐγενεαλογεῖτο· εἰ δὲ οὖν μὴ τοῦτο ἐγεγόνει, ἀπάτωρ ἂν ἐνομίσθη ὁ παῖς μὴ ἐκ πατρὸς γενεαλογούμενος· τοῦτο δὲ εἰς ἀσέβειαν ἥγαγεν ἀν τοὺς πολλούς, εἰ δι’ ἄγνοιαν τῆς περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀληθείας ἐδυσφήμουν τὴν γένεσιν· χρησίμως οὖν καὶ τοῦ τέκτονος τέκνον καὶ τῶν ὀνομασμένων τέκνων ἀδελφὸς ἐχρημάτιζεν.<sup>29</sup> ἐπεὶ καὶ Θεὸς λόγος ὡν, οὐκ ἀπηρνεῖτο ἑαυτὸν εἶναι ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλὰ καὶ παρήγγελλε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶη ὁ πάλαι πρὸς τῶν προφητῶν ἤξειν βοώμενος ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.<sup>30</sup> οὐ γάρ ἂν οὐδὲ ἐπίστευσαν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν τότε θεωμένων αὐτὸν εὐτελὲς σχῆμα περιβεβλημένον· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ ὅρει μεταμορφώσεως ἐνετείλατο πάλιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς λέγων· μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα, ἔως οὗ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ<sup>31</sup> εἰκὸς γάρ μὴ δὲ τοῦτο πιστεῦσαι τῶν τότε τοὺς πολλούς· εἰ δὲ ταῦτα μὴ εἰς φανερὸν ἤκειν ἔκρινεν ἢ πού γε τὰ τῆς ἐκ παρθένου γενέσεως ἀποιωπάσθαι τὸ τηνικαῦτα παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχρῆν, εἰς ἐπιτήδειον καιρὸν τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀληθείας ἀναφανησόμενα· οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναλήψεως, τῆς τε εἰς πάντα τὸν κόσμον ὡς ἀν περὶ λόγου Θεοῦ διαδραμούσης περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμης· ὅ τε τῆς τῶν ἐθνῶν κλήσεως, καθ’ ὃν καὶ αἱ θεῖαι αὐτοῦ φωναὶ

25. Matt 16.13–14; cf. Mark 8.27–28; Luke 9.18–19.

26. Matt 16.16.

27. Matt 16.17.

28. Luke 2.19.

29. Cf. Matt 13.55.

30. Cf. Matt 16.20.

31. Matt 17.9.

they were asked what their own idea of him could be, they all stopped talking, as having no answer; it was only Peter who said that he was actually the Christ, the Son of the living God. He was the only one to have recognised that, and that is why Jesus confers on him the accolade: "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, because it was not flesh and blood that revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven". Mary, too, provides evidence that she kept to herself what had happened, in profound reflection: in the scripture's words, "Mary preserved all these matters, storing them up in her heart."

**9.** [6] Thus it has been shown to be advantageous that at that point in time there was no public mention of Jesus' origin from the Holy Spirit, and that Joseph was accepted in the position of his father. It was, therefore, logical for him to be put as his father in the genealogy. Had that not been done, the boy, with no paternal descent given, would have been believed to be fatherless; and that would have led people in general into the impiety of slandering his birth, through not knowing the truth of the matter. Hence it was also advantageous for him to be known as the carpenter's son, and the brother of the children whose names have been given. Divine Word though he was, he did not deny that he was human. In fact he even told his own disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ of God, long ago proclaimed by the prophets as to come; most people, seeing the lowly appearance in which he was cloaked, would simply not have believed that. Similarly, on the mount of the transfiguration as well, he again commanded his disciples: "Tell no-one what you have seen until the Son of man rises from the dead"; naturally that too would have been generally disbelieved at the time. If those were matters that he judged should not come into the open, it was surely necessary for the circumstances of his virginal conception, above all, not to be spoken of publicly for the time being, but to come into view at a moment appropriate for the truth about him; and that was at his resurrection from the dead, his reception into heaven, the spreading of the report about him as the Word of God into all

τέλος ἐλάμβανον, τὰ τῶν προγνώσεων αὐτοῦ καὶ προρρήσεων διὰ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκβάσεως ἐναργῶς πιστούμεναι.<sup>32</sup>

**10 [7]** Τοῖς γοῦν καθ' ἡμᾶς ταῦτα παραδεξαμένοις καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ φύσιν ἐπεγνωκόσιν, εἰκότως τὰ τε λοιπὰ καὶ τὰ τῆς γενέσεως πιστὰ εἶναι ὅμοιογεῖται· πλὴν ἀλλ' οἱ θαυμάσιοι εὐαγγελισταὶ ἀναγκαίως τότε παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἐγενεαλόγουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν παρὰ πᾶσι βιώμενον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πατέρᾳ· εἰ γάρ τοῦτο παρελθόντες μητρόθεν αὐτὸν ἐγενεαλόγουν, πρὸς τῷ καὶ ἀπρεπές εἶναι τοῦτο, καὶ τῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν εὐηθείας ἀλλότριον, διτὶ μηδεὶς τὸ πρότερον ἐκ γυναικὸς γενεαλογηθεὶς ἴστορεῖται,<sup>33</sup> ἔδοξεν ἂν ἀπάτωρ τις εἶναι καὶ δυσγενής ὁ γενεαλογούμενος· τοῦτο δέ, ὡς ἔφην, οὐ μικρᾶς ἦν δυσφημίας ὅμοιος καὶ κατηγορίας· διὸ χρησίμως τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ διὰ τὴν ἀποδοθεῖσαν αἵτιαν γενεαλογοῦντες,

ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ τὴν Μαριὰμ ἐκ Δαβὶδ γεγονέναι συνίστων, διὰ τοῦ μηνηστῆρος τὸ τῆς γαμετῆς ὑποφάινοντες γένος· νόμου γάρ Μωσέως διαγορεύοντος μὴ ἄλλοθεν ἔξεῖναι πρὸς γάμον λαμβάνειν, ἥ ἐκ τοῦ γένους τοῦ οἰκείου καὶ τῆς ἰδίας φυλῆς, ὡς ἂν μὴ περιστρέφοιτο τοῦ γένους ὁ κλῆρος ἀπὸ φυλῆς εἰς φυλῆν.<sup>34</sup> αὐτάρκης ἦν ἡ περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναγραφή, καὶ τὴν γυναικα δηλῶσαι· νομικῶς γάρ βιοὺς οὐδὲ’ ἄλλοθεν ἐμνᾶτο τὴν γυναικα, ἥ πρῶτα μὲν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς πατρικῆς αὐτοῦ, αὕτη δὲ ἦν ἡ τοῦ Ἰούδα· ἔπειτα ἐκ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πατριᾶς, αὕτη δὲ ἦν ἡ τοῦ Δαβὶδ· τοιαῦτα γάρ ἦν τὰ τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλματα· ὅτε τοίνυν ὁ Ἰωσὴφ φυλῆς γεγονὼς ἀποδείκνυται Ἰούδα, κλήρου τε καὶ πατριᾶς Δαβὶδ, πῶς οὐχ ἔπειται καὶ τῇ Μαρίᾳ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν ὄρασθαι;

**11 [8]** Εἰ δὲ λέγοιτο ὑπάρχειν συγγενῆς τῆς Ἐλισάβετ,<sup>35</sup> αὐτὴν μὲν οὖσαν ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, τῆς τε Ἐλισάβετ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Λευί, μὴ θαυμάσῃς· πᾶν γάρ τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἐνὸς ἦν γένους, αἱ τε φυλαὶ πᾶσαι ἀλλήλων συγγενεῖς· ἔνθεν καὶ ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ πάντας ὄνομάζει Ἰουδαίους, λέγων· ηὐχόμην γάρ ἀνάθημα εἶναι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μουν τῶν συγγενῶν μουν κατὰ σάρκα οἴτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται.<sup>36</sup> καίτοι συγγενεῖς

32. Cf. Isa 7.14 LXX.

33. Cf. 1 Chr 1-8, etc.

34. Cf. Num 36.6-9.

35. Cf. Luke 1.36.

36. Rom 9.3-4.

the world, and the calling of the Gentiles. That was when the divine voices about him were to find their fulfilment, plainly establishing the credibility of the foreknowledge and prophecies of him through their coming true in reality.

**10.** [7] Those in our own day to whom this information has come down, and who have recognised Christ's superhuman nature, naturally acknowledge also the credibility of the rest, including the facts of his birth. However, the admirable evangelists had no choice at the time, in the Jewish context, but to give the descent of Joseph, who was universally proclaimed as Jesus' father. If they had omitted that, and traced his descent through the maternal line instead, it would have been unbecoming, and alien to the simplicity of the holy scriptures; there is no recorded precedent for anyone having his genealogy traced through the maternal line. What is more, it would have made the subject of that genealogy appear to have been a fatherless person, of discreditable birth; and that, as I have said, would have led to a great deal of adverse comment and condemnation. Therefore, for the reason stated, it was advantageous for them to give Joseph's descent from David.

In doing so, they were also establishing Mary's descent from David, giving an indication of the bride's ancestry by means of the bridegroom's. This is because the law of Moses lays down that one may not take a bride from any other than one's own tribe and specific kinship-group, in order to avoid one tribe's inheritance shifting to another. Thus the husband's family registration sufficed to show the wife's as well, as a law-abiding man would not have taken a wife from any other group than, firstly, his own paternal tribe, which in this case was Judah, and, secondly, from the same people and kinship-group, which in this case was that of David—those being the law's provisions. Therefore, when Joseph is shown to be a member of the tribe of Judah and the inheritance and kinship-group of David, of course it follows that Mary must be seen as from the same ones as well!

**11.** [8] Do not be surprised, however, at Mary's being called a kinswoman of Elizabeth's, when Mary is a member of the tribe of Judah, while Elizabeth is a Levite. The explanation is that the Jewish race as a whole shares a single descent, and all the tribes are interrelated. Hence the divine apostle calls all Jews his kinsmen ("For the sake of my brothers,

αύτοῦ ἐτύγχανον μόνοι οἱ ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίν,<sup>37</sup> οὐκοῦν πάντας ἀπλῶς τοὺς ἔξ Ισραὴλ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ συγγενεῖς ἑαυτοῦ προσεῖπεν ὁ Παῦλος· οὕτω δ' οὖν καὶ τὴν Ἐλισάβετ συγγενίδα προσεῖπεν ὁ ἄγγελος τῇ Μαριάμ,<sup>38</sup> διὰ τὸ ἄμφω Ἰσραηλίτιδας εἶναι·

καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰκὸς ἀπὸ τόπου συγγενίδα τῆς Μαρίας κεκλήσθαι τὴν Ἐλισάβετ, διὰ τὸ οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰούδα φυλῆς ἀφ' ἣς ὥρματο ἡ Μαρία· μαρτυρεῖ γοῦν ὁ Λουκᾶς λέγων· ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὴν ὁρεινὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου, καὶ ἡσπάσατο τὴν Ἐλισάβετ.<sup>39</sup> τοῦ γάρ Μωσέως νόμου μὴ ἀφορίσαντος τῇ τῶν ιερέων φυλῇ κλῆρον, ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεὸς μερὶς αὐτῶν, διαταξαμένου δὲ μεταξὺ τῶν λοιπῶν φυλῶν οἰκεῖν αὐτούς,<sup>40</sup> τοῦ τε Ζαχαρίου καὶ τῆς Ἐλισάβετ πόλιν φυλῆς Ἰούδα κατοικησάντων,<sup>41</sup> ἀφ' ἣς ὥρματο Μαρία, εἰκὸς καὶ ταύτης ἔνεκεν τῆς αἰτίας συγγενεῖς αὐτὰς ἀνειρῆσθαι.

οὐκ ἀπεικός δὲ καὶ τῆς ὁμοιοτροπίας χάριν, δι' ἣς ἄμφω τῆς σωτηρίου οἰκονομίας ἤξιώθησαν, ἡ μὲν τὸν σωτῆρα, ἡ δὲ τὸν πρόδρομον τοῦ σωτῆρος ὑποδεξάμεναι· ἐνός τε καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος μετασχοῦσαι· διὸ καὶ μάλιστα μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν συγγενείας μετεῖχον.

**12 [9]** Εἰ δὲ κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς<sup>42</sup> τυγχάνει ὁ ὄντας ἀνὴρ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον ἀπόστολον, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν<sup>43</sup> κατὰ τὸν Μωσέως νόμον, ἡ τε μεμνηστευμένη ἀνδρὶ διαμαρτοῦσα μοιχείας κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τιμωρίαν ὑπομένει,<sup>44</sup> ὡς ἥδη τοῦ μνηστῆρος σῶμα γενομένη καὶ κεφαλὴν ἐπιγραψαμένη τὸν ἀνδρα·<sup>45</sup> πῶς οὐχὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς γενεαλογουμένης, ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῇ κεφαλῇ συναριθμεῖσθαι; Ωστε καὶ τὴν Μαρίαν ἥδη συνημμένην τῷ Ἰωσήφ, εἰκότως συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς γενεαλογίας

37. Cf. Phil 3.5.

38. Cf. Luke 1.36.

39. Luke 1.39–40.

40. Cf. Num 35.1–8; Josh 21.1–42, etc.

41. Cf. Luke 1.39.

42. Eph 5.23; cf. 1 Cor 11.3.

43. Gen 2.24; cf. 1 Cor 6.16.

44. Cf. Deut 22.23–24.

45. Cf. 1 Cor 11.3; Eph 5.23.

my kinsmen in the flesh, the Israelites, I would have called down a curse on myself”), although his actual kinsmen were only those of the tribe of Benjamin. Paul, then, called all Israelites in general his brothers and kinsmen; and that is the sense in which the angel, to Mary, called Elizabeth her kinswoman, because of their both being Israelites.

There was another way, too, in which it was reasonable for Mary to be called a kinswoman of Elizabeth’s: that is because of where she lived, in the territory of Judah, which was Mary’s place of origin. Luke tells us: “In these days Mary arose and hastened to make her way to the hill country, to a town of Judah. She entered Zachariah’s house and greeted Elizabeth”. The law of Moses made no provision for a separate inheritance for the priestly tribe, because it was the Lord God who was their portion; instead, he arranged for them to live in among the other tribes. As Zachariah and Elizabeth had settled in a town of Judah, which was Mary’s place of origin, that was another good reason for them to be spoken of as kinswomen.

It could also, plausibly, be because of their similarity of character, which was the reason why they had both been found worthy to be part of the saving dispensation: one became the mother of the Saviour, the other of the Saviour’s forerunner, and both shared one and the same Holy Spirit. Thus it was in relation to God, above all, that they shared a kinship.

That, then, is how this problem is to be solved.<sup>6</sup>

**12. [9]** According to the divine apostle the man is “the woman’s head”,<sup>7</sup> and under the law of Moses “the two shall become one flesh”, with an engaged woman who sins being subject to the same punishment as for adultery, on the ground that by then she has become her fiancé’s body and has designated him her head. If so, once the descent of the head has been established, it must of course follow that the body is counted along with the head. Thus, once Mary has been linked to Joseph, she may justifiably

6. This sentence is present, and cited by Zamagni, in Mai’s second edition, though missing from his first. Zamagni omits it from his own text, but to me there is no good reason to doubt its authenticity; it seems likelier that Mai corrected in his second edition an inadvertent omission in his first. The Greek is ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὗτως ἀπολυτέον.

7. Transposing ὁ ὥν into ὥν ὁ.

ὅτε μάλιστα τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτῷ φυλῆς οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ δῆμους καὶ πατριᾶς ἀποδέδεικται γενομένη· καὶ ἄλλως δὲ ἐν τῷ πρὸς αὐτὴν χρηματισμῷ θεσπίζων ὁ Γαβριὴλ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εἴρηκε· καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.<sup>46</sup> σαφῶς διδάσκων ὅτι τοῦ ἔξ αὐτῆς γενησομένου, προπάτωρ ἦν ὁ Δαβὶδ· πῶς γὰρ ἄλλως εἰκὸς ἦν ταῦτα τῇ παρθένῳ φάναι τὸν ἄγγελον, ᾧ συνομολογοῦντα αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ εἶναι; Οὐ γὰρ ἄν μὴ ἐκ Δαβὶδ τυγχανούσῃ εἰρήκει τὸ δώσει αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.<sup>47</sup> ποίου γὰρ πατρός; Εἰκότως ἄν ἥρετο ἡ παρθένος, ὅμολογοῦσα μὲν ὅτι ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκει, μαθοῦσα δὲ ὅτι ἐκ πνεύματος ἀγίου συλλήψεται, εἰ μὴ ὅτι σαφῆς ἦν ὁ λόγος πρὸς θυγατέρα Δαβὶδ λεγόμενος· ἔνθεν εἰκότως φησὶν ὁ Λουκᾶς· ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρὲθ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀπογράψασθαι εἰς πόλιν Δαβὶδ ἥτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἔξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαβὶδ σὺν Μαρίᾳ τῇ μεμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ οὕσῃ ἐγκύω.<sup>48</sup> Οὐκέτι γὰρ ἀμφιβόλως ἀναγνωσόμεθα τὴν παροῦσαν λέξιν ὡς τῆς Μαρίας ἀπογράψασθαι μόνης συνελθούσης, ἀλλ’ ὡς καὶ αὐτῆς σὺν τῷ Ἰωσὴφ ἔξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαβὶδ ὑπαρχούσης, τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἔχοντες τῆς τοιαύτης ἐρμηνείας τοῦ λόγου ἐκ τῶν προαποδεδομένων.

δεδεῖχθαι τοίνυν σαφῶς ἡγοῦμαι, ὅτι μὴ μάτην ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ἐγενεαλογεῖτο παρὰ τοῖς θαυμασίοις τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλοις, καὶ ὅπως ἡ Μαρία ἐκ σπέρματος οὖσα τοῦ Δαβὶδ συνίσταται, ὅ τε ἔξ αὐτῆς γεγεννημένος Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

46. Luke 1.32.

47. Luke 1.32.

48. Luke 2.4–5.

claim to share his descent, especially as she has been shown to belong, not just to the same tribe as his, but to the same people and kinship-group as well. Quite apart from that, in his divine message to her, Gabriel has included among his prophecies the words: “and God will grant him the throne of his father, David”, making it clear that David was the forebear of the One who is to be her son. What else, logically, could the angel have meant by saying this to the Virgin, but an acknowledgement that she was descended from David? He could not have used the words “God will grant him the throne of his father, David” to a woman not actually descended from David. “What do you mean, ‘father’?”, the Virgin would justifiably have asked, if it was not clear that what he said was addressed to a daughter of David, given that she is acknowledging that she “does not know a man” and has just been told that she is to conceive by the Holy Spirit. It is thus with good reason that Luke says: “Joseph also went up from Galilee, from the town of Nazareth, to be registered in a town of David called Bethlehem, because he was from the house and kinship-group of David, along with his duly-betrothed bride Mary, who was pregnant”. Now that we have the proofs of such an interpretation of the wording from what has been said above, we shall read this sentence as meaning unambiguously, not that Mary had gone with him to be registered separately, but that she, along with Joseph, was of the house and kinship-group of David.

I regard it, then, as clearly shown that the tracing of Joseph’s descent by our Saviour’s admirable apostles was *not* “futile”, and that Mary is established as being from the seed of David, just as is the son born to her, Jesus, the Christ of God.

## 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, ἥρξατο μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, ἀνάγει δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ τὸν Θεόν· δέον, εἴγε σύμφωνα καὶ συνψδὰ ἀλλήλοις ἔγραφον, ἡ τὸν Λουκᾶν ἀνιόντα μέχρι τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ στῆναι, ἡ τὸν Ματθαῖον μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ εἰς ὃν κατέληξεν ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἀπάρξασθαι τῆς γενεαλογίας.<sup>49</sup>

**2** Ρᾳδία δὲ καὶ τούτων ἡ λύσις, καὶ οὐδὲ πολλῆς κατασκευῆς δεομένη· μίαν ἀμφοτέροις ὁδὸν πορευθεῖσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν ἀνάντη καὶ ὅρθιον πορείαν ἀνιόντας, καὶ τὸν ἔμπαλιν διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς κατιόντας, οὐκ ἄν τις ἐτέραν φαίη βαδίζειν, μιᾶς ἀμφοτέροις ἐγκειμένης, τοῖς τε ἀνιοῦσι καὶ τοῖς κατιοῦσι, τρίβουν. Τὸν αὐτὸν γοῦν τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν γενῶν διαδοχῆς πάρεστιν· οὗτος δὲ πόρρωθεν Ἐβραίοις 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 αὕται αἱ γενέσεις Φαρὲς· ὁ δὲ ἦν Ἰούδα τοῦ ἀρχιφύλου παῖς· Φαρὲς ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐσρώμ· Ἐσρὼμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀράμ· καὶ Ἀρὰμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμιναδάβ· Ἀμιναδὰβ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ναασσών· καὶ Ναασσὼν ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλμών· Σαλμὼν ἐγέννησε τὸν Βοόζ· καὶ Βοόζ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ωβήδ· καὶ Ωβήδ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεσσαί· καὶ Ἰεσσαὶ ἐγέννησε τὸν Δαβὶδ.<sup>50</sup> Τοῦτο 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?<sup>8</sup>

**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 of<sup>9</sup> 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”<sup>10</sup> (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.

**4 [2]** Ἡ δέ γε πρώτη τῶν Βασιλειῶν ἔξῆς διαδεξαμένη τὴν Ῥοὺθ τὴν γραφήν, ἀπὸ τῶν κάτωθεν ἄνεισιν· ὥσπερ οὖν πεποίηκεν ὁ Λουκᾶς· τὸν γοῦν πατέρα τοῦ Σαμουὴλ τὸν Ἐλκανᾶ γενεαλογοῦσα ὡδέ φησί· καὶ ἐγένετο ἀνθρωπὸς ἐξ Ἀρμαθὲμ Σουφείρ ἐξ ὅρους Ἐφραίμ· καὶ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἐλκανᾶ, νίδος Ἱερεμιήλ, νιοῦ Ἐλίου, νιοῦ Θοοῦ, νιοῦ Σοῦρ, Ἐφραταῖος.<sup>51</sup> Ἄλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς Παραλειπομένοις, ποτὲ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐπὶ τοὺς καθεξῆς δευτέρους πρόεισιν ὁ λόγος, τῇ τοῦ Ματθαίου γραφῇ παραπλησίως, ποτὲ δὲ ἐμφερῶς τῷ Λουκᾷ γενεαλογεῖ· ἄκουσον γοῦν καὶ τῶνδε· Δαβὶδ, φησίν, ἦν νίδος Σολομῶν· νιοὶ Σολομῶν· Ῥοβοάμ, Ἀβιά, νίδος αὐτοῦ Ὁσά, νίδος αὐτοῦ Ἰωσαφάτ, νίδος αὐτοῦ Ἰωράμ, νίδος αὐτοῦ Ὁχοζῆ, νίδος αὐτοῦ Ἰωάς, νίδος αὐτοῦ Ἀμεσίας,<sup>52</sup> καὶ οὕτως καθεξῆς κάτεισι μέχρι τοῦ Ἱερονία καὶ τῆς εἰς Βαβυλῶνα αἰχμαλωσίας ὡς ὁ Ματθαῖος.<sup>53</sup> Ως δὲ ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἡ αὐτὴ πάλιν ἄνεισι γραφή, τὸν Σαμουὴλ γενεαλογοῦσα· φησὶ γοῦν· Σαμουὴλ νιοῦ Ἐλκανᾶ, νιοῦ Ἱεροβοάμ, νιοῦ Ἡλιήλ, νιοῦ Θοοῦ, νιοῦ Σουφέ, νιοῦ Ἐλκανᾶ, νιοῦ Ἰωήλ, νιοῦ Ἀζαρίου, νιοῦ Σοφονίου, νιοῦ Θαάρ, νιοῦ Ἀσείρ, νιοῦ Ἀβιασάρ, νιοῦ Κορέ, νιοῦ Ἰσσαάρ, νιοῦ Καάθ, νιοῦ Λενί, νιοῦ Ἰσραήλ.<sup>54</sup> καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ ἄντικρυ τὸν ὅμιοιν τούτοις μεμίμηται τρόπον ὁ Λουκᾶς· μυρία δ' ἀν καὶ αὐτὸς εὗροις τοιαῦτα, ἀφ' ὧν λείπεται ὁμολογεῖν μηδὲν ξενίζον πεποιηκέναι τοὺς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ήμῶν εὐαγγελιστάς.

**5** Οὐκ ὄρθως γάρ οἴεται τις αὐτοὺς διαφωνεῖν· ἐκάτερος γάρ οἰκείω λογισμῷ τὴν ἔκθεσιν πεποίηται τῆς γραφῆς, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἀρξάμενος διὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ παρ' αὐτῷ λόγουν, ὃν οὐ καιρὸς νῦν ἐρμηνεύειν· ὁ δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ὑπερβάς, ἐπί τε τὸν πρῶτον ἀνθρωπον ἀνελθών· καὶ μὴ δὲ μέχρι τούτου στάς, τὸν πάντα δὲ λόγον ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀναρτήσας, διὰ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ παλιγγενεσίας μυστήριον ἀναβιβάζει.

---

51. 1 Sam 1.1.

52. 1 Chr 3.10–12; cf. 1 Chr 3.5.

53. Cf. 1 Chr 3.13–16.

54. 1 Chr 6.18–23.

4. [2] However, the very next book after Ruth, 1 Kingdoms,<sup>11</sup> goes upwards from the lower end, just as Luke has done. This is how it puts the genealogy of Samuel's father Elkanah: "There was a man from Armathem-Soupheir in the hill country of Ephraim, an Ephrataean called Elkanah, son of Jeremiel, son of Elias, son of Thoos, son of Sour". In Chronicles,<sup>12</sup> moreover, there are times when the description goes from the earliest ones to the next in succession, as in the text of Matthew, but there are others when the genealogy is given in the same way as in Luke. Listen to these two, for instance: "Solomon," he says, "was David's son. Solomon's son<sup>13</sup> was Rehoboam, his son was Abijah, Abijah's son was Ahaz, his was Jehoshaphat, his was Joram, his was Ahaziah, his was Joash, his was Amaziah..." and so it goes on in turn down to Jeconiah and the Babylonian captivity, as in Matthew; but Samuel's descent, in the same book, is traced back upwards as in Luke, with: "Samuel was the son of Elkanah, son of Jeroboam, son of Eliel, son of Thoos, son of Souphe, son of Elkana, son of Joel, son of Azaria, son of Sophonios, son of Thaar, son of Aseir, son of Abiasar, son of Kore, son of Issaar, son of Kaath, son of Levi, son of Israel". Now, look! Is that not just the same style as Luke has modelled himself on? You could find hundreds of examples like these for yourself, as well; so all that remains is to agree that there is nothing odd about what our Saviour's evangelists have done.

5. Anyone who thinks that they are at variance is incorrect. Each has worded his book's exposition to suit a design of his own: one began with Abraham, because of the plan of his account (which this is not the occasion to explain); the other goes right on past Abraham up to the first man, and, not stopping even there, connects his whole narrative to God, taking it up to him because of<sup>14</sup> the mystery of the rebirth in Christ.

11. In the Hebrew and Septuagint texts, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings are called 1– 4 Kingdoms.

12. A literal translation of the Greek name for Chronicles would be "Omissions".

13. The translation accepts both of Mai's emendations. The manuscript has Solomon's name only once, and (as in the Septuagint) "sons"; Zamagni's text accepts only the first of them.

14. Reading τὸ τῆς for τῆς, with the corresponding passage in fragment Fr.St.1, Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 269).

## Πρὸς Στέφανον γ'

Πῶς ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ καὶ Σολομῶνος διαδόχων ἐπὶ Ἰακώβ  
καὶ Ἰωσῆφ τὰ γένη κατάγει.<sup>55</sup> ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Νάθαν καὶ  
τῶν τοῦ Νάθαν παίδων ἐπὶ Ἡλί καὶ Ἰωσῆφ ἐναντίως γενεαλογῶν τῷ  
Ματθαίῳ,<sup>56</sup>

**1** Τὸ τρίτον τῶν προτάσεων καιρὸς ἐπισκέψασθαι· ἀτενὲς οὖν ταῖς  
λέξεσιν αὐταῖς ἐπερείσωμεν τὴν ἑαυτῶν διάνοιαν. Ὡδωμεν δὲ τί φησὶν ὁ  
Λουκᾶς· καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὥν νίσις,  
ώς ἐνομίζετο, τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ, τοῦ Ἡλί, τοῦ Μελχὶ.<sup>57</sup> Ἄλλ’ οὐχ ὅ γε Ματθαῖος  
ἐχρήσατο τῇ ώς ἐνομίζετο φωνῇ· ἀλλὰ τί φησί· Ματθὰν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν  
Ἰακώβ, Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσῆφ.<sup>58</sup> ἄλλο δὲ δῆπου ἐστὶ τὸ νομίζειν,  
ἄλλο δὲ δῆπου τὸ οὔτως ἔχειν διαβεβαιοῦσθαι· εἰ μὲν δὴ τοῦ Ματθαίου  
διαβεβαιωσαμένου τὸν Ἰωσῆφ νίδιον εἶναι τοῦ Ἰακώβ καὶ τοῦ Ματθάν,  
ὁ Λουκᾶς ὅμοιώς δισχυρίσατο τὸν Ἰωσῆφ γεγονέναι νίδιον τοῦ Ἡλί καὶ  
τοῦ Μελχὶ, ἀληθῶς μάχη τις ἦν καὶ πόλεμος, καὶ ἦν τῶν διαιτησόντων  
αὐτοῖς χρεία· νῦν δὲ ὅτε, τοῦ Ματθαίου διαβεβαιωσαμένου, ὁ Λουκᾶς  
διατείνεται, δόξαν δὲ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς νενομισμένην τίθησιν, οὐ τὴν  
παρ’ αὐτῷ κρατοῦσαν, οἷμαι μηδεμίαν ὑπολείπεσθαι ζήτησιν.

**2** Διαφόρων γὰρ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ὑπολήψεων περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ  
κεκρατημένων, καὶ πάντων μὲν συμφώνως ἐπὶ τὸν Δαβὶδ ἀναγόντων,  
διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δαβὶδ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπαγγελίας, ἥδη δὲ τῶν μὲν ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ  
καὶ Σολομῶνος καὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους<sup>59</sup> πειθομένων ἔσεσθαι τὸν  
Χριστόν, τῶν δὲ ταύτην μὲν φευγόντων, διὰ τὸ πλείστην ἐμφέρεσθαι τῶν  
βασιλευσάντων κατηγορίαν, διά τε τὸ ἐκκήρυκτον ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου  
Ιερεμίου γεγονέναι τὸν Ἱερονίαν, καὶ διὰ τὸ εἰρῆσθαι μὴ ἀναστήσεσθαι  
ἔξ αὐτοῦ σπέρμα καθήμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου Δαβὶδ.<sup>60</sup> διὰ δὴ οὖν ταῦτα,  
ἔτεραν ὄδευόντων, καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν Δαβὶδ ὄμολογούντων, οὐ μὴν διὰ

55. Cf. Matt 1.1–17.

56. Cf. Luke 3.23–38.

57. Luke 3.23.

58. Matt 1.15–16.

59. Cf. 2 Sam 7.1–17; 1 Chr 17.3–15; Ps 131.11.

60. Cf. Jer 22.20–30; 36.29–31; Ps 131.12.

## TO STEPHANUS 3

How is it that Matthew takes the line of succession from David and Solomon down to Jacob and Joseph, whereas Luke takes a line opposed to Matthew's, from David and Nathan through Nathan's sons to Eli and Joseph?

[There is another version of this part of *To Stephanus* in fragment Fr.St.1, from Nicetas. The two epitomators have chosen different parts to excise.]

**1.** It is time to consider the third problem put forward. Let us, then, base the evangelists' meaning firmly on their actual words, and see what Luke says: "Jesus himself, when he began, was in about his early thirties. He was, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, son of Eli, son of Melchi..." Matthew, though, did not use the expression "as was supposed". What, then, does he say? "Matthan was Jacob's father, Jacob was Joseph's father..." Now, I take it that "supposing" is one thing, affirming that something is so is quite another. If it had been the case that Matthew affirmed that Joseph was the son of Jacob and Matthan, while Luke insisted equally that Joseph was the son of Eli and Melchi, there would indeed be a conflict, a real battle—they would need to go to arbitration! In fact, though, I do not think there is any question left to answer. Matthew is making an affirmation, whereas Luke is not<sup>15</sup> being positive; he is putting, not the view that commands his own assent, but the one held by people in general.

**2.** Among the Jews, differing suppositions have prevailed about the Christ. They all agree in taking his line back to David, because it was to David that God's promise was given; but from there on, some are convinced that the Christ would come from David by the royal line through Solomon, while others eschew that opinion, because of the very heavy condemnation levelled at the subsequent kings, and because of Jeconiah's rejection by Jeremiah, with the saying that no offspring of his would arise to sit on the throne of David. For these reasons, therefore, they take a different line, agreeing that it was from David, but through David's son

---

15. The word οὖ, required by the sense and present in the text of Mai and Migne, has been omitted in Zamagni's.

Σολομῶντος, ἀλλὰ διὰ Νάθαν, ὃς ἦν τοῦ Δαβὶδ παῖς, φασὶ δὲ τὸν Νάθαν καὶ προφητεῦσαι κατὰ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Βασιλείαις<sup>61</sup> φερόμενα, ἀπό τε τοῦ Νάθαν διαδόχων προελεύσεσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν διαβεβαιουμένων, καὶ τόν γε Ἰωσῆφ ἐκεῖθέν ποθεν γενεαλογούντων, σφόδρα ἀναγκαῖώς ὁ Λουκᾶς τὴν τούτων ἀνιστορῶν δόξαν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν αὐτοῦ, προσέθηκε τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ίστορίᾳ τὸ ὡς ἐνομίζετο· τῷ Ματθαίῳ παραχωρήσας μὴ τὸ ὡς ἐνομίζετο ίστορεῖν, ἀλλ' ὡς εἶχεν ἀληθείας τὰ τῆς γενέσεως.

αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ πρώτη ἀπόδοσις. 3 Εἴη δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἄλλος ἐν τοῖς προκειμένοις λόγος·

Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ ὅμολογουμένως τὴν ἔνσαρκον γένεσιν ίστορῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸν Ἰωσῆφ ἀποδεῖξαι βουλόμενος ἀληθῶς ἐκ Δαβὶδ, ὅθεν ἔχρην τῇ εἰσβολῇ κέχρηται τοῦ λόγου· τὸν δὲ Λουκᾶν ἡγοῦμαι μὴ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γένεσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γενεαλογεῖν ἐθέλοντα, νῦν τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι· τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ εἰ κατὰ γνώμην ἔπραττεν, οὐκ ἡγνόει ὅτι ἔχρην ταύτην ἐκθήσεσθαι· ἐπειδὴ δὲ νῦν τῆς διὰ λουτροῦ ἀναγεννήσεως μέμνηται, υἱὸν αὐτὸν εἰσάγων Θεοῦ,<sup>62</sup> βούλεται ὡς ἐν ὑποδείγματι παραστῆσαι ὅτι δὴ πᾶς ὁ ἐν Θεῷ ἀναγεννώμενος, κανὸν ἀληθῶς υἱὸς εἶναι ἀνθρώπων νομίζοιτο δι' ἣν περίκειται σάρκα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἵσταται γε αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς γενέσεως εἰς τοὺς κατὰ σάρκα γονεῖς, οὐδὲ μέχρι τῶν τοῦ σώματος προπατόρων φθάνει· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ νομίζοιτο ἀνθρώπων εἶναι υἱὸς διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος γένεσιν, ὅμως δ' οὖν οὐκ ἀλλότριος τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ νίοθεσίας ὑφέστηκεν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὖν οὐ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν τῷ Ματθαίῳ διάνοιαν ἔξετίθετο τὴν διήγησιν, εἰκότως τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείνῳ καιρὸν ὑπερβάς, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγέννησιν τὴν διὰ λουτροῦ παραγίνεται· καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐκτίθεται τῶν γενῶν διαδοχῆν· ὅμοι καὶ ἀνάγων ἀπὸ τῶν ὑστάτων ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα, ὅμοι καὶ τὴν μνήμην τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὑπαιτίων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἀποσειόμενος· ἐπειδήπερ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἀναγεγεννημένος, ἀλλότριος καθίσταται τῆς ἔνσαρκου γενέσεως καὶ τῶν κατὰ σάρκα ἀμαρτωλῶν

61. Cf. 2 Sam 7.2; 12.1; 1 Kgs 1.8; etc.

62. Cf. Luke 3.22.

Nathan, certainly not through Solomon; they add that Nathan, according to the tradition in Kingdoms, was a prophet. As there was this strong view that the Christ was to come forth from Nathan's successors, and that Joseph was in some way descended from that line, Luke is recording that opinion, not his own; it was thus absolutely necessary for him to add "as was supposed" to the version he was giving. He left it to Matthew to give the true facts of the descent, rather than the "as was supposed" version.

That, then, is the first reply. 3. On this topic, however, there would also be another explanation, a deep and veiled one,<sup>16</sup> as follows.

Matthew is avowedly recounting the incarnate birth of Christ, and wishing to prove Joseph's descent from David as genuine; the starting-point he has used for his account is thus the appropriate one. My view, however, is that the reason for Luke's introducing the genealogy at this point is that he did not<sup>17</sup> wish to give an account of Jesus' physical birth; if that had been his intention, he was well aware that it was the physical birth that he should have set out. Actually, though, it is because he has just mentioned Jesus' rebirth in baptism, and is introducing him as the Son of God, that he now wishes to set before us, by way of an example, a fact about everyone reborn in God: that even if the flesh in which he is clothed should lead one to suppose, correctly, that he is physically of human parentage, the facts of his birth are not confined to his physical parents, and do not end with his physical ancestors. Even if he is thought of as a son of human parents, by reason of his physical descent, he still subsists as a person not excluded from adoption by God. Thus, as Luke has not set out his narrative with the same intention as Matthew, it is natural that he does not take the same opportunity to put down the genealogy as Matthew did, but waits till he reaches the rebirth through baptism. He then puts the steps of the succession in reverse order, starting at the end and going back to the beginning; and simultaneously, in doing so, he gets rid of any mention of the guilty, sinful men in Matthew. This is because one born again in God becomes estranged from his physical descent and his sinful forebears,

---

16. The phrase between commas, present in Mai's second edition on manuscript authority and confirmed by Fr.St.1, is recorded by Zamagni in his critical note but omitted from his text. The Greek is βαθὺς καὶ ἀπόρρητος.

17. The parallel passage in Fr.St.1 has a different, and in my view possibly preferable, reading here. See note on p. 141.

πατέρων, υἱὸς ἀποφαινόμενος Θεοῦ, καὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν ἀνεπιλήπτως βεβιωκότων.

**4** Οἶον, ὡς ἐπὶ παραδείγματος, Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος ἔχετα μὲν κατὰ σάρκα πατέρᾳ Ιουδαῖον τινα ὡς εἰκὸς ἄπιστον· ἔχετα δὲ καὶ κατὰ Θεόν, οὐ κατὰ τοὺς τρόπους ἐβίου· εἰ δὴ οὖν μέλλει τις αὐτὸν κατὰ σάρκα γενεαλογεῖν, τίνος εἰκότως ἂν ἐμνήσθη, ἢ πάντως που τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα πατρός; Εἰ δ' αὖ πάλιν ἔτερος τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ γένεσιν αὐτοῦ δηλοῦν ἐθέλοι, τίνος ἂν τὴν μνήμην θείη ἂν εἰκότως, ἢ πάντως τοῦ κατὰ Θεὸν αὐτὸν ἀναγεννήσαντος; Οὕτω καὶ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ εἴρηται· σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύσῃ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας σου τραφεὶς ἐν γῆρᾳ καλῷ.<sup>63</sup> οὐ δῆπου τοὺς κατὰ σάρκα πατέρας δηλοῦντος τοῦ λόγου, εἰ μὴ καὶ θεοσεβεῖς λέγοιντο γεγονέναι, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Θεῷ πατέρας διὰ τὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας ὁμοιοτροπίαν αἰνιττομένου· οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἔξ Ἀβραὰμ ἀσεβεῖς ἥσαν μὲν κατὰ σάρκα οἱ νίοι Ἀβραάμ, κατὰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον, νίοι Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας· διὸ λέγεται πρὸς αὐτούς· ἀκούσατε λόγον Κυρίου ἄρχοντες Σοδόμων, προσέχετε νόμον Θεοῦ λαὸς Γομόρρας.<sup>64</sup> ὡς αὖ πάλιν ἔξ ὧν ἥμελλεν νίοι Ἀβραὰμ γίγνεσθαι· οἱ γοῦν ἔξ ἐθνῶν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ πεπιστευκότες, κατὰ σάρκα πατέρων ἀλλοφύλων φύντες, νίοι γεγόναμεν Ἀβραάμ, Χριστοῦ γενόμενοι παῖδες καὶ τῶν Χριστοῦ μαθητῶν· ὡστε καὶ δευτέραν ἡμᾶς ἐπιγράφεσθαι γένους διαδοχὴν πολὺ κρείττονα τῆς κατὰ σάρκα διὰ τὴν κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀναγέννησιν.

**5** Εἰκότως τοιγαροῦν καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἄτε τὴν ἀναγέννησιν ἴστορῶν, οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδεύει τῷ Ματθαίῳ, οὗτ' οὖν τοῦ Σολομῶνος καὶ τῆς Οὐρίου, οὐ

---

63. Gen 15.15.

64. Isa 1.10.

and is revealed as a son of God and of all those who have lived a blameless and godly life.

4. Let us take it, as an example, that the apostle Paul has as his physical father some Jew, probably an unbeliever; but that he also has a father in God, on whose character he modelled his life. Well, then, if someone is going to trace his physical descent, which father would he be likely to mention? It would, of course, have to be his physical father, would it not? But if, on the other hand, someone else wanted to show his birth in Christ, whom else would he naturally put on record but, of course, his father in God? Similarly, when Abraham was told: “You will go to your fathers, nurtured<sup>18</sup> in a fine old age”, that must, surely, not mean his physical forebears, unless they were also to be recorded as godly men; it must refer to his fathers in God, because of their similarity to him in godliness. The same applies to Abraham’s descendants, too: the irreligious ones were, physically, the sons of Abraham, but in character they were sons of Sodom and Gomorrah. That is why they are told: “Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom; heed God’s law, you people of Gomorrah”,<sup>19</sup> on the ground that they were unlikely to turn back into sons of Abraham from what they now were<sup>19</sup>. At any rate, those of us Gentiles who have believed in God’s Christ *have* become sons of Abraham, although our physical birth is from fathers of other races, by becoming the sons of Christ and of his disciples. Thus, thanks to our Christian rebirth, we can be accounted as also having a second line of descent, far superior to our physical one.

5. That is why it is reasonable that Luke, because his subject is the rebirth, does not take the same route as Matthew, and so does not include

18. Eusebius’ text here agrees with the older Septuagint manuscripts in reading τραφεῖς (“nurtured”), but current Septuagint texts emend this to ταφεῖς “buried”, a correct rendering of the Hebrew.

19–19. The manuscript text of this clause, as printed in Zamagni, is ὡς αῦ πάλιν ἐξ ὧν ἤμελλεν νιοὶ Ἀβραὰμ γίγνεσθαι. This must be corrupt, for two reasons: there is no verb for the relative clause starting ἐξ ὧν, and the verb of the clause on which it depends, ἤμελλεν, is singular, although the subject is plural (Mai’s second edition has the plural, ἤμελλον; Migne’s ἤμελλεν appears to be a mere misprint). The sense printed above requires the emendation ὡς οὐ πάλιν ἐξ ὧν <νῦν ἥσαν> ἤμελλον νιοὶ Ἀβραὰμ γίγνεσθαι, as the translation given seems to fit both Eusebius’ argument and the meaning of ἤμελλον better than Zamagni’s rendering “comme si d’eux devaient naître à nouveau des fils d’Abraham”, despite the fact that the original context in Isa 1 does envisage the possibility of their repentance and pardon.

τῆς Θάμαρ, οὐ τῆς Ρούθ, οὐ τοῦ Ἰεχονίου καὶ τῶν μεταξὺ διαβεβλημένων ἀνδρῶν τὴν παράθεσιν πεποίηται,<sup>65</sup> ἀλλὰ δι’ ἑτέρων ἀνεπιλήπτων ἄνεισι, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ προφήτου Νάθαν ἀναγεγεννημένον εἰσάγει· καὶ ὁ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ κατὰ σάρκα γεγεννημένος, υἱὸς ἦν Ἀβραὰμ ἐντεῦθεν γενεαλογούμενος, ἐπειδήπερ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ πρώτῳ ἡ ἐπαγγελία δέδοτο τῆς τῶν ἔθνῶν εὐλογίας, οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ προελευσομένου γενησομένης· ὁ δὲ ἐν Θεῷ ἀναγεγεννημένος, ἑτέρους πατέρας τοὺς κατὰ Θεὸν ἐπιγραψάμενος, οὐδ’ αὐτοὺς ἀληθῶς ἐσχηκώς, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐνομίζετο<sup>66</sup> διὰ τὴν τῶν ἥθων ὄμοιοτροπίαν, ἄνεισιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ πατέρα, μετὰ πάντας χρηματίσας Γίδος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον δ'

Ἀφρικανοῦ περὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐαγγελίοις γενεαλογίας;<sup>67</sup>

**1** Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἥτοι τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν ἴστορίαν ἡγνοηκότες ἢ συνεῖναι μὴ δυνηθέντες, δοξολογούσῃ πλάνη τὴν ἀγνωσίαν ἐπύκνωσαν εἰπόντες ὅτι δικαίως γέγονεν ἡ διάφορος αὕτη τῶν ὀνομάτων καταρίθμησίς τε καὶ ἐπιμιξία τῶν τε ιερατικῶν ὡς οἶόν τε καὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν· ἵνα δειχθῇ δικαίως ὁ Χριστὸς ἱερεύς τε καὶ βασιλεὺς γενόμενος· ὥσπερ τινος ἀπειθοῦντος ἢ ἑτέραν ἐσχηκότος ἐλπίδα· ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀίδιος μὲν ἀρχιερεὺς Πατρός, τὰς ἡμετέρας πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐχὰς ἀναφέρων, βασιλεὺς δὲ ὑπερκόσμιος, οὓς ἡλευθέρωσε νέμων τῷ Πνεύματι, συνεργὸς εἰς τὴν διακόσμησιν τῶν ὅλων γενόμενος· καίτοι ἀγνοεῖν αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐχρῆν ὡς

65. Cf. Matt 1.3–15.

66. Luke 3.23.

67. Cf. Matt 1.1–16; Luke 3.23–31.

in his list Solomon, and Uriah's wife, nor Tamar, Ruth, Jeconiah and the disreputable men in between. Instead, he goes back though other, irreproachable ones; in particular, he introduces Jesus, reborn, as descended from the prophet Nathan. By his physical birth Jesus was, as in Matthew, a son of Abraham, and so has his descent traced from him, as Abraham had been the first to receive the promise of the nations' blessing,<sup>20</sup> and that blessing was solely to come about through one who was going to come forth from his seed. He who is reborn in God, however, has other forebears recorded, his forebears in God, although they are not his actual ancestors at all, but only "as was supposed" because of their similarity of character; he has his ascent traced up to his true Father, and is recognised by all as the Son of God.

## TO STEPHANUS 4

On the genealogy in the holy gospels: from Africanus

1. Those who have been either ignorant of the gospel account, or unable to understand it, have compounded their ignorance by an error made in an attempt at glorification: they say that this difference in the enumeration of the names, together with the mixing of priestly ones (as they suppose),<sup>21</sup> with royal ones as well, is justifiable, in that its purpose is to show that Christ was entitled to become both priest and king. As if anyone disbelieved that he was, or had any other idea! Christ is certainly both the eternal High Priest of the Father, conveying up our prayers to him, as well as being the King over all the universe, shepherding in the Spirit those whom he has freed, and being a partner in the government of the whole; yet they<sup>22</sup> should not

20. See Gen 22.18.

21. The text here reads ως οιον τε "as far as possible", but better sense is given by the reading of the corresponding passage in Mai's fragment Fr.St.8, ως οιονται, which the above translation adopts. (These two readings would by this time have been indistinguishable in pronunciation.)

22. "They", here, are "those who have been either ignorant..." etc. in the opening

έκατέρα τῶν κατηριθμημένων τάξις τὸ τοῦ Δαβίδ ἐστι γένος ἡ τοῦ Ἰούδα φυλὴ βασιλική· εἰ γὰρ προφήτης ὁ Νάθαν,<sup>68</sup> ἀλλ’ ὅπως καὶ Σαλομῶν ὁ τε τούτων πατὴρ ἔκατέρου· ἐκ πολλῶν δὲ φυλῶν ἐγένοντο προφῆται, ἵερεῖς δὲ οὐ δεῖνες τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν, μόνοι δὲ Λευΐται·<sup>69</sup> μάτην ἄρα πέπλασται τὸ ἐψευσμένον· μὴ δὴ κρατοίη τοιοῦτος λόγος ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατέρων ἀκριβοῦς ἀληθείας, ὅτι ψεῦδος σύγκειται εἰς αἴνον καὶ δοξολογίαν Χριστοῦ.

**2** Ἰνα οὖν καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τοῦ εἱρηκότος ἐλέγχωμεν τὴν ἀμαθίαν, παύσωμεν δὲ τοῦ μηδένα ὑπ’ ἀγνοίας ὁμοίας σκανδαλισθῆναι, τὴν ἀληθῆ τῶν γεγονότων ἴστορίαν ἐκθήσομαι.

Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ὄνόματα τῶν γενῶν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἡριθμεῖτο ἡ φύσει ἡ νόμῳ· φύσει μέν, γνησίου σπέρματος διαδοχῇ· νόμῳ δέ, ἐτέρου παιδοποιουμένου εἰς ὄνομα τελευτήσαντος ἀδελφοῦ ἀτέκνου.<sup>70</sup> οὐδέπω γὰρ αὐτοῖς δέδοτο ἐλπὶς ἀναστάσεως, ἀφ’ ἣς τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀναστάσει ἐμιμοῦντο θνητῇ, ἵνα ἀνέκλειπτον τὸ ὄνομα μείνῃ τοῦ μετηλλαχότος· ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ ταύτῃ ἐμφερόμενοι, οἱ μὲν διεδέξαντο παῖς πατέρα γνησίως, οἱ δὲ ἐτέροις μὲν ἐγεννήθησαν, ἐτέροις δὲ προσετέθησαν κλήσει, ἀμφοτέρων γέγονεν ἡ μνήμη καὶ τῶν γεγεννηκότων καὶ τῶν ὡς γεγεννηκότων· οὕτως οὐδέτερον τῶν εὐαγγελίων ψεύδεται καὶ φύσιν ἀριθμοῦν καὶ νόμον· ἐπεπλάκει γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὰ γένη τὰ τε ἀπὸ Σαλομῶνος καὶ τοῦ Νάθαν ἀναστάσει ἀτέκνων καὶ δευτερογαμίαις καὶ ἀναστάσει σπερμάτων· ὡς δικαίως τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἄλλοτε ἄλλων νομίζεσθαι· τῶν μὲν δοκούντων πατέρων, τῶν δὲ ὑπαρχόντων· καὶ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς διηγήσεις κυρίως ἀληθεῖς οὖσας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ πολυπλόκως μέν, ἀλλ’ ἀκριβῶς κατελθεῖν.

Ἴνα δὲ σαφὲς ἡ τὸ λεγόμενον, τὴν ἐπαλλαγὴν τῶν γενῶν διηγήσομαι. Ἡ κατὰ φύσιν γένεσις ἐστι Ματθαίου· ἡ κατὰ νόμου ἀνάστασις γένους,

68. Cf. 2 Sam 7.2; 12.1; 1 Kgs 1.8; etc.

69. Cf. Num 1.47–53; 3.5–10, etc.

70. Cf. Deut 25.5–6.

have been unaware that both lists of names are David's line, the royal tribe of Judah. Yes, Nathan was a prophet; but so too was Solomon, and so was the father of them both. Prophets came from several tribes, whereas priests were not just anybody from all twelve tribes, but only Levites. That falsehood is therefore a futile fiction. May such an argument, that a falsehood has been composed to the praise and glorification of Christ, never by any means prevail in the church of Christ and of God, the fathers of the strict truth!

**2.** Therefore, so that we may prove the ignorance of the one who said that, and prevent anyone from being tripped up through similar ignorance, I shall put down the real explanation of the facts.

In Israel, the names of descendants were enumerated either by natural or by legal descent. "Natural" denotes succession by legitimate birth; "legal" means succession from a different father, in the name of a brother of his who had died childless. Because, at that stage, they had not yet been given the clear<sup>23</sup> hope of resurrection, they used to represent that forthcoming promise by a mortal 'resurrection', to keep the departed man's name from dying out. Some of those included in that line of descent, therefore, were succeeding in the regular way, father to son, while others had two different fathers: their actual father, and the man whose sons they were called. That being so, the record contains both actual fathers and so-called fathers. Thus neither of the gospels is wrong in giving both natural and legal descent. The lines of descent from Solomon and from Nathan have been interwoven, with the 'resurrection' of those who were childless, by second marriages and by 'raising-up of seed'. It is thus right that the same men are, in different contexts, regarded as sons of different fathers, either their actual father, or the man accepted as their father; and that both accounts are perfectly true, and bring the descent down to Joseph in a way which, though complicated, is accurate.

To make my point clear, I shall give the interconnection of the descents. The one with the natural descent is Matthew's; the one with

---

sentence of the paragraph. The connection of thought is much clearer in the corresponding fragment Fr.St.8, where "they" refers to the evangelists, from a sentence omitted in this abridgement.

23. Reading σαφῆς, with Mai, for the MS ἀφ' ἡς ("from which"), to give more coherent sense.

ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ Λουκᾶ· Ματθὰν ὁ ἀπὸ Σαλομῶνος, ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ· Ματθὰν ἀποθανόντος, Μελχὶ ὁ ἀπὸ Νάθαν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς γυναικὸς ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἡλί.<sup>71</sup> ὄμοιμήτροι ἀδελφοί, Ἡλὶ καὶ Ἰακώβ· Ἡλὶ ἀτέκνου ἀποθανόντος, ὁ Ἰακώβ ἀνέστησεν αὐτῷ σπέρμα, γεννήσας τὸν Ἰωσήφ, κατὰ φύσιν μὲν ἔαυτῷ, κατὰ νόμον δὲ τῷ Ἡλὶ οὕτως ἀμφοτέρων υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ε'

Διὰ τί ὁ Ματθαῖος τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ προτάττει τὸν Δαβὶδ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίᾳ φήσας· βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,  
νιοῦ Δαβὶδ, νιοῦ Ἀβραάμ;<sup>72</sup>

1 Ἐπειδὴ πρώτῳ καὶ μόνῳ τῷ Δαβὶδ μεθ' ὄρκου διαβεβαιώσεως, ἔξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ σάρκα φῦναι ὁ Χριστὸς ἐθεσπίζετο· γέγραπται οὖν· ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας σου θήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον σου.<sup>73</sup> καὶ πάλιν· διεθέμην διαθήκην τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς μου· ὥμοσα Δαβὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ἔως τοῦ αἰῶνες ἑτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου, καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου.<sup>74</sup> καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ προφητευομένου, τοιαῦτα ἦν· τοῦ δὲ Σολομῶνος τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἄδηλος ὁ χρόνος· λέγεται δὲ οὖν ἐπὶ μόνοις ἔτεσι τεσσαράκοντα βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ.<sup>75</sup> πῶς οὖν γένοιτ' ἂν ἀληθὲς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφερόμενον τὸ ἀνορθώσω τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα;<sup>76</sup> Ἄλλ' εὶ λέγοι τις περὶ τῆς ἔξ αὐτοῦ διαδοχῆς εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα, οὐκ ἀγνοητέον ὅτι μέχρις Ἱερονίου καὶ τῆς εἰς Βαβυλῶνα αἰχμαλωσίας, καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Σαλομῶνος διαδοχὴ τῆς βασιλείας διήρκησε, μηδενὸς μετὰ τὸν Ἱερονίαν ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Δαβὶδ καταστάντος.<sup>77</sup>

71. Cf. Matt 1.15–16; Luke 3.23–24.

72. Matt 1.1.

73. Ps 131.11.

74. Ps 88.4–5.

75. Cf. 1 Kgs 11.42; 2 Chr 9.30.

76. 1 Chr 17.12; cf. 2 Sam 7.13.

77. Cf. 2 Kgs 24.8–17; 2 Chr 36.8–10.

the legal raising-up of the succession is Luke's. Matthan, descended from Solomon, was Jacob's father; on Matthan's death, Melchi, descended from Nathan, married the same woman and fathered Eli. Eli and Jacob are half-brothers, with the same mother. When Eli died childless, Jacob 'raised up seed' for him by fathering Joseph, who was his own son in nature, but Eli's in law. Thus Joseph is the son of them both.

## TO STEPHANUS 5

Why does Matthew give David precedence over Abraham in the genealogy of Christ, in the words: "The book of the birth of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham?"

1. It is because it was to David first, and only to him, that a prophecy was given, confirmed by an oath, that the Christ's birth was, in physical terms, from him. Hence it is written: "From the fruit of your loins I shall set one on your throne"; and again "I have covenanted a covenant with my chosen ones; I have sworn to David my servant 'Until eternity I shall provide your seed, and I shall build your throne to generation and generation'". That is how the wording of the promise of the prophesied one ran; but Solomon's reign was of no uncertain duration: he is recorded as having been king over Israel for just forty years. How, in that case, could it be true to take the words "I shall set up his throne for eternity" as referring to him? Whereas, if anyone were to allege that that saying refers to his successors, one must not fail to observe<sup>24</sup> that the royal succession from David and Solomon lasted only until Jeconiah and the Babylonian captivity; after Jeconiah there was no successor to the throne of David's kingdom.

---

24. Deleting καὶ before ἡ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ. It is absent in the corresponding passage in fragment Fr.St.10.

**2 Θέα** δὲ ώς καὶ τοῦτο προσέθηκεν ἡ προφητεία περὶ τοῦ θεοπιζόμενου φήσασα· ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα· καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νιόν.<sup>78</sup> καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ πάλιν· αὐτὸς ἐπικαλέσεται με· πατήρ μου εἶ σύ· κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν.<sup>79</sup> ὅπερ ἀνοίκειον γένοιτ’ ἄν Σολομῶνι. [2] παραθετέον δὲ τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν Βασιλείαις ιστορούμενα ἐν τούτοις· καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλομῶν ἦν φιλογύνης· καὶ ἔλαβε γυναικας ἀλλοτρίας πολλάς· καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραώ, Μωαβίτιδας, καὶ Ἀμμανίτιδας, καὶ Ἰδουμαίας, Σύρας, Χετταίας, καὶ Ἀμορραίας, ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὃν ἀπεῖπεν κύριος ὁ Θεός τοῖς νιοῖς Ἰσραὴλ· οὐκ εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς αὐτούς.<sup>80</sup> οἵς ἐπιφέρει· καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία μετὰ κυρίου Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, καθὼς ἡ καρδία Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.<sup>81</sup> καὶ μετὰ βραχύ· τότε ὠκοδόμησε Σαλομῶν ὑψηλὸν τῷ Χαμώς εἰδώλῳ Μωὰβ ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Ιερουσαλήμ· καὶ τῷ Μολχῷ εἰδώλῳ νιῶν Ἀμμών, καὶ τῇ Ἀστάρτῃ βδελύγματι Σιδωνίων· καὶ οὕτως ἐποίησε πάσαις ταῖς γυναιξὶν αὐτοῦ ταῖς ἀλλοτρίαις, αἱ ἐθυμίων καὶ ἔθνουν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν· καὶ ὡργίσθη κύριος ἐπὶ Σαλομῶν, ὅτι ἔξεκλινε καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κυρίου Θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.<sup>82</sup>

ἥδη τὰ τοιαῦτα τοῦ Σολομῶνος κατηγορεῖται, πῶς οὖν ἐφαρμόσεις αὐτῷ τὰ τοῦ ὄρκου, ἐφ' ᾧ εἴρηται πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τό ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νιόν;<sup>83</sup> Άλλὰ γὰρ ἄντικρυς Σολομῶνος μὲν ἀλλότρια ταῦτα· ἀνάγοιτο δ’ ἄν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ ἤξειν θεοπιζόμενον Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, δις ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ ἀνέστη.

78. 1 Chr 17.13; 2 Sam 7.14; cf. 1 Chr 22.10; 28.6.

79. Ps 88.27, 28.

80. 1 Kgs 11.1–2; cf. Deut 7.1–4; Exod 34.11, 16.

81. 1 Kgs 11.4 (11.3 LXX).

82. 1 Kgs 11.7–9 (11.5–7, 9 LXX).

83. 1 Chr 17.13; 2 Sam 7.14; cf. 1 Chr 22.10; 28.6.

2. Consider also the following continuation to the prophecy about the one destined to come: "I shall be to him as a father, and he shall be to me as a son"; then again, in another place: "He shall address me with 'You are my father', and I shall make him my firstborn". That would not be appropriate for Solomon. One should compare what is recorded about him in Kingdoms, in these words: "King Solomon was fond of women. He took many foreign wives, including a daughter of Pharaoh, and Moabite women, and Ammonites, Idumaeans, Syrians, Hittites and Amorites, the races from which the Lord God debarred the sons of Israel, saying 'You shall not go in to them'". It adds: "His heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as the heart of his father David had been"; and a little further on: "Then Solomon built a high place to Chemosh, the idol of Moab, on the hill facing Jerusalem, and to Moloch the idol of the sons of Ammon, and to Astarte the abomination of the Sidonians; and he did so for all his foreign wives, who burnt incense and sacrificed to their idols. And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because he inclined his heart away from the Lord God of Israel".

These, then, are the sort of charges laid against Solomon; so how are you going to apply to him the terms of the oath, in which, among other things, occur the words: "I shall be to him as a father and he shall be to me as a son?" No, these words are entirely inapplicable to Solomon. They should be referred instead to the Christ of God, prophesied as to come from the seed of David, who arose from David's line.

## Πρὸς Στέφανον σ'

Διὰ τί μετὰ τὸν Δαβὶδ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔξῆς διαδόχους τοῦ γένους κατάγει,  
ἀνατρέχει δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄδαμ, οὐδὲ ἐφ’ ἔτερόν  
τινα τῶν πάλαι θεοφιλῶν ἀνδρῶν;<sup>84</sup>

**1** Ἐπειδὴ πρώτω πάλιν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ<sup>85</sup> περὶ τῆς κλήσεως τῶν ἐθνῶν  
διάφοροι ἐδέδοντο χρησμοί· πρὸ γὰρ τῆς Μωσέως νομοθεσίας, καὶ πρὸ<sup>86</sup>  
τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῆς περιτομῆς, ἀλλοεθνῆς ὡν  
ό Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τῆς Χαλδαίων γῆς ὄρμῷμενος, ἀπολείπει μὲν τὰ πατρῷα,  
Θεὸν δὲ γνοὺς τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων,<sup>87</sup> μεμαρτύρηται ὡς ἄρα ἐπίστευσε τῷ  
Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.<sup>87</sup> δίκαιος τε καὶ θεοφιλῆς  
ἀποπέφανται, οὐ διὰ περιτομὴν σώματος, οὐδὲ διὰ φυλακὴν ἡμέρας  
σαββάτου, ἢ ἐօρτῶν, ἢ νουμηνιῶν, οὐδέ γε δι’ ἄλλης τινὸς παρὰ Μωσεῖ  
φερομένης ἐθελοθρησκείας,<sup>88</sup> ἀλλὰ δι’ ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεοῦ,  
ἐπιφανείας δὲ τοῦ ὁφθέντος αὐτῷ κυρίου, οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτῆρος,  
ό τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, διά τε σεμνοῦ καὶ ἐναρέτου βίου.<sup>89</sup> τοῦτον δ’ οὖν  
αὐτῷ κατορθοῦντι τῆς θεοσεβείας τὸν τρόπον, ἡ περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δέδοτο  
ἐπαγγελία, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν ποτε κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ζῆλον θεοσεβῶν  
ὄντων καὶ τῆς ἵσης τῷ θεοφιλεῖ καταξιωθησομένων εὐλογίας.<sup>90</sup>

**2** Ων οὕτως ἔχόντων, ἀκόλουθον ἦν τῆς τῶν ἐθνῶν κλήσεως  
προπάτορα ὄντα τὸν Ἀβραάμ, ὑπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ δεύτερον  
παραληφθῆναι μετὰ τὸν Δαβὶδ.<sup>91</sup> δυοῖν γὰρ τούτων ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν  
πρώτων ἡξιωμένων τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπαγγελίας περὶ τε τοῦ σωτῆρος  
τῶν ἐθνῶν<sup>92</sup> καὶ περὶ τῆς κλήσεως τῶν ἐθνῶν,<sup>93</sup> χρῆναι δήπου τὸν μὲν  
περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ πάντων ἀνθρώπων σωτῆρος τὰς ὑποσχέσεις

84. Cf. Matt 1.1–6; Luke 2.34–38.

85. Cf. Gen 12.3; 17.4; Gal 3.8, etc.

86. Cf. Gen 12.1–9.

87. Cf. Gen 15.6; Rom 4.3.

88. Cf. Exod 31.12–17; Lev 23.1–44; Deut 16.1–17, etc.

89. Cf. Rom 4.1–22.

90. Cf. Gal 3.9.

91. Cf. Matt 1.1.

92. Cf. 2 Sam 7.11–16; 1 Chr 17.11–14; Ps 88.4–5.

93. Cf. Gen 12.3; Rom 4.16; Gal 3.14.

## To Stephanus 6

After David, why does he not take the descent down through the successive generations, instead of jumping back to Abraham—but not to Adam or to any other of the men of old who were loved by God?

1. Again, it is because Abraham was the first to have been given various prophecies about the calling of the nations. It was before Moses' giving of the law, and before there was a race of Jews, in fact even before circumcision, that Abraham, a member of another race, set out from Babylonia. He forsook the ways of his ancestors, and recognised the God who is over all; and it is attested that, remarkably, "he reached belief in God; and it was accounted to him for righteousness". It was not because of physical circumcision, or of keeping the sabbath day or festivals or new moons, nor yet through any of the other traditional observances introduced by Moses, that he is shown to have been upright and loved by God; it was through his recognition of the God who is over all, through the appearance to him of the Lord whom he saw—that was our Saviour, the Word of God—, and through his pious and virtuous life. It was because he had achieved that reverent character that he had been given the promise about the nations: that one day they too, when their religious zeal matched that of God's beloved Abraham, would also be accounted worthy of a blessing like his.

2. That being the case, it followed that Abraham, as the forebear of the calling of the nations, should be taken by the evangelist as second to David, because—given that there were these two great men who were the first to have been found worthy of God's promise about the Saviour of the nations, and about the calling of the nations<sup>25</sup>—the one who received the promise of the birth of the Saviour of all mankind had evidently to be

---

25. The MS text omits the words for "the Saviour of the nations". This translation follows Zamagni's emendation, from Fr.Syr. 2.

εἰληφότα, προτιμηθῆναι τῇ τάξει τοῦ τὰς περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγγελίας καταδεξαμένου· δεύτερον δὲ ἐν τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ παραληφθῆναι τὸν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀρχηγόν· διόπερ ἡ βίβλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πρώτῳ μὲν ἀνάκειται τῷ κατὰ σάρκα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ προπάτορι, δεύτερον δὲ τῷ κατὰ πνεῦμα πατρὶ τῶν διὰ Χριστοῦ σωθησομένων· ἡγεῖτο γὰρ ὁ σώζων τῶν σωζομένων ἐθνῶν.

## Πρὸς Στέφανον ζ'

Διὰ τί τῆς Θάμαρ,<sup>94</sup> οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἑτέρας ἐπ’ ἀγαθοῖς κατορθώμασι μαρτυρουμένης γυναικὸς ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ Ματθαῖος;

1 Τὴν Θάμαρ εἴ τις ώς πόρνην<sup>95</sup> διαβάλλειν πειρῶτο, αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ Ἰούδα ἐπακουούσατο λέγοντος· δεδικαίωται Θάμαρ ἡ ἔγώ, οὗ ἔνεκεν οὐκ ἔδωκα αὐτὴν Σλάωμ τῷ νίψι μου.<sup>96</sup> οὐ γὰρ δὴ πορνεύειν προθεμένη ἐπὶ τοῦ τέγονους ἔστη, λογισμῷ δὲ σεμνῷ παιδοποιίας χάριν τὸν Ἰούδαν θηρᾶται· οὐκ ἄδηλος δὲ καὶ ἡ αἰτία· ὃ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῇ παρακελεύεται μένειν ἐπ’ οἴκου, ἔως μέγας γένηται Σιλάωμ ὁ νίὸς αὐτοῦ, ώς αὐτὸς ληψόμενος αὐτήν.<sup>97</sup> ή δὲ ἐπείθετο προθύμως, ἅπαις μένουσα καὶ χήρα, τὰς τοῦ Ἰούδα παρεγγυάς ἐκδεχομένη· ώς δὲ οὐκ ἐπῆγε ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις τέλος, τοῦ περὶ παῖδας πόθου τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις διὰ σπουδῆς ἀγομένου, καὶ τῆς ἀτεκνίας ἐν ἐσχάτοις κακοῖς παρὰ πᾶσι τότε λελογισμένης,<sup>98</sup> διαψευσάμενον αὐτῇ συνιδοῦσα τὸν Ἰούδαν,<sup>99</sup> καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλπίδας εἰς μάτην παραληφθείσας, αὕτη ἐπιτίθεται τῷ ἀνδρὶ, οὕπω τότε νόμου Μωσέως, οὐδέ γε προφητῶν, οὐδὲ ἑτέρου τινὸς ἀπαγορεύοντος τὰ τοιαῦτα· κἄπειτα σοφίζεται τὴν ἔξ αὐτοῦ παιδοποιίαν· μὴ δείξασα γοῦν ἔαυτὴν τίς ποτε ἦν, συνελθεῖν αὐτῷ μηχανᾶται· ὅμοι τὸ σῶφρον τὸ ἔαυτῆς, κάκείνου

94. Matt 1.3; cf. Gen 38.1–30.

95. Cf. Gen 38.13–24.

96. Gen 38.26.

97. Cf. Gen 38.11.

98. Cf. Gen 15.2; Lev 20.20–21, etc.

99. Cf. Gen 38.11.

given precedence in the order of the genealogy over the one who received the promises about the nations, while the leader of the nations should be taken second. It is for that reason that the book of Jesus Christ is dedicated in the first place to Jesus Christ's physical ancestor, and secondly to the spiritual father of those who are to be saved through Christ; he who saves preceded the nations being saved.

## TO STEPHANUS 7

Why did Matthew mention Tamar? And why not also some other woman, one whose exploits are attested as being good ones?

1. If anyone were to attempt defaming Tamar as a prostitute, he should listen to Judah himself, whose words are: "Compared with me, Tamar has been proved in the right, because I did not marry her to my son Silom". It was not for the purpose of prostitution that she took her place in the brothel; it was a trap she was setting for Judah, with the high-minded motive of having a child. And the reason is not hard to see: it was his telling her to stay at home until his son Silom was grown-up enough for him to marry her. She eagerly obeyed him, and remained a childless widow, waiting for Judah's instructions. However, when he did not bring his undertakings to fulfilment, she realised that he had deceived her all along, and that the hopes she had entertained of his son were in vain; so she took matters into her own hands,<sup>26</sup> and turned on him. The law of Moses did not yet exist, and there were no prophets or anyone else to forbid the kind of thing that she then did: in her longing for children (something people in those days took seriously, with childlessness being reckoned by everyone as an utter disaster), she formed the ingenious plan of having a child

---

26. Reading αὐτή for αὕτη.

τὸ ἀκρατὲς ἀπελέγχουσα· ἡ μὲν γὰρ μακροῖς ἔτεσιν αὐτῷ πειθομένη, χήρα καὶ ἄπαις διέμενεν· ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὸν γήμασθαι ἐτέρῳ, καὶ τέκνων μητέρα ἐκ τίνος ἀλλογενοῦς καταστῆναι ἀνδρὸς οὐ ποιεῖ τοῦτο, τῆς τῶν προγόνων τοῦ Ἰούδα, Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ συγγενείας ἐφιεμένη· ὁ δὲ χηρεύειν τὴν παῖδα καταλιπών, καὶ κόρην ἄπαιδα ἐπὶ μακροὺς ἀναρτήσας χρόνους, οὐχ οἶός τε ἦν κρατεῖν ἑαυτοῦ μετὰ τὴν τῆς γυναικὸς τελευτήν· ἀλλ’ ἅμα τελευτᾶ ἡ τοῦ Ἰούδα γυνή,<sup>100</sup> ὁ δέ, μηδενός πως νόμου τῶν τοιῶνδε ἀπείργοντος, πόρνην ὑπολαβὼν τὴν εἰρημένην, ἥλισκετο πρὸς αὐτῆς οὐ δίκαια πράττων· ὅτι δὴ τοιοῦτος ὃν αὐτὸς τὴν ἐπὶ μακροῖς ἔτεσι τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἐκδεξαμένην τὰς αὐτοῦ, φιλόσοφόν τε καὶ σώφρονα βίον ἐπιδεδειγμένην, ἀπεστέρει τοῦ περὶ τὴν παιδοποίιαν καρποῦ.

**2** Ταύτη οὖν τὸν ἀνδρα ὑποδῦσα, ἐκ πρώτης ὄμιλίας διδύμου γονῆς<sup>101</sup> ἐξ αὐτοῦ γίνεται μήτηρ, τοῦτον αὐτῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ καρπὸν τῆς ἀγαθῆς προθέσεως ἔνεκα δεδωρημένου· παρὸν γὰρ ἄλλοις ἑαυτὴν ἀγαγεῖν, καὶ ἐτέροις ἀλλοφύλοις καὶ ἀσεβέσι συναφθῆναι, τοῦτο μὲν οὐ διενοήθη· τοῦ δὲ τῶν θεοφιλῶν γένους εὐχὴν θεμένη καταξιωθῆναι, καίπερ οὖσα ἀλλόφυλος, τὴν τοσαύτην συνεσκευάσατο δραματουργίαν·

οὐ πρότερον δὲ ἡ Θάμαρ ἐτόλμα παρεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἰούδα κοινωνίαν, ἥ ἐκποδῶν γενέσθαι τὴν προτέραν αὐτοῦ γαμετήν· πρὸ τοῦ ταύτης θανάτου οὐχ ὅσιον ἡγουμένη τὸ ἐπιχείρημα· ἔμενε γοῦν παρ' ἑαυτῇ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς,<sup>102</sup> καίπερ οὖσα ἄτεκνος κἄν μέχρι τέλους ἄπαις διέμενεν, εἰ μὴ τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῇ συλλαβέσθαι ἡγήσατο· διὸ δὴ, ὡς ἔφην, Θεοῦ καταξιοῦται συνεργοῦ, ὃς ἐκ μιᾶς τοῦ Ἰούδα κοινωνίας, παίδων αὐτῇ διττῶν ἀθρόως ἐδωρήσατο καρπόν· ὄμοιο περὶ τὴν τῶν παίδων γένεσιν μυστηριώδεις ἐπιτελῶν οἰκονομίας· δι’ ἣς καὶ οἷμαι μάλιστα τὸν θαυμάσιον εὐαγγελιστὴν τὴν πᾶσαν μνήμην αὐτῶν τῇ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν συμπεριλαβεῖν γενεαλογίᾳ· διδύμων γὰρ παίδων ἐξ αὐτῆς γενομένων, τοῦ

100. Cf. Gen 38.12, 16.

101. Cf. Gen 38.27.

102. Cf. Gen 38.11.

by him. Without revealing at all who she was, she contrived to have intercourse with him, thus simultaneously proving her own self-control and his lack of it. After all, she had been obedient to him for long years in remaining a childless widow, when it would also have been open to her to marry someone else and become the mother of children by a husband of a different race. She did not do so, because her aim was for them to have kinship with Judah's ancestors Abraham and Isaac, and indeed with Israel. He, on the contrary, abandoned his daughter-in-law to a childless, unmarried widowhood, leaving her in suspense for long ages; and after his wife's death, he was unable to control himself: the moment his wife died he took this woman for a prostitute—there being no law at all to forbid such behaviour—and was caught by her in the injustice of depriving her of the enjoyment of childbearing, after long years of awaiting his promises. She had given evidence of a life of philosophic chastity, whereas his behaviour was as I have described.

2. By slipping under his guard in this way, she became, after the first intercourse, the mother of twins by him. This was God's reward, granted to her for her good intention. She could have taken herself off elsewhere<sup>27</sup> and been joined to different men, irreligious ones of other races, but that was not her idea. Instead, she made it her aspiration to be thought worthy of the race that God loved, even though she was not of that race. And what a great performance she staged!

However, Tamar did not have the effrontery to present herself for intercourse with Judah before his first wife ceased to be an obstacle; to make the attempt before the wife's death was something she thought wicked. Thus she waited on her own in her father's house, despite her childless state, and would have remained childless to the end, if she had not seen the opportunity as her ally. And that is why, as I said, she was thought to deserve God's assistance, in granting her offspring of two children at once, from a single act of intercourse with Judah, and in simultaneously bringing about mysterious dispensations in the circumstances of the children's birth. It is mainly because of those dispensations, I believe, that the admirable evangelist includes that whole reference to them in his genealogy of our Saviour. You see, with the birth of these twins to her,

---

27. Reading ἄλλοσε αὐτήν for ἄλλοις ἐαυτήν, to fit with the idea of motion implied by ἀγάγειν.

τε Ζαρᾶ καὶ τοῦ Φαρές, οὐ τὰ τυχόντα μοι δοκεῖ ἐκ τῆς τούτων γενέσεως ὁ τῆς γραφῆς αἰνίττεσθαι λόγος· διὸ καὶ ἀμφοῖν μνημονεῦσαι τὸν Ματθαῖον τῆς τε τούτων μητρὸς εἰπόντα· Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Φαρὲς καὶ τὸν Ζαρᾶ ἐκ τῆς Θάμαρ·<sup>103</sup> διὰ τί γὰρ οὐκ ἡρκέσθη φάναι Ἰούδας ἐγέννησε τὸν Φαρές, παραλιπὼν τὸν Ζαρᾶ, ὅπερ πεποίηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ;<sup>104</sup> Μόνου γὰρ τοῦ Ἰακώβ μνησθείς, ἀποσιωπᾷ τὸν Ἡσαῦ.<sup>105</sup> [3] προστίθησι δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τίνος μητρός, λέγων ἐκ τῆς Θάμαρ,<sup>106</sup> παρακαλῶν ἐπισκέψασθαι τὴν περὶ τούτων ἴστορίαν.

**3** Γράφει γοῦν ὁ Μωυσῆς ἐν τῇ Γενέσει λέγων· ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἔτικτε Θάμαρ, καὶ τῆδε ἦν δίδυμα ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ αὐτῆς· ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τίκτειν αὐτήν, ὁ εἰς προεξήνεγκε τὴν χεῖρα· λαβοῦσα δὲ ἡ μαῖα, ἔδησεν ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ κόκκινον, λέγουσα· οὗτος προεξελεύσεται πρότερος· ὡς δὲ ἐπισυνήγαγε τὴν χεῖρα, εὐθὺς ἔξηλθεν ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ εἰπεν· τί διεκόπη διὰ σὲ φραγμός; Καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Φαρές· καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἔξηλθεν ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐπὶ τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ κόκκινον· καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ζαρᾶ.<sup>107</sup> Ὁρᾶς ὁπόσα τῶν εἰρημένων ἡ γένεσις περιέχει; Ὄντες ἔνεκα ἡγοῦμαι μὴ παρασειωπῆσθαι τὰ παρὰ τῷ θαυμασίῳ εὐαγγελιστῇ τὰ ἐν τούτοις αἰνίγματα· φησὶν οὖν ὁ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος διερμηνεύων τὰ περὶ τοῦ φραγμοῦ, τάχα που περὶ οὗ εἰρηται· τί διεκόπη διὰ σὲ φραγμὸς;<sup>108</sup> Ὅδε πως ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἔνα καὶνὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ Θεῷ.<sup>109</sup>

**4** Τούτοις οὖν τὴν διάνοιαν ἐπιστήσας, θέα μήποτε ἡ τῶν δυοῖν

103. Matt 1.3.

104. Cf. Matt 1.2.

105. Cf. Gen 25.20–26.

106. Matt 1.3.

107. Gen 38.27–30.

108. Gen 38.29.

109. Eph 2.14–16.

Zara and Phares, the scriptural account seems to me to be making a veiled allusion to matters of extraordinary significance; and that is why Matthew mentions them both, as well as their mother, in the words: “Judah was the father of Phares and Zara, by Tamar”. Why else would it not have sufficed to say “Judah was the father of Phares”, without mentioning Zara? That is just what he did in the case of Jacob, where he mentions Jacob alone, saying nothing about Esau.

[3] In adding also their mother’s name—“by Tamar”—he is inviting us to look carefully at the story about them all. 3 This is what Moses wrote in Genesis: “And it came about, when Tamar was giving birth, that she had twins in her womb. And when she was in labour, it came about that one put his hand out first; the midwife took hold of it and tied a piece of scarlet to his hand, saying: “This one will come out first”. But he pulled his hand in again, and all of a sudden his brother came out. “Why was the barrier<sup>28</sup> broken through because of you?” said the midwife, and gave him the name “Phares”.<sup>28</sup> After that his brother came out, the one with scarlet on his hand, and she gave him the name Zara. Do you see how much is contained in the birth of those children? That is why I believe its veiled meanings were not passed over in silence by the admirable evangelist. So the holy apostle, in his interpretation of the passage about the barrier—he is, presumably, talking about the one mentioned in “Why was the barrier broken through because of you?”—says, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, in pretty much these words: “Because he is our<sup>29</sup> peace, having<sup>30</sup> made both sides one and broken the central barrier-wall, abolishing in his incarnate person the hostility—the law of commandments in ordinances—in order to build the two into a single new person in himself, and reconcile the two sides to God in a single body”.

#### 4. Direct your mind to those words, then, and consider the possibil-

28. The Septuagint’s Greek word φραγμός (*phragmos*) means a dividing line or fence, but the Hebrew word it is meant to translate, פֶּרֶת (*perets*, in Greek transcribed as Φαρές, Phares), means a break or breach. Note that below, in discussing this passage of Genesis, Eusebius uses φραγμός sometimes for an internal partition, sometimes for an enclosing boundary-fence.

29. Accepting Zamagni’s emendation ἡμῶν for the MS ὑμῶν, which is not otherwise attested in the text of Eph 2.14.

30. The translation follows Mai’s text; Zamagni’s follows that of Ephesians in reading ὁ before ποιησάς: “he who made”.

τῶν εἰρημένων μία γένεσις, ἥ τε τοῦ Φαρὲς δὶ' ὃν διεκόπη φραγμός, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πρώτου μὲν τὴν χεῖρα προβάλλοντος, δευτέρου δὲ προελθόντος, αἰνίττεται δύο βίων τρόπους τῶν ἡξιωμένων τῆς παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ γεννήσεως· ὃν ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Μωσέως ὑπέστη νόμον· ἀλλὰ γάρ τούτων πρῶτος μὲν τὴν χεῖρα προβέβλητο ὁ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· οὐ μὴν καὶ πρῶτος πρόεισιν εἰς φῶς· ὑποστείλας δὲ τὴν χεῖρα, τῷ κατὰ Μωυσῆς δευτέρῳ ἰόντι προελθεῖν ἐπιτρέπει πρώτῳ· εἴθ' οὕτως αὐτὸς πρῶτος ὅν, ὕστατος ἔξεισι μετὰ τοῦ περὶ τὴν χεῖρα συμβόλου τοῦ πρῶτον αὐτὸν συνιστῶντος· ἢν δ' ὁ τῶν πρὸ Μωσέως θεοφιλῶν ἀνδρῶν βίος ὁ κατὰ τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὐαγγέλιον, καθ' ὃν διαπρέψαι μνημονεύονται οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ,<sup>110</sup> καὶ Ἰσαάκ,<sup>111</sup> καὶ Ἰακώβ,<sup>112</sup> Μελχισεδέκ<sup>113</sup> τε καὶ Ἰώβ,<sup>114</sup> καὶ πολὺ τούτων πρότεροι οἱ ἀμφὶ Νῶε,<sup>115</sup> καὶ Σήμ, καὶ Ἰάφεθ,<sup>116</sup> Ἐνώχ<sup>117</sup> τε καὶ ὅσοι ἄλλοι τούτοις γεγόνασι παραπλήσιοι.<sup>118</sup> Δίκαιοι γοῦν οἵδε πάντες, καὶ εὐσεβεῖς καὶ θεοφιλεῖς· εἰ καί τινες ἔτεροι μαρτυρηθέντες, τῆς μὲν κατὰ Μωσέα νομοθεσίας πάμπαν ὑπῆρχον ἀλλότριοι· προλαβόντες δὲ τὸν κατὰ Μωσέα τρόπον, ἡμῖν ὁμοίως τῇ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φιλοσοφίᾳ διέλαμψαν.

5 Ό μὲν οὖν πρῶτος διὰ τοῦ Ζαρᾶ ἐδηλοῦτο, ὃς ἐρμηνεύεται ἀνατολή· φωτὸς γάρ εὐσεβείας αἱ πρῶται τῆς ἀνατολῆς αὐγαί, διὰ τῶν πρώτων ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐσεβησάντων ἔξελαμψαν· οἷοί περ ἵσαν οἱ πρὸ Μωσέως ἐκ πρώτης ἀνθρώπων συστάσεως θεοφιλεῖς ἀποφανθέντες· οἱ δὴ καὶ τῷ Ζαρᾷ παραπλησίως, πρῶτοι μὴν τὴν χεῖρα προεβάλοντο τὸν πρακτικὸν βίον ἐνδειξάμενοι, οὐ μὴν καὶ ἐκράτυνέ γε τοῦτον· τοῦ δὲ κατ' αὐτοὺς τρόπουν ἐν ὑποστολῇ γενομένουν, καὶ ὥσπερ τινὸς φραγμοῦ διακοπέντος ἔξηλθεν ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ κατὰ Μωσέα βίος· ὃν δὴ μεσότοιχον φραγμοῦ κέκληκεν ὁ θαυμάσιος ἀπόστολος· διὸ καὶ ὠνομάσθη Φαρές, τῆς τοῦ φραγμοῦ διακοπῆς ἐπώνυμος· ἐρμηνεύεται γοῦν Φαρὲς μερισμός· ἔνθεν καὶ φαρισαῖοι παρ' αὐτοῖς διέπρεπον, παρὰ τὸ μερίζειν καὶ ἀφορίζειν ἑαυτοὺς τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ἐπιμιξίας. Μακάριον μὲν οὖν καὶ πολὺ κρείττον

110. Cf. Gen 11.27–19.29.

111. Cf. Gen 25.11, etc.

112. Cf. Gen 28.10–20; 32.25–31, etc.

113. Cf. Gen 14.18–20.

114. Cf. Job 1.1, etc.; Ezek 14.14.

115. Cf. Gen 6.9, etc.

116. Cf. Gen 9.18–27, etc.

117. Cf. Gen 5.22–24.

118. Cf. Gen 5.

ity that the birth of these two sons just described—that of the one, Phares, because of whom the barrier was broken through, and that of the other, who put his hand out first but came out second—is a veiled reference to the two ways of life of those found worthy of the birth under God: one of these ways came into existence by the gospel, the other by the law of Moses. The point is that it was the gospel way that was the first of them to put out its hand, yet without also coming out first into the light; by withdrawing its hand, it allowed the Mosaic one, which was coming second, to come out first. Thus it then, despite being the first, comes out last, with the token on its hand that establishes it as first. Now, the life of those before Moses who were loved by God was the one in accordance with the gospel of the Christ, and it is for living in that way that Abraham and his like are recorded as having been pre-eminent: Isaac, Jacob, Melchizedek, Job, and, long before them, men such as Noah, Shem, Japhet, Enoch and any others like those. These at least (despite the evidence that there were some others entirely out of keeping with the Mosaic law) were all upright, religious and loved by God; they anticipated the Mosaic character, and constitute for us shining examples of a philosophy in accordance with that of the gospel.

5. That first way of life, then, was signified by Zara, which translates as “rising”, because the earliest beams of the rising of the light of religion shone out through the first among mankind who were religious; that is, those before Moses who were revealed as having been loved by God, ever since the origin of mankind. They it was who, like Zara, first put out their hand and revealed the effective way of life, even though Zara did not cause it to prevail; instead, their way of life went into the background and, as if a barrier had been broken through, his brother, the Mosaic life, came out. This is what the wonderful apostle has called “the central barrier-wall”, and that is why he was called “Phares” from his breaking through the barrier, because the name translates as “separation”. (This is also the derivation of “Pharisees”, from their being distinguished among the Jews by their separation, cutting themselves off from mingling with the ordinary people.) It would have been a blessed thing, and far preferable, for the barrier not to

ἥν μὴ διακοπῆναι τὸν φραγμόν, ἔνα δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἀδιάκοπον μεῖναι· τοῦτο δ’ ἄν γέγονεν εἰ τῷ τὴν χεῖρα προβεβλημένῳ πρώτῳ, συνακολουθήσας ὁ δεύτερος, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐπολιτεύσατο· πολὺ γὰρ ἦν βέλτιον τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς εἰ κατὰ τὸν βίον τῶν πρόπαλαι θεοφιλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐτύγχανον πεπολιτευμένοι· καὶ οὕτω γὰρ ἦν εἰς ὁ φραγμός, καὶ μία οἰκοδομὴ τῶν τε πρώτων καὶ τῶν ὑστάτων.

**6** Ἐπειδὴ δὲ μὴ τὸν πρῶτον κρατῆσαι τρόπον ἡ τῶν δευτέρων συνεχώρησεν ἀσθένεια, διακοπῆς εἰκότως τοῦ κατὰ Θεὸν φραγμοῦ γενομένης, τοῦ τε μεσοτοίχου τοῦ φραγμοῦ παραβληθέντος ὁ πάλαι πρῶτος τὴν χεῖρα προτείνας, δεύτερος ἔξεισιν εἰς φῶς διὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ τὸν παλαίτατον καὶ ἀρχαῖον φραγμὸν ἀνακτησαμένου· διὸ καὶ φησιν εἰς αὐτὸν ἡ προφητεία· καὶ κληθῆσῃ οἰκοδόμος φραγμῶν.<sup>119</sup> οὗτος δὴ καὶ τὸ δηλωθὲν μεσότοιχον ἀνείλεν· δις κύριος ὃν καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου<sup>120</sup> ποιεῖ τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν,<sup>121</sup> κατὰ τὸν ιερὸν ἀπόστολον εἰπόντα· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας.<sup>122</sup> καὶ τί τὸ μεσότοιχον διασαφῶν, ἐπιλέγει· τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας,<sup>123</sup> ἐκποδῶν μεταστησάμενος τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ Μωυσέως νόμου, ὅπερ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν ἀπείργει εὐσεβείας, διὰ τὸ μὴ δὲ βουλομένοις δυνατὸν εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι κατὰ Μωυσέα πολιτεύσασθαι.

**7** Ὡσπερ οὖν συνεστήσαμεν ἐν ταῖς Εὐαγγελικαῖς ἀποδείξεσι, τὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς πᾶσι προεβάλετο πολιτείαν, τοῦ πρώτου τῆς εὐσεβείας τρόπου τελείαν καὶ λαμπροτέραν τὴν γένεσιν πεποιημένου, μετὰ τοῦ τῇ χειρὶ συνεπάγεσθαι τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ πρῶτον αὐτὸν γεγονέναι· ὁ γοῦν διὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου εὐαγγελίου πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι παραδοθεὶς βίος, οὗτος αὐτὸς ἦν ἐκείνος ὁ καὶ πρὸ Μωσέως τὴν χεῖρα προτείνας, καὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν διὰ τῶν πρώτων θεοφιλῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπιδεδειγμένος· οὗτός τε οὗτος ἦν ὁ Ζαρᾶ τῆς ἐνθέου πολιτείας τὴν πρώτην ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀνατολὴν καταβεβλημένος· γέγονέ τε ὁ αὐτός, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, πρῶτός τε καὶ ὑστάτος, ἀνατολή τε μικρὰ καὶ ὑστάτη πάλιν εἰς πάντας ἐκλάμψασα ἀνθρώπους.

119. Isa 58.12.

120. Cf. Matt 12.8; Mark 2.28; Luke 6.5.

121. Cf. Eph 2.14.

122. Eph 2.14.

123. Eph 2.15.

have been broken through, but to have remained an unbroken whole; and that would have been the case, if the second had followed the one that was first to put its hand out, and had lived its life in the same way. It would have been far better, I mean, if the people of the circumcision had in fact lived their lives in accordance with the life of the men of the most ancient times whom God loved. That way, the barrier would have been intact, and there would have been a single building made up of both the first and the last.

6. However, as the weakness of those who came second did not allow the first way of life to prevail, it was with good reason that a break in God's barrier took place. The "central wall of the barrier" was tossed aside, and the second way of life, the one which originally had been first to put out its hand, came out second into the light through our Saviour Jesus Christ, who has restored the original, pre-existing barrier. That is also why the prophecy says of him: "And he will be called the builder of fences". He it is who has destroyed the central division, mentioned above. Being "Lord also of the Sabbath", he makes both sides one, in the holy apostle's words: "Because he is our peace, he who has made both sides one and broken the central barrier-wall". To make clear what the "central wall" is, he adds: "abolishing the law of the commandments in ordinances"—that is, taking out of the way the central division, the Mosaic law which keeps us, the gentiles, away from the religion of God—because it is impossible for all nations to live by the Mosaic law, even if<sup>31</sup> they wish to do so.

7. Therefore, as we have established in our *Gospel Proofs*,<sup>32</sup> he was setting before everyone the gospel way of life. The first form of religion ensured the perfection of its birth, and enhanced the glory of it, by bringing with it on its hand the evidence of its being the first-born. That life, conferred on all nations through the saving gospel, was the very one which extended its hand, even before Moses, and gave a practical demonstration of itself through the first men whom God loved. And this, this was Zara, who instituted the original rising among mankind of the godly way of life. He has been the same, beginning and ending, first and last; he was that small rising which finally shone out onto all mankind.

---

31. Reading μηδέ, with Mai, for Zamagni's μὴ δέ.

32. Cf. *Demonstratio Evangelica* 1.2.4–6.

**8** Πλὴν ἀλλὰ κἀκεῖνο προσήκει τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπιθεῖναι, ώς ἡ βίβλος τῆς γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ<sup>124</sup> οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν δυοῖν πρώτου, λέγω δὲ τοῦ Ζαρᾶ, τὸν γενεαλογούμενον φῦναι εἰσάγει, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ δευτέρου τοῦ Φαρές·<sup>125</sup> ἐπεὶ γέγονε κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ φυλῆς καὶ σπέρματος τοῦ δευτέρου· οὐ μόνον γεννώμενος ἐκ γυναικός,<sup>126</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμου, ἵνα καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμου ἔξαγοράσῃ,<sup>127</sup> κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ περὶ τούτου μαρτυρίαν.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον η'

Διὰ τί τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου γυναικὸς ἐμνήσθη<sup>128</sup> ἐπὶ τῆς γενεαλογίας ὁ εὐαγγελιστής;

**1** Μονονουχὴ διὰ τοῦ φάναι, Δαβὶδ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐγέννησε τὸν Σολομῶνα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου,<sup>129</sup> τοιοῦτόν τι ἔοικε δηλοῦν ἡ βίβλος αὗτη τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γενέσεως·<sup>130</sup>

τὰς λιτανείας καὶ τὰς ἱκεσίας τοῦ Δαβὶδ ὅσον οὕπω προχωρήσειν εἰς τέλος εὐαγγελίζεται.<sup>131</sup> περιέχει γοῦν τὴν οἰκονομίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος τῶν ὀλων καὶ ιατροῦ, δι’ οὐ μόνου ἐλπὶς ἦν καὶ τῷ Δαβὶδ τῆς κατὰ τὸν Οὐρίαν καὶ τὴν τούτου γυναῖκα ἀμαρτίας ἀπολυθήσεσθαι,<sup>132</sup> καὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ καθείρξεως ἐλευθερωθήσεσθαι· τούτου γοῦν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν μέχρι θανάτου παρουσίαν, δι’ ἣς ἥμελλε καὶ ἡ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἀπολυτροῦσθαι ψυχή, θεσπίζων ἐν τοῖς Ψαλμοῖς, αὐτὸς ὁ Δαβὶδ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκεῖσε καθόδου τοῦ σωτῆρος, τά τε περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας ἐδήλου

124. Matt 1.1.

125. Cf. Matt 1.3.

126. Gal 4.4.

127. Gal 4.4–5.

128. Cf. Matt 1.6.

129. Matt 1.6; cf. 2 Sam 12.24, etc.

130. Cf. Matt 1.1.

131. Cf. 2 Sam 12.13–23.

132. Cf. 2 Sam 11.2–12.24, etc.

**8.** It is, though, also appropriate to add to the above that “the book of the birth of Jesus Christ” does not introduce the One whose birth it is tracing as having been born from the first of the two (Zara, I mean), but from Phares, the second. This is because, physically, he is descended from the tribe and seed of the second, being not merely “born of woman” but also “born under the law, so that he could ransom also those under the law”, as the apostle’s testimony, upon this matter also, has it.

## To STEPHANUS 8

Why does the evangelist mention Uriah’s wife in the genealogy?

**1.** What this “book of the birth of Jesus Christ” seems to be telling us, virtually in just the words “King David was the father of Solomon by Uriah’s wife”, is something on the following lines.

It is giving the good news that David’s prayers and entreaties are almost at the point of attaining their goal. It includes the dispensation of Jesus Christ, Saviour of all and Physician, through whom alone David, too, had the prospect of being absolved from his sin over Uriah and his wife, and of being freed from imprisonment in death. David himself, in the Psalms, predicted this Jesus Christ’s presence here till death, through which presence his own soul, too, was going to be ransomed from Hades.<sup>33</sup> He revealed the matters of the Saviour’s descent into that place and of his

---

33. The words “from Hades” are a conjectural restoration to the text, to make sense of the words “to that place” in the next sentence.

δι’ ὧν ἔφασκε· κύριε, ἀνήγαγες ἐξ ἄδου τὴν ψυχήν μου, ἔσωσάς με ἀπὸ τῶν καταβαινόντων εἰς λάκκον,<sup>133</sup> καὶ τό· ὁ ὑψῶν με ἐκ τῶν πυλῶν τοῦ θανάτου,<sup>134</sup> καὶ τό· οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ἄδην,<sup>135</sup> καὶ τό· ἐπιστρέψας ἔζωποίσας με, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀβύσσων τῆς γῆς πάλιν ἀνήγαγές με,<sup>136</sup> τίς δ’ ἦν ὁ καταβὰς καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀβύσσων; Τίς δ’ ὁ σώσας αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν καταβαινόντων εἰς λάκκον, ἀλλ’ οὗτος φήσῃ γενέσεως τὴν βίβλον ὁ θαυμάσιος εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀναγράφει, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἀγαθὰ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν εὐαγγελιζόμενος;

**2** Οἶμαι δὲ τούτῳ τῷ πτώματι περιπεσεῖν τὸν Δαβὶδ διὰ μίαν ταύτην φωνήν, ἣν ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ καὶ ἐνάτῳ προήκατο ψαλμῷ· ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ μου, οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα<sup>137</sup> τὸ γὰρ μέγα φρονῆσαι καὶ τοιοῦτον προίεσθαι ῥῆμα δτὶ οὐκ ἄν ποτε σαλευθῆ, μένοι δὲ ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀπαθῆς ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὑπέρογκον ἦν καὶ ὑπερήφανον, καὶ οὐχ ὅμοιον τοῦ ἐὰν μὴ κύριος οἰκοδομήσῃ οἴκον, εἰς μάτην ἐκοπίασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες αὐτόν· ἐὰν μὴ κύριος φυλάξῃ πόλιν, εἰς μάτην ἡγρύπνησεν ὁ φυλάσσων αὐτήν.<sup>138</sup> ἐν εὐθηνίᾳ οὖν τῶν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἀγαθῶν γενόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα προκόψας ἀρετῆς, ἐτόλμησε φάναι, οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.<sup>139</sup> διὸ καὶ παραχρῆμα καταλείπεται ὑπὸ τοῦ συνεργοῦντος αὐτῷ τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου,<sup>140</sup> συμπλέκεται δὲ αὐτῷ πνεῦμα ἀλλότριον· λέγει δὲ οὖν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ψαλμῷ· ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ μου· οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· σὺ δὲ ἀπέστρεψας τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ ἐγενήθην τεταραγμένος· κύριε, ἐν τῷ θελήματί σου παράσχου τῷ κάλλει μου δύναμιν,<sup>141</sup> διδάσκων δτὶ πρότερον εἰπών οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,<sup>142</sup> μετὰ ταῦτα ἀποστρέψαντος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν μεγαλορήμονα φωνήν, ὅμολογεῖ τεταράχθαι· εἴτ' ὡφεληθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτοις, τὰ πάλαι ἔαυτοῦ κατορθώματα, οὐκέτι ἔαυτῷ, τῷ Θεῷ δὲ προσγράφει λέγων·

133. Ps 29.4.

134. Ps 9.14.

135. Ps 15.10.

136. Ps 70.20.

137. Ps 29.7.

138. Ps 126.1.

139. Ps 29.7.

140. Cf. Ps 29.8.

141. Ps 29.7–8.

142. Ps 29.7.

own salvation, in his words: “Lord, you have brought my soul up from Hades; you have saved me from those that go down into the pit”; in “He that raises me from the gates of death”; in “You will not abandon my soul into Hades”; and in “You have turned and given me life, and brought me back again from the depths of the earth”. And who was it who went down and brought him back from the depths? And who saved him from those that go down into the pit? Who, but the One to whom the admirable evangelist dedicates the book of his birth, as he gives us all the gospel: the good news about David, too, along with the rest of us?

2. I think the sole reason for David’s falling into this sin was this sentence that he uttered in the twenty-ninth<sup>34</sup> Psalm: “And I said, in my prosperity, ‘I shall surely not ever be shaken’”. Such pride, and the uttering of such a remark that he would never be shaken,<sup>35</sup> but would remain immune in his prosperity from reverses and suffering, was overweeningly arrogant, and out of keeping with “Unless the Lord builds the house, its builders have laboured in vain; unless the Lord guards the city, its sentry has kept watch in vain”. So, after becoming rich in God’s blessings, and having made great progress in virtue, he had the temerity to say: “I shall surely not ever be shaken”; and that is why he is also at once abandoned by the Lord, who was helping him in bringing about his blessings, and an alien spirit grapples with him. Anyhow, in that same Psalm he says: “And I said, in my prosperity, ‘I shall surely not ever be shaken’; but you turned away your face, and I became dismayed. Lord, it was in your will that you granted<sup>36</sup> my beauty<sup>37</sup> strength”. He is explaining that, after first saying “I shall surely not ever be shaken”, he subsequently, when God turned his face away from him because of that arrogant remark, admits that he was dismayed. Then, after receiving help on the strength of that admission, he no longer ascribes his own former successes to himself, but to God, in

34. In the English Bible, Ps 30.6

35. Assuming that both Eusebius and his epitomator were more conversant with the by-then-obsolete optative mood than their copyists, we should read σαλευθείη for σαλεύθῃ here.

36. The text and editions here (compare the same citation twice more, below), as in the Septuagint itself, vary between παράσχου “grant” and παρέσχου “you granted”. As Eusebius’ argument shows plainly that he took it as the latter, that is the reading here adopted in all three places.

37. For the Hebrew יְהָרָרִי (*lahārārī*) “to my mountain”, the Septuagint, perhaps misreading the Hebrew text as יְהָדָרִי (*lahādārī*), has κάλλει μου “to my beauty”.

κύριε, ἐν τῷ θελήματί σου παρέσχου τῷ κάλλει μου δύναμιν.<sup>143</sup> Οτε γάρ, φησίν, ἀπέστρεψας τὸ πρόσωπόν σου καὶ ἐγενήθην τεταραγμένος,<sup>144</sup> τότε ἔγνων ὅτι καὶ πάλαι πρότερον τῷ σῷ θελήματι παρέσχου τῷ κάλλει μου δύναμιν.<sup>145</sup> Εἴ γάρ ἦν τι κάλλος ὑπάρχον περὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν πρὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, τοῦτο αὐτὸν ἐκ σῆς χάριτος καὶ δωρεᾶς μοι προσῆν· ταῦτα δὲ μετὰ τὴν συναίσθησιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθενείας ὁμολογεῖ.

**3** Πλὴν ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν Νάθαν τὸν προφήτην, ἡνίκα εἰσῆλθε πρὸς Βηρσαβεέ,<sup>146</sup> καὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ πεντηκοστῷ ψαλμῷ εὐχὴν ἀναπέμπει λέγων· σοὶ μόνῳ ἥμαρτον,<sup>147</sup> καὶ τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιόν σου ἐποίησα·<sup>148</sup> λέγων δὲ σοὶ μόνῳ ἥμαρτον,<sup>149</sup> οὐ τοῦτο φησιν ὅτι εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἥμαρτον μόνον· οὕτε γάρ βλασφημίας, οὕτε ἐπιορκίας, οὕτε τοιαύτης τινὸς ἀσεβείας ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἵνα τις ὑπολάβοι αὐτὸν εἰς Θεὸν ἥμαρτηκεν· ἀλλ’ εἰ χρὴ εἰπεῖν, τὰ μεγάλα ἥμαρτεν εἰς τὴν Βηρσαβεέ, τὰ μέγιστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν Οὐρίαν, ὑπὲρ πάντας δὲ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν· πῶς οὖν ἐνταῦθα φησι, σοὶ μόνῳ ἥμαρτον;<sup>150</sup> Ἀλλ’ οἶμαι τοῦτ’ αὐτὸν λέγειν, ὅτι σοι μόνῳ ἔγνωσται τὸ ἀμάρτημά μου· Ἐπιφέρει γοῦν τὸ σαφέστερον ἐν τῷ· καὶ τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιόν σου ἐποίησα·<sup>151</sup> ἀνθρώπων γάρ οὐδείς μοι φόβος ἔχει, εἰ μὴ ὁ σὸς ἐπέκειτο φόβος. Ρίψας γοῦν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, οὐ πρότερον ἀναστῆσεσθαί φησιν, ἢ τυχεῖν τῆς ἀξιώσεως,<sup>152</sup> καὶ συνεύχονται γε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἀγαθῶν συνεργοί, παρακαλοῦντες εἰσακουσθῆναι αὐτόν· διὸ εἴρηται ἐν ἑκατοστῷ τριακοστῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ· μνήσθητι, κύριε, τοῦ Δαβὶδ καὶ πάσης τῆς πραότητος αὐτοῦ· ὡς ὥμοσε τῷ κυρίῳ, ηὔξατο τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακὼβ· εἰ εἰσελεύσομαι εἰς σκήνωμα οἴκου μου, εἰ ἀναβήσομαι ἐπὶ κλίνης στρωμνῆς μου, εἰ δώσω ὑπνον τοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς μου καὶ τοῖς βλεφάροις μου νιυσταγμόν, ἔως οὗ εὕρω τόπον τῷ κυρίῳ, σκήνωμα τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακὼβ.<sup>153</sup>

**4** Οὕτως δὲ αὐτῷ εὐξαμένῳ καὶ διαβεβαιωσαμένῳ, ὅτι μὴ πρότερον

143. Ps 29.8.

144. Ps 29.8.

145. Ps 29.8.

146. Cf. Ps 50.1–2.

147. Cf. 2 Sam 12.13.

148. Ps 50.1–2.

149. Ps 50.6.

150. Ps 50.6.

151. Ps 50.6.

152. Cf. 2 Sam 12.13–23.

153. Ps 131.1–5; cf. 2 Sam 7.1–2; 1 Chr 17.1–2; 28.2.

the words: “Lord, it was in your will that you granted my beauty strength”. “When ‘you turned away your face, and I became dismayed’”, he is saying, “I then realised that earlier, too, long ago, ‘it was in your own will that you granted my beauty strength’”. For, if there was any beauty existing about my soul before my sin, that very beauty had accrued to me from your bountiful grace.” That is what he admits, after realising his own weakness.

3. However, when the prophet Nathan came to him, on his going in to Bathsheba,<sup>38</sup> he then sent up also the prayer in the fiftieth Psalm:<sup>39</sup> “To you alone have I sinned, and done the wickedness in your sight”. By saying “To you alone have I sinned”, he does not mean: “It is *in respect of* God alone that I have sinned”, because his sin was not in the class of things like blasphemy, oathbreaking or any such impiety, to make one suppose that his sin was in respect of God. If one must say so, his great sin was in respect of Bathsheba; but his greatest was actually in respect of Uriah, and more than anyone else, in respect of his own soul. So, what does he mean here by “To you alone have I sinned”? Well, what I think he means is: “It is to you alone that my sin has become known”. His continuation, at any rate, makes that clearer: “and done the wickedness in your sight”—because as far as humans are concerned, I had no fear of them; it is just fear of you that was oppressing me. At any rate, he throws himself on his face and says he will not get up until he had been granted his petition. Praying with him, too, are all those who join in assisting the good, urging that he should be heard; because in the hundred and thirty-first Psalm<sup>40</sup> it is said: “Remember, Lord, David and all his meekness: how he swore to the Lord, he prayed to the God of Jacob: ‘If<sup>41</sup> I will enter the dwelling-place of my house, if I will get up onto the couch of my bedding, if I will give sleep to my eyes and closure to my eyelids, until I find a place for the Lord, a dwelling-place for the God of Jacob’”.

4. When he had prayed like this, insisting that he would not get up

38. Here, like the Septuagint in all its references to Uriah’s wife, the text calls her Βηρσαβεε, as in the place-name “Beersheba”. (For that place-name the Septuagint, in every case except Amos 5.5, gives the literal translation “the well of the oath”.)

39. Ps 51.4.

40. Ps 132.1–5.

41. By “If...”, the Septuagint is translating literally a Hebrew idiom in which the apodosis of the oath (e.g., “May I be struck dead”) is unexpressed. It thus amounts to: “I swear that I will not...”

ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ κλίνης στρωμνῆς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τε οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔτι οὐ δώσει τοῖς βλεφάροις αὐτοῦ νυσταγμόν, ἔως οὗ εὕρῃ τὸν μέλλοντα τοῦ κυρίου τόπον, δείκνυσιν ὁ κύριος αὐτῷ τὴν Βηθλεέμ· διὸ μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν οἱ συνευξάμενοι αὐτῷ ἵεροι ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ ἐπιλέγουσιν ἔξῆς· ἴδον ἡκούσαμεν αὐτὴν ἐν Ἐφραθᾶ,<sup>154</sup> Ἐφραθὰ δέ ἐστιν ἡ Βηθλεέμ, ὡς ἴστορεī Μωυσῆς λέγων· ἀπέθανε δὲ Ραχὴλ, καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν ὁδῷ Ἐφραθᾶ· αὕτη ἐστὶ Βηθλεέμ,<sup>155</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ Μιχαίας φησὶ τὴν Ἐφραθὰ εἶναι Βηθλεέμ, λέγων· καὶ σύ, Βηθλεέμ οἴκος τοῦ Ἐφραθᾶ,<sup>156</sup> οὐδαμῶς εἰ ἐλαχίστη ἐν τοῖς ἥγεμόσιν Ἰούδᾳ.<sup>157</sup> Εἴτα ἐπεύχατο ὁ Δαβὶδ οὐ μόνον τὸν τόπον γνῶναι τοῦ κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ ὀπόθεν ἔσται· σκήνωμα δὲ τὸ σκῆνος καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὃ ἀνείληφεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος τυγχάνει· εἰκότως περὶ μὲν τοῦ τόπου προαπήγγειλαν, φήσαντες· ἴδον ἡκούσαμεν αὐτὴν ἐν Ἐφραθᾷ.<sup>158</sup> περὶ δὲ τοῦ σκηνώματος ἔξῆς ἐπιλέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἄμοσε κύριος τῷ Δαβὶδ ἀλήθειαν, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσῃ αὐτὴν· ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας σου θήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον σου.<sup>159</sup> δι’ ᾧ διδάσκεται ὁ Δαβὶδ ὅτι τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι τοῦ κυρίου σκήνωμα, ὁ καρπὸς ἦν ὁ ἐκ κοιλίας αὐτοῦ γενησόμενος.

## Πρὸς Στέφανον θ'

Διὰ τί τῆς Ρούθ ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ εὐαγγελιστής;<sup>160</sup>

**1** Καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἔμελλεν ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος τὴν τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἔθνῶν κλῆσιν τῷ πνεύματι προθεωρῶν διὰ τοῦ οἰκείου εὐαγγελίου γενησομένην, τῆς ἀλλοφύλου μνημονεύειν; Ἀλλόφυλος γὰρ ή Ρούθ καὶ ἔξ

154. Ps 131.6.

155. Gen 35.19.

156. Mic 5.1.

157. Matt 2.6.

158. Ps 131.6.

159. Ps 131.11.

160. Cf. Matt 1.5.

onto the couch of his bedding, that he would not go into his house, and even that he would not give closure to his eyelids, until he found the place that was to be the Lord's, the Lord showed him Bethlehem; because, after his prayer, the holy angels of God who were praying with him go on to say: "Lo, we heard it in Ephratha". Now Ephratha is Bethlehem, as Moses relates in the words: "And Rachel died, and was buried on the road to Ephratha, that is, Bethlehem". Micah, too, says Ephratha is Bethlehem: "And you, Bethlehem, house of Ephratha, shall be by no means<sup>42</sup> least among the leaders of Judah". David then also prayed not just to discover the the Lord's place, but also where his "dwelling-place" would come from. Now "dwelling-place" means, in fact, the tabernacle, the body, which the Word of God took on; so it is in accordance with reason that they gave an advance indication of the place, in the words: "Lo, we have heard it in Ephratha". They go on to tell him also about that dwelling-place: "The Lord has sworn truth to David, and will surely not annul it: 'From the fruit of your loins I shall place one on your throne'". In these words, David is being informed that the Lord's future dwelling-place was the fruit that was to come from his loins.

## To STEPHANUS 9

Why did the evangelist mention Ruth?

1. Of course the divine apostle, foreseeing in the spirit the calling of the foreign nations which was to come about through his own gospel, was going to mention the foreign woman! For Ruth was a foreigner, and

---

42. The Greek text Eusebius is quoting is that of Matt 2.6, which includes "by no means", not that of the saying's original context, Mic 5.2, which has no negative either in the Hebrew or in the Greek. "And you, Bethlehem, house of Ephratha, are very few in number to be among the thousands of Ioudas" is the rendering of *The New English Translation of the Septuagint*.

ἀλλοφύλων τῶν ἀπηγορευμένων παρὰ Μωυσεῖ Μωαβῖτῶν.<sup>161</sup> *Μωαβῖται*, γάρ φησί, καὶ Ἀμμανῖται οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου ἔως τρίτης καὶ τετάρτης γενεᾶς, καὶ ἔως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.<sup>162</sup> πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ κρείττων τοῦ νόμου γενομένη θεοφιλής, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου.<sup>163</sup> ἐπείπερ ὁ νόμος τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ· δικαίω δὲ νόμος οὐ κεῖται, ἀλλ' ἀνόμοις καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἀσεβέσι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοῖς.<sup>164</sup> ἡ δὲ Ἱούθ οὐ τοιαύτη, εὶ καὶ τὸ γένος ἀλλόφυλος ἦν, ὑπερβᾶσα δὲ τὸν διορισμὸν τοῦ νόμου, καὶ εἰσελήλυθεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου, καὶ τοῦ γένους ἐχρημάτισε τοῦ Ἰσραηλιτικοῦ, καὶ ἐν προγόνοις ἀναληφθῆναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν κατηξιώθη διὰ τὴν τῶν τρόπων, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος εὐγένειαν· πᾶσι τε ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνῶν ἀλλοφύλοις μέγιστον ὑπόδειγμα κατέστη, ὅτι δὴ τὰ ὅμοια πράξαντες αὐτῇ, τῶν Ἰσων παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ τευξόμεθα.

**2** Εἰκότως οὖν τὴν τῶν ἀλλοφύλων κλῆσίν τε καὶ εἰσποίησιν μέλων εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ αὐτὴν τέθεικεν, ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐξ ἔθνῶν ἀλλοφύλους μονονουχὶ παιδεύων δι' αὐτῆς, ὅτι δὴ τὰ πάτρια καταλιπόντες, εἰκότως καὶ τὰ ἀκόλουθα εἰς ἡμᾶς πληρωθήσεται· οὐκέτι γάρ ἐν ἀλλοφύλοις καταλεγησόμεθα, οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀλλοφύλων χρηματίσομεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ κλήρου τοῦ Θεοῦ.

**3** Ἀναγκαίως δὲ αὖ πάλιν ἐμνήσθη τῆς Ἱούθ, τὰ αἴτια διὰ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἱστορίας διδάξας<sup>165</sup> τίνα ἦν τὰ λύσαντα τὴν ἀπαγόρευσιν τοῦ νόμου τὴν φήσασαν, *Μωαβῖται* οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου.<sup>166</sup> γέγονε γάρ ἡ μωαβῖτις ὡς *Ραχὴλ* καὶ ὡς *Λεία*, καὶ ὡκοδόμησαν ἀμφότεραι τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ.<sup>167</sup> πῶς δὲ οὐχὶ χρήσιμος ἦν τῇ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίᾳ ἡ μνήμη τῆς Ἱούθ, ἐφ' ἣν εἴρηται καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι δύναμιν ἐν Ἐφραθᾷ, καὶ ἔσται ὄνομα ἐν Βηθλεέμ;<sup>168</sup> Προφητείας γάρ ἀντικρυς ταύτας εἰκότως ἄν τις φαίη τυγχάνειν, τὸ ἐκ Βηθλεέμ ὄνομα τὸ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογιμένῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ἐξάκουστον εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων θεωρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐν Ἐφραθᾷ γενομένην δύναμιν, δι' ἣς δυνάμεως πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὸν ἐκ τῆς Ἱούθ γενεαλογούμενον Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντα, δι'

161. Cf. Ruth 1.4, etc.

162. Deut 23.4 (3); cf. Neh 13.1 (2 Esd 23.1 LXX).

163. Cf. Ruth 1.16–17, etc.

164. 1 Tim 1.9.

165. Cf. Matt 1.5; 2.6.

166. Deut 23.4; cf. Neh 13.1 (2 Esd 23.1 LXX).

167. Ruth 4.11; cf. Gen 29.1–30.24; 35.23–26.

168. Ruth 4.11.

from the Moabites, one of the foreign nations banned by Moses. “Moabites and Ammonites,” he says, “shall not enter the Lord’s congregation until the third and fourth generation, and until eternity.” Exceptionally, though, God’s love for her put her actually above the law, and she did enter the Lord’s congregation, because the law addresses those under it, whereas “the law is not laid down for the upright, but for the lawless, undisciplined, impious and sinful”. That is not the kind of person Ruth was, even though she was born a foreigner; she surmounted the law’s exclusion, entered the congregation of the Lord, and counted as a member of the Israelite nation. Thanks not to any physical nobility, but to her nobility of character, she was found to deserve a place among our Saviour’s ancestors. She constitutes, for all of us gentile foreigners, a very important example: if we do as she did, we shall receive from God a reward equal to hers.

2. It is logical, therefore, that as he was about<sup>43</sup> to embark on his gospel, the good news of the call and inclusion of foreigners, he has put her into the genealogy. Thus, through her, he is practically teaching all of us gentile foreigners the lesson that if we do abandon our inherited ways, it stands to reason that the rest will also be fulfilled for us: that is, that we shall no longer be counted as foreigners, or live as people of alien descent, but as members of the true Israel, and of the people of God’s inheritance.

3. There was another reason, too, why he had to mention Ruth. By his version of the narrative, he explained what the causes were that broke the law’s ban: “Moabites shall not enter the Lord’s congregation”; it was because the Moabitess “has become like Rachel and like Leah, who<sup>44</sup> both built the house of Israel”. Of course the mention of Ruth served a purpose for the genealogy of our Saviour Jesus Christ! It is with reference to her that that saying also mentions “making power in Ephratha, and there shall be a name in Bethlehem”. One can justifiably say that these prophecies came exactly true, if one observes that the appellation “from Bethlehem” for Jesus Christ, whose descent is traced in Matthew, has been heard of in every nation of mankind; as has the power which came about in Ephratha. That is the power through which all nations came to recognise the Christ of God, whose descent is traced from Ruth, and through him abandoned

---

43. Reading μέλλων with Mai, as required by the sense and reported, but not adopted, in Zamagni’s text.

44. Reading αῖ, with Mai and the Septuagint, for the MS καὶ, tentatively retained by Zamagni. Either reading is possible.

αύτοῦ τῆς μὲν πατρῷας ἀπέστη, τῆς Ροὺθ παραπλησίως, τῷ δὲ Θεῷ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐαυτὰ ἐπιδέδωκεν, ὁμοίως αὐτῇ πάλιν·

ῶν ἔνεκά μοι δοκεῖ οὐκ ἀσυλλόγιστος ἡ παράθεσις τῆς Ροὺθ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Ματθαίου παρειλῆφθαι γενεαλογίᾳ.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ι'

Διὰ τί τὸν Ἰωακεὶμ Ἰεχονίαν ὄνομάζει ὁ εὐαγγελιστής;<sup>169</sup>

**1** Διώνυμος οὗτος ἦν· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ κατὰ τὸν προφήτην Ἱερεμίαν Ἰεχονίας ὄνομασθεὶς διακέκληται δι' ὃν φησιν· ἡτιμώθη Ἰεχονίας ὡς σκεῦος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ χρεία· τί ὅτι ἀπερρίφη αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ; Γῆ, γῆ, ἄκουε λόγον κυρίου· γράψον τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον ἐκκήρυκτον, ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀναστῇ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνου Δαβίδ, ἄρχων ἔτι ἐν τῷ Ιούδᾳ<sup>170</sup> καὶ ἐπειδὴ τούτων ἔνεκα συνέβη τὴν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα αἰχμαλωσίαν ἅμα τῷ λαῷ ὑποστῆναι τὸν εἱρημένον, εἰκότως ὁ θαυμάσιος εὐαγγελιστής τοῦ λυτρωτοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἀπάντων ὑπογράφων τὴν γένεσιν, καὶ τοῦδε ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἡτιμωμένου τοῦ ἀπορριφθέντος ἅμα τῷ σπέρματι εἰς τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν γῆν, τοῦ ἐκκηρύκτου γενομένου, τοῦ αἰχμαλώτου· διδάσκων ὅτι κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν ἀπεσταλμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρός, οὗτος ἦν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, οὗ τὴν βίβλον ἀναγράφει, εἰς ὃν ἀναφέρεται τὸ φάσκον ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ λόγιον· πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέ με, εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέ με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν,<sup>171</sup>

---

169. Cf. Matt 1.11; 1 Chr 3.15.

170. Jer 22.28–30.

171. Isa 61.1; Luke 4.18.

their native land as Ruth did, and have devoted themselves to the God of Israel, again like her.

On these grounds, it seems to me that it is not without due consideration<sup>45</sup> that the mention of Ruth has been added in Matthew's genealogy.

## TO STEPHANUS 10

Why does the evangelist call Jehoiachim 'Jeconiah'?

1. He had two names. According to the prophet Jeremiah, he was called Jeconiah. That is the name used for him in the passage:<sup>46</sup> "Jeconiah has been despised, like a useless piece of pottery. What about the fact that he and his offspring have been thrown away?"<sup>47</sup> Land, land, hear the word of the Lord: 'Write this man down as banished, because surely no offspring of his shall arise to sit on David's throne, ruling any longer in Judah'. The result of this was that the person mentioned underwent, with his people, the captivity in Babylon. Thus it is logical for the admirable evangelist, in recording the descent of the Redeemer and Saviour of all, to mention even this disgraced man, who was banished and thrown away into the land of Babylon as a prisoner, with his offspring. In doing so, he teaches us that the One<sup>48</sup> sent by the Father to proclaim release for prisoners was this Jesus Christ whose book he is writing, who is referred to in the prophet's saying: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, and that is why he has anointed me and sent me to bring the good news to the poor, and to proclaim release to

45. Reading ἀσυλλογίστως for ἀσυλλόγιστος of the MS and editions, as a better fit with the grammar of the sentence.

46. Jer 22.24–30. English Bibles call him Coniah.

47. This translation follows Zamagni's reading τί ὅτι; from the MS. The Septuagint, in Rahlfs' edition, has only ὅτι ("because"); Mai printed first τί; ὅτι ("Why? Because...") and in his second edition, used by Migne, διοτί, a synonym for ὅτι.

48. This translation assumes that ὁ has been omitted from the text after ὅτι ("that").

περὶ οὗ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ φησὶν ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης· οὗτος οἰκοδομήσει τὴν πόλιν μου, καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει.<sup>172</sup>

**2** Κατὰ καιρὸν τοιγαροῦν αὐτῷ τε Ἱερονίᾳ καὶ τῇ τούτου ψυχῇ, τοῖς τε τὴν ἵσην αὐτῷ πεπονθόσιν ἀτιμίαν τε καὶ ψυχῶν αἰχμαλωσίαν, τὴν τοῦ λυτρωτοῦ παρουσίαν εὐαγγελίζεται Ματθαῖος ὁ τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ νιοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ δὴ τῶν ἄλλων ὑπαιτίων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἀνδρῶν καταγαγών· εἰς γὰρ ἦν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος δι’ ὃν καὶ τῆς τοῦ Δαβὶδ περὶ τὴν τοῦ Οὐρίου γυναικα παρανομίας, τῆς τε τοῦ Ἰούδα πορνείας, τῆς τε ἀλλοφύλου καὶ Μωαβίτιδος Ῥοὺθ ἐμνήσθη· ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ τυγχάνει καθ’ ὃν καὶ τελώναις καὶ ἀμαρτωλοῖς συμβιοῦντα, καὶ αἰσχιστά γε ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ὑπομένοντα, καὶ τέλος ἄμα τοῖς κακούργοις σταυρούμενον αὐτὸν εἰσάγει· ἦν δ’ οὗτος ὁ λόγος καθ’ ὃν εἴρηται· ἵδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.<sup>173</sup> Εχρῆν γὰρ τὸν μέλλοντα καθάρσιον γίνεσθαι τῶν πάλαι πώποτε πεπλημμεληκότων καὶ τῶν γε μετὰ ταῦτα γενησομένων, ἀντίψυχόν τε τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ψυχῶν, διὰ πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων διελθεῖν, καὶ τὰς κατὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ ἀσεβῶν τιμωρίας αὐτὸν ἀναμάρτητον ὅντα ὑπομεῖναι, ὡς ἂν πληρωθείη εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ θεσπίσματα, τά τε ἄλλα· καὶ δι’ ὃν φησιν ὁ θαυμάσιος Ἡσαίας· οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αἴρει, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται· αὐτὸς ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν· τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ιάθημεν.<sup>174</sup>

**3** Εἰ δὲ λέγοι ὁ προφήτης περὶ τοῦ Ἱερονίᾳ τῇ γῇ· γράψον τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον ἐκκήρυκτον, ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀναστῇ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνου Δαβὶδ, ἄρχων ἔτι ἐν τῷ Ἰούδᾳ,<sup>175</sup> οὐ πάντως ἀναιρεῖ τὸ στήσεσθαι αὐτοῦ σπέρμα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ καὶ γέγονεν ἀληθές· λέγει γοῦν· ἡτιμώθη Ἱερονίας ὡς σκεῦος οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ χρεία, τί ὅτι ἀπερρίφη αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰς γῆν ἦν οὐκ ἥδει,<sup>176</sup> ἀντικρυς τὴν Βαβυλῶνος γῆν θεσπίζων.<sup>177</sup> πλὴν ἀλλ’ ὁ ἐλθὼν κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σειράς, τῶν τε πάλαι ὑπὸ τὸν θάνατον πεπεδημένων ψυχῶν τούς δεσμοὺς λῦσαι ἀπεσταλμένος, ἐπὶ τὴν πάντων τούτων ἐλήλυθε σωτηρίαν· διό

172. Isa 45.13.

173. John 22.30.

174. Isa 53.4–5.

175. Jer 22.30.

176. Jer 22.28.

177. Cf. 2 Kgs 24.8–16; 2 Chr 36.9–10.

prisoners". The same prophet says of him elsewhere: "He will build my city, and will bring home again the captivity of my people".

**2.** It is thus apposite that Matthew announces to Jeconiah himself and to his soul, as well as to those who have suffered a similar dishonour and captivity of their souls, the good news of the coming of the Redeemer. Here he is tracing the descent of the Son of God along with the rest of them, guilty and sinful men! It was in the course of one and the same account that he mentioned David's breach of the law in the matter of Uriah's wife, Judah's fornication, and the foreign woman, Ruth the Moabitess; and it is actually just the same account into which he brings Jesus<sup>49</sup> associating with tax-collectors and sinners, undergoing the most shameful treatment at the hands of mankind, and finally being crucified along with the criminals. This was the account that contains the words: "Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world". And that is because the One who was to be the cleanser of all the sins that had ever been committed in the past, and that will be committed in the future, had to undergo all the things I have mentioned, as a life given for the lives of human beings. While sinless himself, he had to endure the punishments due to impious sinners in order that the prophecies of him should be fulfilled, especially that of the admirable Isaiah: "He takes away our sins, and suffers agony for us; he was wounded for our sins, and has been made sick for our transgressions. By his bruising we were all healed".

**3.** Even if the prophet did say to the land, about Jeconiah: "Write this man down as banished, because surely no offspring of his shall arise to sit on David's throne", he is not ruling out totally that offspring of his would arise, but only that offspring of his would arise to become kings of the Jewish nation. And that came true: for one thing, his words: "Jeconiah has been dishonoured, like a useless piece of pottery. What about the fact that he and his offspring have been thrown away to a land he did not know?"<sup>50</sup> are an exact prophecy of Babylonia. The difference is that the One who came to proclaim release to prisoners, and was sent out to undo the cords of sins and the bonds of the souls fettered long ago under the power of death, has come for the salvation of them all. Thus

---

49. The sense requires the name Ἰησοῦν, not in the text, to be supplied.

50. There are the same differences in reading as in note 47, above.

φησιν ὁ Δαβὶδ περὶ αὐτοῦ θεσπίζων· ἀπέστειλε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ίάσατο αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν διαφθορῶν αὐτῶν· ἔξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ καὶ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ τοῖς νιοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅτι συνέτριψε πύλας χαλκᾶς, καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροὺς συνέκλασε· καὶ ἀντελάβετο αὐτῶν ἐξ ὁδοῦ ἀνομίας αὐτῶν· ἐταπεινώθησαν, καὶ ἔξήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐκ σκότους καὶ σκιᾶς θανάτου, καὶ τὸν δεσμὸν αὐτῶν διέρρηξε.<sup>178</sup> Ταῦτα γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου διὰ Χριστοῦ γενομένης ἀπολυτρώσεως λέγεται, ὡς συνάδει καὶ τὸ φάσκον λόγιον· κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας, καὶ πάλιν ἀφεῖλεν ὁ Θεὸς πᾶν δάκρυνον ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου.<sup>179</sup>

Τηρητέον δὲ ὅτι μὴ διαπίπτει ὁ χρησμὸς ὁ φῆσας, οὐ μὴ ἀναστῇ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἱερονίμου καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνου Δαβὶδ, ἄρχων ἔτι ἐν τῷ Ἰούδᾳ.<sup>180</sup> ἐπεὶ μηδεὶς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἰούδα φυλῆς μετὰ Ἱερονίμου τῆς τοῦ Δαβὶδ βασιλείας κατέστη διάδοχος,<sup>181</sup> μετὰ γοῦν τὴν ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος αἰχμαλωσίαν, ὑπὸ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι διετέλεσε τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἀρχόμενον μέχρι τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας· ἥσαν γοῦν κατ’ αὐτὸν τετράρχαι οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡρώδην καὶ Φίλιππον, ἡγεμών τε Πιλάτος, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι βασιλεύς.<sup>182</sup>

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ια'

Διὰ τί ταῖς ἐν τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ κέχρηται ὑποδιαστολαῖς, μὴ ὅμοι συνάψας ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστὸν γενεὰς τεσσαράκοντα δύο, διελών δὲ τὰς διαδοχὰς καθ’ οὓς ἔξέθετο ἀφορισμούς;<sup>183</sup>

**1** Διὰ τὰς διαφόρους καταστάσεις τοῦ λαοῦ τὰς ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας παρισταμένας· ἄλλη μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἐπὶ Δαβὶδ, καὶ πάλιν ἔτερα ἡ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ, ἥτε μέχρι τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας, ὡς πάλιν ἡ ἀπὸ ταύτης

178. Ps 106.20–21, 16–17, 14.

179. Isa 25.8; cf. 1 Cor 15.54; Rev 7.17; 21.4.

180. Jer 22.30.

181. Cf. Esd 7.1–26, etc.

182. Cf. Luke 3.1.

183. Cf. Matt 1.17.

David, in prophesying about him, says: "He sent out his Word, and healed them from what was destroying them. Confess to the Lord his mercies, and his marvellous works for the sons of men; for he has smashed bronze gates and shattered iron bars, and he has grasped them out of the way of their transgression. They were brought low, and he led them out of darkness and the shadow of death, and broke their bonds apart". This refers to the ransoming from death brought about by Christ. The saying: "Death became strong and swallowed them up, and God took away again every tear from every face" also chimes with it.

We must observe that the prophecy: "Surely no offspring of his shall arise to sit on David's throne, ruling any longer in Judah" does not fall through, because since Jeconiah there has been no successor to David's kingship from the tribe of Judah. After the Babylonian captivity the whole nation remained under the rule of the high priests until the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ; and in his time there were tetrarchs (such as Herod and Philip), a governor (Pilate), and, over them all, the emperor.

## TO STEPHANUS 11

Why has he used subdivisions in the genealogy, not combining the forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ together, but separating the successive generations into the distinct groups he has set out?

1. Because of the nation's differing political situations that are covered by the narrative. One was from Abraham to David; then there was a different one from David down to the captivity; different, again, was the one

μέχρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀπὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τὸν Δαβὶδ οὐ φαίνονται ὑπὸ βασιλέας πολιτευσάμενοι· ἥρξαν δὲ τοῦ ἔθνους μετὰ Μωσέα καὶ Ἰησοῦν οἱ ἐπικληθέντες παρ' αὐτοῖς κριταί· καὶ ἦν τις ἴδιος τρόπος τῆς τούτων καταβάσεως.<sup>184</sup> ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμά πως συνειστήκει, οὐδέ γε ὁ ἐν αὐτοῖς νεώς· διόπερ ἐπιστημόνως ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς μὴ συγχέων τὴν ἱστορίαν, μέχρι Δαβὶδ ἔστη, τοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἰδίως καταριθμήσας· εἴτ' αὖ πάλιν ἐπειδήπερ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ μέχρι τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας οἰκείοις κέχρηται βασιλεῦσι, τοῖς τε ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ<sup>185</sup> ἄρξασι καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ διαστάσει τοῦ λαοῦ γενομένοις,<sup>186</sup> τό τε ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ ιερὸν ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ μέχρι τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας διήρκεσεν,<sup>187</sup> εἰκότως καὶ τούτοις πάλιν ἰδίως ἀφορίσας, ὑφ' ἔνα συνήγαγεν ἀριθμόν· ὕσπερ οὖν καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας μέχρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, παρ' οἷς οὐκέτι μὲν ἡ τοῦ Δαβὶδ συνέστη βασιλεία, μεταπεπτώκει δὲ τὰ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Ἰούδα φυλῆς ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ιερέων γένος, οἵ δὴ καὶ ἥρξαν αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν Κύρου χρόνων<sup>188</sup> καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ γένεσιν· ὅθεν καὶ τούτους ἰδίως ἀφορίσας, καθ' ἔαυτοὺς ἡρίθμησεν.

οὐκ ἀσυλλογίστως ἄρα τὰς τρεῖς πεποίηται διαστολὰς διὰ τὰς ἀποδοθείσας αἰτίας.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ιβ'

Διὰ τί ἀπὸ τῶν Δαβὶδ χρόνων ἐπὶ Ἱερονίαν καὶ τὴν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα αἰχμαλωσίαν ἐπτὰ καὶ δέκα βασιλευσάντων,<sup>189</sup> δεκατέσσαρας εἶναι φησι γενεὰς ὁ εὐαγγελιστής;<sup>190</sup>

**1** Εἰ μὲν διαδοχὰς ἀναγράφειν αὐτῷ προύκειτο, καὶ εὐλόγως τις

184. Cf. Judg 2.16–19, etc.

185. Cf. 1 Chr 3.1–16, etc.

186. Cf. 1 Kgs 12.1–19; 2 Chr 10.1–19, etc.

187. Cf. 1 Kgs 6.1–8.66; 2 Chr 3.1–8, 16.

188. Cf. 2 Chr 36.22–23; Ezra 1.1–4, etc.

189. Cf. 1 Chr 3.10–16, etc.

190. Cf. Matt 1.17.

from then till Christ. From Abraham to David their polity was clearly not under kings: the rulers of the nation after Moses and Joshua were what they called “judges”, and theirs was one particular kind of succession. Jerusalem, and its temple, had not yet come into existence at all. Thus it was discerning of the evangelist not to mix his narrative up, but to make a stop at David, numbering those<sup>51</sup> from Abraham separately. Then again, from David down to the captivity they<sup>52</sup> had their own kings, both David’s successors and those who ensued at the division of the nation, with the Jerusalem temple lasting from him until the captivity. Thus, again, it was logical for Matthew to group those,<sup>53</sup> too, together in a separate list. He does just the same with those from the captivity to Christ; in their time the Davidic kingdom no longer existed, and the leadership had devolved from the tribe of Judah to the priestly class, who in fact ruled the people from the days of Cyrus until Christ’s birth. Hence he lists those names, too, in a separate group, and enumerates them on their own.

Thus we see that it is not without due consideration that he has made his three divisions, for the reasons given.

## TO STEPHANUS 12

Given that there were seventeen kings from David’s time to Jeconiah and the Babylonian captivity, why does the evangelist say there are fourteen generations?

1. If his purpose had been to record successions, one would have

---

51. Reading τούς, with Mai, for the MS τοῦ.

52. Reading κέχρηνται, with Mai, for the MS κέχρηται.

53. Reading τούτους, with Mai, for the MS τούτοις.

έμεμψατο ως παρεκθεμένω τὴν τῶν βασιλέων διαδοχήν· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Βασιλείαις<sup>191</sup> καὶ ἐν τοῖς Παραλειπομένοις<sup>192</sup> συμφώνως μετὰ Ἰωράμ τὸν τοῦ Ἰωσαφάτ, τριῶν ἐφεξῆς βασιλευσάντων, Ὄχοζία καὶ Ἰωάς καὶ Ἀμεσία,<sup>193</sup> εἴτα μετ' αὐτοὺς Ὄζία καὶ Ἰωάθαμ καὶ Ἀχαζ, παρελθὼν τοὺς προτέρους τοὺς τρεῖς ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, μετὰ Ἰωράμ τὸν τοῦ Ἰωσαφάτ ἔξης συνάπτει τὸν Ὄζίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰωάθαμ καὶ τὸν Ἀχαζ, τοὺς εἰρημένους μεταξὺ παρελθών.<sup>194</sup> τοῦτο δ' εἰ πεποιήκει σκοπὸν θέμενος τὴν τῶν βασιλέων διαδοχὴν ἐκθέσθαι, χρῆν ως ἡμαρτημένην ἐκθέσθαι τὴν παρ' αὐτῷ γραφήν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ διαδοχὰς ἀλλὰ γενεὰς ἀριθμῆσαι προούθετο, τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ βούλεται φήσαντι πᾶσαι οὖν αἱ γενεαὶ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ μέχρι Δαβὶδ, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες· καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ μέχρι Ἱερονίου καὶ τῆς μετοικησίας Βαβυλῶνος, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες,<sup>195</sup> ἀλλ' οὐ διαδοχαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, εἰκότως πάσης ἀπολύοιτ' ἀν κατηγορίας· ἐπεὶ διὰ τί μὴ διαδοχὰς ὡνόμασε, τῆς δὲ ἐν ταῖς Βασιλείαις καὶ Παραλειπομένοις ιστορίας διαδοχὰς ἀλλ' οὐ γενεὰς ιστορούσης, οὐκ ἄν γένοιτο ἐναντίωμα ἐκ τῆς ἀμφοτέρων παραθέσεως.

**2** Γενεὰν γὰρ χρόνον ἀνθρώπου ζωῆς οὐχ οἶόν τέ ἐστιν ὄνομάζειν, ἐπεὶ συμβαίνει πολλάκις τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ βραχὺ βιῶναι, καὶ θᾶττον ἀποσβεσθῆναι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδὸς ἡλικίαν, τοὺς δὲ μέχρι τοῦ μειρακίου φθάσαι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν νεανίαν προελθεῖν, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐπ' ἔσχατον γῆρας παρατεῖναι τὴν ζωήν· ποίαν οὖν τις ἀριθμήσει γενεάν; Εἴ δὲ φέρει μέχρι δεκάτου ἔτους, δὲ μέχρις εἰκοστοῦ, δὲ μέχρις πεντηκοστοῦ, ἄλλος δὲ μέχρις ἑβδομηκοστοῦ, δὲ καὶ τὰ ἑκατὸν ὑπερβάς, οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄραται· πῶς οὖν οἴονται τὴν ἀνθρώπου ζωὴν γενεὰν ὄνομάζειν; Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέχρι τῆς παιδοποιίας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸ τῶν εἰκοσι ἐτῶν γήμαντες πεπαιδοποίηνται, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ τὰ τριάκοντα γενόμενοι· καὶ τῶν ισηλίκων δὲ ἵδοις ἄν τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ πρώτους νίοὺς στάντας, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τετραγονίαν ἐλάσαντας· ὥστε ἐν πεντήκοντα ἔτεσι τοὺς μὲν ἐκγόνους θεάσασθαι, ἐτέρους δὲ ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα μηδενὸς ἀξιωθῆναι παιδός· πῶς οὖν ἀριθμητέον τὰς γενεάς; Πότερον ἐκ τῶν μακροβίων ἢ τῶν ὀλιγοβίων; Καὶ ἐκ τῶν

191. Cf. 2 Kgs 8.16–29; 12.1–22; 14.1–22; 15.1–7; 15.32–16.20, etc.

192. Cf. 1 Chr 3.11–13, etc.

193. Cf. 1 Chr 3.11–13, etc.

194. Cf. Matt 1.8.

195. Matt 1.17.

been quite justified in criticising him for giving an incorrect<sup>54</sup> list of the kings' succession, because Kingdoms and Chronicles agree in putting the three consecutive kings Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah after Joram son of Jehoshaphat, and then, after those, Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz; whereas the evangelist omits those first three and follows Joram son of Jehoshaphat directly with Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz, omitting the intermediate ones mentioned. If he had done so despite having made as his aim a list of the kings in succession, one would be compelled to expose his version as wrong. However, his purpose was to enumerate generations, not successions: that is the meaning of the words in his account: "Therefore all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations; and again from David to Jeconiah and the deportation to Babylon, fourteen generations"—not "fourteen successions". It would thus be reasonable to acquit him of any charge. Why else did he not use the word "successions"? Given that the narrative in Kingdoms and Chronicles tells of successions, not generations, no contradiction could emerge from comparing the two.

2. It is not possible to use the word *generation* to mean "the duration of a human life", because it is often the case that some have a short life, quickly snuffed out in their childhood years, while others reach adolescence, others grow up into young men, others to full manhood, and others extend their life into extreme old age. What sort of generation is one going to count, if one life lasts till the tenth year, another to the twentieth, another to the fiftieth, another to the seventieth, and another can be seen—not just in antiquity, but in our own day as well—to reach over a century? How, then, do they suppose they can use the human lifespan to define a generation? "Up to the age of having children" will not do, either, because some marry, and have had children, before they are twenty, and some not till after thirty; and among people of the same age, you could see some with the support of their first sons alone, whereas others go on to four generations, so that some see grandchildren of theirs by the time they are fifty, while others of seventy have not been granted any children at all. So how is one going to assign a numerical value to a generation? From the long-lived, or the short-lived? From those who have had children quickly,

---

54. The sense demands a conjectural restoration to the text of, e.g., οὐκ ὄρθως ("incorrectly") after ως, unless, with Zamagni, one assumes an otherwise unexampled meaning, "make a mistake," for παρεκτίθημι.

ταχὺ πεπαιδοποιημένων ἢ τῶν βραδέων; Καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ πρώτοις νίοῖς σαλευσάντων ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ πλείοσι διαδοχαῖς;

**3** Ων οὕτως ἔξητασμένων, ὁ θεῖος εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐ διαδοχὰς προθέμενος εἰπεῖν, γενεὰς δέ, καθ' οὓς αὐτὸς ἡπίστατο λόγους ἀπαριθμούμενος, τῆς μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις διαδοχῆς ἥττον πεφρόντικε,<sup>196</sup> τοσούτους ἀναλαμβάνει εἰς τὴν γενεαλογίαν, ὅσοι ἀπήρκουν αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν δεκατεσσάρων γενεῶν.<sup>197</sup> οὕτως τε αὐτῷ· ὑγιῆς ἀποσώζεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐναντίος τῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν γραφῇ.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ιγ'

Διὰ τί τῶν μετὰ Ἰεχονίαν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ γενεαλογουμένων, δύο καὶ δέκα ὄντων, ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς δεκατέσσαρας πάλιν εἶναι φησιν;<sup>198</sup>

**1** Διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν· οὐ γὰρ διαδοχάς, γενεὰς δέ, ὡς ἔφην, ἀναγράφειν ἐβούλετο· συμβαίνει δὲ πολλάκις ἐν μακροβίοις καὶ πολυέτεσι, τὰς μὲν γεγονέναι τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰς διαδοχάς, τὸν δὲ τῶν γενεῶν ἀριθμὸν ἀποδεδόσθαι πλήρη· ὡς δὴ οὖν λόγω ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αἱχμαλωσίαν πλείοσιν οὖσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῖς ἐν τῇ διαδοχῇ φερομένοις, ὀλιγώτεραι ἀπεδόθησαν αἱ γενεαί· ἐν γὰρ διαδοχαῖς ἀνδρῶν ἐπτὰ καὶ δέκα, γενεαὶ εἴρηνται δεκατέσσαρες· κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λογισμὸν καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν διαδοχαῖς δώδεκα, αἱ δεκατέσσαρες ἃν ἐπληροῦντο γενεαί, μακροβίων ὡς εἰκὸς πολυχρονίων αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν δώδεκα γεγενημένων, καὶ ἀρκούντων εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν τῶν δεκατεσσάρων γενεῶν.

Μία μὲν ἀπόδοσις τοῦ ζητηθέντος ἥδε.

196. Cf. 1 Chr 3.10–16, etc.

197. Cf. Matt 1.17.

198. Cf. Matt 1.12–17.

or those who were slow to do so? From those who depend on their first sons, or those who have several generations to depend on?

3. The question has thus been dealt with. The divine evangelist, whose purpose was to talk of generations, not successions, enumerates them in the terms in which he himself understood them. With no great concern for the successions in the histories, he has included in his genealogy only as many as sufficed to make up his fourteen generations. Thus the soundness of his account is preserved, and it is in no way in conflict with the historical books.

## TO STEPHANUS 13

Given that there are twelve names in the genealogy from Jeconiah to Joseph, why, again, does the evangelist say that there were fourteen?

1. For the same reason: that is, as I have said, that he wishes to record generations, not successions. In the case of those whose long lives span many years, it often comes about that there have not been many<sup>55</sup> individuals in the succession, compared with what comes out as the full number of generations; so it is on that reckoning that, in the case of those included in the succession from David down to the captivity, a larger number, the generations came out as fewer: that is, there are seventeen men in the successions, but that has been called “fourteen generations”. In the present case, on the same calculation, the fourteen generations would be complete in twelve successions, these particular twelve long-lived men having presumably made up a sufficient length of years to fill the fourteen generations.

That is one answer to the question.

---

55. Reading δόλιγας μὲν γεγονέναι for τὰς μὲν γεγονέναι, as seems demanded by the contrast.

**2** Καθ' ἑτέραν δὲ διάνοιαν εὕροις ἄν ἀκριβώσας κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν δεκατέσσαρας ὠνομασμένους καὶ ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ διαδοχῇ, εἰ πρὸς τοῖς δώδεκα συναριθμήσεις αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν<sup>199</sup> νίδον τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ χρηματίσαντα,<sup>200</sup> προσθείης τε τούτοις καὶ τὸν Ἱεχονίαν τὸν ἐν τῇ Βαβυλῶνι γεγενημένον,<sup>201</sup> οὐχὶ τὸν πρὸ τῆς μετοικησίας ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ βασιλεύσαντα.<sup>202</sup> δύο γάρ ὄμώνυμοι γεγόνασιν Ἰωακεὶμ μετὰ Ἰωσίαν, ὃ γε αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰωσίου νίδος,<sup>203</sup> ὃς μετὰ τοῦτον ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ,<sup>204</sup> καὶ ὁ τούτου παῖς ἔτερος Ἰωακεὶμ.<sup>205</sup> οὗτοι δὲ καὶ Ἱεχονίαι ἔχρηματισαν, ἐξελληνισθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὀνόματος. Ὁ τοίνυν πρῶτος Ἰωακεὶμ ὁ καὶ Ἱεχονίας νίδος ὡν Ἰωσίου, ταῖς πρὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας συγκαταλεγέσθω γενεαῖς.<sup>206</sup> ὁ δὲ τούτου παῖς ὁ δεύτερος Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἱεχονίας, νίδος ὡν τοῦ πρώτου Ἰωακεὶμ, τοῦ δὲ Ἰωσίου ἔκγονος, ἐν τοῖς μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν γενεαλογουμένοις ἀριθμούμενος.<sup>207</sup> τέλειον ἀποδοίη ἄν τὸν τῶν δεκατεσσάρων γενεῶν ἀριθμόν.

**3** Περὶ δὲ τοῦ δύο γεγονέναι Ἰωακεὶμ, μαρτυρήσει ἡ τῶν Βασιλειῶν γραφή, τοῦτον ἔχουσα τὸν τρόπον· καὶ ἐβασίλευσε Φαραὼ Νεχαὼ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τὸν Ἐλιακεὶμ νίδον Ἰωσίᾳ βασιλέως Ἰούδα, ἀντὶ Ἰωσίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐπέστρεψε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωακεὶμ.<sup>208</sup> οἵς ἐξῆς ἐπιλέγει· νίδος εἰκοσιπέντε ἐτῶν Ἰωακεὶμ ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐνδεκα ἔτη ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.<sup>209</sup> οἵς μεθ' ἔτερα ἐπιλέγει· καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωακεὶμ, καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν, οὐκ ἴδον γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ Λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Ἰούδα; Καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωακεὶμ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἰωακεὶμ νίδος αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ· νίδος ὀκτὼ καὶ δέκα ἐτῶν Ἰωακεὶμ ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν· καὶ τρίμηνον ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ ὄνομα τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἔσθά· καὶ ἐποίησε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖς κυρίου κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ. Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ

199. Cf. Matt 1.16.

200. Cf. Luke 3.23.

201. Cf. Matt 1.12; 2 Kgs 24.15; 2 Chr 36.10, etc.

202. Cf. Matt 1.11; 2 Kgs 23.36; 2 Chr 36.5, etc.

203. Cf. 1 Chr 3.15, etc.

204. Cf. 2 Kgs 23.36; 2 Chr 36.5, etc.

205. Cf. 2 Kgs 24.5; 2 Ch. 36.8, etc.

206. Cf. Matt 1.11.

207. Cf. Matt 1.12.

208. 2 Kgs 23.34; cf. 2 Chr 36.4.

209. 2 Kgs 23.36; cf. 2 Chr 36.5.

2. However, in another sense, taking the narrative precisely, you would find that the present succession-list does also have fourteen names, if, as well as the twelve, you were to include Jesus Christ himself, known as Joseph's son, in the count, and were also to add to those the Jeconiah who was in Babylon—not the one who was king in Jerusalem before the deportation. After Josiah, you see, there were two with the same name, Joachim: Josiah's actual son, who succeeded him as king in Jerusalem, and that one's son, Joachim II. These were both also known by the Hellenised form of their name, Jeconiah. Now Joachim I, or Jeconiah I, Josiah's son and successor as king in Jerusalem, is to be included in the pre-captivity generations; but his son, Joachim II (also known as Jeconiah; he was the son of Joachim I, and grandson of Josiah) would, when counted with those listed in the genealogy from the captivity down to Christ, bring the total number up to the fourteen generations.

3. Evidence for there having been two Joachims will be given by the book of Kingdoms, which contains the following passage:<sup>56</sup> “And Pharaoh Necho made Eliakim, son of Josiah king of Judah, king over Israel in place of his father Josiah, and changed his name to Joachim”. It then adds: “His son Joachim was twenty-five years old when he began to reign, and he reigned eleven years in Jerusalem”. Later, it goes on to say: “and the remaining accounts of Joachim, and all that he did, behold, are they not written in the book of the Accounts of the Days of the Kings of Judah? And Joachim slept with his fathers, and his son Joachim became king in his place. His son Joachim was eighteen years old when he began to reign, and he reigned three months in Jerusalem; and his mother's name was Estha; and he did what was wicked in the eyes of the Lord, in the same

---

56. Reading τόπον, the usual word for a passage from a book, for τρόπον (“manner, style”).

ἐκείνω ἀνέβη Ναβουχοδονόσορ βασιλεὺς βαβυλώνος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ πόλις ἐν περιοχῇ· καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς βαβυλώνος ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ ἐποιόρκουν αὐτήν· καὶ ἔξῆλθεν Ἰωακεὶμ βασιλεὺς Ἰούδα ἐπὶ βασιλέα βαβυλώνος, αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ μῆτηρ, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐνοῦχοι αὐτοῦ· καὶ τοὺς ἴσχυρούς τῆς γῆς ἀπήγαγεν ἀποικεσίαν ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα.<sup>210</sup> Οὗτος δὴ οὖν ὁ δεύτερος Ἰωακεὶμ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἀπαχθείς, οὗτος ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ πρὸς τοῦ Ἱερεμίου Ἰεχονίας ὠνομασμένος,<sup>211</sup> ἔκγονος τυγχάνων τοῦ Ἰωσίᾳ, ἀλλ’ οὐχ νίος· διὸ εἰκότως ἂν συναριθμοῖτο ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ γενεαλογίᾳ τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰεχονία μέχρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεῶν δεκατεσσάρων· τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, δις ἦν τοῦ Ἰωσίᾳ παῖς, σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀνωτέρω γενεαῖς καταριθμουμένου.

καὶ οὕτως ἡμῖν καὶ ὁ τῶν ὑστάτων δεκατεσσάρων γενεῶν ἀριθμὸς συνίσταται πλήρης.

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ιδ'

Διὰ τί τοῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἐχρημάτισεν, ἀλλ’ οὐ τινὸς ἐπισήμου καὶ ἐνδόξου ἀνδρός;<sup>212</sup>

**1** Οὐ τὴν ἔνθεον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ἐπιδείξων ἐλήλυθεν· ἐπεὶ μὴ δὲ φανητιῶν καὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶς ἡμῖν παρήει· ἡ δὲ ὁδὸς αὐτῷ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀφίξεως ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐγίνετο, ἐφ' ὃ τε τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον περικαθάροιτο, τὸν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλης ἀμνὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀντίψυχον καὶ καθάρσιον ὑπὲρ πάντων ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἐαυτὸν ἐπιδούς· ἵν’ οὖν ἀπαραποδίστως εἰς τέλος ἀχθείη τοῦτο, τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν αὐτοῦ θαυμάτων ἀπέκρυπτε τε καὶ ἐπεσκίαζε, ποτὲ μὲν παραινῶν μὴ εἰς πάντας ἐκφέρειν τὰ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πραττόμενα,<sup>213</sup> ποτὲ δὲ τὰς ἐρημίας διώκων καὶ τὰς

210. 2 Kgs 24.5–6, 8–12, 15; cf. 2 Chr 36.8–10.

211. Cf. Jer 22.24–30.

212. Cf. Matt 13.55.

213. Cf. Matt 8.4; 9.30; 17.9; Mark 1.44; 5.43; 7.24; 8.26; 9.9; Luke 4.41; 5.14; 8.56.

way as all that his father had done. At that time Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up against Jerusalem, and the city came under siege. And the king of Babylon came into the city, and his sons were besieging it; and Joachim king of Judah went out to the king of Babylon, he and his sons, and his mother, and his officers, and his eunuchs; and he took the strong men of the land away from Jerusalem to settle in Babylon.” Thus the one called Jeconiah by Jeremiah was this Joachim, Joachim II, who was driven off to Babylon. He is in fact Josiah’s grandson, not his son, and so could reasonably be counted among the third generation-list, the one “From Jeconiah to Christ, fourteen generations”; while his father, Josiah’s son, is counted with his father among the previous generations.

Thus we find that the final fourteen generations do also comprise the full number.

## TO STEPHANUS 14

Why was our Saviour known as “the carpenter’s son”, not as the son of some famous and distinguished man?

1. It was not to demonstrate his divine kingship that he came; he came among us with no desire for display or showing off. The condition of his journey towards his arrival in heaven was that he should entirely cleanse the life of mankind by giving himself, God’s Lamb from the human flock, in person for us all, as a purificatory offering of his life for ours. To enable this to be brought to its conclusion unhindered, he concealed most of his marvellous acts and kept them dark, sometimes giving instructions not to disclose them to everyone, and sometimes trying to find deserted places,

ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσι διατριβάς.<sup>214</sup> καὶ τὴν ἔνθεον αὐτοῦ μεταμόρφωσιν οὐδὲ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἄπασιν, μόνοις δὲ τρισίν, ἐπεδείκνυτο, αὐτοῖς τε τούτοις παρεκελεύετο μηδενὶ φάναι τὸ ὄραμα, ἵνα ὁ νίδος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθῇ.<sup>215</sup>

οὐκ ἄν δὲ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα, εἰ οἴα τις ἔνδοξος βασιλεὺς μετὰ δορυφορίας ἐνθέου καὶ παρατάξεως ἐπήει.<sup>216</sup> ὁμοῦ καὶ τὰς ἐνθέους ἐνεργῶν παραδοξοποιίας, ὁμοῦ καὶ κρείττονα ἔαυτὸν ἐπιδεικνὺς πάσης φύσεως.<sup>217</sup> εἰκότως οὖν κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἔαυτὸν ἐκένωσε μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.<sup>218</sup> καὶ τοῦ πένητος Ἰωσῆφ υἱὸς οὐκ ἀπηνήνατο χρηματίσαι· ἵνα καὶ οὕτως ἐπαληθεύσῃ τὸ φάσκον περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγιον ὅτι πλούσιος ὡν, δι' ἡμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς τῇ αὐτοῦ πτωχείᾳ πλουτήσωμεν.<sup>219</sup>

### Πρὸς Στέφανον ιε'

Πῶς ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον λέγεται Δαβὶδ κεκαθικέναι;<sup>220</sup>

**1** Διαφόρως νοεῖται ὁ θρόνος Δαβίδ· καθ' ἔνα μὲν τρόπον, καθ' ὃν εἴποι ἄν τις δηλοῦσθαι τὸν ἐφ' ᾧ ἐκαθέζετο βασιλεύων, τάχα που ἔξ ἐλέφαντος καὶ ξύλων πεποιημένον, χρυσῷ τε καὶ λίθοις βασιλικοῖς κεκοσμημένον· καθ' ἔτερον δὲ καθ' ὃν τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ ἔθνους ἡγεμονίαν, θρόνον βασιλείας εἰώθαμεν ἀποκαλεῖν.

214. Cf. Matt 14.23; Mark 6.46; Luke 6.12; John 6.15.

215. Cf. Matt 17.1–9; Mark 9.2–10; Luke 9.28–36.

216. Cf. John 18.36.

217. Cf. John 1.1; Phil 2.6; Col 1.15; Heb 1.3; 1 John 1.1–2, etc.

218. Phil 2.7.

219. 2 Cor 8.9.

220. Cf. Luke 1.32.

and opportunities to spend time in the hills. He did not even display his divine transfiguration to all his disciples, but only to three of them; and even to those he gave orders to tell no-one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead.

He would not have undergone what is recorded of him, on our behalf, if he had come to us like some famous king with a divine bodyguard and a military parade, simultaneously working his divine miracles and showing himself off as an entirely supernatural being. It was with reason, therefore, that, in the apostle's words, "he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave", and did not disdain to be known as the son of the poor man, Joseph. This was, additionally, to substantiate the saying about him that "being rich, for us he became poor, so that we, by means of his poverty, might become rich".

## TO STEPHANUS 15

In what sense is he said to have sat "on the throne of David"?

1. The throne of David is conceived of in different ways. In one way, one would say that what it means is the seat he sat on as king, probably made of ivory and wood, and embellished with gold and royal gems. In another, as we habitually use the phrase "his royal throne", it means his actual power, his leadership over the whole people.

τρίτος ἂν παρὰ τοὺς εἰρημένους λεχθείη τρόπους, καθ' ὃν ὁ ἐπηγγελμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Δαβὶδ θρόνος ὄνομασθείη ἂν αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἐφ' ὃν αὐτὸς ἐκαθέσθη, ἀλλ' ὃν διὰ τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν θεοπρεπῶν οἱ θεῖοι λόγοι περιέχουσι· γέγραπται γάρ ἐν ὄγδοηκοστῷ ὄγδόῳ ψαλμῷ· ὡς ἥμοσα Δαβὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου, ἔως τοῦ αἰώνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου· καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου.<sup>221</sup> καὶ πάλιν· καὶ θήσομαι εἰς τὸν αἰώνα τοῦ αἰώνος τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ὡς τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.<sup>222</sup> καὶ πάλιν· ἀπαξ ἥμοσα ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ μου, εἰ τῷ Δαβὶδ ψεύσομαι, τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα μένει, καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐναντίον μου, καὶ ὡς ἡ σελήνη κατηρτισμένη εἰς τὸν αἰώνα, καὶ ὁ μάρτυς ἐν οὐρανῷ πιστός.<sup>223</sup>

**2** Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν θρόνον ὡς τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ὡς τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ τὴν σελήνην εἰς τὸν αἰώνα διαμένοντα δώσειν ἐπήγγελτο διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Δαβὶδ, πολλὴ μέν τις ἦν διὰ ταῦτα τῷ παντὶ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνει προσδοκία περὶ τοῦ δηλωθέντος θρόνου· βραχὺν δὲ χρόνον τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἡγησαμένου, καὶ Σολομῶνος μετ' αὐτόν, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν διαδόχων τῆς αὐτῶν βασιλείας εἰς Ἱερονίαν καὶ τὴν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα αἰχμαλωσίαν καταστρεψάντων, ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου λελύσθαι τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας Δαβὶδ, ἐδόκει τὰ τῆς τῶν θείων χρησμῶν ἐπαγγελίας μὴ συνίστασθαι.<sup>224</sup> τοῦτο οὖν αὐτὸ τῷ θείῳ Πνεύματι πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ψαλμὸς προαγορεύει ἐξῆς τοῖς προπαρατεθεῖσι λέγων· ποῦ εἰσι τὰ ἐλέη σου τὰ ἀρχαῖα, κύριε, ἀ ἥμοσας τῷ Δαβὶδ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου;<sup>225</sup> Καὶ τὴν γε καθαίρεσιν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς διαδοχῆς αὐτοῦ, τοῦ θρόνου τε τὴν καταστροφὴν διαρρήδην ὑποσημαίνει πάλιν ἐξῆς διὰ τούτων· σὺ δὲ ἀπώσω καὶ ἔξουδένωσας, κύριε· ἀνεβάλου τὸν χριστόν σου, κατέστρεψας τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ δούλου σου, ἐβεβήλωσας εἰς τὴν γῆν τὸ ἀγίασμα αὐτοῦ:<sup>226</sup> καὶ ἐπιφέρει· τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν κατέρρηξας.<sup>227</sup>

**3** Ταῦτα πάντα κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ συνάγει τὸ θεῖον Πνεῦμα, μονονουχὶ βουλόμενον ἡμᾶς διδάξαι, ὅτι οὐ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῆς αἰσθητῆς, οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ σωματικῶτερον νοούμενου αἱ πρὸς Δαβὶδ ἥσαν

221. Ps 88.4–5.

222. Ps 88.30.

223. Ps 88.36–38.

224. Cf. Jer 22.24–30, etc.

225. Ps 88.50.

226. Ps 88.39–40.

227. Ps 88.45.

Apart from those just mentioned, there is a third way in which the word “throne”, promised by God to David, would be called “his”: not as the one he personally sat on, but as the one which occurs in the divine scriptures, in the prophecies<sup>57</sup> given to him. The eighty-eighth Psalm<sup>58</sup> contains the words: “As I swore to my servant David: ‘To eternity I shall provide your seed, and I shall build up your throne to generation and generation’; and again: ‘And I shall set his seed until the eternity of eternity, and his throne as the days of heaven’; and again: ‘I swore once in my holiness “If I shall lie to David...!”’<sup>59</sup> His seed shall<sup>60</sup> remain for eternity, and his throne be as the sun before me, and as the moon, set firm for eternity; and the witness is trustworthy in heaven”.

**2.** Now, as God had promised David, in the passages quoted, to give him a throne “as the days of heaven”, and “as the sun”, and “as the moon”, lasting for eternity, the whole Jewish nation had for that reason a strong expectation about the “throne” in question. However, after the brief hegemony of David, and of Solomon after him—not to mention also the successors to their kingdom, who came to an end with Jeconiah and the Babylonian captivity, so that after him the kingdom of David had been abolished,—it seemed that the promise of the divine oracles did not hold good. That is just what, again, this same Psalm puts forward in the divine Spirit, with the words following those I have cited: “Where are your ancient mercies, Lord, which you swore to David in your truth?” Again, the fall of his kingdom and his succession, and the end of his throne, are explicitly, though not literally, indicated in the words that come next: “But you, Lord, have thrust it away and brought it to nothing; you have put off your anointed one, you have brought your servant’s covenant to an end; you have profaned his sacredness to the ground”. It adds: “You have shattered his throne to the ground”.

**3.** The divine Spirit brings all these passages to the same point, to all intents and purposes wishing to inform us that the promises to David were not about the visible kingship, nor about the throne in its physical sense.

57. Reading θεοπρόπων for θεοπρεπῶν.

58. English Bible Ps 89.

59. For the Hebrew idiom “If I ...” in oaths, see note 41.

60. Reading μενεῖ, with Rahlfs’ Septuagint, for μένει.

ἐπαγγελίαι· αἱ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τίνος αἰώνιου θρόνου, ἀπεικαζομένου ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ οὐρανῷ, διαμένοντός τε εἰς αἰῶνα, προεθέσπιζον· ἡ δέ γε τοῦ Δαβὶδ βασιλεία ἡ αἰσθητὴ χρόνῳ λέλυτο οὐκ εἰς μακρόν· εἰκότως τοιγαροῦν τοῦ θρόνου τῆς αἰσθητῆς βασιλείας Δαβὶδ τὴν καθαίρεσιν ὑπογράψας, καὶ εἰπών, τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν κατέρρηξας,<sup>228</sup> περὶ τοῦ διὰ τῶν θείων χρησμῶν ἐπηγγελμένου αἰώνιου καὶ οὐρανίου θρόνου ἔξῆς τὴν εὐχὴν ποιεῖται λέγων· ποῦ εἰσὶ τὰ ἐλέη σου τὰ ἀρχαῖα, κύριε, ἡ ὥμοσας τῷ Δαβὶδ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου;<sup>229</sup> Μονονούχῃ τὰς ἐκβάσεις τῶν μεθ' ὄρκου διαβεβαιώσεως ἐπηγγελμένων αὐτῷ τέλους τυχεῖν ἀξιῶν.

**4** Τοῦτον οὖν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον ὃν ὥμοσεν ὁ Θεὸς δώσειν τῷ Δαβὶδ θρόνον, τὸν ὡς τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ τὸν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸν ὡς σελήνην κατηρτισμένην εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, παντὸς ἐπιστῆναι τοῦ ἔθνους εὐχομένου, ὁ μέγας ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ τὴν παρθένον εὐαγγελίζεται τῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννησομένῳ δοθήσεσθαι θεσπίζων· διό φησι πρὸς αὐτήν· καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ νιὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται· καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,<sup>230</sup> ἐπιφέρει δ' οὖν ἐφεξῆς, διασαφῶν ὅποιον ἔφησε θρόνον, καὶ λέγει· καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος,<sup>231</sup> σύμφωνα τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν χρησμῶν ἐρμηνεύων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸν Δαβὶδ περὶ θρόνου βασιλείας αἰώνιου καὶ οὐρανίου προϋλεγεν, ὁ δὲ ὡσαύτως τὸν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου γεννησόμενον λήψεσθαι φησι τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ, τουτέστι τὸν τῷ Δαβὶδ ἐπηγγελμένον μέν, οὐ μὴν καὶ δεδομένον· οὗτος δ' ἦν ὁ οὐράνιος καὶ εἰς αἰῶνα διαμένων· ἦν οὖν καὶ τοῦτο συμπέρασμα μεγίστης προφητείας τῷ Δαβὶδ κεχρησμένης, προσδοκωμένης τε τῷ παντὶ λαῷ, πεπληρωμένης δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Γαβριὴλ μαρτυρίαν φήσαντος· καὶ βασιλεύσει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.<sup>232</sup> διόπερ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν πρὸς τὸν ἐρόμενον αὐτόν, εἰ αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων βασιλεύς, ἀπεκρίνατο· ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.<sup>233</sup> οὐδέν γὰρ θνητὸν οὐδὲ ἐπίκηρον ἐπήγετο αὐτῷ ὁ τῆς βασιλείας θρόνος· ἀλλ' ἦν ἀληθῶς καθ' ὅλης τῆς ἀνθρώπων οἰκουμένης, φωτὸς δίκην ἐκλάμπων ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ

228. Ps 88.45.

229. Ps 88.50.

230. Luke 1.31–32.

231. Luke 1.33.

232. Luke 1.33.

233. John 18.36.

They were predictions of an eternal throne, which is compared to the sun, moon and heaven, and lasts for eternity; whereas David's visible kingdom had in time—no long time—been abolished. That is why it is with good reason that, after the implied reference to the fall of the throne of David's visible kingdom, and saying: "You have shattered his throne to the ground", he next makes his prayer about the eternal, heavenly throne that had been promised through the divine oracles, in the words: "Where are your ancient mercies, Lord, which you swore to David in your truth?"—virtually a request that the fulfilments of the promises to him, which were strengthened by an oath, should come to fruition.

4. Therefore, the throne about which the great angel Gabriel gives the Virgin the good news, prophesying that it will be given to the One who is to be born of her, is this very same throne that God swore to give David, the throne which is "as the days of heaven", "as the sun before God", and "as the moon, set firm for eternity", with the whole nation praying for it to be established. Hence he says to her: "And you shall call his name Jesus; he shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give him the throne of his father David". He goes on, too, to make it clear what kind of throne he was talking about, by saying: "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for eternity; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." His explanation agrees with that of the oracles. They were telling<sup>61</sup> David in advance about an eternal, heavenly throne of kingship; exactly so, Gabriel is saying that the One who is to be born of the Virgin will receive the throne of David—that is to say, the throne promised to David, though not by any means actually given to him yet: the heavenly throne, the one lasting to eternity. This, then, was the actual fulfilment of the greatest prophecy delivered to David, awaited by the whole people, and fulfilled in our Saviour Jesus Christ, as Gabriel testified in the words: "And he shall reign for eternity; and of his kingdom there shall be no end". That, too, is why our Lord and Saviour himself said, in reply to the questioner who asked him if he was the king of the Jews: "My kingdom is not of this world". The royal throne that was in store for him was nothing mortal or perishable, but was truly world-wide, shining as a light like the sun and set

---

61. Grammatical concord, not otherwise irregular in Eusebius, suggests that for ὁ μὲν ... προΐλεγεν we should read οἱ μὲν ... προΐλεγον, to agree with the plural οἱ χρησμοί.

ώς ή σελήνη κατηρτισμένη είς τὸν αἰῶνα, ψυχὰς νοερὰς καταυγάζων διὰ τῆς ἐνθέου καὶ οὐρανίου διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ.

5 Εἰ δὲ λέγοιτο ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰακὼβ βασιλεύσειν,<sup>234</sup> μὴ τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος νόμιζε διὰ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ δηλοῦσθαι. Ὁ γοῦν ταῦτα ἴστορῶν Λουκᾶς ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὴν τοῦ Γαβριὴλ φωνὴν οἰκείᾳ παραδοὺς γραφῇ, σαφῶς ἤπιστατο τὸν Ἰησοῦν οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος τὸν σωτῆρα βεβασιλευκότα, οὐδὲ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας αὐτὸν ἅρξαντα,<sup>235</sup> ὥν γε καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ συσκευήν, καὶ τὴν εἰς θάνατον ἐπιβουλὴν ἀκριβῶς ἴστορεῖ<sup>236</sup> καὶ οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰς κατὰ τῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαθητῶν ἐπαναστάσεις αὐτῶν<sup>237</sup> οὐκ ἀν οὖν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς βασιλεύσειν τὸν Χριστὸν τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Γαβριὴλ νομίσας εἰρηκέναι, ὡς ἀληθῆ αὐτὴν παρελάμβανεν, εἰ μὴ πάντας τοὺς διὰ τῆς κλήσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν ἔθνῶν<sup>238</sup> εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀγίων νιοθεσίαν εἰσποιουμένους, οἶκον Ἰακὼβ ἡγήσατο κατὰ διάνοιαν δηλοῦσθαι· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος ἐπιστάμενος σαφέστατα, παρίστη λέγων· οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι, οὐδὲ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ.<sup>239</sup>

---

234. Cf. Luke 1.33.

235. Cf. Luke 1.33.

236. Cf. Luke 6.11; 11.53–54; 19.47–48; 20.19–20; 22.2, 66–71; 23.13–25.

237. Cf. Acts 4.1–21; 5.17–41; 6.8–7, 58, etc.

238. Cf. Acts 10.1–11, 26; 13.1–14, 28, etc.

239. Rom 2.28–29.

firm for eternity like the moon, illuminating understanding souls through his divine, celestial teaching.

5. Even if there was a reference to the future kingship being “over Jacob”, do not suppose that it is the Jewish nation that is meant by “Jacob”. For one thing, our authority for this event, the evangelist Luke, in recording Gabriel’s words in his own work, written after our Saviour’s ascension into heaven, knew perfectly well that our Saviour had not reigned over the Jewish nation, nor ruled for eternity; in fact, he records in detail the Jews’ plot against him and their plan to put him to death. Not just that, either: in the Acts of the Apostles he also records their renewed uprisings against Jesus’ disciples. He would not, therefore, have thought that Gabriel’s statement meant that Christ would be king over the Jews. He would not have accepted it as true, had he not believed that it was intended to mean that the “house of Jacob” comprised all, from every nation, who were included in the adoption of the saints, through our Saviour’s calling. Thus the divine apostle, who understood this quite clearly, proves this, in the words: “For the praise—from God, not from mankind—belongs not to the man who is outwardly a Jew, or to the outward, physical circumcision, but to the Jew who is inwardly so, and the spiritual, not literal, circumcision of the heart”.

## Πρὸς Στέφανον Ις'

’ Πῶς ἀπὸ τῆς Βηθλεὲμ ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἴστορεῖ,  
ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, κάκεῖθεν εἰς Ναζαρὲθ πρὸς τῶν  
γονέων φέρεσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν;<sup>240</sup>

**1** Λουκᾶς μὲν τὸν καιρὸν ἴστορῶν τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενέσεως, τῆς Αὐγούστου βασιλείας μνημονεύει καὶ τῆς κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀπογραφῆς.<sup>241</sup> φησί τε μὴ δὲ ἐσχηκέναι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ Βηθλεὲμ κατάλυμα,<sup>242</sup> πλήθους συνόντος ὡς εἰκός ἐν τῇ Βηθλεὲμ τῶν ἀπὸ γένους Δαβὶδ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς ἔνεκεν.<sup>243</sup> διὸ μὴ δὲ οἴκου τὸν Ἰωσὴφ εὐπορεῖν· ὅθεν τεκοῦσάν φησι τὴν Μαρίαν σπαργανῶσαι τὸ βρέφος καὶ ἀποθέσθαι ἐν φάτνῃ, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτοῖς τόπον ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.<sup>244</sup> καὶ εἰκός γε ἦν πλείστων συνόντων διὰ τὴν ἀπογραφὴν μὴ εὐπορεῖν καταγωγίου, ἀλλὰ καί, ὅτε, φησίν, αἱ ἡμέραι ἐπλήσθησαν τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν, χρὴ δὲ τοῦτο γίνεσθαι ὄγδόη μετὰ τὴν ἀπότεξιν ἡμέρᾳ,<sup>245</sup> ἀνήγαγον τὸ παιδίον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,<sup>246</sup> καὶ τελέσαντες ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τὰ νενομισμένα, ἀπίασιν εἰς Ναζαρέθ.<sup>247</sup>

**2** Τούτων παρὰ τῷ Λουκῷ κειμένων οὐδενὸς μνημονεύσας ὁ Ματθαῖος, παραχωρήσας δὲ τῷ Λουκῷ τὰ εἰρημένα, ἔτερα αὐτὸς διηγεῖται τίνα δὲ ἦν ταῦτα, ἀλλ’ ἡ τῶν μάγων ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἄφιξις;<sup>248</sup> Κινησάντων μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας γῆς ἄμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀστέρος αὐτοῖς τὴν γνῶσιν τῆς γεννήσεως ὑποφήναντος, οὐδῆπου δὲ τὴν τοσαύτην στειλαμένων πορείαν καιρῷ βραχεῖ· οὐ γάρ ἐν ἡμέραις ὀκτὼ τὴν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ὄδον εἰκός αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίων ἥνυσθαι, ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν νομίσαι εἶναι καιρὸν τῆς τε τούτων ἀφίξεως, καὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενέσεως· εἰ δὲ καὶ πυνθανόμενοι λέγουσι· ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς

240. Cf. Matt 2.13–15; Luke 2.22–39.

241. Cf. Luke 2.1.

242. Cf. Luke 2.7.

243. Cf. Luke 2.3–5.

244. Cf. Luke 2.7.

245. Cf. Gen 17.12; Lev 12.3.

246. Luke 2.21–22.

247. Cf. Luke 2.39.

248. Cf. Matt 2.1–12.

## TO STEPHANUS 16

How is it that Matthew records that Jesus was taken from Bethlehem to Egypt, but Luke that he was taken to Jerusalem, and from there to his parents' home at Nazareth?

1. Luke is recording the time of our Saviour's birth. He mentions Augustus' reign and the registration that took place in his time, and says that they had nowhere to stay in Bethlehem, as there was, naturally, a large number of people of David's stock together in Bethlehem for the registration. That was why there was no house available for Joseph; and so, he says, Mary, after giving birth, swaddled the baby and put it down in a manger, "because there was no room for them in the lodging-house". It was not at all surprising that no lodging was available, with a very large number of people there together because of the registration. However, he also says: "When the number of days was complete for his circumcision"—and that must take place on the eighth day after the birth—"they took the child up to Jerusalem"; and, after carrying out the customary observances for him, they leave for Nazareth.

2. Matthew mentions none of this that is down in Luke, but by-passes what Luke has said and, for his part, recounts different events. And what were these, but the arrival of the magi from the East, and how they left their own country at the time that Jesus was born, because a star had given them the clue by which to know of the birth? Now, it was most certainly not a short time that they took, to make a journey as long as that. It is implausible that they could have completed the journey from the East to the land of the Jews in eight days, to allow it to be thought that the time of their arrival and the time of our Saviour's birth were the same. Even though the wording of their question is: "Where is the child who has been

*τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα καὶ ἥλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ,<sup>249</sup> οὐ τὸν σήμερον τεχθέντα, ὡς ἂν τις ὑπολάβοι, καθ' ὃν ταῦτα ἐπυνθάνοντο χρόνον δηλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν τότε γενόμενον ὅτε αὐτοῖς ὁ ἀστὴρ ἐπέφανε.*

**3 [2]** Πόσος δὲ ἦν οὗτος ὁ μεταξὺ χρόνος, τοῦ τε φανέντος τοῖς μάγοις ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενέσεως ἀστέρος, καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα παρουσίας, αὐτός σε διδάξει ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς λέγων· τότε Ἡρώδης λάθρα καλέσας τοὺς μάγους, ἡκρίβωσε παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος,<sup>250</sup> καὶ ὡς ἂν ἀκριβώσας παρ' αὐτῶν, μαθὼν ὅστις ἦν οὗτος, μετὰ τὸ ἀναχωρῆσαι λάθρα τοὺς μάγους,<sup>251</sup> ἵδων ὅτι ἐνεπαίχθη ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἔθυμωθη λίαν, καὶ ἀποστείλας ἀνεῖλε πάντας τοὺς ὄντας εἰς Βηθλεέμ, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἡκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων.<sup>252</sup> οὐκοῦν διετής χρόνος ἥδη παρεληλύθει ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰησοῦ γενέσεως καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄφιξιν τῶν εἰρημένων.

**4** Οὐκ ἄρα διαφωνεῖ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς, εἰ ὁ μὲν Λουκᾶς ὄγδόῃ τῆς γενέσεως ἡμέρᾳ ἀνάγει αὐτὸν ἅμα τοῖς γονεῦσιν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ τῆς τῶν νομίμων ἐκπληρώσεως ἔνεκα, κἀκεῖθεν ἀπάγει ἐπὶ τὴν Ναζαρέθ· ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος μετὰ διετῆ χρόνον γενομένους πάλιν ἐν Βηθλεέμ ἀναγράφει, ἐντεῦθεν τε εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπεληλυθέναι φησὶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιβούλην· καὶ ἦν εἰκὸς οὐ μόνον δεύτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλειστάκις ἐπιφοιτᾶν αὐτοὺς τῷ τόπῳ μνήμης τοῦ παραδόξου χάριν· δείκνυται γοῦν ἀναμφιβόλως οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς ὃν καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ γεγέννηται κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ἐν ᾧ τε κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ὑπῆντησαν οἱ ἔξ ἀνατολῶν μάγοι.

**5 [3]** “Οτι δὲ μὴ εῖς ἦν ὁ παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς χρόνος, καὶ ἄλλως ἐστὶ συλλογίσασθαι. Λουκᾶς φησι μὴ εὐπορῆσαι αὐτοὺς καταγωγίου ἐν τῇ Βηθλεέμ.<sup>253</sup> διὸ καὶ τεκοῦσαν ἀνακλῖναι τὸ παιδίον ἐν φάτνῃ, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τόπον ἐν τῷ καταλύματι,<sup>254</sup> ὡς εἰκός, τῆς ἀπογραφῆς ἔνεκεν πάντων πανταχόθεν τῶν ἔξ οἰκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαβὶδ συντρεχόντων εἰς τὴν εἰρημένην πόλιν, διά τε τὸ πλῆθος τῶν

249. Matt 2.2.

250. Matt 2.7.

251. Cf. Matt 2.12.

252. Matt 2.16.

253. Cf. Luke 2.7.

254. Cf. Luke 2.7.

born as King of the Jews? We have seen his star, and have come to worship him”, it is not, as one might suppose, the one born “today” that they mean, at the time they were asking the question, but the one born at the time when the star appeared to them.

3. [2] How long this time was between the appearance of the star to the magi at the time of our Saviour’s birth, and their presence in Jerusalem, the evangelist himself will tell you, in the words: “ Then Herod summoned the magi secretly and established from them the precise time of the star’s appearance”. Having established it precisely from them, he thought he would have found out who this was; but the magi went back without telling him, so then “he was extremely angry at the realisation that he had been fooled by them, and sent and killed all two-year-olds and under in Bethlehem and its whole district, according to the time he had established from the magi”. Therefore, by the time these men arrived, a two-year period had elapsed since Jesus’ birth.

4. Thus there is no discrepancy between what the holy evangelists say, if it is on the eighth day after his birth that Luke takes him up to Jerusalem with his parents for the performance of the customary observances, and from there brings him to Nazareth; whereas it is after two years that Matthew writes that they were back in Bethlehem, and from there says they left for Egypt because of the king’s designs against them. It was also likely that this was not just the second time they visited the place; they may actually have done so quite often, in commemoration of the miracle. Anyhow, it is unambiguously shown that the time at which our Saviour was born, according to Luke, is not the same as the time at which, according to Matthew, the magi from the East encountered him.

5. [3] There is also another way of working out that there is not just the one time given in the two evangelists. Luke says there was nowhere available for them to stay in Bethlehem, and that is why, when she had the baby, she put him to bed in a manger, “because there was no room in the lodging-house”—as one would expect, with everyone from the house and homeland of David flocking from all over the place to the city in question for the registration, and there being a large number of people staying there

ἐπιξενουμένων αὐτόθι μὴ εὐπορούντων καταλύματος,<sup>255</sup> ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος ἀκούσαντες, φησίν, οἱ μάγοι τοῦ βασιλέως Ἡρώδου, ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς Βηθλεέμ· καὶ ἴδον ὁ ἀστὴρ ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ προῆγεν αὐτούς, ἔως οὗ ἐλθὼν ἐστάθη οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ· καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.<sup>256</sup> ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν φάτνῃ κείμενον οὗτοι καταλαμβάνουσι τὸ παιδίον ὅμοιῶς τοῖς ποιμέσιν, ἀλλ’ ἐνδον ἐν οἰκίᾳ μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτὸ το θεωροῦσι.<sup>257</sup> καίτοι Λουκᾶς ἔφησε μὴ εἶναι τόπον αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.<sup>258</sup> πῶς οὖν ὁ Ματθαῖος οἰκίαν αὐτοῖς ἀφορίζει; Ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ Λουκᾶς τὸν καιρὸν ίστορεῖ τῆς γενέσεως, οὗτος δ’ ἦν ὁ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς, καθ’ ὃν πανδημεὶ συνέτρεχον οἱ τῷ αὐτῷ γένει προσήκοντες ἐν τῇ τοῦ Δαβὶδ πόλει, ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος τὰ μετὰ δύο ἑτῶν χρόνους ίστορεῖ· τοσούτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ χρόνος ὃν Ἡρώδης παρὰ τῶν μάγων ἡκρίβωσεν.<sup>259</sup> ὥστε σχολῆς οὕσης ἐν τῇ Βηθλεέμ, κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον εὐπόρουν καταγωγίου· διὸ εἰσελθόντες οἱ μάγοι εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, εἶδον τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.<sup>260</sup>

καὶ αὕτη μὲν ἡ τοῦ ζητηθέντος λύσις.

Ταῦτά σοι ἔξ ἡμῶν, ιερώτατε ἀνδρῶν καὶ φιλοπονώτατε νιὲ Στέφανε, γνησίας ὄντα δείγματα διαθέσεως ἀνακείσθω.

---

255. Cf. Luke 2.3–5.

256. Matt 2.9, 11.

257. Cf. Matt 2.11.

258. Cf. Luke 2.7.

259. Cf. Matt 2.7.

260. Matt 2.11.

with no lodging available for them. Matthew, though, says: "The magi, having heard King Herod, made their way to Bethlehem. And look! The star they saw in the East led them on, until it stopped when it reached where the child was, with his mother Mary; and they prostrated themselves and worshipped him". But it is not lying in a manger that they find the child, as with the shepherds; they see him indoors, with his mother, in a house. Yet Luke said "there was no room for them in the lodging-house"; so how is it that Matthew specifies a house for them? No: when Luke records the time of the birth, that was the time of the registration, at which the entire body of those belonging to the same stock were flocking to David's city; but Matthew is recording the events of two years later, that being the length of time that Herod established from the magi. There was thus no pressure in Bethlehem and, according to Matthew, there was lodging available for them, because: "Entering the house, the magi saw the child with his mother Mary, and they prostrated themselves and worshipped him".

That, then, is the solution of the problem.

My son Stephanus, most holy and industrious of men, please accept from us these books dedicated to you, as demonstrations of sincere feeling.



To MARINUS

Translated by David J. D. Miller

## Πρὸς Μαρῖνον α'

Τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις εὐαγγελίοις περὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπορουμένων ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων δύο πεπονηκώς ἥδη πρότερον συγγράμματα, πάρειμι νῦν, τὰ μέσα παρελθών, ἐπὶ τὰ πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῶν αὐτῶν πάντοτε τοῖς πᾶσι ζητούμενα· τάχα που τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλῆς διὰ τῶν σῶν ἐπιταγμάτων ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἡμᾶς παρορμησάσης, Μαρῖνε νιὲ τιμιώτατέ μοι καὶ φιλοπονώτατε.

Ἡρώτας δὲ τὸ πρῶτον.

Πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὁψὲ σαββάτων φαίνεται ἐγηγερμένος ὁ σωτήρ,<sup>1</sup> παρὰ δὲ τῷ Μάρκῳ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων;<sup>2</sup>

**1** Τούτου διττὴ ἄν εἴη ἡ λύσις·

ὅ μὲν γὰρ τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸν τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσαν περικοπὴν ἀθετῶν,<sup>3</sup> εἴποι ἄν μὴ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου· τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων τὸ τέλος περιγράφει τῆς κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ίστορίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὀφθέντος νεανίσκου ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ εἰρηκότος αὐταῖς, μὴ φοβεῖσθε, Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν ναζαρηνόν,<sup>4</sup> καὶ τοῖς ἔξης,<sup>5</sup> οἵς ἐπιλέγει· καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.<sup>6</sup> Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου περιγέγραπται τὸ τέλος· τὰ δὲ ἔξης<sup>7</sup> σπανίως ἐν τισιν ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι φερόμενα περιττὰ ἄν εἴη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ·

ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἴποι ἄν τις παραιτούμενος καὶ πάντῃ ἀναιρῶν περιττὸν ἐρώτημα.

1. Matt 28.1.

2. Mark 16.2; cf. Mark 16.9.

3. Cf. Mark 16.9–20.

4. Mark 16.6.

5. Cf. Mark 16.6–7.

6. Mark 16.8.

7. Cf. Mark 16.9–20.

## To MARINUS 1

My most honoured and most industrious son, Marinus! Now that I have worked through my earlier two books of *Problems and Solutions* on the points that present difficulties at the opening of the divinely-inspired gospels, I shall proceed, omitting the central parts, to the things everyone always wants to find out about their ending. I think it is perhaps the will of God, working through your injunctions, that has prompted us to this task.

Your first question was:

How is it that the Saviour's resurrection evidently took place, in Matthew, "late on the Sabbath", but in Mark "early in the morning on the first day of the week"?

1. The answer to this would be twofold.

The actual nub of the matter is the pericope which says this. One who athetises<sup>1</sup> that pericope would say that it is not found in all copies of the gospel according to Mark: accurate copies end their text of the Marcan account with the words of the young man whom the women saw, and who said to them: "Do not be afraid; it is Jesus the Nazarene that you are looking for, etc. . . .", after which it adds: "And when they heard this, they ran away, and said nothing to anyone, because they were frightened." That is where the text does end, in almost all copies of the gospel according to Mark. What occasionally follows in some copies, not all, would be extraneous, most particularly if it contained something contradictory to the evidence of the other evangelists.

That, then, would be one person's answer: to reject it, entirely obviating the question as superfluous.

---

1. "Athetises" means "marks the passage as spurious".

**2** Ἄλλος δέ τις οὐδ' ὁτιοῦν τολμῶν ἀθετεῖν τῶν ὄπωσοῦν ἐν τῇ τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφῇ φερομένων, διπλὴν εἶναί φησι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλοῖς, ἔκατέραν τε παραδεκτέαν ὑπάρχειν, τῷ μή μᾶλλον ταύτην ἔκείνης, ἢ ἔκείνην ταύτης, παρὰ τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ εὐλαβέσιν ἐγκρίνεσθαι.

**3 [2]** Καὶ δὴ τοῦδε τοῦ μέρους συγχωρουμένου εἶναι ἀληθοῦς, προσήκει τὸν νοῦν διερμηνεύειν τοῦ ἀναγνώσματος· εἰ γοῦν διέλοιμεν τὴν τοῦ λόγου διάνοιαν, οὐκ ἄν εὑροιμεν αὐτὴν ἐναντίαν τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Ματθαίου ὅψὲ σαββάτων ἐγγέρθαι τὸν σωτῆρα λελεγμένοις,<sup>8</sup> τὸ γὰρ ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον,<sup>9</sup> μετὰ διαστολῆς ἀναγνωσόμεθα· καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστὰς<sup>10</sup> δέ, ὑποστίξομεν· καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀφορίσομεν τῶν ἔξῆς ἐπιλεγομένων· εἴτα τὸ μὲν ἀναστὰς<sup>11</sup> ἄν, ἐπὶ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὅψὲ σαββάτων,<sup>12</sup> τότε γὰρ ἐγήγερτο, τὸ δὲ ἔξῆς ἑτέρας ὃν διανοίας ὑποστατικόν, συνάψωμεν τοῖς ἐπιλεγομένοις· πρωὶ γὰρ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου, ἐφάνη Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ.<sup>13</sup> τοῦτο γοῦν ἐδήλωσε καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης πρωὶ καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου ὥφθαι αὐτὸν τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ μαρτυρήσας·<sup>14</sup> οὕτως οὖν καὶ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ πρωὶ ἐφάνη αὐτῇ·<sup>15</sup> οὐ πρωὶ ἀναστάς, ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρότερον κατὰ τὸν Ματθαίον ὅψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου.<sup>16</sup> τότε γὰρ ἀναστὰς ἐφάνη τῇ Μαρίᾳ, οὐ τότε, ἀλλὰ πρωὶ.<sup>17</sup>

ώς παρίστασθαι ἐν τούτοις καιρούς δύο· τὸν μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, τὸν ὅψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου· τὸν δὲ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιφανείας, τὸν πρωὶ, ὃν ἔγραψεν ὁ Μάρκος εἰπών, ὃ καὶ μετὰ διαστολῆς ἀναγνωστέον, ἀναστὰς δέ· εἴτα ὑποστίξαντες, τὸ ἔξῆς ρῆτέον, πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου ἐφάνη Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἣς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπτὰ δαιμόνια.<sup>18</sup>

---

8. Matt 28.1.

9. Mark 16.9.

10. Mark 16.9.

11. Mark 16.9.

12. Matt 28.1.

13. Mark 16.9.

14. Cf. John 20.1, 14–19.

15. Cf. Mark 16.9.

16. Cf. Matt 28.1.

17. Cf. Mark 16.9; John 20.1.

18. Mark 16.9.

**2** Another view, from someone diffident about athetising anything at all in the text of the gospels, however transmitted, is that there is a twofold reading, as in many other places, and that both are to be accepted; it is not for the faithful and devout to judge either as acceptable in preference to the other.

**3** [2] Supposing the latter point of view to be granted as true, the proper thing to do with the reading is to interpret its meaning. If we were to divide up the sense of the wording, we would not find it in conflict with the words in Matthew to the effect that the Saviour's resurrection was "late on the Sabbath", because we shall read the words in Mark: "Having risen again early in the morning" with a pause, punctuating after "Having risen again," and making a break in the sense before the following words. Let us then refer<sup>2</sup> "having risen again" back to Matthew's "late on the Sabbath", because that was when the resurrection had taken place; but the next part forms part of a separate idea, so let us connect it with the words that follow: "early in the morning on the first day of the week he appeared to Mary of Magdala". As confirmation, that is what John has told us, as well: he too testifies that Jesus had been seen by the Magdalene early in the morning on the first day of the week. In this way, therefore, he appeared to her "early in the morning" in Mark also. It was not that the resurrection took place early in the morning; it was well before that, "late on the Sabbath", as Matthew has it. That was when he appeared to Mary, after his resurrection; the appearance was not at the time of the resurrection, but "early in the morning".

Thus two points of time are presented here: that of the resurrection, "late on the Sabbath", and that of the Saviour's appearance, "early in the morning", as written by Mark in words to be read as including a pause: "Having risen again". Then the next words are to be pronounced after our punctuation-mark:<sup>3</sup> "early in the morning on the first day of the week he appeared to Mary of Magdala, from whom he had driven out seven devils".

2. The text here has ἄν after ἀναστάς, which does not fit into the syntax of the sentence, and there is no verb for this clause to correspond with "let us connect" in the next. The translation assumes emendation of ἄν to ἀναφέρωμεν, "let us refer".

3. The point would be much clearer if Eusebius could simply have written: "The sentence should be punctuated with a comma after 'again', thus: 'Having risen again, early in the morning on the first day of the week he appeared...' ". Evidently he could not expect either his copyists or his readers to be sufficiently familiar with punctua-

## Πρὸς Μαρῖνον β'

Πῶς κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ὁψὲ σαββάτων<sup>19</sup> ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ τεθεαμένη τὴν ἀνάστασιν,<sup>20</sup> κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἡ αὐτὴ ἐστῶσα κλαίει παρὰ τῷ μνημείῳ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου;<sup>21</sup>

**1** Οὐδὲν ἂν ζητηθείη κατὰ τοὺς τόπους εἰ τὸ ὁψὲ σαββάτων<sup>22</sup> μὴ τὴν ἐσπερινὴν ὥραν τὴν μετὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου λέγεσθαι ὑπολάβοιμεν, ὃς τινες ὑπειλήφασιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ βραδὺ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς νυκτὸς τῆς μετὰ τὸ σάββατον· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς ὥρας εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, καὶ ὁψὲ τοῦ καιροῦ, καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς χρείας· οὐ τὴν ἐσπέραν δηλοῦντες, οὐδὲ τὸν μετὰ ἡλίου δυσμὰς χρόνον, τὸ δὲ σφόδρα βράδιον τούτῳ σημαίνοντες τῷ τρόπῳ· ὅθεν ὡσπερ διερμηνεύων αὐτὸς ἔαυτόν, ὁ Ματθαῖος μετὰ τὸ ὁψὲ σαββάτων, ἐπήγαγε τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ,<sup>23</sup> φησί· δηλαδὴ ὥρᾳ τῇ λοιπὸν ἥδη

---

19. Matt 28.1.

20. Cf. Matt 28.1–10.

21. Cf. John 20.1.11.

22. Matt 28.1.

23. Matt 28.1.

## To MARINUS 2

How is it that the Magdalene, who according to Matthew had witnessed the resurrection “late on the sabbath” [“late of sabbaths”], is, according to John, the very person who stands at the tomb in tears “on the first day of the week”?<sup>4</sup>

1. There would be no problem raised about these passages if we took “late on the sabbath” [“late of sabbaths”] as meaning not “the evening-time after the sabbath day”, as some have taken it, but “late, far on into the night after the sabbath”. In the same way, we customarily use the expressions “late in the day”, “late in time”, and “too late”<sup>5</sup> when we are not talking about the evening, or the time after sunset, but when what we mean by this idiom is “very late indeed”. Hence Matthew, acting, as it were, as his own commentator, added to his “late on the sabbath” [“late of sabbaths”] the words “as it was dawning”;<sup>6</sup> he is evidently saying “at the time when it

---

tion marks, which is why he is having such a struggle here to explain what he means, using even more repetition than usual. Such markings were at this date never used in ordinary manuscripts; some readers might occasionally insert them in existing copies for their own purposes, presumably not yet on any standard system.

4. The meaning, and still more the translation, of sections 1 and 2 are complicated by the fact that the word σάββατον, “sabbath”, can be used in Greek either in singular or in plural, either with or without “the”, to mean either “the sabbath day” or “the week”. Where the context makes it immediately clear which is meant, as in the phrase in the title of this Problem, “on the first day of the week” (literally “on the first of the sabbath”), a single English phrase is used; but otherwise, as Eusebius’ discussion partly depends on the precise wording, a literal translation is added in square brackets, so as to show whether it is singular or plural, and whether with or without “the”. Hence the odd-sounding “late of sabbaths”, in the title and elsewhere, from the text of Matthew 28:1—which is translated with a different meaning by RSV, as “after the sabbath”. The ambiguity is not entirely unlike that in English between “day” as opposed to night, and “day” as a whole period of twenty-four hours, *including* night.

5. More literally, these phrases are “late in the time”, “late in the moment”, and “late in the need”.

6. There is a hitherto-unobserved textual difficulty here, to be resolved from the text printed in fragment Fr.Mar.Supp.16 (from J. A. Cramer, *Catena in Evangelia S. Matthaei et S. Marci* [Oxford, 1840], p. 252). This, with the parallel version in C. F. Matthaei, *Anecdota Graeca* (Moscow, 1775), vol. 2, p. 62, shows that the extraordinary

ύποφαινούση, καὶ ἐπιφωσκούση τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, ἥτις ἦν ὁψὲ καὶ πόρρω λοιπὸν ἐλαύνουσα τῶν σαββάτων· λέλεκται δὲ ὁψὲ<sup>24</sup> τοῦ σαββάτου παρὰ τοῦ ἔρμηνεύσαντος τὴν γραφήν· ὁ μὲν γάρ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ματθαῖος ἐβραίδι γλώττῃ παρέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλλήνων φωνὴν μεταβαλὼν αὐτό, τὴν ἐπιφωσκοῦσαν ὥραν εἰς τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, ὁψὲ σαββάτων<sup>25</sup> προσεῖπεν· ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν σχεδὸν νοεῖσθαι καιρόν, ἥ τὸν σφόδρα ἐγγὺς παρὰ τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς διαφόροις ὀνόμασι τετηρημένον· μηδέν τε διαφέρειν Ματθαῖον εἰρηκότα· ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων ἥλθε Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον,<sup>26</sup> Ιωάννου φῆσαντος· τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ πρωὶ εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, ἔτι οὕσης σκοτίας.<sup>27</sup> πλατυκῶς γὰρ ἔνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῦν χρόνον διαφόροις ρήμασι· ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ὁψὲ,<sup>28</sup> ἀντὶ τοῦ βράδιον καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς νυκτὸς· ὀνομάσας πρωὶ ὁ διερμηνεύων ἐπίγαγε τὸ σκοτίας οὕσης,<sup>29</sup> ἵνα μή τις τὸν ὅρθρον λέγειν αὐτὸν ὑπολάβοι· ὡς καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος τῷ ὁψὲ σαββάτων, ἵνα μὴ τὴν ἐσπερινὴν ὥραν νομίσειε τις λέγεσθαι, προσέθηκε τὸ τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων,<sup>30</sup> ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀκριβῶς οὗτος σαββάτου εἶπεν τὴν ὁψίαν, μή τις τὴν ἐσπέραν ὑπολάβοι λέγεσθαι τὴν μετὰ ἥλιου δυσμάς, ἀλλὰ σαββάτων φησὶν ὁψέ.

---

24. Matt 28.1.

25. Matt 28.1.

26. Matt 28.1.

27. John 20.1.

28. Matt 28.1.

29. John 20.1.

30. Matt 28.1.

was by then just beginning to show light, and dawning towards the Lord's day"—that being late, and running already a long way on in the sabbath [*or* in the week; literally "of the sabbaths"]. The wording "late of the sabbath"<sup>7</sup> is that of the translator of the scripture; you see, the evangelist Matthew handed down the gospel in Hebrew, and the person who turned it into Greek called the time dawning towards the Lord's day "late of sabbaths". Thus it is practically the same, or very nearly the same, time that is meant and kept to by the evangelists, in different words; and there is no difference between what Matthew has said: "Late on the sabbath ["late of sabbaths"], as it was dawning towards the first day of the week, Mary of Magdala and the other Mary came to see the grave", and John's: "Early in the morning on the first day of the week, while it was still dark, Mary of Magdala came to the tomb". Broadly speaking, it was one and the same time that they are denoting, in different expressions: Matthew has "late", for "quite far on", and "late at night", whereas his commentator,<sup>8</sup> after using the word "early" for "late at night", added "while it was still dark", to avoid anyone's supposing that he meant "at dawn". In the same way, Matthew added to his "late on the sabbath" the explanation "as it was dawning towards the first day of the week", to avoid anyone's thinking that he meant "in the evening", just because he was actually being precise in calling that the later part of the sabbath,<sup>9</sup> in case anyone took it as "in the evening, after sunset"; but he says "in sabbaths, late".

---

positioning of φησί is due simply to a scribal error. The words τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ ("as it was dawning") occur three times in a few lines, and the copyist of Mai's MS, after reaching the first one, started again from the second, omitting the intervening twenty-one words. For a translation of the missing words, the reader is referred to fragment Fr.Mar.Supp.16.

7. This is the only example in this whole Solution of this precise wording of the phrase: in the singular, and with "the". Zamagni is presumably right to suggest that all the emphasis here is on the word ὥψε, "late"; if so, the precise wording of the rest of the phrase perhaps seemed not to matter for once. At any rate, as Zamagni has pointed out, the author's biblical citations do often vary slightly from each other in wording, perhaps as part of his tendency toward stylistic variation; so here this citation has "late of the sabbath", although he had cited the words immediately before in the form "late of the sabbaths".

8. Here this means the author of the gospel of John.

9. Even by this author's standards, the words from here to the end of the sentence seem intolerably repetitive and otiose. Perhaps they are a gloss, i.e., a marginal note by some still-puzzled reader (the reversed order "in sabbaths, late" suggesting a question as to why Matthew's wording did use this plural form), mistakenly incorporated into the text by a later copyist. Unfortunately, the epitomator of the version in Cramer and

**2** Ἔθος δὲ ὅλην τὴν ἑβδομάδα σάββατον καλεῖν, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας οὕτως ὀνομάζειν. Λέγεται γοῦν παρὰ τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων·<sup>31</sup> ἐν δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ, δευτέρᾳ σαββάτῳ, καὶ τρίτῃ σαββάτῳ, καὶ τετάρτῃ σαββάτῳ· οὕτως οὖν ὁ Ματθαῖος τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐπιφαύσκοντα εἰς τὴν ἔω τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμέρας, σαββάτων ὅψὲ ὠνόμασεν. οὐκ εἰπὼν ἐσπέραν τοῦ σαββάτου, οὐδὲ ὅψὲ σαββάτου·<sup>32</sup> ἐπεὶ ἔχρην ἡμᾶς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου μετὰ ἡλίου δυσμὰς ἐσπέρας γινομένης ἀπονηστίζεσθαι· καὶ οὐκέτι τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν ἀγαλλιάν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐσπέραν τοῦ σαββάτου, εἴπερ τοῦτ' ἐδήλουν ὁ εὐαγγελιστής· ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἐσπέρας τοῦ σαββάτου εἰώθαμεν τὰς νηστείας καταλύειν, ἀλλ’ ἡ νυκτὸς ἐπιλαβούσης, αὐτῷ μεσονυκτίῳ, καὶ ἡ περὶ ἀλεκτόρων βοάς, ἡ ἀμφὶ τὸν ὄρθρον· ὥστε καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος, καὶ ἐκ τῆς κεκρατηκίας ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ συνηθείας, τὸν διὰ τοῦ ὅψὲ σαββάτων<sup>33</sup> δηλούμενον καιρόν, μὴ τὴν ἐσπερινὴν ὥραν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ταύτην, ἥν Ματθαῖος αὐτὸς παρέστησεν εἰπὼν τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων.<sup>34</sup>

**3** Οὐδὲ γὰρ λόγον εῖχε κατὰ τὴν ἐσπέραν τοῦ σαββάτου τοιούτων θαυμάτων ἀμφὶ τὸ μνημεῖον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀποτελουμένων, μὴ οὐχὶ πάντας τοὺς τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντας μαθεῖν τὰ γινόμενα, καὶ συνδρομὴ γεγόνει ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα, πάντων ἐγρηγορότων. Άκολουθον δὲ ἦν ἀνατραπέντος τοῦ λίθου παραδόξως, παραχρῆμα σπεῦσαι τοὺς φρουροὺς τὰ πραχθέντα δηλῶσαι, τῆς ὥρας αὐτοῖς ἐπιτρεπούσης· οἱ δὲ καὶ διδάσκονται τῇ

---

31. Mark 16.2; Luke 24.1; John 20.1, 19.

32. Matt 28.1.

33. Matt 28.1.

34. Matt 28.1.

2. It was customary to call the whole week “sabbath”, and to express all the days using the same word. Accordingly, we read in the evangelists “on the first day of the week” [“on the first of the sabbaths”]; and, in normal usage, “the second of the week” [“..of sabbaths”], “the third of the week”, and “the fourth of the week”.<sup>10</sup> It is in that sense<sup>11</sup> that Matthew has called the time of growing light towards the dawn of the Lord’s day “late in sabbaths”, not meaning “the sabbath evening”, or “late on sabbath”; otherwise we should have been ending our fast after sunset in the evening of the sabbath day, and not be celebrating the Lord’s day any more, but the sabbath evening instead, if that were what the evangelist was denoting. Actually, though, our custom is to break our fast not on the sabbath evening, but either when night has set in, or<sup>12</sup> actually at midnight, or else<sup>13</sup> at cock-crow, or with the dawn; thus, from actual practice and the custom that has prevailed among the churches of God, the time denoted by the phrase “late on the sabbath” [“late on sabbaths”] is not evening-time, but the time Matthew himself has presented in the words “as it was dawning towards the first day of the week”.

3. Furthermore, if miraculous events of that kind were reaching fulfilment at the Saviour’s tomb on the evening of the sabbath, it would be inexplicable that the whole population of the city did not find out what was happening. If everyone had been awake, there would have been a rush to the tomb, and the sequel to the miraculous pushing-back of the stone would have been for the guards at once to hurry and reveal what had been done, had it happened at a time which allowed them to do so. In fact,

Matthaei (Fr.Mar.Supp.16, p. 239) omitted the whole second half of this paragraph, so no help on this point is available from them.

10. In modern Greek, the days from our Monday to Thursday are still designated by these numbers, Thursday being “fifth”.

11. The argument is not clear, but appears to depend in part on the view that, whereas in Jewish usage the sabbath lasts from dusk on Friday to dusk on Saturday, Matthew’s “late in sabbaths” here is to be interpreted in the context of a “day” thought of as beginning at midnight. Thus this use of “sabbaths” implies that the resurrection took place not on the sabbath day but just before full dawn on the next day of the week (“the first of sabbaths”, i.e., “the first day of the week”).

12. Inserting ḥ, as in the text of the parallel passage in Cramer’s *Catena on Matthew* p. 252 and Matthaei *Anecdota* p. 63 (Fr.Mar.Supp. 16).

13. Reading ḥ καὶ for καὶ ḥ. The version in Cramer and Matthaei omits καὶ altogether.

νύστεραιά ύπο τῶν ἀρχιερέων διαφημίσαι εἰς πάντας, ὅτι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς ἐλθόντες ἔκλεψαν αὐτὸν ἡμῶν κοιμωμένων.<sup>35</sup> ὁ δὴ χώραν οὐκ εἶχεν πλάττεσθαι αὐτοὺς εἰ τῇ ἑσπέρᾳ ἐγήγερτο. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὸ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ λεγόμενον ὃψὲ σαββάτων, μὴ τὴν ὁψινὴν ὥραν τοῦ σαββάτου σημαίνειν, μὴ δὲ τὸν ἑσπερινὸν καιρὸν· ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ὁ Ματθαῖος ἐπήγαγεν τὴν ἐπιφώσκουσαν ὥραν εἰς μίαν σαββάτων,<sup>36</sup> ἥτις ἦν πρωΐ, ἔτι σκοτίας οὕσης<sup>37</sup> κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην· οὕτω γὰρ ἡ συμφωνία συνδράμοι ἄν τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν φωνῶν· ὡς καιροῦ μὲν ἐνὸς δι’ αὐτῶν σημαινομένου, ἐναλλαττόντων δὲ παρ’ ἕκαστου τῶν τοῦ καιροῦ μορίων ἐπεὶ καὶ μᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὥρας, καὶ τὴν ἀρχήν ἐστιν ἐπινοῆσαι, καὶ τὸ μέσον, καὶ τὸ τέλος.

**4 [3]** Οὐκ ἄν γοῦν ἀμάρτοις τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν σημαίνεσθαι εἰπών παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννην, παρ’ ὁ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ πρωΐ, ἔτι οὕσης σκοτίας,<sup>38</sup> καὶ πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον ἐπιστᾶσα τῷ μνήματι,<sup>39</sup> καὶ μὴ εὑροῦσα τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος, κλαίει διὰ τὸ μηδένα μήπω ἐγνωκέναι περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ· τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ ὥρας μέρος εἴναι δεύτερον τὸν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ χρόνον, καθ’ ὃν τρίτον ἐπιστᾶσα ἡ αὐτὴ Μαγδαληνὴ ἄμα τῇ ἄλλῃ Μαρίᾳ τῷ μνήματι,<sup>40</sup> οὐκέτι κλαίει, ὡς ἄν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννην τεθεαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν σωτῆρα.<sup>41</sup> τὰ γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾶ καὶ τῷ Μάρκῳ ἐτέρων ἄν εἴη δηλωτικά, παρ’ οἵς πλείους ἀπαντῶσιν γυναῖκες ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν.<sup>42</sup> τὴν δέ γε Μαγδαληνὴν μὴ μακρὰν ἀλλήλων διεστῶσιν ἀπηντήκεναι καιροῖς νόμιζε, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸν παρατυχεῖν καὶ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον· τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, καθ’ ἔαυτὴν μόνην· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας·

οὕτω δ’ οὗν ἡ αὐτὴ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἐθεᾶτο καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ· οὐκ ἀπελιμπάνετο δὲ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀναγεγραμμένων· οὐ γὰρ ἀπεστάτει τοῦ τόπου· παρῆν δὲ καὶ παρέμενεν καταπεπληγμένη μὲν τὰ τεθεαμένα, ποθοῦσα δὲ πρὸς τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ δευτέρων καὶ τριῶν θεοφανειῶν καταξιωθῆναι· ὃν ἐτύγχανεν μετὰ

35. Matt 28.13.

36. Matt 28.1.

37. John 20.1.

38. John 20.1.

39. Cf. John 20.1–2, 11.

40. Cf. Matt 28.1–8.

41. Cf. John 20.11–18.

42. Cf. Mark 16.1–8; Luke 24.1–11.

though, they are next day actually instructed by the high priests to spread to everyone the report: "His disciples came and stole him during the night, while we were asleep." If his resurrection had taken place during the evening, there would certainly have been no scope for that fiction of theirs. No, I regard that as proving that Matthew's "late of sabbaths" indicates, not a late time on the sabbath, or the sabbath evening period, but, as Matthew himself added, the time "dawning towards the first day of the week"; that is, according to John, "early in the morning, while it was still dark". That is how the gospels' voices would coincide and chime together, there being only one period indicated by them both, and the time-divisions in each being interchangeable. After all, even the same single period of time may be conceived of as having a beginning, a middle and an end.

4. [3] Thus you would not be wrong in saying that the first stage of our Saviour's resurrection is indicated in John, where "early in the morning, while it was still dark" the Magdalene is standing at the tomb, for both the first and the second time, and is in tears at not finding the Saviour's body, because no-one yet knows of his resurrection; and that the second stage of the same period is the time in Matthew at which that same Magdalene is at the tomb for the third time, with the other Mary, and is no longer in tears, as having, in John, seen the angels and the Saviour himself. The accounts in Luke and Mark, you see, would refer to other stages, at which several other women are present at the sighting; regard the Magdalene, however, as having been there at intervals closely following each other, being present at the same place and during the same period on both the first and second occasions, the first time alone, and then with the other Mary.

In this way the same Mary of Magdala saw both what is in Matthew and what is in John; she was not missing from what is recorded in the others, because she did not leave the place, but was there, staying there, stunned, as the sightings took place, and longing to be found worthy of a second and third<sup>14</sup> divine appearance, as well as the first. And that is

---

14. Reading τρίτων, with the corresponding passage in Cramer p. 253 and Matthaei p. 64, for τριῶν. (Fr.Mar.Supp. 16)

ταῦτα, διαφόρως μὲν πλειόνων γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀφικνουμένων, ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλως αὐταῖς ἀγγελικῆς ὄψεως παραφαινομένης, αὐτῆς δὲ ἐφ' ἑκάστῃ θέᾳ παρατυγχανούσης· οὕτω γοῦν τῶν παρὰ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν εὐαγγελισταῖς ἀναγεγραμμένων θεωρὸς ἐγίγνετο ἡ Μαγδαληνή· διὸ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐμνημονεύθη· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ μὲν καιρὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τοῦ Ματθαίου παριστάμενος· τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ καιροῦ διάφορα διαστήματα παρ' ἑκάστῳ τετηρημένα.

**5 [4]** Μὴ ταραττέω δέ σε τὸ λέγεσθαι παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ μετὰ τὸ ἔλθεῖν τὰς δύο Μαρίας θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον, τὸ ἄγγελος γάρ κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας;<sup>43</sup> οὐ γάρ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν προσήκει νοεῖν τὸν ἄγγελον ἀποκεκυλικέναι τὸν λίθον· πῶς γάρ; Ὁπότε προυπῆρχεν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, παρ' ὧ οὐχ ἡ Μαρία μόνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ δύο μαθηταὶ εἰσεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον.<sup>44</sup> διόπερ εἴποις ἀν τὸν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ λόγον διηγηματικὸν εἶναι τῶν πρὸ τούτου γεγενημένων· ἥλθον μὲν γάρ κατὰ τούτον αἱ δύο Μαρίαι θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον, εὗρον δὲ αὐτὸν ἀνεῳγμένον, ἐπειδήπερ πρὸ τούτου σεισμὸς ἐγεγόνει μέγας,<sup>45</sup> καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ἀποκεκυλίκει τὸν λίθον, διὸ ἐπιστάς,<sup>46</sup> αὖθις εὐαγγελίζεται τὰς γυναῖκας.<sup>47</sup>

Αὕτη μὲν οὖν μία λύσις ἀν γένοιτο τῶν κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀπορουμένων.

**6 [5]** Λυθείη δ' ἀν καὶ ἄλλως τὰ προκείμενα, εἰ ἔτέρας μὲν τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ Μαρίας ὑπολάβοις εἶναι, ἔτέραν δὲ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ· τέσσαρας γοῦν τὰς πάσας Μαρίας παρούσας τῷ πάθει τοῦ σωτῆρος μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν εὑρίσκομεν.<sup>48</sup> πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τὴν Θεοτόκον τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος μητέρα· δευτέραν δὲ τὴν ταύτης ἀδελφὴν Μαρίαν τὴν τοῦ Κλωπᾶ· εἴτα τρίτην Μαρίαν τὴν Μαγδαληνήν· καὶ τετάρτην τὴν Ἱακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μητέρα· καὶ τῶν μὲν πρώτων τριῶν Μαριῶν ἐμνημόνευσεν Ἰωάννης λέγων οὕτως· εἰστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή.<sup>49</sup> Τῆς δὲ τετάρτης Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς Ἱακώβου

43. Matt 28.2.

44. Cf. John 20.1–18.

45. Cf. Matt 28.2.

46. Cf. Matt 28.2.

47. Cf. Matt 28.5–7.

48. Cf. Matt 27.55–56; Mark 15.40–41; Luke 23.49; John 19.25.

49. John 19.25.

what she did subsequently experience, when several other women arrived at the tomb on different occasions, with one angelic sight presenting itself to them on one occasion and another on another, but being herself present at each. Thus the Magdalene witnessed what is recorded in all four evangelists, which is why she was also mentioned in them all. Thus, also, the period presented by John and Matthew is the same, but differing intervals in that period are preserved in each.

5. [4] Do not let it disturb you that it is said in Matthew, after the two Marys came to see the tomb: “For an angel of the Lord, who came down from heaven, rolled the stone back from the entrance”. It is inappropriate to imagine that the angel had rolled the stone back at that actual time; of course not, given that he had been there before, in John, who has not just Mary, but two of the disciples as well, going into the tomb! For that reason, you would say that Matthew’s sentence narrates what had already happened: that the two Marys came to see the grave, but found it had been opened, because there had previously been a great earthquake and the angel had rolled the stone back; and it was he who was standing there and who repeated the good news to the women.

That, then, would be one solution to the problems presented by the passage.

6. [5] The issue could also be resolved in a different way, if one took the Marys in Matthew as being different from the one in John. We then find that there were in all four Marys among the other women present at the Saviour’s passion: first, the Mother of God,<sup>15</sup> the Saviour’s own mother; second, her sister, Mary the wife of Clopas; then thirdly, Mary the Magdalene; and fourthly the mother of James and Joseph. The first three Marys were mentioned by John, in the words: “Standing by Jesus’ cross were his mother, his mother’s sister Mary, Clopas’ wife, and Mary of Magdala”. The fourth Mary, the mother of James and Joseph, is mentioned by the other

---

15. Θεοτόκον. The presence of this keynote slogan of the fifth century suggests that the text has undergone modification.\*

καὶ Ἰωσήφ, οἱ λοιποὶ τρεῖς ἐμνημόνευσαν εὐαγγελισταί, συμπαραλαβόντες τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ καὶ αὐτήν.<sup>50</sup> Ματθαῖος μὲν οὕτως εἰπών· ἡσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, αἵτινες ἤκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ· ἐν αἷς ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ,<sup>51</sup> αἱ ἐθεάσαντο τὸν τόπον ποῦ τίθεται,<sup>52</sup> καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς δὲ περὶ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας οὕτως ἴστορει· ἡσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς.<sup>53</sup>

**7 [6]** Τούτων οὖν τῶν τεσσάρων Μαριῶν, εἰ τὰς δύο τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὁψὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων<sup>54</sup> ἐλθούσας ἐπὶ τὸ μημεῖον, καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον θεασαμένας, ἑτέρας εἶναι ἐκλάβοις παρὰ τὴν πρῳ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, ἔτι σκοτίας οὔσης<sup>55</sup> ἀφικομένην μόνην κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἀγνοοῦσαν τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κλαίουσαν, οὐδὲν ἂν σκολιὸν ἀπαντήσεται, πάσης ἀπορίας καὶ ζητήσεως ἐκ ποδῶν ἀρθείσης· καὶ ὁψὲ μὲν σαββάτων,<sup>56</sup> κατὰ τὰ ἀποδεδομένα, πεπραγμένων τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ Ματθαίῳ συγγεγραμμένων ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τῶν δύο Μαριῶν, πρωίας δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων<sup>57</sup> ἑτέρας Μαρίας τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη τεθεαμένης, ἀληθεύεσθαι τε κάκεῖνα καὶ ταῦτα, μή δὲ ἀντιλογίαν περιέχειν τοὺς τόπους, μήτε κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους, μήτε κατὰ τὰ πρόσωπα, μήτε κατὰ τοὺς λόγους.

**8 [7]** Εἰ δὲ τὸ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς προσκείμενον ἐν ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς ὄνομα τὴν διάνοιαν ταράττει, ἀλλ’ οὐ προσήκει τὴν θείαν συγχεῖν γραφὴν λέξεως μιᾶς ἢ ὄνόματος ἔνεκεν, ὃ πολλάκις συμβαίνει, καὶ κατὰ γραφικὸν προσκείσθαι σφάλμα· ἥ γάρ δύο καὶ ταύτας ἀπὸ μιᾶς πόλεως ἥ κώμης τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ὄρμασθαι ἥγητέον· ἥ ἐπὶ μιᾶς αὐτῶν προσκείσθαι τὸ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ἐπώνυμον, ἅπαξ τοῦ γραφέως κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν σφαλέντος, ὅτι ἐξ ἐκείνου τῶν μετ’ αὐτὸν πρώτῳ ἐπηκολουθηκότων σφάλματι· τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐφ’ ἑτέρῳ συμβάν, σμικρὸν ὕστερον ἐπιδείξωμεν· ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοιούτων ὄρθως κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπηγόρευτο, κατὰ

50. Cf. Matt 27.56; Mark 15.40; Luke 24.10.

51. Matt 27.55–56.

52. Cf. Matt 27.61; Mark 15.47; Luke 23.55.

53. Luke 24.10.

54. Matt 28.1.

55. John 20.1.

56. Matt 28.1.

57. John 20.1.

three evangelists, who include her, too, along with the Magdalene. Matthew does so in the words: “There were many women there, watching from a distance, who had come with him from Galilee in attendance on him; among them were Mary of Magdala and Mary the mother of James and Joseph”. These saw the place where he was put. Luke, too, mentions the other Mary in his account, as follows: “Mary the Magdalene, Joanna, James’ Mary, and the other women with them....”

**7.** [6] Of these four Marys, if you were to detach the two in Matthew, who came to the tomb “late on the sabbath, as it was dawning towards the Lord’s day” and saw the angel, as being different from the one who, according to John, arrived by herself “early in the morning on the first day of the week, while it was still dark”, without knowing anything of the resurrection—which is why she was in tears—everything will turn out straightforward, and any difficulty and question will have been obviated. What is described in Matthew will have taken place in the presence of the two Marys “late on the sabbath”, in accordance with the explanation already given; and the other Mary will have seen what is described in John as happening “early on the first day of the week”, so that<sup>16</sup> both one account and the other prove truthful, with no contradiction involved between the passages in either the times or the people, or in the wording.

**8.** [7] Now, if the fact that the name “Magdalene” occurs in both evangelists confuses the meaning—no, it is inappropriate to introduce confusion into divine scripture on account of a single word or name, which often turns out to be actually due to a scribal error. Either we are to suppose that there were two women, both from the same town or village of Magdala; or that the appellation “of Magdala” belonged to only one of them, and that once the scribe had made an error at the outset,<sup>17</sup> subsequent scribes then followed the original error. A little further on, we shall<sup>18</sup> be proving that this did in fact occur in another instance; meanwhile, just as it has happened in similar cases that something had originally been dictated correctly, but since then an erroneous alteration, not subsequently

16. The infinitives in the last part of the Greek sentence seem to depend on a word omitted; the translation assumes ώς or ὥστε.

17. The text includes the word ὅτι at this point, which does not fit the syntax, but the sense is clear.

18. Reading ἐπιδείξομεν for ἐπιδείξωμεν.

σφάλμα δὲ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἀκριβούντων τὴν μεταβολήν, συμβέβηκέ τινα ζητεῖσθαι, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπωνύμου τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς περιττῶς ἐπὶ μιᾶς Μαρίας κείμενον εἴποις ἂν γεγονέναι.

**9** Οὗ νφαιρεθέντος, περιγέγραπται πᾶσα ζήτησις, μηδενὸς μηκέτι κατὰ τοὺς τόπους ἀπορουμένου· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡψὲ σαββάτων,<sup>58</sup> τοῦτ' ἔστιν βαθείας νυκτός, τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ πεπραγμένων ἑωραμένων ὑπὸ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς καὶ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας· καὶ πρωίας, ἔτι σκοτίας οὕσης,<sup>59</sup> ἐτέρας Μαρίας ἀφικομένης ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον· καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἀπορούσης ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος,<sup>60</sup> ὕστερον δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς αὐτοπτούσης αὐτόν.<sup>61</sup>

Κάλλιον δὲ τὸ μὴ δὲ σφάλμα αἰτιάσασθαι κατὰ τοὺς τόπους, δύο δὲ ἀληθῶς γεγονέναι τὰς Μαγδαληνὰς φάσκειν, ώς καὶ τέτταρας ἀπεδείξαμεν τὰς Μαρίας· ὃν οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Μαγδαληνῆς δύο Μαρίας ὁρμάσθαι λέγειν, μηδέν τε λοιπὸν ἀπορεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐτέραν μὲν εἶναι τὴν ὡψὲ σαββάτων<sup>62</sup> παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ Μαγδαληνήν, ἐτέραν δὲ αὖθις καὶ αὐτὴν Μαγδαληνὴν τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ πρωίας ἐπὶ τῷ μνημεῖον ἐλθοῦσαν·<sup>63</sup> ταύτην δὲ εἶναι τὴν καὶ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ δηλουμένην, κατά τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων, ἀφ' ἣς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπτὰ δαιμόνια.<sup>64</sup> καὶ ταύτην εἰκός εἶναι τὴν ἀκούσασαν μή μου ἄπτουν,<sup>65</sup> ἀλλ’ οὐ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ.<sup>66</sup> εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα κάκείνη ἀπὸ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ὠρμᾶτο, ἀλλ’ οὐ τὰ ὅμοια καὶ αὐτῆς ἡ θεία κατηγορεῖ γραφή.

---

58. Matt 28.1.

59. John 20.1.

60. Cf. John 20.1–2.

61. Cf. John 20.11–18.

62. Matt 28.1.

63. John 20.1.

64. Cf. Mark 16.9.

65. John 20.17.

66. Cf. Matt 28.1.

put right, has given rise to a problem, so one could say that the same thing has happened in the case of the appellation “the Magdalene”, wrongly attached<sup>19</sup> to one Mary.

9. Once that appellation is removed, all questioning is brought to an end and no-one is any longer in any difficulty over these passages. “Late on the sabbath”, that is to say at dead of night, the events in Matthew were seen by the Magdalene and the other Mary; and “early in the morning, while it was still dark”, a different Mary arrived at the same place, and was at first puzzled at not finding the Saviour’s body, but then she too saw him for herself.

It is better, though, not to invoke error in the passages as the cause, but to say that there were really two women from Magdala, just as we showed that there were four Marys. Of these, it is perfectly reasonable to say that two Marys came from the same place, Magdala. There is then no difficulty in saying that one of them was the Magdalene who, in Matthew, came to the tomb late on the sabbath; and then again that the other, also a Magdalene, came there early in the morning, in John, and that she is the one of whom it is stated in Mark (according to some copies) that “he had cast seven devils” out of her, and also presumably the one who heard the words “Do not touch me”—but not the one in Matthew, about whom, even if she too was certainly from Magdala, the divine scripture makes no such derogatory statement.

---

19. Reading κειμένου, with Mai, for κείμενον; maybe also ἐπωνυμίου for ἐπωνύμου. The text may be further corrupt here: one might have expected the writer to put, e.g., “properly belonging to one Mary, but wrongly attached to one of the others”.

## Πρὸς Μαρῖνον γ'

Πᾶς κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ὁψὲ σαββάτων<sup>67</sup> ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας ἀψαμένη τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος,<sup>68</sup> ἡ αὐτὴ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου<sup>69</sup> ἀκούει μή μου ἅπτουν<sup>70</sup> κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην;

**1** Εἰ μὲν οὖν μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ εἴη Μαρία παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς, λέξομεν ὅτι ἡ αὐτὴ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπήντα τόπον, ἐπειδὴ εἶλκεν αὐτὴν ἡ ἔκπληξις τοῦ πράγματος καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι χαρά· πρώτη τοίνυν ἀπαντήσασα καὶ πρώτη τεθεαμένη τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη, ἐσπευσμένως ἀπήει πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους τὸ πρῶτον, τὴν τοῦ μνήματος ἄνοιξιν ἀπαγγέλλουσα.<sup>71</sup> εἴθ’ ἄμα τὴν ἀνάστασιν τεθεαμένη, ἐδυσφόρει ὑπονοοῦσα ἥρθαι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνήματος, μὴ εἰδέναι τε ὅπου τέθειτο.<sup>72</sup> εἴτ’ ἐπανήει δεύτερον σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα· ὡς δ’ ἐπέστρεφον οἴκαδε ἐκεῖνοι, μόνη πάλιν ἀπολειφθεῖσα ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ἔκλαιεν ἐστῶσα.<sup>73</sup> εἴτα τοῦ μνήματος εἴσω διακύψασα, τοὺς δύο ἀγγέλους ἐθεώρει· ἐπειτα καὶ αὐτὸν ὁρᾶ τὸν σωτῆρα.<sup>74</sup> ὃς, ἐπειδὴ κλαίουσα εἰστήκει, ἀνθρωπίνως δὲ καὶ ταπεινῶς, ὡς ἂν κλαπέντος τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, διακειμένη, ἀνάξιά τε περὶ αὐτοῦ φρονοῦσα, πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὴν γυναικα ὄνομάζει, ἐπιπλήττων αὐτῇ καὶ ὄνειδίζων τὸ γυναικεῖον πάθος· διό φησιν, γύναι, τί κλαίεις;<sup>75</sup> Εἴτα φησιν πρὸς αὐτήν· Μαρίᾳ.<sup>76</sup> διὰ τοῦ ὄνόματος αὐτὴν ἔαυτῆς ὑπομιμνήσκων, καὶ τῶν πάλαι πρὸς αὐτήν τε καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς μαθητὰς περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ λόγων· ἡ δ’ εἰς συναίσθησιν ἐλθοῦσα, καὶ τίς ποτε ἦν ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς καὶ τῆς τοῦ λόγου δυνάμεως ἐπιγνοῦσα, ῥαββουνί φησιν ὃ μεθερμηνεύεται διδάσκαλε.<sup>77</sup>

---

67. Cf. Matt 28.1.

68. Cf. Matt 28.9.

69. John 20.1.

70. John 20.17.

71. Cf. John 20.1–2.

72. Cf. John 20.2.

73. Cf. John 20.3–11.

74. Cf. John 20.12, 14.

75. John 20.15.

76. John 20.16.

77. John 20.16; cf. John 1.38.

## To MARINUS 3

How is it that the same Magdalene who has, according to Matthew, touched the Saviour's feet with the other Mary, late on the sabbath, is told "Do not touch me" early in the morning on the first day of the week, according to John?

1. Well, on the supposition of its being one and the same Mary in both evangelists, we shall say that the same woman came to the same place several times, drawn by her astonishment at the event and her joy at what had happened. In this case, she was the first to be there and the first to have witnessed what is in John, and began by rushing off to the apostles to tell them about the tomb being open. Despite having witnessed the resurrection, she was then at the same time distressed at the idea that Jesus' body had been removed from the tomb and that she did not know where it had been put. Next, she went back for a second time to the tomb, with them; and when they returned home, she stood there, left alone again, and wept. She then stooped down into the tomb, and saw the two angels; and then she actually sees the Saviour himself, and he begins by calling her "Woman", upbraiding her, and rebuking her for her womanly emotion, because she was in a low, human state, standing in tears in the belief that his body had been stolen, and thinking unworthy thoughts about him. That is why he says "Woman! Why are you weeping?" Then he says "Mary!" to her, recalling her to herself by the use of her name, and reminding her of what he had previously told her and the other disciples about his resurrection. She then reached realisation. From his voice, and the forcefulness of his words, she recognised who he really was, and says: "Rabboni!" which translates as 'Teacher".

**2** Εἴτ' ἐπειδὴ ώς διδασκάλω αὐτῷ ἔτι καὶ οὐχ ώς Θεῷ προσιέναι ὡρμᾶτο, ἀναίνεται καὶ παραιτεῖται αὐτήν μή μου ἄπτου.<sup>78</sup> Θνητὰ γὰρ ἔτι φρονοῦσα, οὐχ οἴα τε ἦν τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος θίγειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄξιον ἦν τὴν ἔτι κλαίουσαν, καὶ κάτω περὶ τὰ μνήματα καὶ τάφους οἴα νεκρὸν ζητοῦσαν αὐτόν, ταπεινά τε καὶ ἀνθρώπινα περὶ αὐτοῦ δοξάζουσαν, τῆς ἐπαφῆς αὐτούν κοινωνεῖν· διὸ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπήλεγχεν· μὴ γὰρ ἀνεληλυθέναι οὕπω φησίν, ὅσον τὸ ἐπ' αὐτήν, πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα,<sup>79</sup> ἐπεὶ μὴ τοῦτ' ἐπίστευεν γεγονέναι, νεκρὸν δέ που κεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὥφετο· διό φησιν πρὸς αὐτήν· μή μου ἄπτου,<sup>80</sup> τοιαύτη τις οὖσα καὶ τοιαῦτα περὶ ἐμοῦ λογιζομένη· σοὶ γὰρ Θεὸς οὕπω πεπίστευμαι· σοὶ ἔτι κάτω εἶναι λελόγισμαι·

οὕτω τὴν κλαίουσαν καὶ δόξασαν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν κηπουρόν, διὰ μὲν τοῦ μή μου ἄπτου<sup>81</sup> ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπιπλήττων αὐτῇ· ώς καὶ διὰ τοῦ γυναικα καλεῖν, καὶ διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, τί κλαίεις;<sup>82</sup> Τὸ γὰρ κλαίειν τὸν ζῶντα, μᾶλλον δὲ τὴν ζωὴν αὐτήν, ἐσχάτης ἦν ἀμαθίας· καὶ διὰ μὲν τούτων ἐπέπληττεν αὐτήν· διὰ δὲ τῶν ἔξης<sup>83</sup> τὴν καθ'<sup>84</sup> ἔαυτὸν ἐπαίδευεν θεολογίαν.

ἡ δ'<sup>85</sup> ἐπὶ τούτοις τὰ μεγάλα ὡφελημένη, πάλιν ἀνεχώρει τοῦ μνήματος· τοῦτο δεύτερον· εἴτ' ἔξειποῦσα τῇ ἄλλῃ Μαρίᾳ τὰ τεθεαμένα παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη, ἐπανείη σὺν αὐτῇ.<sup>86</sup> τοῦτο τρίτον· καὶ τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ μνημονευομένων, θεωρὸς ἐγίγνετο οὐκέτι μόνη, σὺν δὲ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ Μαρίᾳ· καὶ οὐκέτι εἴσω τοῦ τάφου παρακύπτουσα ώς παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ,<sup>87</sup> οὐδὲ δύο ἀγγέλους, ἀλλ' ἔνα πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ καθήμενον δρῶσα.<sup>88</sup>

**3** Εἴτ' ἐπὶ τούτοις αὐτὸν πάλιν τὸν σωτῆρα μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας θεωρεῖ· τοῦτο δεύτερον.<sup>89</sup> καὶ οὐκέτι μὲν ἀκούει μή μου ἄπτου,<sup>90</sup> τούναντίον δὲ χαίρειν ἀντὶ τοῦ κλαίειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ κελεύεται.<sup>91</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ

78. John 20.17.

79. Cf. John 20.17.

80. John 20.17.

81. John 20.17.

82. John 20.13.

83. John 20.17.

84. Cf. Matt 28.1.

85. Cf. John 20.11–12.

86. Cf. Matt 28.2.

87. Cf. Matt 28.9–10.

88. John 20.17.

89. Cf. Matt 28.9.

**2.** Then, because she was starting to approach him as teacher still, not as God, he rejects that and tells her: “Do not touch me”. As she was still thinking in human terms, she could not touch his Godhead. It would not have been fitting for her, with lowly human thoughts of him, still in tears, and looking for him down among the tombs and graves as if he were a corpse, to share in contact with him. That is why he gave the conclusive reason, saying that he had not yet ascended to the Father as far as she was concerned, because she did not believe that had happened, but thought he was lying dead somewhere. That is why he says to her: “Being the sort of person you are, and harbouring such thoughts of me, do not touch me, because *you* have not attained faith that I am God; *you* have thought that I am still on earth”.

Thus, as she was weeping, and supposing him to be the gardener, he corrected her by the rebuke: “Do not touch me”, as also by calling her “Woman”, and by “Why are you weeping?” To weep for one who was alive, or rather was Life itself, was utter ignorance. That is why he rebuked her, but in his next words went on to instruct her in the fact of his divinity.

Much helped by all this, she left the tomb again—this being the second time—and then told the other Mary what she had seen, as in John, and returned<sup>20</sup> with her—this being the third time. No longer alone, but with the other Mary, she witnessed what is mentioned in Matthew, this time not stooping down into the tomb, as in John, and seeing not two angels, but one, sitting at the stone.

**3.** In addition to those occasions, she then again (i.e. for the second time with the other Mary) sees the Saviour himself. This time she is not told “Do not touch me”. On the contrary, she is now bidden by him to be

---

20. Reading ἐπανήει, with Mai, for the ungrammatical ἐπανείη.

ἄπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ συγχωρεῖται,<sup>90</sup> ἐπεὶ καὶ προσκυνεῖ αὐτὸν ὁς Θεόν· λέγει γοῦν αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· χαίρετε· αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι, ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.<sup>91</sup>

καὶ οὕτως ἄμα ἀληθεύει τὰ ἵερὰ εὐαγγέλια, κατ’ οὐδένα λόγον διαφωνοῦντα· τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ Μαρίαν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν εἰσάγοντα καὶ μὴ ἀπτομένην πρότερον τοῦ σωτῆρος, ὅτε ἔκλαιεν καὶ ἤπιστει.<sup>92</sup> καὶ ἀπτομένην αὐτοῦ, ὅτε χαίρειν ἐκελεύετο.<sup>93</sup> πρῶτα δὲ ἡγεῖσθαι τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ δηλούμενα τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ φερομένων, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν γεγυμνασμένων ἡμῖν κατὰ μίαν τῶν ἐκδοχῶν παρεστήσαμεν, διασαφήσαντες ὅπως εἴρηται παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ τὸ ὄψὲ σαββάτων,<sup>94</sup> οὐ τὴν ἐσπερινὴν ὥραν δηλοῦντος τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐπιφαύσκοντα εἰς μίαν σαββάτων.<sup>95</sup> ἦν δ’ οὗτος δεύτερος τοῦ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ δεδηλωμένου.

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἰρήσθω, εἴπερ τις ἔξ ἄπαντος τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι Μαρίαν παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς Ἰωάννῃ τε καὶ Ματθαίῳ δισχυρίζοιτο.

4 Εἰ δὲ συγχωρηθείη τὸ μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι, ἐτέραν δὲ τὴν ὄψὲ σαββάτων<sup>96</sup> κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας ἀπαντήσασαν, καὶ ἄλλην τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, ἔτι οὕσης σκοτίας,<sup>97</sup> μόνην ἐλθοῦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, πᾶσα λυθείη ἀν ἀμφιβολίᾳ· τὸ τὰς μὲν πρώτας ὄψὲ σαββάτων<sup>98</sup> ἀφικομένας, ἄτε σπουδαιοτέρας καὶ πιστοτέρας ὑπαρχούσας, καὶ τὸ χαίρειν παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀκοῦσαι, καὶ προσκυνῆσαι, καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κρατῆσαι καταξιωθῆναι.<sup>99</sup> τὴν δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ Μαρίαν ἐτέραν οὖσαν παρ’ ἐκείνας βράδιον μὲν ἀπηντηκέναι καὶ πρωὶ· ταύτην δ’ αὐτὴν εἶναι κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἀφ’ ἣς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπτὰ δαιμόνια.<sup>100</sup> σφόδρα δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τεθορυβήσθαι καὶ

90. Cf. Matt 28.9.

91. Matt 28.9.

92. Cf. John 20.11–17.

93. Cf. Matt 28.1–9.

94. Matt 28.1.

95. Matt 28.1.

96. Matt 28.1.

97. John 20.1.

98. Matt 28.1.

99. Cf. Matt 28.1–9.

100. Cf. Mark 16.9.

glad<sup>21</sup> instead of weeping; and not just that, but she is even allowed to touch him, because she is worshipping him as God. That is what is indicated by: “Jesus says to them ‘Greetings!’<sup>21</sup> and they went up to him, and clasped his feet and worshipped him.”

In this way, the holy gospels are both telling the truth at once; they are not at variance in anything they say. They introduce the same Mary of Magdala as originally not touching the Saviour, while she was weeping and not believing; but as touching him, when she was given the greeting “Be glad!”<sup>22</sup> We must<sup>23</sup> regard what is stated in John as being prior to what is related in Matthew. We have also, in our previous discussion, put forward a clear explanation of the sense in which, on one of the interpretations, Matthew has used the expression “late on the sabbath”: that is, that the evangelist was not denoting evening-time, but the period brightening towards dawn on the first day of the week, this being subsequent to that denoted by John.

Supposing it to be insisted that it is the same Mary throughout in both evangelists, John and Matthew, let the discussion rest there.

4. Supposing, however, that it is conceded that it is *not* the same one, but that there is one Mary who is there with the other Mary, according to Matthew, and a different one who, in John, comes to the tomb alone, early in the morning, while it was still dark; all doubt would then be resolved. There would be, late on the sabbath, the women who arrive first, being more fervent and having more faith; they hear the Saviour’s greeting, worship him, and are found fit to clasp his feet. Then the Mary in John would be a different person, who gets there later than the others, early in the morning; this would be the same one from whom, according to Mark, he had cast out seven devils. She is in a state of severe psychological shock, and

21. The Greek expression (here plural) χαίρετε is used at both these places. It literally means “Be glad!” but was also the ordinary word used as a greeting; hence the NRSV’s translation “Greetings!” here (Matt 28:9).

22. See previous note.

23. Reading πρῶτα δὲ δεῖ ἡγεῖσθαι for πρῶτα δὲ ἡγεῖσθαι, to provide the verb on which the infinitive depends. Δεῖ could easily have been missed out, from its similarity to the preceding δέ.

ἀπιστοτέραν εἶναι ὡς ἐστῶσαν κλαίειν, καὶ ὑπολαμβάνειν ὑφαιρεῖσθαι τοῦ μνημείου τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος, καὶ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μετενηγέλθαι γῇ· οὕτω δὲ συγκέχυτο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῇ, ὡς μὴ δὲ τοὺς δύο ἀγγέλους τοὺς εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ὁφθέντας αὐτῇ καταπλαγῆναι, μὴ δὲ αὐτὸν γνωρίσαι ὁφθέντα αὐτῇ τὸν σωτῆρα, νομίσαι δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν κηπουρόν.<sup>101</sup>

### Πρὸς Μαρίνον δ'

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Περὶ τοῦ τάφου καὶ τῆς δοκούσης διαφωνίας.} Πῶς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας ἔξω τοῦ μνήματος ἔώρακεν τὸν ἔνα ἄγγελον ἐπικαθήμενον τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ μνήματος.<sup>102</sup> καὶ πῶς κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ἀγγέλους δύο θεωρεῖ καθημένους ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία.<sup>103</sup> κατὰ δὲ τὸν Λουκᾶν δύο ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν ταῖς γυναιξίν.<sup>104</sup> κατὰ δὲ τὸν Μάρκον νεανίσκος ἦν αὐταῖς ὁ ὥρωμενος καθήμενος ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς τοῦ μνημείου τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ Μαρίᾳ καὶ Μαρίᾳ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμῃ;<sup>105</sup>

**1** Τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ προηγοῦνται· ὅθεν καὶ αἱ δύο Μαρίαι ἄρτι τὸν ἄγγελον ἐπιστάντα καὶ τὸν λίθον ἀποκυλίσαντα ἐθεάσαντο.<sup>106</sup> τὰ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ὕστερον γίνεται, δύο ἀγγέλων εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ὁφθέντων,<sup>107</sup> ἑτέρων δὲ ὅντων παρὰ τὸν ἔξω φανέντα καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον καθεζόμενον, ὡς Ματθαῖος λέγει.<sup>108</sup> τὸ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ λεγόμενον, ὅτι

101. Cf. John 20.1–17.

102. Cf. Matt 28.1–2.

103. Cf. John 20.11–12.

104. Cf. Luke 24.1–4.

105. Cf. Mark 16.1–5.

106. Cf. Matt 28.1–2.

107. Cf. John 20.12.

108. Cf. Matt 28.2.

is lacking in faith, so that she stands there weeping, and supposes that the Saviour's body has been removed from the tomb and taken away to some other piece of ground. Her psychological confusion is such that she is not even amazed by seeing the two angels inside the tomb, and does not recognise the Saviour himself when she sees him, but thinks he is the gardener.

## To MARINUS 4

[*By the same author: on the grave, and on the apparent disagreement.<sup>24</sup>*]

How is it that in Matthew Mary of Magdala, with the other Mary, has seen the one angel outside the tomb, sitting on the stone of the tomb, and how, according to John, does Mary of Magdala see two angels, sitting inside the tomb; but according to Luke it was two men who appeared to the women, and according to Mark it was a young man that was seen by them—Mary of Magdala, James' Mary, and Salome—sitting to the right of the tomb?

1. The incident in Matthew comes first,<sup>25</sup> in which the two Marys saw the angel who had recently appeared and rolled back the stone. The incident in John takes place later on, with the two angels seen inside the tomb, not the same as the one who was seen outside, sitting on the stone, as Mat-

24. The only other Problem with any such extra heading is *To Stephanus 2*, and Zamagni rightly excises this as being a copyist's note rather than part of the text itself. However, this heading, and the differences in style between this Solution and the rest, make it likely that Solution 4 has been added from a different collection of extracts from Eusebius' work. It would seem that this collection was probably made by a different epitomator, whose style is quite different. The sections where the Greek style is different, and oddly abrupt, are represented by the indented text from 2 onwards.

As Zamagni points out, paragraphs 5 and 6 evidently come from the Solution to a different, otherwise unpreserved Problem.

25. Some of the wording in this paragraph corresponds closely with fragment *Nicetas-Marinus 5*. However, this first statement is directly opposed to that, which starts: "I take it that the narrative in John comes before that in Matthew".

δύο ἄνδρες ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ ὁφθέντες.<sup>109</sup> ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὁ παρὰ Μάρκω νεανίσκος λευκὴν περιβεβλημένος στολήν, δεξιός τε ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀριστερὸς δρώμενος, ὁ τὰ φαιδρὰ καὶ δεξιὰ ταῖς γυναιξὶν εὐαγγελιζόμενος,<sup>110</sup> ἔτεροι ἀλλήλων ἄν εἰεν καὶ αὐτοί, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν παρὰ τοῖς πρώτοις εὐαγγελισταῖς λεγομένων· διὸ οὐδὲ ἀγγέλους αὐτοὺς οὗτοι ὠνόμασαν· ὁ δὲ Μάρκος καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς οὐδὲ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Ματθαίῳ ἐμνημόνευσαν, λέγω δὴ τῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος ὁπτασιῶν· ἀλλὰ τοῖς κρείττοσιν Ματθαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ κατέλιπον εἰπεῖν· αὐτοὶ τὰ δεύτερα εἰπόντες, καὶ ἀναπληροῦντες τὰ ἐκείνοις σεσιγημένα.

**2** Ἐστιν οὖν εἰπεῖν οὕτως,

ὅτι τεσσάρων ὅντων τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, ἴσαριθμοι τούτοις καὶ αἱ παρ’ αὐτῶν ἀναγραφεῖσαι φαίνονται ὄπτασι· οἵ τε καιροὶ τέσσαρες, καὶ οἱ καθ’ ἕκαστον καιρὸν ὁφθέντες ἰδιαζόντως· ὅμοίως δὲ καὶ αἱ θεώμεναι τῶν γυναικῶν διάφοροι, καὶ οἱ παρὰ τῶν ὁφθέντων λόγοι λεγόμενοι πρὸς αὐτὰς παραλλάττοντες.<sup>111</sup> πῶς οὖν ἐστιν τοῦτο;

Πρῶτος οὖν καιρός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὁψὲ σαββάτων,<sup>112</sup> ὅπου ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης ἔξω τοῦ μνήματος, ὅτε καὶ ἐγένετο σεισμός, ἔνα εἶδον<sup>113</sup> λέγοντα οὕτως, μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς· οἴδα γὰρ ὅτι Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε· οὐκ ἐστιν ὥδε· ἡγέρθη γάρ· δεῦτε, ἵδετε.<sup>114</sup>

Τέταρτος δὲ καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκω ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος φανεῖς, ὁ νεανίσκος ὁ ὁφθεὶς ταῖς γυναιξὶν τῇ Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ καὶ τῇ Μαρίᾳ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμῃ· μετ’ ἀρωμάτων ἐλθοῦσαι<sup>115</sup> ἥκουσαν, μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε, Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον.<sup>116</sup> Μέσοι δὲ οἱ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ τῷ Λουκᾷ καὶ ὁφθέντες κατὰ καιρὸν ἰδιάζοντες.<sup>117</sup>

109. Luke 24.4.

110. Cf. Mark 16.5.

111. Cf. Matt 28.5–7; Mark 16.6–8; Luke 24.5–7; John 20.13.

112. Matt 28.1.

113. Cf. Matt 28.1–2.

114. Matt 28.5–6.

115. Cf. Mark 16.1–2.5.

116. Mark 16.6.

117. Cf. Luke 24.4–7; John 20.12–17.

thew says. What it says in Luke, that there were two men seen in dazzling clothes, and also the young man in Mark wearing a white robe, seen on the right-hand side<sup>26</sup> as opposed to the left, and giving the women the bright, propitious good news, would also be all different from each other and from those spoken of in the first evangelists; that is why these writers do not call them angels, either. Mark and Luke did not even mention the incidents in John and Matthew—I mean, of course, the appearances of the Saviour—but left them for their betters, Matthew and John, to tell, while themselves telling the secondary incidents, and filling in what the others had passed over in silence.<sup>27</sup>

**2.** One can say, then, as follows:

that there are four evangelists, and also a corresponding number of sightings to be found recorded in them. There are four occasions, and four seen, those on each occasion to be distinguished from each other. Similarly, of the women, the ones experiencing the sightings are different; and the words spoken to them by those they saw vary. So, how is this?

First, then, is the occasion in Matthew, late in the Sabbath, after the earthquake had taken place, on which Mary of Magdala, with the other one, outside the tomb, saw one person who said: “Be unafraid, both of you. I know that you are looking for Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here; he has risen. Come and see.”

The fourth and final one is the young man in Mark, who appeared after sunrise, and was seen by the women: Mary of Magdala, James’ Mary, and Salome. They came with spices, and were told: “Do not be amazed. It is Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified, that you are looking for”.

26. The same Greek word, δεξιός, is here translated first as “on the right-hand side” and then as “propitious” in the following line. The association of the two meanings is due to the fact that, in augury, omens on the right were generally seen as signifying divine favour.

27. A fuller version of this passage appears in Fr.Mar. 5–7, and in the footnote from Combefis in Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 265, and Migne, cols. 953–54, translated as fragment Fr.Mar.Supp. 16.

ἐφάνη μὲν γὰρ ὁψὲ σαββάτων<sup>118</sup> ἄγγελος εἰς ἐκτὸς τοῦ μνήματος.<sup>119</sup> μεθ' οὗ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ<sup>120</sup> ὅρθρου δὲ βαθέος,<sup>121</sup> ἔτεροι οἱ κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν δύο ἀνδρες ὡνομασμένοι οὐκ εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ὀφθέντες.<sup>122</sup> ὕστερος ἀπάντων ὁ νεανίσκος,<sup>123</sup> καὶ πρὸ τούτου καὶ τῶν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ<sup>124</sup> οἱ δύο εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος.<sup>125</sup>

**3** Ὅτι ὁ Λουκᾶς μιᾶς λέγει τῶν σαββάτων, ὅρθρου βαθέος,<sup>126</sup> φέρειν ἀρώματα γυναικας δύο τὰς ἀκολουθησάσας αὐτῷ, αἵτινες ἦσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας συνακολουθήσασαι αὐτόν, ὅτε ἔθαπτον αὐτὸν ἐλθοῦσαι ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα· αἵτινες δύο ἀγγέλους εἶδον, οἵ καὶ εἶπον, τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; Οὐκ ἔστιν ᾧδε ἀλλ' ἡγέρθη· μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὥν σὺν ὑμῖν λέγων, ὅτι δεῖ παθεῖν τὸν νιὸν ἀνθρώπου,<sup>127</sup> καὶ τὰ ἔξῆς.<sup>128</sup>

**4** Ὅτι Ἰωάννης λέγει τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρίαν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν μόνην ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς τὸ μνῆμα, σκοτίας ἔτι οὖσης, καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἡρμένον καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα καὶ πρὸς Ἰωάννην καὶ λέγει· Ἡραν τὸν κύριον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν· ἤλθεν οὖν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον,<sup>129</sup> καὶ τὰ ἔξῆς. Εἴτα εἰσάγει κλαίουσαν τὴν Μαγδαληνήν,<sup>130</sup> καὶ παρακύψασαν ἰδεῖν λέγει δύο ἀγγέλους καθεζομένους, ἔνα πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἔνα πρὸς τοῖς ποσίν· καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῇ· γύναι, τί κλαίεις; Ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἡραν τὸν κύριόν μου καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν. Εἴτα ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὄπιστα, καὶ εἶδεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα· καὶ οὐκ ἦδει ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἔστιν· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λέγει· γύναι, τί κλαίεις; Τίνα ζητεῖς;<sup>131</sup>

118. Matt 28.1.

119. Cf. Matt 28.1–2.

120. Cf. John 20.14–17.

121. Luke 24.1.

122. Cf. Luke 24.1.4.

123. Cf. Mark 16.5.

124. Cf. Luke 24.4.

125. Cf. John 20.12–13.

126. Luke 24.1.

127. Luke 24.5–7.

128. Cf. Luke 23.49–24.7.

129. John 20.1–3.

130. Cf. John 20.11.

131. John 20.12–15.

Between these are those in John and Luke, distinct ones seen on each occasion: one angel appeared outside the tomb “late on the Sabbath”, after<sup>28</sup> whom the Saviour himself also appeared; “deep in the dawn twilight” there were the two others seen, “men” as Luke calls them, not inside the tomb; last of all was the young man; before him, and before those in Luke, there were the two inside the tomb.

3. that Luke says that on the first day of the week, deep in the dawn twilight, two women who had followed him, who had come with him from Galilee, were bringing spices after burying him, and came to the tomb. These saw two angels, who said: “Why are you looking among the dead for one who is alive? He is not here, but has risen. Remember how he spoke to you, while he was still with you: ‘The Son of man must suffer...’” etc.
4. that John says that on the first day of the week, Mary of Magdala comes alone to the tomb, while it is still dark; she sees the stone taken away, and goes to Simon and to John and says: “They have taken the Lord away from the tomb, and I do not know where they have put him.” So Peter, and John, went to the tomb...etc. He then puts in the Magdalene weeping and stooping down; and, he says, she sees two angels sitting down, one at the head and one at the feet, and they say to her: “Woman, why are you weeping?” She said: “They have taken my Lord, and I do not know where they have put him”. She then turned round and saw Jesus standing there, and did not know it was Jesus; but Jesus says: “Woman, why are you weeping? For whom are you looking?”

---

28. The text, in all editions referred to, reads  $\mu\epsilon\theta'ou$  (“with whom”). To give the required sense “after whom”, as all those editors have translated it [“post quem”, Mai/ Migne; “après lui”, Zamagni], we must read  $\mu\epsilon\theta'\delta v$ .

5 Ὄτι ἀποροῦσί τινες ώς τρεῖς ἡμέραι καὶ τρεῖς νύκτες πληροῦνται, καθὼς εἶπεν Χριστός,<sup>132</sup> αἱ τῆς ἀναστάσεως· καὶ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν·

οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς προδοσίας.<sup>133</sup>

οἱ δὲ τὴν παρασκευὴν εἰς δύο ποιοῦσιν, ἐπεὶ νὺξ γέγονεν<sup>134</sup> καὶ πάλιν ἡμέρα· ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἥλιου σκοτισθέντος καὶ πάλιν ἀναφλεχθέντος· εἴτα ἡ τοῦ σαββάτου ἡμέρα ὅλη καὶ ἡ νὺξ αὐτῆς·

οἱ δὲ ἡμέραν μὲν τὴν παρασκευὴν ὅλην καὶ τὴν νύκτα αὐτῆς, σάββατον ὅλον καὶ τὴν νύκτα αὐτοῦ· τῆς δὲ κυριακῆς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς ἡμέραν μετροῦσιν ὅλην· ως ἀρξαμένης ἡδη τότε ὁ Χριστὸς ἡγέρθη· οὕτω τρεῖς ἡμέρας λέγουσιν. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐπὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρτιγεννῶν παίδων οὕτως μετρεῖν ἔθος ὅλην ἡμέραν, τὴν ὅτε ἀπὸ τῆς δεκάτης ὥρας ἀρξαμένην γέννησιν μετροῦμεν, ἢ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς ἡμέρας ἀρξαμένην γέννησιν· ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ νεκρῶν τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν ἐνάτην καὶ τὴν τεσσαρακοστὴν τὰ νενομισμένα ποιοῦντες· οὐχ ὅλην τὴν τρίτην μετὰ τῆς νυκτὸς αὐτῆς· οὐδὲ ὅλην τὴν ἐννάτην μετὰ τῆς οἰκείας νυκτὸς αὐτῆς· οὐδὲ τὴν τεσσαρακοστὴν ὁμοίως ὅλην μετὰ τῆς νυκτὸς αὐτῆς· ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν τελευταίων ἡμερῶν ὄρῶντες ἐκτελοῦμεν τὰ πραττόμενα, ὅλην ἡμέραν ταύτην καὶ μετροῦντες καὶ λογιζόμενοι.

6 Ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ Χριστός φησιν τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς ἔσομαι,<sup>135</sup> ἔστι δὲ οὕτως εἰπεῖν·

ἄρα εἰ χρεώστην ἐπαγγειλάμενον τῷ οἰκείῳ δανειστῇ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας πληρώσειν τὸ χρέος, πρὸ τῆς προθεσμίας πληρώσαντα θεασάμενοι, ως ψευσάμενον κρινοῦμεν, ἢ ως πλέον ἀληθεύσαντα; Καὶ ἄλλως· εἰ θᾶττον ἢ εἶπεν ἀνέστη, πλέων ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἔγκλημα οὐκ ἔχει· τὸ δὲ βράδιον, ὑποψίας γέμει καὶ ψεῦδος λογίζεται γιγνόμενον.

132. Cf. Matt 12.40.

133. Cf. Matt 26.47–50; Mark 14.42–46; Luke 22.47–48; John 18.3–13.

134. Cf. Matt 27.45; Mark 15.33; Luke 23.44.

135. Matt 12.40.

5. Because some people are puzzled how the days of the resurrection add up to three full days and three full nights, as Christ said, one can say:

Some, that it is from the betrayal.

Others make the Preparation-day<sup>29</sup> into two, because there had been night and then day again, the sun having gone dark that day and then come out again; then the whole Sabbath day and its night.

Others reckon the Preparation-day and its night as a whole day, and the Sabbath and its night as a whole day, but they measure the beginning of the Lord's day, up till daylight, as a whole day, because it was when that was only just beginning that the Lord rose; that is how they call it three days. It is also customary in the case of the dead, and of new-born babies, to measure it as a whole day in the same way, when<sup>30</sup> we measure the birth beginning at the tenth hour or the one beginning at the beginning of the day. Similarly, when we carry out the customary rites for the dead on the third, the ninth and the fortieth day, it is not the whole third day, with its night, nor the whole ninth day with its corresponding night, nor, equally, the fortieth day with its night that we have in view when we perform the actions, but the beginnings of the final days, counting this as a whole day and reckoning it as such.

6. However, as Christ says: "I shall be in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights", it is possible to say as follows:

If a debtor has promised his own banker to pay his debt in full after three days, and we observe that he has paid it in full before the settlement-day, are we going to judge him as having told a lie, or as having told the truth all the more? To put it another way, if he rose again earlier than he said, his power is the greater, and it is irreproachable; later, though, is fraught with suspicion, and is counted as resulting in a lie: a

29. Παρασκευή: i.e., as in modern Greek, Friday

30. Reading, with Mai, ὅτε τὴν for τὴν ὅτε; but the corruption may go deeper, as the syntax is even more oddly abrupt here than in the rest of this Solution. The sense is: "For the purposes of reckoning the right number of days after the baby's birth for the various ceremonies, it makes no difference whether the birth was at the beginning of the birthday or near the end of it; either way, the days are counted from the same birthday, without having to reckon an exact multiple of 24 hours."

ψεῦδος μέν, ὅτι παρῆλθεν ὁ λεχθεὶς ὄρος· ὑποπτὸν δέ, ὅτι, τῶν φυλάκων ἀναχωρησάντων, κλοπὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐνομίσθη ἄν.

lie, because the stated term has elapsed, and suspicious, because after the guards had gone the matter would have been regarded as theft.<sup>31</sup>

---

31. The text of *To Marinus* ends suddenly here, with no conclusion such as that at the end of *To Stephanus*.



GREEK FRAGMENTS  
TO STEPHANUS

Translated by David J. D. Miller

SUPPLEMENTS TO EUSEBIUS' GOSPEL PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS  
FROM MAI AND OTHER EDITORS<sup>1</sup>

The fragments are numbered as in Mai<sup>2</sup>. Additional fragments are placed at the end of Mai's material and numbered as a continuation.

The location and edition of the printed text translated is given at the head of each fragment. Within each fragment, the paragraph numbers are those of the text translated.

Bold type marks passages where this text overlaps with that of the corresponding passage already translated in the main body of the *Problems and Solutions*.

{.} shows where a word that is found in the main text is not present in the fragment.

{...} shows a gap of several such words, and {with words between} shows a clause or sentence occurring in a different place.

1. Mai<sup>2</sup> p. 268 introduces all the fragments with the following note:

"What we have so far printed, in complete and continuous form, is the splendid original *Epitome* of Eusebius' work as it is in the very fine Palatine MS Vatican 220, from leaf 61 to leaf 96; that is where the work in fact ends, though there are some further pages left blank."

"As we have seen, there were twenty *Problems*, sixteen *To Stephanus* and four *To Marinus*. Although supplements to both parts were available to us from various sources, we have preferred not to combine these within the *Epitome*, in order to avoid any disturbance to the order of a text that is coherent and complete in itself. Now, however, it is time for the supplements to both parts, *To Stephanus* and *To Marinus*, to be appended.

"To begin with, there are some finished passages in the great *Catena* of Nicetas on Luke, in MS A (=Vatican 1611). These have evidently been excerpted from the work itself, not from the *Epitome*, even though Nicetas himself does seem, as is usual in *Catenae*, to have shortened Eusebius at times; evidence for that is that there are, on occasion, some details in the *Epitome* that Nicetas removes, whereas otherwise, in the passages quoted by him with approval, Eusebius is generally intact, and always fuller.

"In first place, then, here are the supplements to *Problems*, *To Stephanus*."

## CONTENTS

Fr.St. 1–12.	Nicetas, Catena on Luke .....	134
Fr.St. 13.	Possinus, Catena on Matthew.....	154
Fr.St. 14.	From an Unpublished Catena in a Vatican MS.....	156
Fr.St. 15.	Possinus, Catena on Matthew.....	156
Fr.St. 16.	From an Unpublished Catena in a Vatican MS.....	158
Fr.St. 17.	Possinus, Catena on Matthew.....	158
Fr.St. 18.	Possinus, Catena on Matthew.....	158

## ADDITIONAL FRAGMENTS

Fr.St. 19.	Anastasius of Sinai, Question 9 .....	160
Fr.St. 20.	From an Unpublished Catena in a Vatican MS.....	164
Fr.St. 21.	Cramer, Catena on Matthew.....	166
Fr.St. 22.	Cramer, Catena on Matthew.....	166
Fr.St. 23.	Cramer, Catena on Matthew.....	168
Fr.St. 24.	Cramer, Catena on Matthew.....	168

α'. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ τὸν Ματθαῖον ἄνωθεν κατάγειν τὰς διαδοχὰς, τὸν δὲ Λουκᾶν ἀνάπαλιν πεποιηκέναι, μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν πορευθέντας, οὐδὲν ἐπιμέμφεσθαι δεῖ· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοὺς ἀνάντη καὶ ὅρθιον πορείαν ἀνιόντας, καὶ τοὺς ἔμπαλιν διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς κατιόντας, οὐκ ἂν τις ἐτέραν φαίη βαδίζειν, μιᾶς ἀμφοτέροις κειμένης τοῖς τε ἀνιοῦσι καὶ τοῖς κατιοῦσι τρίβου. Τὸν αὐτὸν γοῦν τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν γενῶν διαδοχῆς πάρεστιν, ὅτῳ φίλον ἐπ' ἔξουσίας διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν, τοῖς μὲν κάτωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πρόσω ἀνιέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνωθεν προπατόρων ἀρξαμένοις, ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑστάτους καταλήγειν· οὗτος δὲ καὶ πόρθωθεν Ἐβραίοις φίλος ἦν ὁ τρόπος ... μὴ μέχρι τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἀνιών ἔστη, μηδὲ ὁ Ματθαῖος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἥρξατο ἐφ' ὃν κατέληξεν ὁ Λουκᾶς, διαφωνεῖν τις αὐτοὺς λέγοι, οὐκ ὀρθῶς οἴεται· ἐκάτερος γὰρ αὐτῶν οἰκείω λογισμῷ τὴν ἔκθεσιν πεποίηται τῆς γραφῆς, ὁ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἀρξάμενος, ὁ δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ὑπερβὰς, ἐπὶ τε τὸν πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον ἀνελθών· καὶ μηδὲ μέχρι τούτου στὰς, τὸν πάντα δὲ λόγον ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀναρτήσας· ποίᾳ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις μάχη; Εἰ τῷ μὲν χρήσιμος ἐφάνη ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχης γενεalogία, διὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ παρ' αὐτῷ λόγου, ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ παλιγγενεσίας μυστήριον, ἀναβιβάζει τὸν διὰ λουτροῦ γεγεννημένον, ἐπέκεινα ἀπάσης γενέσεως· τίτηρει γὰρ ὅτι δι' ὅλου τοῦ λόγου σεσιώπηκε τὸ τῆς γενέσεως ὄνομα, ἄγει τε αὐτὸν ἀνάγων, καὶ ἵστησιν οὐκ ἐπὶ τινα ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν πάντων Θεὸν, μονονουχὶ προσάγων, ἄτε δὴ Υἱὸν γενόμενον τῷ Πατρί.

Fr.St. 1–12. Nicetas, *Catena on Luke*

Printed in Mai's second edition, pp. 268–77, and Migne, PG 22:957–71,<sup>1</sup> as "Supplementa Quaestionum ad Stephanum". Mai printed Fr.St. 1–12 from a manuscript of Nicetas, *Catena on Luke*.<sup>2</sup>

The first fragment corresponds to *To Stephanus* 2.

**1.** No fault is to be found with the fact that Matthew traces the successive generations downwards from the earliest, whereas Luke has written them in the other direction; they are traversing one and the same 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 { } is the same one, whether they are going up it or down it. Well, then, one may also speak of the steps of a genealogy in the same way; anyone who likes is free either to proceed upwards from the lower end, or to begin with the remote ancestors and end with the last. This was also the accepted practice from long ago among the Hebrews ...

Here Mai omits the Greek text, as being identical with that already printed by him in *To Stephanus* 2, down to ...

... If someone were to say that they are at variance, in that Luke did not stop at Abraham on his way up, while Matthew did not begin with Adam, where Luke stopped, that is an incorrect opinion. Each of them has worded his book's exposition to suit a design of his own: one began with Abraham {...}; the other goes right on past Abraham up to the first man, and, not stopping even there, connects his whole narrative to God. And, if one of them regarded the descent from Abraham to his successors as important {because of the plan of his account}, while the other, because of the mystery of the rebirth in Christ, traces the One reborn in baptism right up beyond all birth, where is the conflict in that? Observe that throughout his whole account Luke has not said a word about Jesus' birth; and that he takes him back upwards to stop, not with any human being, but with the God of all, in virtual juxtaposition, as being the Father's Son.

---

1. The Migne text is very widely available, while the Mai editions are not. References to the PG 22 text have been added for the convenience of the reader.\*

2. Ms. Vatican. Gr. 1611. This MS he labelled A.\*

β'. Ἰνα οὖν καὶ τοῦτο εἰρηκότος τὴν ἀμαθίαν ἐλέγξωμεν, παύσωμεν δὲ τοῦ μηδένα ὑπ' ἀγνοίας ὁμοίας σκανδαλισθῆναι, τὴν ἀληθῆ τῶν γεγονότων ἴστορίαν ἐκθήσομαι·

πρότερον δὲ τὴν προταθεῖσαν ἡμῖν πρότασιν καιρὸν ἐπισκέψασθαι· ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τὸν Δαβὶδ, καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῶν Σολομῶνα καὶ τοὺς τούτου διαδόχους μέχρι τοῦ Ἰακὼβ, ἐξ οὗ Ἰωσῆφ ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χρηματίσας πατήρ, κάτεισιν· ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς τὸν Ἰωσῆφ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ εἶναί φησιν ὡς Ματθαῖος, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἡλεί· είτα ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἡλεί ἀνιών ἐφ' ἔτέρους χωρεῖ, ὃν οὐδὲ ὅλος ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ Ματθαῖος· καὶ οὕτως πλαγίαν τινὰ δραμῶν, ἔρχεται οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν Σολομῶνα τὸν τοῦ Δαβὶδ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ Νάθαν τὸν καὶ αὐτὸν τοῦ Δαβὶδ· ὄφείλων, εἰ δὴ περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς γενεαλογίας ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἀνελθεῖν, ᾧ τὸν Ματθαῖον δι' ὃν ὁ Λουκᾶς χωρῆσαι ὀνομάτων· εἰ δὲ οὕτως οὐ συνηνέχθησαν ἀλλήλοις, ὡς τὸν ἕνα εἰπεῖν τοῦ Ἰακὼβ τὸν Ἰωσῆφ εἶναι νίδον καὶ Σολομῶνος νίον Δαβὶδ· τὸν δὲ ἔτερον, μὴ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ἡλεί καὶ Νάθαν νίον Δαβὶδ· δι' ὃν ἐοίκασι πολλὴν διαφωνίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιέχειν.

Τί δὴ οὖν εἰς τὸ προταθὲν τοῦτο πρόβλημα εἴποι ἄν τις; φέρε τῆς ψυχῆς διανοίξαντες τὸ ὅμμα, ἀτενῶς ταῖς λέξεσιν αὐτοῖς ἐπερείσωμεν τὴν διάνοιαν, ἵδωμέν τε τί φησιν ὁ Λουκᾶς. “Καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἀρχόμενος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ὃν νίδος ὡς ἐνομίζετο τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ, τοῦ Ἡλεί, τοῦ Μελχὶ·” ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅ γε Ματθαῖος ἐχρήσατο τῇ ὡς ἐνομίζετο φωνῇ, ... αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ πρώτη ἀπόδοσις.

The first paragraph of 2 corresponds to *To Stephanus* 4.2 and the last to *To Stephanus* 3.1 and 2.

**2. Therefore, so that we may also refute the ignorance of the<sup>3</sup> person who said that, and prevent anyone else from being tripped up by a similar lack of knowledge, I shall set out the true story of what actually took place.**

First, though, it is time to examine the problem with which we are presented. Matthew goes down from Abraham to David, and so on to<sup>4</sup> Solomon and his successors, as far as the Jacob from whom Joseph, known as Christ's father, was descended. Luke, however, says that Joseph was descended not from Jacob, as Matthew says, but from Eli; and he then goes up from Eli to others who are not so much as mentioned at all by Matthew, and so, running as it were by a side-route, he arrives, not at Solomon, but at Nathan, himself also a son of David; when he should, if they were both giving an account of the same descent, have gone up through the same people as Matthew—or else Matthew should have gone along by the names Luke went by. In fact, they are so discordant that one says Joseph was the son of Jacob and of David's son Solomon, while the other says he was the son of Eli, not Jacob, and of David's son Nathan. Thus they seem to contain serious mutual disagreement.

That, then, is the problem presented; and what is one to reply? Come, let us open the eye of the spirit, and let us {.} base the evangelists' meaning firmly on their actual words. Let us see what Luke says: “Jesus himself was in about his early thirties; and was, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, son of Eli, son of Melchi”. Matthew, though, did not use the expression “as was supposed”...

Here Mai omits the Greek text, as being identical with that in *To Stephanus* 2 down to the next paragraph.

The beginning of 3 corresponds to *To Stephanus* 3.3.

---

3. Reading ἵνα οὖν καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ εἰρηκότος... for Mai's ἵνα οὖν καὶ τοῦτο εἰρηκότος; cf *To Stephanus* 4.2, line 1.

4. Reading ἐπὶ τὸν Σολομῶνα for ἐπὶ τῶν Σολομῶνα.

γ'. Εἴη δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἄλλος βαθὺς καὶ ἀπόρρητος ἐν τοῖς προκειμένοις λόγος.

Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ ὁμολογουμένως τὴν ἔνσαρκον γένεσιν ἴστορῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸν Ἰωσῆφ ἀποδεῖξαι βουλόμενος ἀληθῶς ἐκ Δαβὶδ, ὅθεν ἔχρην τῇ εἰσβολῇ κέχρηται τοῦ λόγου, φήσας, Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἔξης· ἀκολούθως τε τὴν ὅλην ἔξης ἴστορίαν τίθησι μετὰ τὸν τῶν προπατόρων κατάλογον, τοὺς Μάγους, τὴν Ἡρώδου μανίαν, τὴν εἰς Αἴγυπτον Ἰησοῦ φυγὴν, τὴν ἐκεῖθεν ἐπάνοδον, τὸν Ἀρχέλαον· καὶ ὡς μετὰ ταῦτα ἥδη λοιπὸν εἰς ἄνδρας Ἰωάννης προβάς μετὰ τριακοστὸν ἔτος τῆς Ἰησοῦ γενέσεως, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου κηρύσσει βάπτισμα μετανοίας, πάρεισί τε μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ Ἱορδάνῃ βαπτισθησόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου· καὶ δὴ συνόρα ἐν τούτοις ὕφος καὶ ἀκολουθίαν ἴστορικῆς διηγήσεως ἦν ὁ Ματθαῖος ἐκτίθεται, Σύρος ἀνὴρ, τελώνης τὸν βίον, τὴν φωνὴν Ἐβραϊος.

δ'. Ό δὲ Λουκᾶς τὸ μὲν γένος ἀπὸ τῆς βωμένης Ἀντιοχείας ἦν, ἐν ᾧ δὴ οἱ πάντες λογιώτατοι τοὺς Ἰωνας προγόνους αὐχοῦσιν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῷ κατὰ φύσιν Ἑλληνικῷ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἐπήγετό τι πλέον ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν λόγοις, ἀτε ἰατρικῆς ἔμπειρος ὃν ἐπιστήμης. Ὁμως δὴ ὁ τοιοῦτος τῆς τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν Εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς ἀρχόμενος, τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὸν Ζαχαρίαν καὶ τὴν Ἐλισάβετ ἴστορει πρῶταιτα τὴν πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν τοῦ Γαβριὴλ ἐπιφάνειαν ἐπισυνάψας, τὰς παραδόξους γενέσεις ἔξης τίθησιν, οὐδεμιᾶς μνησθείς γενεαλογίας τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ· ἔπειτα δωδέκατον ἔτος ἀναγράφων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, οὕπω καὶ νῦν γενεαλογίας μνημονεύει. Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Αὐγούστου χρόνους, Τίβεριον διαδεξαμένου τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, κατὰ τὸ πεντεκαιδέκατον αὐτοῦ ἔτος, φησὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου κηρῦξαι μετανοίας βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν· διδασκαλίας τε αὐτοῦ τίθησι, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἄπασιν, Ἰησοῦ, φησὶ, βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχαμένου ἐγένετο ἀνοιγῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ Πνεῦμα ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐκεῖθεν ἐνεχθῆναι· “Σὺ εἶ ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.” Ἐνθα γενόμενος, ὥσπερ ἔξ ὑπνου διανήψας, τῆς γενεαλογίας ἀκαίρως, ὡς ἀν οἰηθείη τις, μνημονεύει λέγων, “Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀρχόμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃν νίὸς ὡς ἐνομίζετο τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ, τοῦ Ἡλεί, τοῦ Μελχὶ,” καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν.

**3. On this topic, however, there would also be another explanation, a deep and veiled one, as follows.**

Matthew is avowedly recounting the incarnate birth of Christ, and wishing to prove Joseph's descent from David as genuine; the starting-point he has used for his account is thus the appropriate one, in the words: "The book of the descent of Jesus Christ" etc. He puts his whole narrative in consecutive order, after the list of forebears: the magi, Herod's frenzy, Jesus' flight into Egypt, his return from there, and Archelaus. Only after that does he put how John, in the thirtieth year from Jesus' birth, came out in public and started proclaiming in the desert a baptism of repentance, and how Jesus came forward with the rest to be baptised by John in the Jordan. Now then, in all that, take in the coherent arrangement and consecutiveness of the historical narrative which Matthew, a Hebrew-speaking Syrian, by profession a tax-collector, is setting out.

**4. Luke, however, came of a family from the renowned Antioch, in which, take note, all the most prominent people vaunt their Ionian ancestry. Moreover, quite apart from the Antiochenes' native Hellenism, Luke had something extra to bring to his writing: he was well versed in medical science. Yet, surprisingly for a man like that, the first thing he recounts as he begins the writing of his gospel is the story of Zacharias and Elizabeth. He then attaches Gabriel's appearance to Mary to that, and continues by putting in the miraculous births, but without any mention of Joseph's descent. In recording Jesus' twelfth year, he still makes no mention of his descent, even then. After the Augustan period, when Tiberius has inherited the Roman empire, he says that in Tiberius' fifteenth year John "proclaimed in the desert a baptism for the remission of sins". He puts in John's teachings; and it is only after all that that he says: "When Jesus had been baptised and was praying, it came about that heaven opened and that the Spirit came down like a dove, and a voice came from heaven: 'You are my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased'". It is not until he has reached that point—an inappropriate one, as one might think—that, as if he has been asleep and has only just woken up, he mentions the descent, in the words: "Jesus himself, when he began, was in about his early thirties. He was, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, son of Eli, son of Melchi<sup>5</sup>..." and the rest of them.**

---

5. "This is the MS reading, omitting Matthat and Levi" (Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 270 n. 2).

ε'. Τίς τοιγαροῦν ἐν τούτοις οὐκ ἀν ἀπορήσειεν; εἰ Ματθαῖος μὲν λόγου σύνταξιν ἐπιστημόνως φαίνεται πεποιημένος, κατὰ καιρόν τε χρησάμενος τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ, Λουκᾶς δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἥλαυνεν ἀπορίας, ὡς ὅτε μὲν ἔχρην κατὰ χώραν τὴν γενεαλογίαν ἐντάξαι, τηνικαῦτα παραλιπεῖν αὐτὴν, ίστορίαν τε τοσαύτην ἐκθέμενον τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι τριάκοντα ἑτῶν, μηδένα καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον συνιδεῖν τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν γενεαλογίας· νῦν δὲ ὅτε τριακονταέτης γεγονὼς πάρεισιν ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα, παρὰ πάντα λόγον καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν, ὕσπερ τινὰ παρενθήκην εἰσάγει τῆς γραφῆς τὴν γενεαλογίαν.

Ἄλλ' εἴ τίς γε αὐτῷ τοιαῦτα ἐμέμψατο, οὐκ ἀν ἡπόρησεν ἀποκρίσεως ὁ Θεῖος εὐαγγελιστής· εἶπε δ' ἀν ὡς εἰκὸς θεῖά τινα καὶ σοφὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θείου Πνεύματος ἐπάξια. Ἐγώ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γένεσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γενεαλογεῖν ἐθέλοντα, νῦν τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι· τοῦτο γάρ εἰ κατὰ γνώμην ἔπραττεν, οὐκ ἡγνόει, ὅτε ἔχρην ταύτην ἐκθέσθαι. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ νῦν τῆς διὰ λουτροῦ ἀναγεννήσεως μέμνηται, Υἱὸν αὐτὸν εἰσάγων Θεοῦ, βούλεται ὡς ἐν ὑποδείγματι παραστῆσαι ὅτι δὴ πᾶς ὁ ἐν Θεῷ ἀναγεννώμενος, κανὸν ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπων εἶναι νομίζοιτο

The highlighted part of 5 corresponds to *To Stephanus* 3.3, starting exactly from where the marked part of 3 (above) left off. However, the epitomator of the version in *To Stephanus* 3 had to put in the name “Luke” (“If Luke wished...”) to cover his omission.

5. Well, who would not be perplexed at all this? Matthew has evidently organised his account in an expert manner, making use of the genealogy at the appropriate time, whereas Luke has been nonplussed—so deeply so that he has omitted the genealogy at the point where he should have included it; has failed to notice any suitable opportunity for inserting it, in such a lengthy exposition of the narrative down to thirty years from Christ’s birth; and only now, when Jesus comes forward for John’s baptism at the age of thirty, brings in the genealogy as some sort of parenthesis, against all logic and appropriateness.

If someone had in fact criticised him in this kind of way, the divine evangelist would have been at no loss for an answer; he would presumably have had divinely wise things to say, befitting the Spirit that was in him. **My view, however, is that** if he wished also to give an account of Jesus’ physical birth, he would have done so now<sup>6</sup>; **if that had been his intention, he was well aware that it was the physical birth that he should have described. Actually, though, it is because he has just mentioned Jesus’ rebirth in baptism, and is introducing him as the Son of God, that he now wishes to set before us, by way of an example, a**

---

6. Mai’s text here has (my underlining): ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γένεσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γενεαλογεῖν ἐθέλοντα νῦν τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι, whereas the parallel passage in *To Stephanus* 3 has τὸν δὲ Λουκᾶν ἡγοῦμαι μὴ ... ἐθέλοντα, etc. As it stands, this should translate as: “However, I think he has done this now because he wanted also to give Jesus’ physical descent”, but that makes nonsense of Eusebius’s argument in the rest of the sentence, which is that Luke did not want to give the physical descent. Mai’s own Latin translation of his Greek text is: Ego autem existimo ipsum Iesu carnalem quoque originem describere volentem, ita se gessisse. This ought to mean, literally: “I, however, think that he, wishing also to describe Jesus’ actual physical origin, had now done so”, which would make no sense at all in the context; but I suppose that what Mai meant it to mean is the translation I have given in the text, which fits the rest of the argument well enough. To mean that, the Greek text must in my view be emended to include the conditional particle ἂν between νῦν and τοῦτο.

The reading μὴ for καὶ in *To Stephanus* 3 gives a smoother and easier sense, but for that very reason it may be the emendation of an intelligent copyist, confronted with a text that had already lost its ἂν through a previous error and so had become incoherent as a stage in the argument.

δι' ἦν περίκειται σάρκα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἵσταται γε αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς γενέσεως εἰς τοὺς κατὰ σάρκα γονεῖς, οὐδὲ μέχρι τῶν τοῦ σώματος προπατόρων φθάνει· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ νομίζοιτο ἀνθρώπων εἶναι υἱὸς διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος γένεσιν, ὅμως δ' οὗν οὐκ ἀλλότριος τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱοθεσίας καθέστηκε. Διὸ ἡγοῦμαι αὐτὸν κατὰ καιρὸν καὶ τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ κεχρῆσθαι, καὶ τῇ προσθήκῃ τῆς ὡς ἐνομίζετο φωνῆς. Καὶ γὰρ ἀκόλουθον ἦν, τῆς ἐξ οὐρανῶν μαρτυρίας φησάσης πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Σὺ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα, μηκέτι καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὄμοιώς αὐτὸν ἀναγορεῦσαι υἱὸν, μετὰ δὲ τῆς ὡς ἐνομίζετο προσθήκης. Θεοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἀνεκηρύχθη υἱὸς εἶναι φύσει, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐνομίζετο· τοῦ δὲ Ἰωσῆφ ἐνομίζετο, ἀλλ' οὐ φύσει υἱὸς ἦν.

ς'. Ὡν οὕτως ἔχόντων, δοκῶ μοι καὶ οὕτως τὸν λογισμὸν ἀποδεδωκέναι, καθ' ὃν ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ἀρχόμενος τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γραφῆς, πρὸ τῆς συλλήψεως τῆς Μαρίας, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐνσάρκου γενέσεως τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κατὰ καιρὸν ὡς ἐν ἴστορίᾳ προτάττει τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γενεαλογίαν· διὸ καὶ τὰ γένη κατάγει, κάθιδον ἀπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων αἰνιττόμενος τοῦ δηλουμένου· σαρκούμενος γὰρ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ κατήει, διτὶ δὴ ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών· ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς, εὶ μὲν ὄμοιώς τῷ Ματθαίῳ τὴν ἔνσαρκον ἔμελλεν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν δηλοῦν, πάντως ἄν ἐχρήσατο καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ τοῦ γένους ἴστορίᾳ, κατὰ τὸν τῆς συλλήψεως ἥ τῆς ἀποτέξεως καιρόν· καὶ ἀκολούθως ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀρξάμενος, κατήει ἐπὶ τοὺς τελευταίους· ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν τῷ Ματθαίῳ διάνοιαν ἔξεθετο τὴν διήγησιν, εἰκότως τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείνων καιρὸν ὑπερβάς, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγέννησιν τὴν διὰ λουτροῦ παραγίνεται· καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐκτίθεται τῶν γενῶν διαδοχὴν, ὅμοιος καὶ ἀνάγων ἀπὸ τῶν ὑστάτων ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα, ὅμοιος καὶ τὴν μνήμην τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὑπαιτίων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποσειόμενος, ἐπειδήπερ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἀναγεγεννημένος, ἀλλότριος καθίσταται τῆς ἐνσάρκου γενέσεως καὶ τῶν κατὰ σάρκα ἀμαρτωλῶν πατέρων, Υἱὸς ἀποφαινόμενος Θεοῦ, καὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ Θεόν ἀνεπιλίπτως βεβιωκότων· οὕτω καὶ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ εἴρητο· “Σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύσῃ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας σου.” οὐ τοὺς κατὰ

fact about everyone reborn in God: that even if the flesh in which he is clothed should lead one to suppose, correctly, that he is physically of human parentage, the truth about his birth is not confined to his physical parents, and does not end with his physical ancestors. Even if he were to be regarded, on account of his physical descent, as being a son of human parents, he is still a person not excluded from adoption by God. That is why I think that the occasion for his use of the genealogy, and of the phrase “as was supposed”, was actually the right one: once the attestation from heaven “You are my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased” had been spoken, it followed that he should no longer be described as of human parentage in the same way as before, but only with the addition of “as was supposed”. He had been proclaimed as in fact the son of God by birth, with no “as was supposed”; he was regarded as Joseph’ son, but was not so by birth.

The highlighted part of 6 corresponds to part of *To Stephanus* 3.3.

6. That being the case, I regard myself as having accounted, in this way also, for Matthew’s having put the physical genealogy first, at the beginning of his book, before Mary’s conception and before Jesus’ physical birth; it being a historical account, that was the proper place. That is also the reason for his tracing the genealogy downwards; he was alluding to the subject’s descent from higher things, in that the Word of God, in becoming flesh, was coming down, in no uncertain manner: “though he was in the form of God, he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave”. However, if Luke had been intending to show his incarnate coming, as Matthew did, he too would certainly have made use of the family’s history at the stage of the conception, or of the birth; and he would have begun with the earlier ones and gone down to the latest. **However, as Luke’s narrative is not designed with the same intention as Matthew’s, it is natural that he does not take the same opportunity to put down the genealogy as Matthew did, but waits till he reaches the rebirth through baptism.** He then puts the steps of the succession in reverse order, starting at the end and going back to the beginning; and simultaneously, in doing so, he rejects any mention of the guilty, sinful men in Matthew. This is because one born again in God becomes estranged from his physical descent and his sinful forebears, and is revealed as a son of God and of all those who have lived a blameless and godly life. Similarly, { } Abraham was told: “You will go to your fathers {...}. Those are not his physical forebears:

σάρκα, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Θεῷ διὰ τὴν εὐσεβείας ὁμοιοτροπίαν αἰνιττομένου τοῦ λόγου.

ζ'. Εἰκότως τοιγαροῦν ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἄτε τὴν ἀναγέννησιν ἴστορῶν, οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ὄδευει τῷ Ματθαίῳ· οὔτ' οὖν τοῦ Σολομῶνος καὶ τῆς Οὐρίου. οὐ τῆς Θάμαρ, οὐ τῆς Ρούθ, οὐ τοῦ Ἰεχονίου καὶ τῶν μεταξὺ διαβεβλημένων ἀνδρῶν τὴν παράθεσιν πεποίηται, ἀλλὰ δι' ἑτέρων ἀνεπιλήπτων ἄνεισι, καὶ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ προφήτου Νάθαν τὸν ἀναγεγεννημένον εἰσάγει. Καὶ ὁ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ κατὰ σάρκα γεγεννημένος, υἱὸς ἦν Ἀβραὰμ, ἐντεῦθεν γενεαλογούμενος, ἐπειδήπερ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ πρώτῳ ἡ ἐπαγγελία δέδοτο τῆς τῶν ἔθνῶν εὐλογίας, οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ προελευσομένου γενησομένη. Ό δὲ ἐν Θεῷ ἀναγεγεννημένος, ἑτέρους πατέρας τοὺς κατὰ Θεὸν ἐπιγραψάμενος, οὐδ' αὐτοὺς ἀληθῶς ἐσχηκώς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐνομίζετο διὰ τὴν τῶν ἡθῶν ὁμοιοτροπίαν, ἄνεισιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ Πατέρα μετὰ πάντας χρηματίσας Γίδος τοῦ Θεοῦ·

ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις ἡμῖν ἀποδόσθω ὁ λόγος. "Ινα δὲ μῆτις ἡμᾶς εὑρεσιλογεῖν ὑπολάβοι, καὶ ἴστορίᾳ χρήσομαι παλαιοτάτῃ παρ' ἣς ἔστι τὴν λύσιν εύρειν τῆς νενομισμένης παρ' ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς διαφωνίας. Τῆς δὲ ἴστορίας γέγονε συγγραφεὺς Ἀφρικανὸς, ἀνὴρ λόγιος καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξωθεν παιδείας ὄρμωμένοις ἐπιφανής· οὐ πρὸς ἄλλοις πολλοῖς καὶ καλοῖς λόγοις, καὶ ἐπιστολὴ φέρεται πρὸς Ἀριστείδην περὶ τῆς νενομισμένης τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν περὶ τὴν Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίαν διαφωνίας· ἔχει δ' οὕτως.

## ΑΦΡΙΚΑΝΟΥ

η'. Οὐκ ἀκριβῶς μέντοι τινὲς λέγουσιν, ὅτι δικαίως γέγονεν ἡ διάφορος αὕτη τῶν ὄνομάτων καταρίθμησίς τε καὶ ἐπιμιξία, τῶν τε ἱερατικῶν, ὡς οἴονται, καὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν, ἵνα δειχθῇ δικαίως ὁ Χριστὸς ἱερεύς τε καὶ βασιλεὺς γενόμενος· ὥσπερ τινὸς ἀπειθοῦντος ἢ ἑτέραν ἐσχηκότος ἐλπίδα, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἀρχιερεύς ἔστι Πατρὸς, τὰς ἡμετέρας πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐχάς ἀναφέρων, καὶ βασιλεὺς ὑπερκόσμιος, οὓς ἡλευθέρωσε νέμων τῷ Πνεύματι, συνεργὸς εἰς τὴν διακόσμησιν τῶν ὅλων γενόμενος.

{...} the saying {.} refers to his fathers in God, because of their similarity to him in godliness.

The marked part of 7 corresponds to *To Stephanus* 3.5.

**7.** That is why it is reasonable that Luke, because his subject is the rebirth, does not take the same route as Matthew, and {.} does not include in his list Solomon, and Uriah's wife, nor Thamar, Ruth, Jechonia and the disreputable characters in between. Instead, he goes back though other, irreproachable characters; in particular, he introduces the reborn Jesus as descended from the prophet Nathan. By his physical birth Jesus was, as in Matthew, a son of Abraham, and so has his descent traced from him, as Abraham had been the first to receive the promise of the nations' blessing; and that promise was solely to come about through one who was going to come forth from his seed. At his rebirth in God, however, Jesus has other forebears recorded, his divine forebears—though even they are not his actual ancestors, but only "as was supposed", because of their similarity of character; and then he has his ascent traced up to his true Father, and is recognised by all as the Son of God.

So much, then, for what I have to say on the veiled explanation. Now, to avoid any suspicion that we are merely devising ingenious arguments, I shall in addition make use of a very early document from which the solution of the supposed disagreement between the two evangelists is to be found. Its author is Africanus, a distinguished man with a high reputation even among those whose educational background is outside Christianity. Included among numerous other fine works of his is a *Letter to Aristides*, on the supposed contradiction between the evangelists over Christ's genealogy. Here it is:

8 corresponds in part to *To Stephanus* 4, from Africanus

**8.** Some say, incorrectly, that this difference in the enumeration of the names, together with the mixing of priestly ones (as they think) with royal ones as well, is justifiable, in that its purpose is to show that Christ was entitled to become both priest and king. As if anyone disbelieved that he was, or had any other idea! Christ is certainly both the {.} High Priest of the Father, conveying up our prayers, as well as being the King over all the universe, shepherding in the Spirit those whom he has

Καὶ τοῦτο ἡμῖν προσήγγειλεν οὐχ ὁ κατάλογος τῶν φυλῶν, οὐχ ἡ μίξις τῶν ἀναγράπτων γενῶν, ἀλλὰ πατριάρχαι καὶ προφῆται. Μὴ οὖν κατίωμεν εἰς τοσαύτην θεοσεβείας σμικρολογίαν, ἵνα τῇ ἐναλλαγῇ τῶν ὄνομάτων, τὴν Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερωσύνην συνιστῶμεν· ἐπεὶ τῇ Ἰούδᾳ φυλῇ τῇ βασιλικῇ, ἡ τοῦ Λευὶ φυλὴ ἱερατικῇ συνεζύγη, τοῦ Ναασσὼν ἀδελφὴν τὴν Ἐλισάβετ Ἀαρὼν ἀξαμένου, καὶ πάλιν Ἐλεάζαρ τὴν θυγατέρα Φατιὴλ, καὶ ἐνθένδε παιδοποιησαμένων. Ἐψεύσαντο οὖν οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ, συνιστάντες οὐκ ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ’ εἰκαζόμενον ἔπαινον· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μὲν διὰ Σολομῶνος ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ ἐγενεαλόγησεν τὸν Ἰακὼβ τὸν τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ πατέρα· ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ Νάθαν τοῦ Δαβὶδ, τὸν Ἡλεὶ τὸν τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ [όμοιῶς] ἄλλως πατέρα· καίτοι ἀγνοεῖν αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἔχρην, ὡς ἐκατέρα τῶν κατηριθμημένων τάξις, τὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἐστι γένος, ἡ τοῦ Ἰούδᾳ φυλὴ βασιλική. Εἰ γὰρ προφήτης ὁ Νάθαν, ἀλλ’ οὖν καὶ Σολομῶν, ὁ τε τούτων πατὴρ ἐκατέρου· ἐκ πολλῶν δὲ φυλῶν ἐγίνοντο προφῆται, ἱερεῖς δὲ ἐξ οὐδεμιᾶς τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν, μόνοι δὲ Λευῖται. Μάτην αὐτοῖς ἄρα πέπλασται τὸ ἐψευσμένον· μηδὲ κρατοίη τοιοῦτος ὁ λόγος ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ Χριστοῦ <κατὰ> ἀκριβοῦς ἀλήθειας, ὅτι ψεῦδος σύγκειται εἰς αἶνον καὶ δοξολογίαν Χριστοῦ· τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἴδε κάκεῖν τὸν ἱερώτατον τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λόγον κηρύσσοντος καὶ διαγγέλλοντος τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ διισχυριζομένου τὴν ἀλήθειαν, μεγάλῳ φόβῳ λέγοντος, ὅτι εἰ Χριστὸν λέγουσί τινες μὴ ἐγγέρθαι, ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦτο καὶ φαμὲν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν, καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐλπίζομεν καὶ κηρύσσομεν, καταψευδομαρτυροῦμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἥγειρε τὸν Χριστὸν ὃν οὐκ ἥγειρεν· εἰ δὲ οὕτως ὁ δοξολογῶν Θεὸν Πατέρα, δέδοικε μὴ ψευδολόγος δοκοίη, ἔργον παράδοξον διηγούμενος, πῶς οὐκ ἀν δικαίως φοβηθείη, ὅτι διὰ ψευδολογίας ἀληθείας σύστασιν ποριζόμενος, δόξαν οὐκ ἀληθῆ συντιθείς; Εἰ γὰρ τὰ γένη διάφορα, καὶ μηδὲν καταφέρει γνήσιον σπέρμα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωσῆφ, εἴρηται δὲ

**freed, and being a partner in the government of the whole; and** this was proclaimed to us in advance not by the list of tribes, nor the mingling of the reported names, but by patriarchs and prophets. Let us therefore not descend to such pettiness in our theology as to try to establish the kingship and priesthood of Jesus merely by the alternation of the names. After all, the priestly tribe of Levi was linked together with the royal tribe of Judah by Aaron's marriage to Naasson's sister Elizabeth; and again, Eleazar married Phatiel's daughter, and had children by her. So, did the evangelists tell lies, then? Was it what they guessed would be creditable that they were trying to establish, not the truth? And is that the reason why one of them traced the descent of Joseph's father from David through Solomon, and the other traced that of Eli, also Joseph's father but in a different way, from David's son Nathan?<sup>7</sup> Yet they should not have been unaware that both lists of names represent a descent from David, or from the royal tribe of Judah. Yes, Nathan was a prophet; yet so too was Solomon, and so was the father of them both—prophets came from several tribes, whereas priests were not just anybody<sup>8</sup> from all twelve tribes, but only Levites. That falsehood is therefore a futile fiction. May such an argument, that a falsehood has been composed to the praise and glorification of Christ, never { } prevail in the church of Christ { ... }. Who does not know, also, of that most sacred saying of the apostle as he was proclaiming, and handing on to us, our Saviour's resurrection? He insists on the truth of it and, very apprehensively, says "If some say Christ has not been raised, though we are both saying, and have believed, that he has, and are also both counting on it and proclaiming it, then we are giving false testimony about God in saying that he raised Christ, whom he did not raise". Now, if the person who is glorifying God the Father is afraid of being seen as telling lies when he relates a miraculous event, surely someone would be afraid, and rightly, if he composed an untrue glorification, in an attempt to establish the truth by falsehood? If the steps of the genealogy differ, if they do not bring down any genuine physical relationship to Joseph, if they are

7. In Mai's text, and his Latin translation, this whole passage is punctuated as statements, not questions. I suppose he meant them as sarcastic exclamations. Ancient manuscripts generally had no punctuation at all.

8. The reading in this fragment is ἐξ οὐδεμιᾶς τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν "from none of the twelve tribes". Mai prefers that to the reading of the corresponding οὐ δεῖνες τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν in *To Stephanus 4*, which I adopt in both places as being the one far more likely to have been altered by a copyist to whom the word δεῖνες was unfamiliar.

μόνον εἰς σύστασιν τοῦ γεννηθησομένου, ὅτι βασιλεὺς καὶ ἵερεὺς ἔσται ὁ ἐσόμενος, ἀποδείξεως μὴ προσούσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν λόγων σεμνότητος εἰς ὑμνον ἀδρανῆ φερομένης, δῆλον ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ μὲν ὁ ἔπαινος οὐχ ἄπτεται, ψεῦδος ὥν· κρίσις δὲ τῷ εἰρηκότι, τὸ οὐκ ὄν, ὡς ὄν κομπάσαντι.

θ'. Τὸν Δαβὶδ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ Ματθαῖος ἔταξεν ἐν τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν γενεαλογίᾳ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρώτῳ καὶ μόνῳ τῷ Δαβὶδ μεθ' ὄρκου διαβεβαιώσεως ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ σάρκα φῦναι ὁ Χριστὸς ἐθεσπίζετο· γέγραπται γοῦν· “Ωμοσε Κύριος τῷ Δαβὶδ ἀλήθειαν, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσῃ αὐτήν· ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας σου θήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον σου.” Καὶ πάλιν· “Ωμοσα Δαβὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου, ἔως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου.” Καὶ ἐν Παραλειπομένοις· “Καὶ ἔσται ὅταν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι σου, καὶ κοιμηθήσῃ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων σου, καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σὲ, ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου, καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον· καὶ ἀνορθώσω τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἔως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νίον.” Τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις καὶ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Βασιλειῶν φέρεται·

ἄλλ' ἐκεῖνα μὲν κἄν ἐλκυσθείη ἐπὶ τὸν Σολομῶνα, τὰ δ' ἐν χερσὶν ὅτι μηδεμίαν ἔχει κοινότητα πρὸς Σολομῶνα, ὥδ' ἂν τις καταμάθοι· μετὰ τὴν Σολομῶνος τελευτὴν, πολλοῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις προφητεύων Ἡσαίας, τοιάδε περὶ τοῦ γενησομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ προκηρύττει· “Ἐξελεύσεται ράβδος ἐκ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαί· (πατὴρ δὲ ἦν οὗτος τοῦ Δαβὶδ) καὶ ἀνθος ἐκ τῆς ρίζης ἀναβήσεται· καὶ ἔσται ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν· ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐθνη ἐλπιοῦσι.” Καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐπηγγελμένου δὲ τῷ Δαβὶδ θρόνου ὥδε θεσπίζει· “Παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, νιὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν, οὐ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕμου αὐτοῦ· καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς Ἀγγελος· μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ὄριον· ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, κατορθῶσαι αὐτήν.”

Διὰ δὲ τῶν ἐκτεθέντων εἴρηται μὲν ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἀναστήσεται τις οὐ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν· εἴρηται δὲ ὅτι γεννηθήσεται παιδίον, καὶ ὄνομασθήσεται Γίδης, ξένοις ὄνόμασι καὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ὑπεραίρουσι κεκοσμημένος, ὅτι τε ὁ τοιοῦτος τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ ἀναλήψεται, καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ κατορθῶσαι αὐτήν.

just being said as a way of establishing that the One who is to be born will a king and a priest, if there is no proof about it but merely high-flown language being produced as an ineffective incantation, it is clear, for one thing, that the encomium, being untrue, has nothing to do with God; and for another, that there is a judgement in store for the one who spoke it, for having claimed that what is not so, is so.

9–10 correspond in part to *To Stephanus* 5

9. Matthew also put David before the rest **because it was to David first, and only to him, that a prophecy was given, confirmed by an oath, that the Christ's birth was, in physical terms, from him.** Hence it is written: "The Lord swore the truth to David, and will not repent: '**From the fruit of your loins I shall set one on your throne**'; and again, "**I have sworn to David my servant 'Until eternity I shall provide your seed'**". In Chronicles, too: "And it shall be that when your days are fulfilled and you sleep with your fathers, I shall raise up your offspring after you, one who will be from your loins, and I shall establish his kingdom. He it is who shall build me a house; and I shall renew his throne for ever. **I shall be to him as a father, and he shall be to me as a son.**" There is a similar statement in the second book of Kingdoms, as well.

Now, those sayings *might* also be made to refer to Solomon; but the one we have now to deal with has no application to Solomon at all, as may be gathered from the fact that Isaiah is prophesying many years after Solomon's death when he makes the following prediction about the one who is to be born of David's line: "A shoot shall come out from Jesse's stock" (Jesse was David's father), "and from the stock shall come a flower...and the stock will be that of Jesse; and he who arises to rule the nations, in him shall the nations hope". Here, too, is how he prophesies about the throne promised to David: "A child has been born to us, a child has been granted us. Power shall be on his shoulder. The name he shall be called by is The Harbinger of Great Counsel; great is his power, and there is no limit to his peace on the throne of David and of his kingdom, to establish it."

What is said in the statements just quoted is, for one thing, that from the stock of Jesse someone will arise to rule, not Israel, but the nations; and for another, that a child will be born, honoured with strange titles surpassing human nature, and will be called "son"; also that he will assume David's throne and kingdom.

ι'. Ταῦτα δὲ ὅτι μετὰ Σολομῶνα περὶ ἑτέρου τινὸς μέλλοντος ἥξειν προανεφωνεῖτο, παντί τῷ δῆλον. Καὶ ἄλλως δὲ τὰ πρὸς τὸν Δαβὶδ ἐκτεθέντα λόγια οὐκ ἀν ἐφαρμόσαιεν Σολομῶνι, ἀκριβοῦς ἔξετάσεως τυγχάνοντα· σαφῶς γάρ ὁ χρησμὸς δηλοῖ, ὅτι μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἀναστήσεται ὁ θεσπιζόμενος. Σολομὼν δὲ, ζῶντος ἔτι τοῦ Δαβὶδ, νεύματι αὐτοῦ καὶ γνώμῃ διάδοχος τῆς βασιλείας· λέγεται γοῦν ἐπὶ μόνοις ἔτεσι τεσσαράκοντα βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· πῶς οὖν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπιφέροιτο τὸ “ἀνορθῶσαι τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα;” Ἀλλ’ εἰ λέγοι τις περὶ τῆς ἐξ αὐτοῦ διαδοχῆς εἰρῆσθαι αὐτά, οὐκ ἀγνοητέον ὅτι μέχρις Ἱερονίου καὶ τῆς εἰς Βαβυλῶνα αἰχμαλωσίας ἡ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Σολομῶνος διαδοχὴ τῆς βασιλείας διήρκεσε, μηδενὸς μετὰ τὸν Ἱερονίαν ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Δαβὶδ καταστάντος. Πῶς δ’ ἀν τῷ φιλογυναίῳ, καὶ οὐ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία τελεία μετὰ Κυρίου Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἐφαρμόσης τὰ τοῦ ὄρκου, καὶ τό· “Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νίόν;” Ἀλλὰ γάρ ἄντικρυς Σολομῶνος μὲν ἀλλότρια ταῦτα· ἀνάγοιντο δ’ ἀν ἐπὶ Χριστὸν, ὃς ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ ἀναστὰς, οἴκον τῷ Θεῷ οὐκ ἐξ ἀψύχων λίθων, οὐδ’ ἐν γωνίᾳ καὶ μέρει γῆς, ἀλλὰ καθ’ ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐκ ζώντων καὶ νοερῶν λίθων συνεστήσατο τὴν θεοπρεπῆ αὐτοῦ Ἔκκλησίαν· ὡς καὶ μόνω τῷ, “Αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νίόν” ἀναφωνούμενον ἀρμόσει.

ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις Γραφαῖς Υἱὸς ἀναγορεύεται τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐν τῇ φασκούσῃ, “Ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε.” καὶ ἐν τῇ λεγούσῃ, “Κύριος εἴπε πρός με, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ.” πάλιν ἐν ᾧ λέλεκται, “Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με.” Τούτοις γοῦν συνάδει καὶ ἡ ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐνεχθεῖσα φωνὴ, “Σὺ εἶ ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,” φήσασα· καὶ τὰ ἐν ἐβδομηκοστῷ δὲ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ περιεχόμενα, τὸ “Συμπαραμενεῖ τῷ ἡλίῳ,” καὶ τὸ, “Πάντα τὰ ἔθνη μακαριοῦσιν αὐτὸν,” ἄντικρυς τοῖς περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεολογουμένοις συντρέχοι ἄν.

“Οτι δὲ ταῦθ’ οὕτως ἔχει, ἀναμφίλεκτος ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἡσαίου σύστασις, ὃς μετὰ τὸν Σολομῶνος θάνατον καὶ μετὰ πλείστας ἄλλας τοῦ γένους διαδοχὰς, ἐκ ρίζης Ἱεσσαὶ καὶ Δαβὶδ ἔξελεύσεσθαι τινα προφητεύει, καὶ

**10.** It is obvious to anyone that these sayings referred to someone else, who was going to come in the future. There are also other reasons why the above-quoted sayings could not, on being given careful study, apply properly to Solomon. The prophecy stated clearly that it is after David's death that the one being prophesied will arise, whereas Solomon's succession to the throne was by the assent and decision of David in his lifetime. And anyhow<sup>9</sup> he is recorded as having been king over Israel for just forty years—so how could the setting-up of his throne for eternity refer to him? Whereas, if anyone alleges that that saying refers to his successors, one must not fail to observe that the royal succession from David and Solomon lasted only up to Jechoniah and the Babylonian captivity; after Jechoniah there was no successor to the throne of David's kingdom. And how could one apply the terms of the oath, in which, among other things, occur the words “I shall be to him as a father and he shall be to me as a son”, to the womaniser whose “heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as the heart of his father David had been”? No, these words are entirely inapplicable to Solomon. They should be referred instead to Christ, who, arising from David's line, established for God a house not made of lifeless stones, nor in a mere corner-plot of land, but God's church, a church fit for God, made of living, sentient stones, among all nations over the whole world. It is only to him that the words “He shall be to me as a son” apply.

There are other scriptures, too, in which he is addressed as God's son. There is the one that says “From the womb, before the dawn, I begot you”; the one which says “The Lord said to me, ‘You are my son’”; and again, the one where it is said “The Lord set me as the beginning of his ways for his works, and is my begetter before all hills”. In harmony with these is the voice that came from heaven: “You are my beloved son”; and what is found in Psalm 71<sup>10</sup>—“he will endure along with the sun”, and “all nations will count him blessed”—would agree exactly with the divine sayings about our Saviour.

That being so, Isaiah's message is unambiguous. He is prophesying after Solomon's death, and after many generations of his line, that someone will come from the stock of Jesse and David, and will be the nations' sav-

---

9. Reading δ' οὖν for γοῦν, with the corresponding sentence in *To Stephanus* 5.

10. Ps 72 in the English Bible.

τοῦτον ἔσεσθαι Σωτῆρα ἐθνῶν, γυμνῶς οὕτω φάσκων· “Καὶ ἔσται ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ιεσσαὶ, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν· ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.”

ια’. Άλλὰ γὰρ τοσούτων ἐκδεδομένων χρησμῶν μόνῳ τῷ Δαβὶδ καὶ μεθ’ ὅρκου διαβεβαιώσεως περὶ τῆς ἐκ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ γενέσεως τοῦ προφητευομένου, παντός τε ὡς εἰκὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τὰς τοσαύτας προρήγσεις ὁ σημέραι προσδοκῶντος τὸν ἐκ Δαβὶδ γεννηθησόμενον Σωτῆρα καὶ Λυτρωτὴν πάντων ἀνθρώπων, εἰκότως τῶν προσδοκωμένων τὴν ἄφιξιν εὐάγγελιζόμενος ὁ Ματθαῖος, ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐλπιζομένης προσδοκίας τὴν καταρχὴν τοῦ λόγου πεποίηται, υἱὸν Δαβὶδ φῆσας τὸν ἐπιλάμψαντα· μετὰ δὲ τὸν Δαβὶδ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ἀνατρέχει, ἐπειδὴ πρώτῳ πάλιν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ περὶ τῆς κλήσεως τῶν ἐθνῶν διάφοροι ἐδέδοντο χρησμοί. Πρὸ γὰρ τῆς Μωυσέως νομοθεσίας, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῆς περιτομῆς, ἀλλοεθνῆς ὥν ὁ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῆς Χαλδαίων γῆς ὀρμώμενος, ἀπολείπει μὲν τὰ πάτρια, Θεὸν δὲ γνοὺς τὸν ἐπὶ πάντα, μεμαρτύρηται ὡς ἄρα ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην· δίκαιος τε καὶ θεοφιλῆς ἀποπέφανται, οὐ διὰ περιτομῆς σώματος, οὐδὲ διὰ φυλακῆς ἡμέρας Σαββάτου, ἑορτῶν ἡ νουμηνιῶν, οὐδέ γε δι’ ἄλλης τινὸς παρὰ Μωυσεῖ φερομένης ἐθελοθρησκίας, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἄλλης Θεοῦ φανείας τε τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ Κυρίου (οὗτος δ’ ἦν ὁ Σωτῆρ), διά τε σεμνοῦ καὶ ἐναρέτου βίου. Τοῦτον δ’ οὖν αὐτῷ κατορθοῦντι τῆς θεοσεβείας τὸν τρόπον ἡ περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δέδοτο ἐπαγγελία, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν ποτε κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ζῆλον θεοσεβησόντων, καὶ ἵσης τῷ θεοφιλεῖ καταξιωθησομένων εὐλογίας. Λέλεκται γοῦν πρὸς αὐτὸν, “Καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς” καὶ πάλιν· “Ο δὲ Κύριος εἰπεν, Οὐ μὴ κρύψω ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἡ ἐγὼ ποιῶ. Ἀβραὰμ δὲ γενόμενος ἔσται εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ, καὶ εὐλογηθήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.”

Ων οὕτως ἔχόντων, ἀκόλουθον ἦν τῆς τῶν ἐθνῶν κλήσεως προπάτορα ὄντα τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ὑπὸ τοῦ εὐάγγελιστοῦ δεύτερον παραληφθῆναι μετὰ τὸν Δαβὶδ. Ἐχρῆν γὰρ τὸν περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὰς ὑποσχέσεις εἰληφότα, προτιμηθῆναι τῇ τάξει τοῦ τὰς περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγγελίας δεξαμένου· δεύτερον δὲ ἐν τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ παραληφθῆναι τὸν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀρχηγόν.

iour. His plain words are: “And the stock will be that of Jesse; and he who arises to rule the nations, in him shall the nations hope”.

11 corresponds in part to *To Stephanus* 6

**11.** The point is that prophecies of such importance about the birth of the One foretold have been given—with the reinforcement of an oath, what is more—only to David. All Israel, as was to be expected in view of such important prophecies, was daily awaiting the saviour and redeemer of all mankind, to be born from David; so it is understandable that Matthew, in giving the good news of the fulfilment of their expectation, has opened the composition of his account with exactly that eagerly-awaited expectation, by calling the One whose light had just dawned “Son of David”. After David, he jumps back to Abraham; **again, because Abraham was the first to have been given various prophecies about the calling of the nations. It was before Moses’ giving of the law, and before there was a race of Jews, in fact even before circumcision, that Abraham, a member of another race, set out from Babylonia. He forsook his ancestors’ ways, and recognised the God who is above all; and it is attested that “He reached belief in God; and it was accounted to him for righteousness”. It was not because of physical circumcision, or of keeping the sabbath day, {.} festivals or new moons, nor yet through any of the other traditional observances introduced by Moses, that he is shown to have been upright and God-loving; it was through {...} something else: through the appearance to him of the Lord whom he saw—that was the Saviour—, and through his reverent and virtuous life. It was because he had achieved that religious character that he had been given the promise about the nations: that one day they too, with a religious zeal matching that of the god-fearing Abraham, would, like him, also be accounted worthy of a blessing like his.** As evidence, it is said to him: “And all the tribes of the earth shall be blessed in you”; and again: “The Lord said ‘I shall surely not hide what I am doing from my child Abraham. Abraham is going to become a great and numerous race, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him’”.

**That being the case, it followed that Abraham, as the forebear of the calling of the nations, should be taken by the evangelist as next after David, {...} because the one who received the promise of the birth of the Saviour of all mankind had {.} to be given precedence in order over the one who received the promises about the nations, while the leader of the nations should be taken second in the genealogy.**

ιβ'. Ό μὲν γὰρ Ἰωάννης τῇ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν Εὐαγγελίου γραφῇ, τὰ μηδέπω τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ βεβλημένου εἰς φυλακὴν, πρὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πραχθέντα, παραδίδωσιν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τρεῖς εὐαγγελισταὶ τὰ μετὰ τὸ δεσμωτήριον λέγουσιν. Οὓς καὶ ἐπιστήσαντι, οὐκέτι ἀν δόξαιεν διαφωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, τῷ τὸ μὲν κατὰ Ἰωάννην τὰ πρῶτα περιέχειν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τὴν ἐπιτέλειον ἴστορίαν.

ιγ'. Εὔσεβίου. "Οτι δὲ ἔγκυος εύρεθη ἡ Θεοτόκος, καὶ ὅτι οὐδενὶ ἑτέρῳ ἀλλ' ἦ τῷ Ἰωσὴφ, ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀπεφήνατο· ἐκ γὰρ Πνεύματος ἀγίου γέγονε, φησὶ, τὸ τοιοῦτον φανερόν· δικαίω γὰρ ὅντι τῷ Ἰωσὴφ οὐκ ἦν θαυμαστὸν γνωσθῆναι διὰ Πνεύματος ἀγίου, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἡ κύησις γέγονεν.

The eleven paragraphs above were compiled by Nicetas, or his source, as a consecutive abridgement of *To Stephanus* 1–6, without regard to Eusebius' division into separate *Problems*. Number 12 has been tacked on at the end by Mai, as he explains: “This short passage about the Baptist is actually presented, in MS A [Nicetas] p.52, at Luke 5:12, with an attribution to Eusebius. See further my remarks on Cyril's *Commentary on Luke*, p.146 note 3. In his preface in *To Marinus*, Eusebius said that it was on the beginnings and endings of the gospels that he wrote his *Enquiries*; hence this passage on the Baptist properly, perhaps, belongs to Eusebius' *Commentary on Luke*. However, as there is specific reference here to disagreement between the gospels, I have put the fragment in this position; the national interest is, I think, undamaged.”

**12.** John, in the book of his gospel, records what took place before Christ, when the Baptist had not yet been thrown into prison; whereas the remaining three evangelists recount events subsequent to the imprisonment. Once one actually understands this, it would no longer look as if the gospels were in disagreement with each other. The fact is that John's gospel contains the earlier stages, while the rest have the story of the sequel.

The remaining fragments are from various sources.

#### Fr.St. 13. Possinus, Catena on Matthew<sup>11</sup>

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 277. Migne, cols. 972–74. From “Possinus, *Catena on Matthew* vol. 1 p. 12”. Cf. *To Stephanus* 1.6[3].

From Eusebius. The evangelist declared that the Mother of God<sup>12</sup> was discovered to be pregnant, and that it was discovered by no-one but Joseph; it was, he says, through the Holy Spirit that such a fact became known. Because of Joseph's uprightness, it was no wonder that he was made aware of it through the Holy Spirit, who was also the source of the pregnancy.

---

11. In this and the next few fragments following, there is no *verbatim* overlap with the text of the main *Problems and Solutions*, so bold type is not needed.

12. Θεοτόκος. The presence of this keynote slogan of the fifth century here (as also on pp. 109 and 223) suggests that the text has undergone modification.\*

ιδ'. Εύσεβίου. Ἐνέτυχον δὲ ἑρμηνείᾳ ἀνεπιγράφῳ λεγούσῃ, ὅτι οἱ μέν φασι συγγενίδα τὴν Ἐλισάβετ τῆς Παρθένου παρὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου ὡνομάσθαι, οὐχ ὡς ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς φυλῆς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν προγόνων, καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κοινῶς τῶν Ἰουδαίων γένους ἀμφοτέρας ὡρμῆσθαι· ὡς ὁ Ἀπόστολος, “Ἐβουλόμην, λέγων, ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα.” Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν δοκίμων λέγουσιν ἀληθῶς κατὰ συγγένειαν συνηφθαι τὴν ἱερατικὴν φυλὴν τῇ βασιλικῇ καὶ ἄνω ἐπὶ Μωυσέως. Ή γὰρ Ἐλισάβετ ἡ γυνὴ Ἀαρὼν ἀδελφὴ ὑπῆρχε Ναασσών υἱοῦ Ἀμιναδὰβ, ὃς ἀπὸ Ἰούδα τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰακώβ κατήγετο, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ βασίλειον γένος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· καὶ κάτω δὲ ὄμοιώς Ἐλισάβετ ἡ γυνὴ Ζαχαρίου ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰούδα φυλῆς εἶλκε τὴν γένεσιν, θυγάτηρ χρηματίζουσα Ἰακώβ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἰωσήφ· ἐκ γοῦν τῆς συγγενείας τούτου τοῦ Ναασσών ὁ Κύριος κατὰ σάρκα γεγένηται· οὐ μάτην οὖν τῆς βασιλικῆς φυλῆς τὴν ἐπιμιξίαν ὁ θεῖος προφήτης ἐδίδαξεν, ἀλλὰ δεικνὺς ὡς ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστὸς ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἐβλάστησεν, ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον χρηματίσας· ἥτις ἐξ ἑνὸς προπάτορος τοῦ Ἰακώβ ὑπαρχούσας, συγγενίδας καλεῖ.

ιε'. Προσηκόντως ἐζήτηται ἡ αἰτία δι' ᾧ ἄνωθεν ὁ Ματθαῖος ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίαν, ὃ δέ γε Λουκᾶς κάτωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἔναντίας· καὶ ὅτεον, ὡς οὐκ ἄτοπον ἄνωθέν τε καὶ κάτωθεν τὴν αὐτὴν βαδίζειν ὁδόν· ἦν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο πάλαι τῇ θείᾳ Γραφῇ σύνηθες· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Δαβὶδ ἐν τῇ Ρούθ ἄνωθεν γενεαλογεῖται, καθὼς καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὁ Χριστός· καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν Βασιλειῶν δὲ πρώτῃ βίβλῳ ὁ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ πατὴρ κάτωθεν γενεαλογεῖται, παραπλησίως τῷ Λουκᾷ.

## Fr.St. 14. From an Unpublished Catena in a Vatican MS

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 277–78. Migne, col. 974. From “an unpublished catena in a Vatican MS”.<sup>13</sup> Cf. *To Stephanus* 1.11[8].

From Eusebius. “I came across an unattributed commentary which said that some give the reason for the angel’s calling Elizabeth a relation of the Virgin as being not that they are of the same tribe, but that they both have the same ancestors, and both alike are of the same Jewish race—as in the apostle: ‘For the sake of my brothers, my kinsmen in the flesh, I would have been willing to call down a curse on myself’; whereas others—distinguished men, too—say that there is a genuine connection of kinship between the priestly tribe and the royal one, even as far back as Moses, because Aaron’s wife Elizabeth was the sister of Naasson son of Aminadab, whose lineage came down from Jacob’s son Judah, ancestor of the Jewish royal line. Similarly, later on, Zachariah’s wife Elizabeth drew her descent from the tribe of Judah: she was known as the daughter of Jacob, Joseph’s father. Thus, physically, our Lord is related by birth to this Naasson, so it is not for nothing that the divine prophet taught that there was this intermingling with the royal tribe: he was showing that the Lord Christ descended from both sides, and so counted in human terms as both king and high priest.” Alternatively, he calls them kinswomen because of their being descended from a common ancestor, Jacob.

## Fr.St. 15. Possinus, Catena on Matthew

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 278. Migne, col. 974. From “Possinus, *Catena on Matthew* vol. 1 p. 8”. Cf. *To Stephanus* 2.

It has rightly been asked what the reason is for Matthew’s having put Christ’s genealogy downwards, whereas Luke has put it in the opposite direction, upwards. One must say that there is nothing absurd about going the same way both upwards and downwards. This had also for long been familiar in holy scripture: in Ruth, for example, David’s genealogy is upwards, as Christ’s is in Matthew; and, in the first book of Kingdoms, Samuel’s father’s genealogy is downwards, as in Luke.

---

13. Mai does not identify this manuscript further.\*

ις'. Περὶ τούτου ὁ Εὐσέβιος ἐν τῷ Εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον οὕτως· Φησὶ δὲ τὸν Νάθαν καὶ προφητεῦσαι κατὰ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Βασιλείαις φερόμενα.

Ἐγὼ δὲ, φησί τις, καὶ τὴν αἵτιαν ἐπυθόμην τὴν τοι μακάριον Λουκᾶν ἀποκλίναι τῆς βασιλείου φρατρίας ὑπαγαγοῦσαν, τῷ μὴ τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Σολομῶντος εἰδωλολατρείας καθαρεύειν, πλὴν ἐλαχίστων, ταύτη παραιτήσασθαι τὴν δι' αὐτῶν γενεαλογίαν.

ιζ'. Εὐσεβίου. Τὴν τοῦ Δαβὶδ μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀμαρτήματι δημοσιεύων ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, ἔμνήσθη τῆς γυναικὸς μεθ' ἡς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐξετέλεσε· καὶ ὅτι εἴ μη διὰ μετανοίας συγγνώμην τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος ἐδέξατο παρὰ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἄν αὐτὸς ἤξιώθη προπάτωρ γεγονέναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

ιη'. Εὐσεβίου. Τοῦ Ἰεχονίου ἦν κατηγόρημα, τὸ ἐκκήρυκτον αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ αἰχμάλωτον· διὸ καὶ ἄτιμος ὑπῆρχε τοῖς πολλοῖς· καὶ τοῦτο ἦν τὸ διιστῶν τοὺς γενεαλογοῦντας τὸν Χριστὸν, ὥστε τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ Σολομῶντος, τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ Νάθαν κατάγειν τὰς γενεάς· κάντεῦθεν ὁ εὐαγγελιστής μνείαν ἐποιήσατο αὐτοῦ· καὶ φησὶ τὸν Λυτρωτὴν τῶν αἰχμαλώτων παραγεγονέναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτοὺς παραδεχόμενον.

## Fr.St. 16. From an Unpublished Catena in a Vatican MS

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 278. Migne, col. 974. From “an unpublished catena in a Vatican MS”. Cf. *To Stephanus* 3.

Here is Eusebius on this, in his commentary on Matthew: “Nathan,” he says, “was, according to what is said in Kingdoms, also a prophet.”

“I have also,” says someone, “discovered the reason that led the blessed Luke<sup>14</sup> to steer clear of the royal kinship: it was because the kings, apart from a very few of them, were not untainted with the idolatry of Solomon himself, and that is why he avoids the line of descent through them.”

## Fr.St. 17. Possinus, Catena on Matthew

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 278. Migne, cols. 974–76. From “Possinus, *Catena on Matthew*, vol. 1 p. 12”. Cf. *To Stephanus* 8.

From Eusebius. In putting on record David’s repentance for his sin, the evangelist mentioned the woman with whom he committed it, and says that, if he had not received pardon for the sin from God through repentance, he would not have been the person found worthy to become Christ’s progenitor.

## Fr.St. 18. Possinus, Catena on Matthew

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 278. Migne, col. 976. From “Possinus, *Catena on Matthew*, vol. 1 p. 10”. Cf. *To Stephanus* 13.

From Eusebius. It was held against Jeconiah that he was exiled and taken prisoner; as a result, he was generally disrespected. This is what caused the difference between those giving Christ’s genealogy, with some tracing the generations from Solomon, but others from Nathan. And that is the reason for the evangelist’s mention of him; he is saying that the ransomer<sup>15</sup> of prisoners had arrived, and was accepting them back through baptism.<sup>16</sup>

14. Reading τόν for τοι.

15. Or redeemer.

16. After Fr.St.18, Mai and Migne print two Syriac fragments and accompanying

Εύσεβίου Παμφίλου ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Μαρῖνον.

Ο γὰρ Νάθαν διὰ τῆς εἰρημένης αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν Δαβὶδ παραβολῆς διδάσκει, ὅτι κατὰ τὸν μέγαν πειρασμὸν συνέβη τῷ Δαβὶδ τὸ ἀμάρτημα· παρίστησι δὲ ὁ λόγος, ὅτι μὴ εἰς πρόσωπον ἔτέρων, μηδὲ ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ διηλέγχθη αὐτόν· ἀλλ’ εἰσελθών, φησι, πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ Δαβὶδ οὐ μόνον τοῖς καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἔξαγορεύει τὸ πλημμεληθὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τοὺς μετέπειτα ἀνθρώπους, τὸν ψαλμὸν ἐπιγράψας εἰρῆσθαι αὐτῷ ἡνίκα εἰσῆλθε πρὸς Βηρσαβεὲ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν Νάθαν τὸν προφήτην· οἶμαι δὲ οὖν τούτῳ τῷ πονηρῷ πνεύματι ἐκδεδόσθαι αὐτὸν, διὰ μίαν ἐκείνην φωνὴν, ἣν ἔφη· ἐγὼ εἶπα ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ μου, οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα· τοῦτο γὰρ μεγαφρονῆσαι, τοιοῦτον προέσθαι ρῆμα, ὅτι οὐκ ᄃν

## ADDITIONAL FRAGMENTS

The first eighteen fragments are as printed by Mai<sup>2</sup> and reprinted by Migne. The following fragments fall into two groups: fragments from the first edition of Mai's work that were omitted from the second; and other fragments from printed catenas.

Fr.St. 19. Anastasius of Sinai, Question 9<sup>17</sup>

Mai<sup>1</sup>, pp. 85–87. From “Anastasius of Sinai Question 9”. Cf. *To Stephanus* 8.<sup>18</sup>

From the *Problems to Marinus*<sup>19</sup> of Eusebius son of Pamphilus.

...because Nathan teaches us, through the parable spoken by him to David, that it was under great temptation that David's sin occurred. The story sets before us the fact that the prophet's reproof of him did not take place in face of others, or in the presence of the people as a whole; on the contrary, it says: “he went in to him”. David, on the other hand, confesses his wrongdoing not just to his contemporaries, but to posterity as well, by putting in the heading of the Psalm<sup>20</sup> that he had composed it “when he had gone in to Bathsheba”, and “on Nathan the prophet's coming to him”. I think that what caused him to be surrendered to this evil spirit was just that one sentence that he uttered {...}: “{.} I said, in my prosperity, 'I shall surely not ever be shaken'. This pride, and the uttering of such a remark that he would never be shaken, but would<sup>21</sup> remain immune

Latin translation. These may be found among the Syriac fragments included in this volume below.

17. This and the following fragment contain text identical to that of the main *Problems and Solutions*. As before, the identical text is printed in bold.

18. 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. The question 9 printed by Migne is related to question 18 of the Richard edition. See Richard and Munitiz, table 7, pp. lviii–lix. For copyright reasons, the Mai text has been reprinted here.\*

19. Both manuscripts of Anastasius used by Mai have this mistake.

20. Ps 51 in the English Bible.

21. Reading μένοι, as in *To St. 8.2*, for μένει.

σαλευθείη, μενει δὲ ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀπαθῆς ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὑπέρογκον ἦν καὶ ὑπερήφανον, καὶ οὐχ ὅμοιον τὸ ἔαν μὴ κύριος οἰκοδομήσῃ οἶκον, εἰς μάτην ἐκοπίασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες· καὶ τὰ ἔξης· ἀλλ’ ὁ γε ἵερὸς ἀπόστολος ταῦτα εἰδὼς, οὐκ ἐτόλμησε φάναι, οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· πεφροντίκει δὲ λέγων· μὴ πως ἄλλοις κηρύξας, αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι· καὶ παραινεῖ λέγων, μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν ἀνθρώποις· δὲ καυχώμενος, ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω· καὶ ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι, βλεπέτω μὴ πέσῃ· οὐ γάρ ἔαυτὸν συνιστῶν, ἐκεῖνός ἐστι δόκιμος, ἀλλ’ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησι. καὶ πάλιν ἡ προφητεία, μὴ καυχᾶσθε καὶ μὴ λαλεῖτε ὑψηλὰ εἰς ὑπεροχήν· μὴ δὲ ἔξελθέτω μεγαλορρημοσύνη ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Σολομῶν φησι, μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὔριον· οὐ γάρ οἴδας τὶ τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα· δέ γε Δαβὶδ ἐν ἀγαθῶν εὐθηνίᾳ τῶν παρὰ θεῷ γενόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα προκόψας ἀρετῆς, ἐτόλμησε φάναι, οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· διὸ καὶ παραχρῆμα καταλείπεται ὑπὸ τοῦ συνεργοῦντος αὐτῷ τάγαθὰ κυρίου καὶ συμπλέκεται αὐτῷ πνεῦμα πονηρόν· ὅθεν φησὶν, ἐγὼ εἶπα ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ μου, οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἀπέστρεψας δὲ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ ἐγενήθην τεταραγμένος· διδάσκων ὅτι πρότερον εἰπών οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, μετὰ ταῦτα ἀποστρέφοντος τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν μεγαλορήμονα φωνὴν, ὄμολογεῖ τεταράχθαι. εἴτα ὠφεληθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτοις, τὰ πάλαι κατορθώματα αὐτοῦ, οὐκέτι ἔαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐπιγράφει λέγων· κύριε ἐν τῷ θελήματί σου παρέσχου τῷ κάλλει μου δύναμιν· ὅτε γάρ ἀπέστρεψας τὸ πρόσωπόν σου καὶ ἐγενήθην τεταραγμένος, τότε ἔγνων ὅτι καὶ πάλαι τῷ σῷ θελήματι καὶ ἐκ τῆς σῆς χάριτος καὶ δωρεᾶς ὑπῆρχε περὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν τὸ κάλλος·

from reverses and suffering, in his prosperity, was overweeningly arrogant, and out of keeping with “Unless the Lord builds the house, its builders have laboured in vain”, and so on. Not so the holy apostle, however; he knew this, and did not dare say: “I shall surely not ever be shaken”; instead, he had been careful, and said: “...for fear that I might perhaps, after preaching to others, be discredited myself<sup>22</sup>”. He gives the exhortation that no-one is to boast on human matters<sup>23</sup>, but: “Let the one who boasts boast in the Lord”; and “Let the one who thinks he stands watch out that he does not fall<sup>24</sup>”—because it is not the one<sup>25</sup> who approves of himself that is accepted, but the one of whom the Lord approves. Again, there is the prophecy: “Do not boast, and do not talk with excessive superiority; let no arrogant language come from your lips”. Solomon, too, says: “Do not boast of what belongs to tomorrow, because you do not know what the next day will produce.” David, though, after becoming rich in the {blessings} of God, and having made great progress in virtue, dared to say “I shall surely not ever be shaken”; that is why he is also at once abandoned by the Lord, who was helping him in bringing about his blessings, and an evil spirit grapples with him. Hence he says: “{.} I said, in my prosperity, ‘I shall surely not ever be shaken; however, you turned away your face, and I became dismayed.’” {...} He is explaining that, after first saying: “I shall surely not ever be shaken”, he subsequently, as God turned his face away from him because of that arrogant remark, admits that he was dismayed. Then, after receiving help, on the strength of that admission, he no longer attributes his {.} former successes to himself, but to God instead, in the words: “Lord, in your will, you have granted my beauty strength”. “When ‘you turned away your face, and I became dismayed’,{.} I then realised that earlier, too, {...} it was in your will, and out of your grace and gift, that my soul had beauty about it.” This is why he says: “After being brought high, I was humbled, and was in utter

22. 1 Cor 9.27.

23. This part of the sentence is a summary paraphrase of Jer 9.23–24, referred to in 1 Cor 1.29 and directly quoted in “Let the one who boasts boast in the Lord” (1 Cor 1.31). To suit that context, the translation assumes emendation of ἀνθρώποις “human beings” to ἀνθρωπίνοις “human matters” as being more likely to be what Eusebius wrote; the supposition is that the copyist, with only the present context before him, misread that as ἐν ἀνθρώποις, to be the natural counterpart to ἐν κυρίῳ in the second part.

24. 1 Cor 10.12.

25. We should probably insert ὁ before συνίστων.

διό φησιν, ύψωθεὶς δὲ ἐταπεινώθην καὶ ἔξηπορήθην· ἀλλ’ ἀγαθόν μοι, ὅτι ἐταπείνωσάς με, ὅπως ἄν μάθω τὰ δικαιώματά σου· καὶ ἔγνων κύριε ὅτι δικαιοσύνη τὰ κρίματά σου, καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ἐταπείνωσάς με.

Εὔσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου.

Θρόνον λέγει τὸν ἐπαγγελθέντα τῷ Δαβὶδ, οὐ μὴν καὶ δοθέντα. “ἄπαξ γάρ, φησι, ὥμοσα ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ μου, εἰ τῷ Δαβὶδ ψεύσομαι· τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μένει, καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐναντίον μου”. καὶ πάλιν, “ὥμοσα Δαβὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου, ἔως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου, καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου”.

ταῦτα δὲ οὐ περὶ σαρκικοῦ σπέρματος φησὶ, οὐδὲ περὶ αἰσθητοῦ θρόνου, ἀλλὰ περὶ οὗ φησὶ καὶ ὁ ἀγγελος πρὸς τὴν παρθένον, τὸν μηδὲν ἐπίκαιρον ἔχοντα, τὸν καθ’ ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης φωτὸς δίκην ἐκλάμποντα, καὶ ψυχὰς νοερῶς καταυγάζοντα διὰ τῆς ἐνθέου διδασκαλίας.

οἶον δὲ Ἱακὼβ μὴ τὸν ιουδαίων λαὸν νόμιζε μόνον, ἀλλὰ πάντας τοὺς διὰ τῆς κλήσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀγίων νίοθεσίαν εἰσποιουμένους· ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ποτὲ μὲν Ἱακὼβ καλεῖται ποτὲ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ· ὁ αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἱακὼβ· καὶ φύσει μὲν Ἱακὼβ ἦν ὁ παλαιὸς λαὸς, ὡς ἐξ Ἱακὼβ κατὰ τὴν ἐξ αἴματος συγγένειαν. Θέσει δὲ ὁ νεὸς λαὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρετῆς συγγένειαν· ἀντεισήχθη γὰρ ὁ νέος τοῦ παλαιοῦ· λοιπὸν οὖν ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν λαὸν βασιλεύσει εἰς τὸν

despair”; but: “It is good for me that you humbled me, so that I should learn your decrees”, and: “I realised, Lord, that your judgements are justice, and it is for truth that you humbled me”.

Fr.St. 20. From an Unpublished Catena in a Vatican MS

Mai<sup>1</sup>, pp. 88–89. From “a catena in an unpublished and unspecified Vatican MS”.

Cf. *To Stephanus* 15.1–4.

From Eusebius son of Pamphilus.

He [sc. God, in the text that the catena is illustrating] is talking of the throne promised, but not actually given, to David. “**I swore once in my holiness**”, he says, ‘**If I shall lie to David...! His seed shall<sup>26</sup> remain for eternity, and his throne be as the sun before me**; {and again:} {“{.}I swore to my servant David: ‘To eternity I shall provide your seed, and I shall build up your throne to generation and generation”}.

It is not in the physical sense that he is speaking about “seed” in these passages, nor is the “throne” a tangible one; it is the throne also spoken of by the angel to the Virgin, a throne with nothing temporary about it: the one which shines out through all the world like light, and illuminates spiritual<sup>27</sup> souls through its divine teaching.

Cf. *To Stephanus* 15.5

**Do not suppose** that the “house of Jacob” is only **the Jewish people**; no, it is all those, from all nations, who through the Saviour’s call are included in the adoption of the saints. God’s people is sometimes called “Jacob” and sometimes “Israel”, because Israel and Jacob were the same person. In nature, Jacob was the ancient people, as being descended from him through blood-relationship; but by adoption, it is the new people, by a relationship of virtue. The new people has been substituted for the old; in future, therefore, he will be king over this people “to eternity” (in other

26. As in *To Stephanus* 15, Mai’s text prints μένει, but the future μενεῖ is preferable.

27. Reading νοερᾶς, with the older MS cited by Mai, for νοερῶς.

αἰῶνα, ἥγουν ἀεί, ἔκ τε τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῶν λόγων ἐπιγνόντα αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκουσίως ὑποτεταγμένον αὐτῷ· ὁ γὰρ χριστὸς ἦν μὲν βασιλεὺς καὶ ὡς θεός· ἡ βασιλεία γάρ, φησιν, ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· ἦν δὲ καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος· εἶχε γὰρ ἔργα βασιλέως τὸ νομεθετεῖν τοῖς ὑπηκόοις αὐτοῦ, τὸ ῥυθμίζειν, τὸ περιέπειν, τὸ ὑπεραποθνήσκειν αὐτῶν· ἀ μάλιστα χαρακτηρίζουσι τὸν ἀληθῆ βασιλέα.

Τίνι δὲ εὑρέθη ἀλλ’ ἡ τῷ Ἰωσήφ; πῶς δὲ καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ ηὕρηται τούτῳ τῷ Ἰωσήφ ὁ λόγος διδάξει· φησὶν «ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἅγιου·» ὡς γὰρ τῇ Ἐλισάβετ ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἅγιου γνωστὸν γέγονε, οὕτω καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ. δίκαιος γὰρ ἦν· δίκαιος δὲ τυγχάνων, οὐ θαυμαστὸν εἰ καὶ θείου Πνεύματος ἡξίωτο· πρὸς τὸ συνεῖναι μὲν τῆς μελλούσης γαμετῆς, ἐπισχεῖν δὲ τὴν κατὰ ἄνδρα κοινωνίαν.

Εὗ γοῦν μοι καὶ τὸ μὴ θέλειν αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι εἰρῆσθαι δοκεῖ ὑπὸ τοῦ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ· οὐ γὰρ ἔφησεν μὴ θέλειν αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι, ἀλλὰ «μὴ παραδειγματίσαι θέλων·»

words, for ever), and it will acknowledge him by its actions and its words, voluntarily submitting itself to his authority. Christ was king both as God, because he says: “My kingdom is not of this world”; and as man, because he had the king’s duties of being the lawgiver for his subjects, of keeping them in order, of looking after them, and of dying for them—things which are especially the mark of the true king.

#### Fr.St. 21. Cramer, Catena on Matthew

From Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, p. 10. Cf. *To Stephanus* 1.6[3].

[Matt 1.18]<sup>28</sup> **And who was it but Joseph who found her so? How it came about, and in what way Joseph discovered it, the account will tell us, in the words “by the Holy Spirit”; and, just as it became known to Elisabeth by the Holy Spirit,<sup>29</sup> that is how it became known to Joseph, also. He was an upright man, and, as such, it is no wonder that he was also found worthy of the Divine Spirit, both to understand about the pregnancy of the woman who was going to be his wife, and to refrain from conjugal intimacy with her.**

#### Fr.St. 22. Cramer, Catena on Matthew

From Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, p. 12. This is on Matt 1.19.

This fragment is the same as the part of *Ad Stephanus* 1.6[3] that deals with “not wishing to make an example of her”, but for one interesting exception. By reversing the words παραδειγματίσαι and δειγματίσαι at their first occurrence, this epitomator or copyist has vitiated Eusebius’ point that what Joseph was trying to avoid was not publicity for a wrongdoing, but simply publicity.

---

28. Each fragment in Cramer’s catena is given against a particular biblical text. This is indicated in brackets.\*

29. This clause gives us the vital part of the sentence, omitted by the copyist of *To Stephanus* 1, which was required to make the full sense of the corresponding passage there.

**ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΥ. ΩΡΙΓΕΝΟΥΣ. ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΗΛΟΥΣΙΩΤΟΥ.**

Τὸ «ἔως» ἐν τῇ γραφῇ πολλάκις ἐπὶ διηγεκοῦς εύρισκεται· ώς τὸ «ἔως  
ἄν θῶ τοὺς ἔχθρους σου, ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.» καὶ τὸ, «ἔως ᄀν  
καταγηράσῃται ἐγώ εἰμι» καὶ τὸ, «οὐκ ἀνέστρεψεν ἡ περιστερὰ πρὸς τὸν  
Νῶε, ἔως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὕδωρ.» ἄπερ εἰσὶ διηγεκῶς εἰρημένα.

νοητέον δὲ καὶ οὕτως· «οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν» πόθεν συνέλαβεν, «ἔως  
οὗ ἔτεκε,» καὶ εἶδεν τὰ γενόμενα σημεῖα.

**ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΥ. ΩΡΙΓΕΝΟΥΣ.**

Ο χρόνος, ὃν ἡκρίβωσεν ὁ Ἡρώδης παρὰ τῶν μάγων, διετής ἦν.  
μετὰ γάρ τὸ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, διὰ δύο ἑτῶν ἥλθον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας  
αὐτῶν· τὰ γοῦν ἀπὸ διετοῦς βρέφη ἀνεῖλε.

Καὶ μετ' ὄλιγον—

Ἐντεῦθεν σοι ἡ γνῶσίς ἐστιν, ὅτι οὐ παρ' αὐτὰ τοῦ Κυρίου γεννηθέντος,  
ἐν τῷ σπηλαιῷ προσεκύνησαν οἱ μάγοι τὸ βρέφος, τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ μηνύοντος

## Fr.St. 23. Cramer, Catena on Matthew

From Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, p. 13.

The preceding extract in the catena, on the same subject, quoting from Basil and Chrysostom, makes it clearer that what is being argued in the first paragraph is that the words “but had no marital relations with her until she had borne a son” (NRSV) [the Greek words mean literally “did not know her”] are not to be taken as implying that after Jesus’ birth he did have such relations.

From Eusebius, Origen, and Isidore of Pelusium.

[Matt 1.25] The word ἕως [heōs: “until” or “while”] is often found in scripture to imply enduring time. As examples: “until I make your enemies your footstool”; “until he grows old, I am”; and “the dove did not return to Noah until the land was dry”. These all imply continuity [sc. as lasting even after the event specified].

It is also to be thought of as: “He did not know her whence she had conceived” [i.e. did not know how she had become pregnant] “until she had given birth” and he had seen the signs that took place.

## Fr.St. 24. Cramer, Catena on Matthew

From Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, p. 15. Cf. *To Stephanus* 16.

From Eusebius and Origen.

[Matt 2.7] The time Herod established from the magi was two years, because during the two years after the Saviour’s birth they had been travelling from their country. The evidence for that is that he murdered the children younger than two.

A little further on:

From that comes your knowledge that it was not in the cave, at just the time of his birth, that the magi worshipped the child whom the

ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ· ἀλλ’ ὅτι μὲν οἱ ποιμένες εὐθέως ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ μετὰ τὴν τῶν Ἀγγέλων θέαν δρομαῖοι ἀπήεσαν ἵδεῖν τὸ ἀληθὲς, ἃτε γειτνιῶντος τοῦ σπηλαίου αὐτοῖς· οἱ δὲ μάγοι συμπεριλαβόντος ἔτους δευτέρου μετὰ τὸ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Συμεών· καταβάντων πάλιν ἐν τῇ Βηθλεὲμ, τοῦ βρέφους φερομένου τὲ ἐν ἀγκάλαις τῆς τεκούσης, καὶ παροικῆσαν ἐν οἰκείᾳ ξενίας ἡμέρας πολλὰς, εἰς οἶκον κατὰ μὲν τὸν αὐτὸν ἐλθόντες οἱ μάγοι ἐκ γῆς ἀνατολῆς, κάκεī προσενέγκαντες αὐτῷ τὰ δῶρα, θεατὰ γεγόνασι τοῦ αἰωνίου βασιλέως· φησί γάρ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς τὸν Ἡρώδην κελεύσαντα τοῖς δημίοις, ἀπὸ διετοῦς μόνον καὶ κατωτέρω κατακτεῖναι τὰ βρέφη· «κατὰ τὸν χρόνον δὸν ἡκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων» φεύγει δὲ τὴν Ἡρώδου μανίαν μετὰ τῶν κατὰ σάρκα γονέων εἰς Αἴγυπτον ὃν ἐτῶν δύο, καὶ καταμένει ἐκεī σὺν αὐτοῖς ἔτερα ἔτη δύο, μέχρι τοῦ πρώτου ἔτους τῆς Ἀρχελάου Βασιλείας, ἐν τῇ καλούμενῃ Πλανό. εἰθ’ οὕτως κακῶς τὸν βίον μετελθόντος Ἡρώδου, διὰ χρηματισμοῦ πάλιν ἄνεισιν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ὁ Κύριος σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς γὴν Ἰσραὴλ, ὃν ἐτῶν τεσσάρων τὸ κατὰ σάρκα· ἔτους μέ τῆς βασιλείας Αύγουστου· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπάνοδον, εὑρήσεις τὸν Λουκᾶν λέγοντά σοι τὰ καθεξῆς ἀκόλουθα.

## ΑΛΛΟ.

Καὶ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ὁ ἀστὴρ ἐφάνη, διὰ τὸ μῆκος τῆς ὀδοιπορίας· πρὸς δὲ πλείονα ἀσφάλειαν τοῦ λῦσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δειλίαν, ἀνεῖλε καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ διετοῦς.

## ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ.

Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἐκρύβη ὁ ἀστὴρ, καὶ πάλιν ἐφάνη μετὰ τὸ ἔξελθεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ἵνα ἀπολέσαντες τὸν χειραγωγοῦντα, εἰς ἀνάγκην ἐμπέσωσιν ἐρωτῆσαι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐκ τούτου τὸ πρᾶγμα κατάδηλον γένηται. οὐχ ἀπλῶς δὲ ἐβάδιζεν ὁ ἀστὴρ, ἀλλὰ καὶ προηγεν αὐτοὺς, ἔλκων καὶ χειραγωγών, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μέση, ἵνα κὰν ἐντεῦθεν μάθωμεν, ὅτι οὐ τῶν πολλῶν ἦν οὗτος ὁ ἀστὴρ, ἀλλὰ λογικωτάτη τίς φύσις.

angel<sup>30</sup> was telling about as lying<sup>30</sup> in the manger; no, it was the shepherds who, after seeing the angels, ran straight off that night to see the truth, as the cave was in their neighbourhood. The magi, on the other hand, came a full two years after Simeon had blessed the child, when the family had revisited Bethlehem, with the child being carried in his mother's arms, and they were staying for several days at a guest-house.<sup>31</sup> Now it was to this same house that the magi came from the land of the East, and that was where they offered him their gifts and had their sight of the eternal King. The proof is that the evangelist says Herod's orders to the people of the region were to kill only the children of two years old and under, "according to the time he had established from the magi". He escapes from Herod's frenzy to Egypt, with his parents according to the flesh, at the age of two, and stays there with them for two years, in the district called "Pan's"<sup>32</sup>, until the first year of King Archelaus. Then, after Herod had come to his bad end, the Lord, now four years old according to the flesh, comes back with them from Egypt to the land of Israel in the 45th year of the reign of Augustus, in response to a divine message. After their return from Egypt, you will find that Luke tells you about the events that followed subsequently.

Another point:

After all, it was a long time earlier that the star appeared, given the length of the journey; but for extra safety in getting rid of his own cowardice, he murdered those younger than two, as well.

[Matt 2.9] From the same:

The reason for the star's being hidden, and then appearing again after they left Herod's presence, was so that, having lost their guide, they would find themselves compelled to ask the Jews; and so that in this way what had happened should become publicly known. The star did not just "go", it actually "led" them, drawing them on and guiding them in broad daylight, so that we should learn from that, too, that this was no ordinary star, but some kind of rational being.

---

30. "Angel" and "lying" are conjectural restorations to fill a presumed lacuna in the text, which makes no sense as it stands.

31. Reading οἰκιά ἔσβιας for οἰκεῖα ἔσβιας.

32. The source of such a detail is not clear.

Τὸ δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῆς φάτνης κείμενον, καθὼς ὁ Λουκᾶς φησὶν, ὅτι ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν κατέκλινεν, οὕτως χρὴ νοῆσαι· ὅτι τεκοῦσα μὲν εὐθέως αὐτὸν κατέκλινεν ἐκεῖ. ἄτε γὰρ πολλοῦ πλήθους συνελθόντος διὰ τὴν ἀπογραφὴν, οὐκ ἦν οἰκίαν εὑρεῖν, ὡς ὁ Λουκᾶς φησίν· «ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος·» μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνείλετο, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων εἶχε.

τί δὲ τὸ πεῖσαν τοὺς μάγους προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ; οὕτε γὰρ ἡ πάρθενος ἐπίσημος ἦν, οὕτε ἡ οἰκία περιφανὴς, οὕτε ἀλλό τι τῶν ὄρωμένων ίκανὸν ἐκπλῆξαι καὶ ἐπισπάσασθαι. ἡ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομένη τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν ἔλλαμψις.

προσάγουσι δὲ αὐτῷ δῶρα· οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ ψιλῷ, ἀλλ’ ὡς Θεῷ. ὁ γὰρ λιβανωτὸς καὶ ἡ σμύρνα τούτου σύμβολον ἦν. ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς παχύτητος πόρρω· οὐ γὰρ πρόβατα καὶ βόας ἔθυον· ἀλλὰ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἐγγὺς ὅντα φιλοσοφίας.

καὶ τὸ εὐθέως δὲ ἀναχωρῆσαι αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὸν χρηματισμὸν, τὴν εὐγνωμοσύνην αὐτῶν δείκνυσι, καὶ τὴν πίστιν· ὅτι οὐκ ἐθορυβήθησαν διαλογιζόμενοι· ὅτι εἰ μέγα τὸ παιδίον ἐστὶ, καὶ ἔχει τινὰ ἴσχὺν, τίς χρεία φυγῆς καὶ λαθραίας ἀναχωρήσεως; ἀλλ’ ἐπείσθησαν τοῖς προσταχθεῖσιν αὐτοῖς μόνοις.

διὰ τί δὲ μὴ παρόντες σώζονται οἱ μάγοι καὶ τὸ παιδίον; ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν εἰς Περσίδα, ὁ δὲ εἰς Αἴγυπτον φυγαδεύεται μετὰ τῆς μητρός; ἔδει γὰρ αὐτὸν μᾶλλον ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Ἡρώδου· καὶ ἐμπεσόντα μὴ κατακόπτεσθαι· ἐπειδὴ εἰ τοῦτο ἐγένετο, οὐκ ἂν ἐνομίσθῃ σάρκα ἀνειληφέναι· οὐκ ἂν ἐπιστεύθῃ τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ μέγεθος.

Καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγον—

Τοὺς μὲν οὖν μάγους ἐκπέμπει ταχέως· ὅμοι μὲν διδασκάλους ἀποστέλλων τῇ Περσῶν χώρᾳ· ὅμοι δὲ ἐκκόπτων τοῦ τυράννου τὴν μανίαν· ἵνα μάθῃ ὅτι ἀνηνύτοις ἐπιχειρεῖ πράγμασιν, εἴ γε συνιέναι

As for their “seeing the child with Mary his mother”, and not “lying in the manger” as Luke says that that was where she put him to bed, we must think of it as follows: immediately on giving birth, that was where she put him to bed, because owing to the large number of people gathered for the registration, it was impossible to find a house—as Luke says, “there was no room for them.” After that, though, she picked him up and had him on her lap.

What was it that persuaded the magi to worship him? The Virgin was not famous; the house was undistinguished; there was nothing else about what they saw that was sufficiently striking to induce them to do that. It was a<sup>33</sup> flash of understanding that came to them from God.

They bring him gifts, not as to a mere human, but as to God, for that is what incense and myrrh symbolise. It is also a long way from Jewish stupidity: they were not sacrificing sheep and cows, but things close to the church’s way of thinking.

Their rapid departure after the divine message shows their good sense and their faith. They did not get into a fuss and start reasoning: “If the child is big, and has some strength, what is the need for us to run off and leave in secret?” No, they carried out the instructions that had been given only to them.

Why did the magi not stay at hand and go into safety with the child; or some go to Persia, and others<sup>34</sup> with his mother on the escape to Egypt? Because he would have been bound to fall into Herod’s hands instead, and then *not* be cut to pieces: had that happened it would not have been thought that he had “taken on flesh”; there would have no belief in the magnitude of the dispensation.

A little further on:

So he quickly dismisses the magi, thus simultaneously sending them out as teachers in the land of the Persians, and cutting out the tyrant’s frenzy, so as to make him see, if he were willing to understand, that his

33. Reading ῥ̄ for Cramer’s ῥ̄ and deleting his preceding full stop.

34. Accepting the MS, reading οι instead of Cramer’s emendation ο (singular).

έβούλετο· ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἡμετέραν φιλοσοφίαν τοῦτο συντείνει, ἵνα ὅτ' ἂν τις καταξιωθῇ διακονησασθαί τινι πνευματικῷ πράγματι· εἶτα ἵδη αὐτὸν θλίψεις ὑπομένοντα καὶ μυρίους κινδύνους, μὴ ταραχθῆ, μηδὲ εἴπῃ, τί δήποτε τοῦτό ἐστι; καὶ μὴν στεφανοῦσθαι με ἔδει, πρόσταγμα πληρώσαντα δεσποτικόν· ἀλλ' ἔχων τοῦτο τὸ ὑπόδειγμα, φέρει πάντα γενναίως.

purposes were impossible to carry out. This also has a bearing on our way of thinking, so that when someone is found worthy to serve in some spiritual matter, and then sees himself<sup>35</sup> enduring afflictions and thousands of perils, he may not be upset and say: “Whatever is this? I really ought to be being granted a wreath as reward for fulfilling my Lord’s command!”, but may instead, with this example, bear it all nobly.<sup>36</sup>

---

35. Reading αὐτὸν for αὐτὸν.

36. Note: Two other fragments are attributed to Eusebius by Cramer in the *Catena on Matthew*, but neither seems to be from this work. The first appears on p. 56 and reads: “(Mt. 7:27) Doing virtuous works is ‘the house’; faith is ‘the rock’; ‘winds, rain and rivers’ are every kind of temptation”. The other is on p. 81 and reads: “(Mt. 10:34) (The sword that Jesus says he came to bring is) the one whose cut divides a man with faith from one without it”.



GREEK FRAGMENTS  
TO MARINUS

Translated by David J. D. Miller



## CONTENTS

## EXTRACTS FROM THE CATENA OF NICETAS

- Nicetas-Marinus 1–11. Nicetas, Catena on Luke ..... 180

## SUPPLEMENTA MINORA

- Fr.Mar.Supp. 1. [Not from this work] ..... 214  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 2. From a Greek scholiast on Mark quoted  
by R. Simon ..... 215  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 3. Possinus, Catena on Mark, p. 343 ..... 216  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 4. Corderius, Catena on John, p. 436 ..... 218  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 5. Possinus, Catena on Mark, p. 364 ..... 220  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 6. John Xiphilinus, unpublished Sunday sermon ..... 220  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 7. Anastasius of Sinai, Question 153 ..... 222  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 8. Anastasius of Sinai, *ibid.* ..... 224  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 9. Anastasius of Sinai, Question 148 ..... 225  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 10. Macarius Chrysocephalus ..... 226

## ADDITIONAL FRAGMENTS

- Fr.Mar.Supp. 11. Possinus, Catena on Mark, p. 365 ..... 228  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 12. Corderius, Catena on John, p. 450 ..... 230  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 13. Cramer, Catena on John, pp. 399–402 ..... 232  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 14. Cramer, Catena on John, pp. 404–406 ..... 234  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 15. Cramer, Catena on Matthew, pp. 7–8 ..... 235  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 16. Cramer, Catena on Matthew, p. 251 ..... 237  
Fr.Mar.Supp. 17. Isidore of Pelusium, Letter 212 ..... 248

**A'.** Τοῦ φόβου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπικειμένου τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῦ Σωτῆρος, λέγει γοῦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ὡς ἡσαν ὁμοῦ συνηγμένοι οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐν οἴκῳ ἐνὶ, τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Πῶς ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἀπήντων ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα; Καὶ ταῦτα στρατιωτικῆς φρουρᾶς φυλαττούσης τὸν τόπον, ὡς ὁ Ματθαῖος ἐμαρτύρησεν· ἡ γὰρ κουστωδία στρατιωτικόν ἔστι τάγμα.

Ἐροῦμεν δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα, θαρσαλέως τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἀπηντηκέναι ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα, προμεμαθηκότας παρὰ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς μηδένα τῶν φυλαττόντων τὸν τόπον αὐτόθι παρεῖναι, ὅπως δῆλον ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν λίθον ἥρθαι τοῦ μνημείου· ἥρτο δὲ οὐκ ἄλλως, ἢ τῷ τὸν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἄγγελον ἔξαστράψαι τὸν τόπον πολλῷ φωτὶ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀποκυλίσαι τὸν λίθον, φοβῆσαι τε τοὺς φύλακας, ὡς μικροῦ δεῖν καὶ ἀπολιθωθῆναι αὐτοὺς τῷ φόβῳ· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς εἰκὸς φυγῇ χρήσασθαι, ὡς μηδένα μὲν περιλειφθῆναι αὐτῶν, σχολάζειν δὲ τὸν τόπον τοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν ἀφικνουμένοις τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως· αὕτη γὰρ ἦν μάλιστα ἡ αἰτία τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ ἄγγέλου. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριν ἀπεκίνει τὸν λίθον, οὐδὲ ἔνεκεν τοῦ λίθου τοιόσδε ὥφθη, ἀλλ’ ἵνα τοὺς μὲν

EXTRACTS FROM THE CATENA OF NICETAS<sup>1</sup>

## Nicetas-Marinus 1–11. Nicetas, Catena on Luke

Printed in Mai's second edition, pp. 283–98; Migne, PG 22:984–1005.<sup>2</sup>

The extracts from Nicetas of *To Stephanus* are presented as a continuous text, but those for *To Marinus* are presented in the form of separate Problems, as in the original work.

1. Given that the Saviour's disciples had the fear of the Jews hanging over them (John says that the disciples had gathered together in one house “with the doors shut, for fear of the Jews”), how did Peter and John reach the tomb, particularly in view of the fact that, as Matthew has attested, there was a military guard watching the place, sentry-duty being a military task?

To this we shall say that the apostles reached the tomb with a confidence due to having been told in advance by the Magdalene that none of the members of the guard on the place were there, as was clear from the fact that the stone had been removed from the tomb. The way it had been removed was simply that the angel from heaven lit up the place with bright light and himself rolled back the stone, and that the sentries were so afraid that they almost turned to stone themselves for fright—and then, as you would expect, resorted to running away without leaving a single one of them behind, thus leaving the field free for those coming to see the Saviour's resurrection. That was the main reason for the angel's appearance. It was not, of course, to bring about the resurrection that he was moving the stone away, nor was his appearance in that form anything to do with the stone; one purpose was to drive the men off, and the other was

1. Mai<sup>2</sup> p. 283 notes: “Here we fulfil our promise on p.268 to give the extensive supplements to Eusebius' *Problems to Marinus* from the *Catena on Luke* by Nicetas, who cites Eusebius by name. These passages were excerpted, not from the *Epitome*, but from the complete work itself. Next, we shall append other fragments of these *Problems To Marinus*, gleaned from various authors or manuscripts in which Eusebius is cited by name. We thus hope to have recovered, in the end, almost the whole of Eusebius' *To Marinus*”.

2. Mai edited these fragments from the unpublished Nicetas, *Catena on Luke*. The text of Migne is readily available, so the references are included for convenience.\*

ἀπελάση, τὰς δὲ ἐρχομένας ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν δεξιωσάμενος, τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐταῖς καταγγείλειε. Τούτων οὖν μάρτυς ὁ Ματθαῖος λέγων, Ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσείσθησαν οἱ τηροῦντες, καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡσεὶ νεκροί. Φθάνει μὲν γάρ καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον ἀναστὰς ὁ Σωτὴρ, οὐδὲ ἀναμένει τὴν ἀποκίνησιν τοῦ λίθου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτου πρὸ τὴν θύραν κειμένου, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀρχιερέων σημαντῆρσι κατεσφραγισμένου, τῶν τε φρουρῶν κυκλούντων τὸν τόπον, ἀφανῆς ἦν τοῦ μνήματος, τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν πεποιημένος θεϊκῇ δυνάμει, καθ' ἥν ὥραν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, καὶ καθ' ὃν οὐδεὶς ἐπεσημήνατο τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν καιρόν· ὥστ' ἀν εἰπεῖν εὐκαίρως τινὰ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ περὶ τῆς καθόλου συντελείας πρὸς αὐτοῦ λελεγμένον ἐν τῷ, “Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ.” Οὕτω γοῦν πρῶτος αὐτὸς ἀπαρχὴ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γεγονώς ὁ Σωτὴρ, καθ' ἥν ὥραν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, ἐγήγερτο, λαθὼν τοὺς ἄπαντας, καὶ ἐγήγερτο τοῦ λίθου μεμενηκότος ἐπὶ σχήματος. Ἀγαθῶν δὲ ἄγγελος, ἀνθρώποις παρῆν ὁ ἄγγελος, οὐδὲν μὲν τῇ ἀναστάσει διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας συμβαλλόμενος, τὰ μεγάλα δὲ τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων διακονούμενος σωτηρίᾳ· διὸ καὶ ἔξήστραπτε τὴν μορφὴν, λευχείμονα δεικνύς ἑαυτὸν, καὶ πρῶτος τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως ἀπαρχόμενος. Καὶ ὥσπερ ἡλίου ἀνατολὰς ἐρπετὰ μὲν ιοβόλα καὶ θηρίων ὅσα νυκτὸς καὶ σκότους εἰσὶ φίλα φεύγει, ἄνδρες δὲ ταύτας οἴα φωτὸς συγγενεῖς μεταδιώκουσι, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον τοὺς μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ζωῆς ἔχθροὺς, θανάτου δὲ οἰκείους καὶ φίλους, ταῖς τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτοῦ μαρμαρυγαῖς καταστράπτων, ἥλαυνεν ὁ ἄγγελος· τοῖς δὲ ποθοῦσι τὴν σωτήριον ἀνάστασιν, ταύτην εὐηγγελίζετο, σχολὴν αὐτοῖς εὐτρεπῆ διὰ τῆς τῶν φρουρῶν ἀπελάσεως παρέχων· δύο γοῦν γνωρίσματα τοῖς οἰκείοις παρεῖχεν ὄρᾶν, τὴν ἀποκίνησιν τοῦ λίθου, καὶ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνήματος τὴν ἄνεσιν, τῶν τε φυλάκων τὴν δίωξιν· ἀ δὴ τεθεαμένη ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπήγγειλεν· οἱ δὲ ταῦτα παρ' αὐτῆς μεμαθηκότες, θαρσαλέως ἀπήντων δρομαῖοι, μηδενὸς αὐτοῖς ἐμποδὼν καθεστῶτος.

**B'.** Καὶ πῶς σκοτίας οὕσης, κατὰ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην, τὰ εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ἔωρων οἱ δύο μαθηταί; Ὁ γάρ αὐτὸς καὶ τὴν ὥραν ἐπεσημήνατο εἰπών· “Πρωὶ ἔτι σκοτίας οὕσης,” καὶ τοὺς δύο μαθητὰς τὰ εἴσω ἐν τῷ μνήματι τεθεαμένους· “Εἰσῆλθον γάρ, φησὶ, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν.”

to receive the women coming to see, and announce the resurrection to them. As witness to that, Matthew's words are: "The watchers were shaken from sheer fright, and became like dead men". You see, the Saviour's resurrection actually preceded the angel. Without waiting for the stone to be moved away, he had disappeared from the tomb even while it was still in place over the entrance, sealed with the high priest's seal, and while the sentries were still cordoning the area; he had made his resurrection from the dead by divine power, no-one knew when, at a time none of the evangelists has indicated. One might appositely apply also to this particular<sup>3</sup> occasion the words spoken by him with reference to the universal End: "About that day no-one knows, not even the angels of God". In just the same way the Saviour, with the stone still in position, had been the first to rise again, unnoticed by anyone, no-one knew when, and had become himself the first-fruits of the resurrection. The angel was there as the bringer of the good news to mankind; he was not contributing anything to the resurrection by his presence, but was playing his great part in the service of mankind's salvation. This is why his appearance was dazzlingly bright as he revealed himself, dressed in white, and was the first to celebrate the Saviour's resurrection. As venomous reptiles and all creatures that love night and darkness shun the sunrise, and men, being akin to the light, hunt them down, so in just the same way the angel, by the lightning-flash of his beams of light, was driving off the enemies of truth and life, the associates and lovers of death. He was giving the good news of the resurrection to those who were longing for it, and providing them with a ready-made respite by driving away the sentries. There were two visible indications he provided for the Saviour's people: the moving away of the stone and opening up of the entrance to the tomb, and the chasing off of the guard. Once the Magdalene had seen those, she reported them to the disciples; and they, on being told about them by her, ran confidently there, with no-one to stand in their way.

2. Just how could the two disciples see what was inside the tomb, given that, according to the evangelist John, it was dark? It is the same evangelist that indicated both the time, "early, while it was still dark", and the fact that the two disciples had observed what was inside the tomb:  
"They went in", he says, "and believed".

---

3. Reading αὐτό for αὐτοῦ.

Ἄρχομένης μὲν κατ' ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἐμαρτύρησεν ἡ Γραφὴ ἔτι τότε σκοτίαν εἶναι· πλὴν ἀλλ' ἥδη πρωία ἦν· τοῦτο δὲ τὸ πρωὶ ἔτι σκοτίας οὕσης αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἰδοῦσα Μαρία ἐπάνεισι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς· εἴτ' ἄγγελος αὐτοῖς παραγίνεται. Ἐν δὴ οὖν τῷ μεταξὺ χρόνῳ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην ἀφίξιν ἀπιούσης αὐτῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ τὴν ὥραν προκόψαι εἰκὸς ἦν· κάκείνων πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον ἀφικνουμένων, ἔτι μᾶλλον αὐξῆσαι τὸν χρόνον, ὡς μηκέτι σκοτίαν εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἥδη καθαρὰν ἡμέραν, καθ' ἣν ἀπαντήσαντες οἱ εἰρημένοι, καὶ τοῦ μνημείου ἐκτὸς ἐστῶτες, διορᾶν τὰ εἷσω κείμενα ὅθόνια οἵοι τε ἥσαν· καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἔνδον γενόμενοι, ὑπὸ λαμπρᾶς ἡμέρας ἥδη τοῦ τόπου κατηγασμένου.

Δοκεῖ δέ μοι τὰ ὅθόνια ἔνδον κείμενα ὅμοια μὲν καὶ δεῖγμα παρέχειν τοῦ μὴ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἥρθαι τὸ σῶμα, ὅπερ Μαρία ὑπέλαβεν· οὐ γάρ ἄν τινες τὸ σῶμα ὑφαιρούμενοι κατελίμπανον τὰ ὅθόνια· οὐδὲ ὁ κλέπτων ποτὲ περιέμεινεν ἔως ὅτε ἀναλύσῃ τὰ ὅθόνια καὶ καταλάβηται· ὅμοι δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως τοῦ σώματος εἶναι παραστατικά. Ὁ γάρ μετασχηματίζων τὰ σώματα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν Θεὸς εἰς τὸ εἶναι σύμμιρφα τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ μὲν σῶμα ὡς ὅργανον τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικησάσης δυνάμεως ἡλλοίου, μεταβάλλων ἐπὶ τὸ θειότερον, τὰ δὲ ὅθόνια ὡς περιττὰ καὶ ἀλλότρια τῆς τοῦ σώματος οὐσίας ἥφιει.

Δοκοῦσι δέ μοι κατὰ καιρὸν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀπαντῶν ἐν ἥδη καθαρᾷ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ φωτὶ λαμπρῷ, ὡς ἂν μὴ νυκτὸς καὶ σκοτίας ἐλθόντες τοῦτο ὑπονοηθεῖεν, ὃ δὴ καὶ κατεψεύσαντο αὐτῶν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, ὅτι νυκτὸς ἐλθόντες ἔκλεψαν. Διόπερ οὐ νυκτὸς ἀπήντων οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ σκοτίας ἔτι οὕσης, ἀλλ' ἥδη καταυγαζούσης λαμπρᾶς ἡμέρας.

Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ὡς ἄρα ἥσαν ὅμοια συνηγμένοι οἱ μαθηταὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, εἴτα πρὸς τοῦτο ἀνθυποφέροι τις λέγων, Πῶς οὖν οἱ συγκεκλεισμένοι ἐφοίτων ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ διαυγεῖ; ἐροῦμεν ὅτι τοὺς μὲν ἐν τῇ πόλει μέσους οἰκοῦντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων, εἰκὸς ἦν ἀποκεκλεῖσθαι ὅμοι τοὺς πάντας ἐν οἴκῳ ἐνὶ συνηγμένους· οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἀφικνουμένοι τῆς πόλεως ἐκτὸς ὄντες, μακρὰν ἐτύγχανον καὶ τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων φόβου, ὡς ἐπὶ ἐρημίζοντα τόπον καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἐσχοληκότα παριόντες. Τάχα δὲ καὶ κρείττους φόβου γενόμενοι τῶν μαθητῶν ὃ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης τολμηρότερον ἐθάρρουν προιέναι τοῦ οἴκου, τῶν

What the scripture testified is that at first, right at the very beginning of the day, it was then still dark at the tomb. It was, however, early morning by then; and at this early hour, all by herself, Mary sees, and returns to the disciples. Subsequently, the angel appears to them; naturally, then, time had gone by during the interval after she first came there and went off to the apostles, and it had grown still later by the time they were back at the tomb again. Thus when they arrived, and were standing outside the tomb, it was no longer dark, but clear daytime, and they could see through to the linen wrappings lying inside—and could see much better once they were in there, and the place was by that time lit up in bright daylight.

It seems to me that the linen lying in there provides, for one thing, evidence that the body had not been removed by human agency, as Mary had supposed; no-one stealing the body would leave the wrappings behind, nor would the thief ever have stayed to undo them and be caught. For another, it is simultaneously also a proof of the body's resurrection from the dead. This is because God, who transforms the bodies of our lowly state into the same form as the body of Christ's glory, was altering the body, as the instrument of the power that had made its dwelling within it, and changing it instead into something divine, while discarding its wrappings as unwanted, and irrelevant to the body's real nature.

It also seems to me that Peter and John's arrival at the tomb only when it was clear, bright daylight was timely, so that they could not, by coming in the darkness of night, be suspected of having "come in the night and stolen him", as the high priests falsely alleged against them. That is why they did not come at night, nor even "while it was still dark", but only in full, bright daylight.

Suppose that, while the gospel says the disciples were actually "gathered together for fear of the Jews", someone were to counter this by saying: "Then how did these people, who were shut in, go back and forth to the tomb in broad daylight?" What we shall then say is that presumably those living in the city, in the midst of the Jews, would have gathered everyone in one house and shut themselves away together; but those who reached the tomb were outside the city, and were in fact also a long way away from any fear of the Jews, as the place they were in was a deserted one, devoid of people. Perhaps, also, Peter and John were the only two disciples to overcome their fear and have the courage to go outside the house when none

ἄλλων μὴ τοῦτο πράττειν τολμώντων, ἢ μόνων δὴ τούτων, οἵ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πλείονος ἡξιωμένοι τιμῆς παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους μεμαρτύρηνται.

**Γ'.** Ἄλλὰ πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ τῆς Μαρίας ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ, κἀπειτα ἐλθόντες εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἐπίστευσαν· παρὰ δὲ τῷ Λουκᾶ εἴρηται ὅτι ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ώστε λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, καὶ ἡπίστουν αὐταῖς;

Ἡ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ Μαρία τοῖς ἐκκρίτοις τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ μόνοις ως ἀπόρρητον ἐκφαίνουσα ἔξειπε τὸ τεθεαμένον· οἱ δὲ πάλιν λαθόντες τοὺς λοιποὺς μαθητὰς μόνοι ἀπήντων ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον δρομαῖοι, καὶ ἰδόντες ἐπίστευσαν· καὶ οὐδέν γε ἦν θαυμαστὸν τοὺς μὲν ἐκκρίτους τῶν ἀποστόλων ἰδόντας πεπιστευκέναι, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς οὓς αἱ γυναικες ἀπήγγελλον, ἄτε μὴ ὅψει παραλαβόντας, μὴ πιστεῦσαι αὐταῖς. Αὐτίκα γοῦν καὶ αὐτοῖς ὁμοῦ συνηγμένοις τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὀφθέντος τοῦ Σωτῆρος κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην, οἱ μὲν ἰδόντες ἔχάρησαν· Θωμᾶς δὲ, ἐπεὶ μὴ παρῆν μηδὲ εἶδεν, οὐκ ἐπείθετο. Εἰ δὲ οὗτος ἡπίστει τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, σχολῇ γ' ἄν μέμψαιτο τις τοῖς λοιποῖς ὅτι μηδέπω τεθεαμένοι, ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἡπίστουν. Πολλὴν δὲ βάσανον καὶ ἀκρίβειαν τῶν μαθητῶν παρίστησιν ἡ Γραφὴ, οὐκ εὐχερῶς τοῖς τούτων λόγοις συγκατιθεμένων, ἀλλ' ἐπεχόντων τὰ πρῶτα, εἰσότε πληρέστατα καὶ ἐναργῶς τάληθὲς ἐπιγνόντες εἰπεῖν δυνηθεῖεν ὕστερον. “Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἐωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν περὶ τοῦ Λόγου τῆς ζωῆς.”

“Ἐχοι δ' ἄν καὶ ἐτέραν διάνοιαν ὁ τόπος. Εἴποι γὰρ ἄν τις ὅτι ταῖς ἀπαγγελλούσαις γυναιξὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ως ἐξ ἀκοῆς τῶν ὀφθέντων αὐταῖς δύο ἀνδρῶν κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν οἱ ἔνδεκα, ἐν οἷς ἦσαν καὶ ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης, μηδὲ αὐτοὶ πεπιστευκότες. Τῇ δὲ Μαρίᾳ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην εἰπούσῃ ὅτι, “Ἡραν τὸν Κύριόν μου ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος,” οὐ πρότερον ἐπίστευσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ, τὸ ἥρθαι τὸν Σωτῆρα, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον καὶ ἔργῳ τοῦτο παραλαβεῖν. “Οτε γοῦν εἰσῆλθον οὗτοι εἰς τὸ μνῆμα, καὶ τὰ ὄθόνια εἶδον μόνα, τὸ δὲ σῶμα

of the others dared to do so; they were the ones who, in other respects also, are attested as having been found to deserve more honour than the rest of the apostles.

3. But how is it that, in John, the disciples heard Mary and then, when they came to the tomb, “believed”; whereas what is said in Luke is: “In their view, these words seemed like nonsense, and they disbelieved the women”?

The Mary mentioned in John told only the select apostles Peter and John what she had seen, disclosing it as a secret. In response they went by themselves to the tomb, at a run, without the rest of the disciples knowing; and “they saw, and believed”. Now, there is nothing at all surprising about the fact that the select apostles saw and attained belief, while the others to whom the women were reporting disbelieved them, not having taken it in with their own eyes. Compare, for instance, the time when, according to John, the disciples themselves were gathered together and the Saviour appeared to them: “they were full of joy” because they had seen him, but Thomas, because he had not been there and had not seen him, was unconvinced. If he disbelieved the apostles, one could hardly blame the rest of them for having disbelieved the women, when they had not yet seen for themselves. The scripture sets before us a very careful process of scrutiny on the disciples’ part. They did not give facile assent<sup>4</sup> to what the women told them, but began by suspending judgement until they were able to realise the truth clearly and in all its fullness, and so could speak of “what was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have witnessed and our hands have felt, about the Word of life”.

The passage could also have another meaning. One might say that what the eleven did not believe—and they included Peter and John, even they having not yet attained belief—was the women’s report of the Saviour’s resurrection, as being hearsay from what, according to Luke, were ‘the two men’ they had seen. And when, according to John, Mary said: “They have taken away my Lord from the tomb”, the two disciples did not believe even that much, that the Saviour had been taken away, before going to the place and taking it in as fact. In support of this is that the

---

4. Correcting συγκατιθεμένων to συγκαταθεμένων.

οὐδαμοῦ, τότε ἐπίστευσαν· τίνι δὲ ἐπίστευσαν, ἀλλ’ ἡ τῷ τῆς Μαρίας λόγῳ φήσαντι, “Ἡραν τὸν Κύριόν μου;” Διὸ ἐπιλέγει ἔξῆς· “Οὕπω γάρ ἥδεισαν τὴν Γραφὴν, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι.”

**Δ'.** Τὸ δὲ πῶς δύο παρὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην μαθητῶν ἐλθόντων εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου, ὁ Λουκᾶς ἔνα μόνον φησὶν ἀπηντηκέναι, οὕτως ἀν λυθείη.

Πολὺς ἦν ὁ Πέτρος ἀεὶ τῇ προθυμίᾳ, ὡς μόνον παρὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους εἰπεῖν τῷ Σωτῆρι· “Κἀν δέῃ με σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι·” καὶ μόνον πάλιν ἐπιβῆναι τοῖς κύμασιν ἀξιῶσαι· καὶ μόνον ἀποκρίνασθαι καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ· “Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος·” διὸ καὶ μόνος τῶν μαθητῶν ἀκούει· “Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βάρ Ιωνᾶ·” Διὸ καὶ πρῶτος τολμᾷ εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, σὺν τῷ ἑτέρῳ μαθητῇ δὲ ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλθὼν, κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην· ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν παρὰ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ἥρθαι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μεμαθηκώς, ἀπήντα ἄμα τῷ ἑτέρῳ μαθητῇ· εἴτα ἀνεχώρει σὺν αὐτῷ, τὰ ὀθόνια εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος τεθεαμένος καὶ πιστεύσας. Κατὰ δὲ Λουκᾶν, τῶν ἀλλων ἀπιστούντων μαθητῶν, μόνος αὐτὸς πάλιν πιστεύει ταῖς λεγούσαις ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἐωρακέναι τοὺς ὄφθεντας ἀγγέλους· οὐ γάρ ἀπιστήσας δὲ ταῖς τῶν γυναικῶν μαρτυρίαις, παλιν δρομαῖος ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον μόνος παραγίνεται· καὶ αὖθις παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα ὡς καὶ τὸ πρότερον·

εἴτα ἀπήγει, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός· καὶ νῦν μὲν ἀπήγει θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός, ἐπεὶ δὲ πολὺς ἦν τῇ προθυμίᾳ καὶ πλείονα σπουδὴν παρὰ πάντας ἐπεδείκνυτο, σπεύδων καὶ περιτρέχων, καὶ πάντη τὸν Σωτῆρα περιαθρῶν ἀνεῳγόσι τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ὅμμασι, πανταχοῦ δὲ ζητῶν καὶ περιβλεπόμενος, οὐκ ἡτύχησε τῆς ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀξιοῦται τῆς αὐτοῦ θεοφανείας· τούτου μάρτυς ὁ αὐτὸς εὐαγγελιστὴς Λουκᾶς ὡδέ πη προιών ἔξῆς καὶ λέγων ὅτι ὄντως ἡγέρθη ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὠφθη Σίμωνι. Συμμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ ἵερος Ἀπόστολος ὡδες Κορινθίοις γράφων, ὅτι “Ωφθη Κεφᾶς, εἴτα τοῖς ἔνδεκα.” Κεφᾶς δὲ αὐτὸς ἦν Σίμων ὁ καὶ Πέτρος,

point at which they did “believe” was when they went into the tomb and saw just the linen wrappings lying there, and the body not there at all. Now what was it that they “believed”, but just what Mary said: “They have taken away my lord”? That is why he goes on to add: “Because they did not yet know the scripture, that he must rise from the dead”.

4. The problem of how it is that Luke says only one of the disciples came to the tomb, when in John there are two, Peter and John, would be solved as follows.

Peter was always strong in his enthusiasm. He was the only one among the apostles who said to the Saviour: “Even if I have to die with you, I shall never, never deny you”; again, he was the only one who thought he could walk on the waves; and the only one who gave an answer, and said to him: “You are the Christ, the son of the living God”. That is why he is the only one of the disciples to be told: “Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah!”; and that is also why he, with the other disciple whom Jesus loved, is the first with the courage to go and enter the tomb, according to John. On that occasion, though, on learning from the Magdalene that the Lord’s body had been removed from the tomb, he went there together with the other disciple, and then left with him, when he had seen the linen wrappings inside the tomb, and believed. According to Luke the other disciples disbelieved the women when they said they had seen the angels that had appeared; Peter is, again, the only one to believe them. Not disbelieving the women’s testimonies, he ran back and reached the tomb, alone. Stooping down, for the second time, he saw just the wrappings, as before, and then went away, wondering to himself at what had happened.

For the moment, then, he was going away, wondering at what had happened; but, strongly enthusiastic as he was, he also displayed more zeal than all of them. He started dashing energetically about and peering all over the place for the Saviour; once the eyes of his soul had been opened, he was searching everywhere and looking about for him. His hope was not disappointed: he too is found worthy of Jesus’ divine appearance. The witness for this is the same evangelist, Luke, who goes on to say in a later passage: “The Lord has risen indeed, and he has been seen by Simon!” His testimony is also corroborated by the holy apostle’s words to the Corinthians: “He was seen by Cephas, and then by the eleven”. (Cephas is the same person as Simon, also called Peter.) It was thanks to

ῷ καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἔνδεκα μόνος μόνω ὥφθη ὁ Σωτὴρ, τῆς παρὰ πάντας ὑπερβαλλούσης αὐτοῦ χάριν σπουδῆς.

**Ε'.** Ἔτι ζητήσειεν ἄν τις πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία μετὰ τῆς ὁμωνύμου ἐωρακέναι ἐκτὸς τοῦ μνήματος ἐπικαθήμενον τῷ λίθῳ ἔνα μόνον ἄγγελον εἴρηται· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ἰωάννην εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος ἀγγέλους δύο θεωρεῖ καθημένους· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Λουκᾶν δύο ἄνδρες ἀπήντων ταῖς γυναιξὶ· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Μάρκον νεανίσκος ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁρώμενος.

Τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Ματθαίῳ λύσεως ἄν τύχοι τοιαύτης.

ἡγοῦμαι γὰρ προηγεῖσθαι μὲν τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἴστορίαν, τῆς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ, καὶ τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν τὸ πρῶτον ἐλθοῦσαν τοὺς δύο ἀγγέλους εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος καθεζόμενους ἰδεῖν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δεύτερον ἐπιστᾶσαν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ μετὰ τῆς ἀλλῆς Μαρίας τὸν ἐπικαθήμενον τῷ λίθῳ ἄγγελον ἐωρακέναι.<sup>7</sup> Η τάχα ἔτερος μὲν ὁ παρὰ Ματθαίῳ ἄγγελος, ἔτερος δὲ καὶ ὁ χρόνος καὶ ὁ τόπος τῆς τοῦ ἀγγέλου θέας· ἔτεροι δὲ καὶ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ οἱ πρὸς τὰς γυναικας· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ δύο ἄγγελοι οἱ εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος ὀφθέντες ἔτεροι εἰσὶ παρὰ τὸν ἔξω πρὸ μνήματος ἐπὶ τῷ λίθῳ καθεζόμενον παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ.

Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Ματθαίου ὄψὲ Σαββάτων εἰρηκότος, καὶ ἔνα πρὸ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ λίθῳ ἴστορηκότος, φυλάξας ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον εἰρήκει ὄψὲ Σαββάτων, πρὸ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνήματος ἐπὶ τῷ λίθῳ δύο καθεζόμενους ὁρᾶσθαι, ἦν ἀληθῶς διαφωνίαν αἰτιᾶσθαι. Καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος ὡσαύτως εἰ ὅμοίως Ἰωάννη τὴν πρωινὴν ὥραν τηρήσας, εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος καὶ αὐτὸς οὐ δύο ἀγγέλους ἀλλ' ἔνα ἔφησε τεθεωρῆσθαι, τάναντία ἔδοξεν ἄν εἰκότως συγγράφειν. Εἰ δ' ἀφώρισαν οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ καὶ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τοὺς

his zeal, outstanding beyond them all, that the Lord appeared to him even before the eleven, one to one.

(Cf. *To Marinus* 4)

5. Another question one might ask is: **How is it that in Matthew Mary of Magdala, with her namesake{...}, is said to have seen only a single angel sitting on the stone outside the tomb, whereas according to John she sees two angels sitting inside the tomb; according to Luke it was two men who met the women; and according to Mark it was a young man that was seen by them<sup>5</sup> {...} ?**

The solution to the accounts in Matthew and John could be found on the following lines.

I take it that the narrative in John comes before that in Matthew,<sup>6</sup> and that firstly the Magdalene arrived and saw the two angels sitting inside the tomb; and that she then stayed in the same place, and secondly, in company with the other Mary, saw the angel sitting on the stone. To put it another possible way, the angel in Matthew is a different one, the time and place at which the angel is seen are different, and his words<sup>7</sup> to the women are also different. Correspondingly, the two angels in John, seen inside the tomb, are also different from the one in Matthew, sitting on the stone outside the<sup>8</sup> tomb.

Given that Matthew said “late on the sabbath”, and gave an account of just one, sitting on the stone in front of the tomb-entrance, it really would have been justifiable to accuse them of discrepancy if John had kept the same time and the same place, and had said that two of them were seen, sitting on the stone in front of the tomb-entrance late on the sabbath. Correspondingly, if Matthew had maintained the time as early morning, as in John, and he too had said that one angel, not two, had been seen inside the tomb, he would plausibly have been regarded as writing a contradictory account. But if the evangelists in fact made a dis-

5. Reading αὐταῖς, as in *To Marinus* 4, for αὐτοῖς.

6. This statement contradicts that at the beginning of *To Marinus* 4. The order given in both *To Marinus* 4.2 and fragment Nicetas-Marinus 7 is different also.

7. Reading λόγοι for ἄγγελοι, as in Nicetas-Marinus 6 p. 194 line 3.

8. Reading τοῦ for πρὸ.

τρόπους, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν θεωμένων, καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἀγγέλων λόγους, οὐκ ἄν τις εὐλόγως μέμψαιτο διαφωνίαν τῆς Γραφῆς, ἀληθευούσης ἐκάστης κατὰ τὸν οἰκείας ἱστορίας λόγον, διαφόρων τε πραγμάτων ὑφήγησιν δηλούσης.

Ἄλλ' οἱ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς εὐαγγελισταῖς ἄγγελοι, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος αἱ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν θεοφάνειαι, παρὰ μόνοις τούτοις ὡς ἄν παρὰ κρείττοις καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος αὐτόπταις τε καὶ αὐτηκόοις φερόμεναι, ταύτην σώζοιεν ἄν τὴν ἀκολουθίαν. Οἱ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾶ δύο ἄνδρες ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ ὄφθεντες, διὰ τὰ τῆς ἑορτῆς σύμβολα· καὶ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ νεανίσκος λευκὴν περιβεβλημένος καὶ αὐτὸς στολὴν, δεξιός τε ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριστερὸς ἔωραμένος, τῷ τε φαιδρὰ καὶ δεξιὰ ταῖς γυναιξὶν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, πάλιν ἔτεροι ἄν εἴεν καὶ αὐτοὶ, ἀλλήλων τε καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς πρώτοις. Διὸ οὐδὲ ἀγγέλους αὐτοὺς οἶδε ἀνόμασαν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὄπτασιῶν ἐμνημόνευσαν τοῖς κρείττοσιν ἢ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς Ματθαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ τὰ κρείττονα γράφειν καὶ ἰστορεῖν παρακεχωρηκότες· αὐτοὶ δὲ τὰ δεύτερα διηγούμενοι, καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τὰ μετὰ τὴν τῶν πρώτων μνήμην ὕστερον πεπραγμένα, παρήσαν μὲν τὰ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτόπταις εἰρημένα, ἀντανεπλήρουν δὲ τὰ παρ' ἐκείνοις σεσιγημένα· ἂ δὴ δεύτερα ἥν καὶ μακρῷ λειπόμενα τῆς τῶν προτέρων ἱστορίας· οὕτω τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος διανείμαντος τὰς πρεπούσας ἐκάστω καὶ καταλλήλους διηγήσεις.

ς'. Αἱ γοῦν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ ὅρθρου βαθέος ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἐλθοῦσαι γυναῖκες καὶ φέρουσαι ἀ ήτοίμασαν ἀρώματα, ἔτεραι ἄν εἴεν τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ. Οὐ γάρ ἄν ἔχοι λόγον τὰς τοσαῦτα προτεθεαμένας Μαρίας ἄρτι πρῶτον ἀρώματα φέρειν, ὡς μήπω τὴν ἀνάστασιν προμεμαθηκούσας. Σαφῶς γάρ δι' ὧν φησι δείκνυσι ὅτι καὶ οἱ ὄφθεντες, ἔτεροι παρὰ τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν δεδηλωμένους· καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐνθα ὥφθησαν ἔτερος· οὕτε γάρ εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ἥσαν, ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐδίδαξεν, οὕτε ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον καθεζόμενοι, ὡς ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἄγγελος· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὅλως

tinction between the times, the positions, the persons observed, and the angels' words, there would be no reasonable ground for anyone to criticise the scripture for discrepancy: each book is giving a description of different events, and is telling the truth about what its own account is narrating.

That is how these evangelists would preserve concinnity. It is only in them, as being the more important ones, having themselves actually seen and heard the Saviour, that the angels and the divine appearances of the Saviour after the resurrection are found. **The two men in Luke, seen in dazzling clothes** (those being indications of the festival), **and also the young man in Mark, also wearing white {.}, seen on the right-hand side<sup>9</sup> as opposed to the left, and giving the women the bright, propitious<sup>9</sup> good news, would be different**, again, both from each other and from those in the first two {.}. That is why these writers do not call them "angels", either, because they also did not mention {...} the appearances of the Saviour, but stood aside for those more important than themselves, **Matthew and John, to write the account of the more important matters, while themselves narrating the secondary incidents** which<sup>10</sup> took place some time after the first ones recorded; they bypassed what the eyewitnesses had said, **and filled in**, instead, **what those had said nothing about**. These were secondary matters indeed, falling far short of the earlier writers' accounts in importance. Thus the Holy Spirit assigned to each the appropriately corresponding narratives.

6. Then the women who, in Luke, came in the dawn twilight, and brought the spices they had prepared, would be different from the ones in Matthew and John. It would be illogical for the Marys, who had previously witnessed such great things, to be bringing spices only now, as if they had had no prior information by then about the resurrection.<sup>11</sup> Luke is making it clear, through what he says, that the persons seen by them are different from those mentioned before, and that the place where they were seen is also different: they were neither inside the tomb, as we learn from John, nor sitting on the stone, like the angel in Matthew. In fact, Luke

9. The same Greek word is here translated first as "on the right-hand side" and then as "propitious".

10. Reading τὰ χρόνω μετὰ ... for τὸ χρόνῳ τὰ μετὰ ...

11. Migne, PG 22:954, prints here a long extra paragraph from Combefis's edition; see Fr.Mar.Supp. 16.\*

ώνόμασεν ἀγγέλους ὁ Λουκᾶς, δύο δὲ ἄνδρας, πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ, διὰ τὰ τῆς ἑορτῆς σύμβολα· καὶ οἱ λόγοι δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ πρὸς τὰς γυναικας ἰδιάζουσι· καὶ αἱ γυναικες δὲ πλείους ἥσαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ δύο Μαρίαι, ἀλλ' ἀπαξαπλῶς αἱ συνελθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· ὀλίγωροι δὲ καὶ αὗται, οὐδὲ τοσαύτην ἐνδειξάμεναι σπουδὴν ὅσην αἱ διὰ νυκτὸς καρτερήσασαι καὶ παραμείνασαι τῷ μνημείῳ. Μαρτυρεῖ γοῦν ὁ Ματθαῖος τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ Μαρίᾳ εὐτονίαν πολλὴν καὶ παραμονὴν, λέγων μετὰ τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ ταῦτα· “Ἡν δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαρίᾳ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἄλλῃ Μαρίᾳ, καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου.” ἀλλ' αὗται μὲν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Παρασκευῆς παρεκάθηντο ἀντικρὺ τοῦ μνήματος· διὸ καὶ θάττον ὄρῶσι πρῶτον μὲν τὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄγγελον, εἴτα καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀρχηγόν. Ἡ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, καὶ αὕτη τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τοὺς ἀγγέλους, μετὰ δὲ τούτους καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Σωτῆρα θεωρεῖ· οὐ μὴν ἀρώματα ἔφερον αὗται, οὐδὲ περὶ ταύτην κατεγίνοντο τὴν σπουδὴν. Αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀκολουθήσασαι αὐτῷ γυναικες, πολλαὶ οὖσαι κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν, τῇ μὲν Παρασκευῇ ὑποστρέψασαι, ἡτοίμασαν τὰ ἀρώματα, ἄτε δὴ μηδὲν μηδέπω προμαθοῦσαι περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Διὸ ταύταις μὲν δύο ἄνδρες ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ φαίνονται καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐαγγελίζονται. Οὐκέτι δὲ αὐταῖς ὁ Σωτὴρ ὥφθη, ὥστε ιδιάζουσαν ἥγεῖσθαι προσήκει τὴν ἴστορίαν.

Κατὰ δὲ τὸν Μάρκον λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν Σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου ἄλλαι πάλιν αὗται, καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ καιρῷ πάλιν, αἱ καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτὰς, “Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον;” καὶ ἔρχονται, καὶ εὑρίσκουσιν ἀποκεκυλισμένον, καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἶδον

did not actually call them “angels” at all, but “two men”, even though they too were in dazzling clothes, those being indications of the festival; and what they say to the women is also peculiar to Luke. For another thing, there were more women, not<sup>12</sup> just the one in John, nor the two Marys, as in Matthew, but simply<sup>13</sup> the ones who had come with him from Galilee. Again, these are uncommitted, not evincing such zeal as those who had the endurance to stay all night at the tomb; for the Magdalene and the other Mary, Matthew attests a high degree of perseverance and staying-power, by saying, after the passion: “Mary of Magdala and the other Mary were there, sitting opposite the sepulchre”. No, on the day of preparation these two were sitting there, right in front of the tomb. That is why they quickly see, first, the angel who gives them the good news, and then the Lord of life himself, as well; while the one in John also sees first the angels and after them the Saviour himself. These women were *not* bringing spices; that was not the direction in which their zeal was engaged.<sup>14</sup> It is the women who had followed him from Galilee, a large number of them according to Luke, and who had “returned” on the day of preparation, who prepared the spices—because they had not, as yet, found out anything at all about the resurrection. That is why it is to those that the two men in dazzling clothes appear, and give the good news of the resurrection; but the Saviour did not yet appear to them as he did to the woman in John, and to the women in Matthew. It is thus appropriate to regard Luke’s narrative as peculiar to him.

Those who according to Mark “come to the tomb very early on the first day of the week, after sunrise”, are, again, others; and, again, on a different occasion. These are the ones who were also saying to themselves: “Who will roll back the stone for us?” and then came and found it rolled

12. The reading of Mai, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ δύο Μαρίαι, is impossible. A line has evidently been omitted in the MS or in Mai’s edition; it can be supplied from the version of this passage printed in Migne: ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ μόνη οὐδὲ αἱ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ δύο Μαρίαι.

13. Mai prints ἄπαξ ἀπλῶς, where ἄπαξ (“once”) makes no relevant sense and is presumably an incompletely deleted error, meant to be corrected by the next word ἀπλῶς (“simply”) but mistaken by the next copyist as being still part of the text.

14. Here Eusebius leaves unmentioned Mark 16.1: “When the sabbath was over, Mary of Magdala, Mary James’s mother, and Salome bought spices, to go and anoint him”. Perhaps his text of Mark did not have these words; see n. 18, p. 199.

νεανίσκον· ἔνθα πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ ἄνδρες ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄγγελοι, οὕτω ὡς καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἄγγελος ὠνόμασται, ἀλλὰ νεανίσκος· ὥστε καὶ ταύτην ἀφωρισμένην εἶναι τὴν διήγησιν, καὶ τὸν ὁφθέντα ἔτερον, καὶ τὰς ἀφικομένας ἄλλας, καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ὁμοίως τὸν μετὰ ἡλίου ἀνατολάς· ὃς εἰ μὲν καὶ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ τερήτητο, εὐλόγως ἂν τις τοὺς παρ' αὐτῷ δύο ἄνδρας ἀπῆτε, καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους. Εἰ δ' ὁ Λουκᾶς τὸν πρὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς καιρὸν προοῦλαβεν, εἰκότως καὶ τοὺς τότε ὁφθέντας δύο ἄνδρας, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν νεανίσκον ἴστορεῖ.

**Z'.** Τεττάρων δὲ ὅντων τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, ἰσάριθμοι τούτων καὶ αἱ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἀναγραφεῖσαι φαίνονται ὀπτασίαι· οἵ τε καιροὶ τέσσαρες, καὶ οἱ καθ' ἔκαστον καιρὸν ὁφθέντες, ἰδιάζοντες· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ αἱ θεώμεναι, διάφοροι· καὶ οἱ τῶν ὁφθέντων αὐτοῖς λόγοι, διαλλάττοντες. Πρῶτος μὲν γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὄψὲ Σαββάτων λεγόμενος· τέταρτος δὲ καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἴστορηθείς· μέσοι δὲ ὅ τε παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ· διὸ καὶ οἱ ὁφθέντες κατὰ καιρὸν ἰδιάζοντες. Ὅψὲ μὲν γὰρ Σαββάτων ἄγγελος εἰς ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος· μεθ' δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτήρ· πρωὶ δὲ ἔτι σκοτίας οὖσης, εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ἄγγελοι δύο· μεθ' οὓς πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς Σωτήρ. Ὅρθρου δὲ βαθέος ἔτεροι κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν δύο ἄνδρες ὠνομασμένοι οὐκ εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος ὁφθέντες. Εἴθ' ὑστερὸν ἀπάντων ὁ νεανίσκος, ὁ ταῖς ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἀφικομέναις τεθεαμένος. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔνα καιρὸν εἰρηκότες οἱ πάντες καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναγράψαντες τόπον, οὐ τὰς αὐτὰς ἐπιφανείας ἐδήλουν, καὶ εὐλόγως ἂν τις ἐμέμψατο. Εἰ δ' ἀφωρισαν τοὺς χρόνους, ἔνειμάν τε καθ' ἔκαστον χρόνον καὶ τόπον ἰδιάζοντα, ἀκολούθως δὲ διαφόρους καὶ τὰς ὀπτασίας ἀνέγραψαν. Ως εἴπερ ἥσαν μιᾶς μὲν οἱ πάντες ἐπιφανείας μνημονεύσαντες, καὶ ἔνα φάντες ἄγγελον ὠφθαι ἢ δύο συμφώνως ἀγγέλους εἰρηκότες, ἢ αὖ πάλιν δύο ἄνδρας ἢ νεανίσκον ἔνα· εἴτα τοὺς καιροὺς διήλλαττον, ἢ μὴ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐδήλουν τόπους, ἢν ἂν καὶ οὕτω μέμψασθαι. Νῦν δ' ὁ λόγος ἀκριβῆς μένει καὶ ἀδιάβλητος ἐπὶ καιροῖς διαφόροις καὶ τόποις ἐναλλαττούσας τὰς ὀπτασίας εἰσάγων, καὶ

back; they went in, and saw a young man. Where, in Luke's case, it was again "men", not angels, so here too he is now called, not an angel, but "a young man". Thus this narrative, too, is distinct: the one seen is different, the women who came are others, and so is the occasion, "after sunrise". If that time had also been maintained<sup>15</sup> by Luke, one could reasonably have required Luke's two men, and the same words; but if Luke has taken the earlier time, "before sunrise", it is quite understandable that his account is about the "two men" that were seen on that occasion, not the "young man".

7.<sup>16</sup> **T**here are four evangelists, and also a corresponding number of appearances to these to be found recorded in them. There are four occasions, and those seen on each occasion are to be distinguished from each other. Similarly, the women who saw them are different, and the words spoken { } by those they saw vary{...}. First { } was the occasion in Matthew, described as late in the sabbath; {...} the fourth and final one was the young man recounted in Mark, after sunrise. {...} Between these are those in John and Luke; and so those seen on each occasion are distinct: one angel outside the tomb late on the sabbath, after whom the Saviour himself also; then, early, while it was still dark, two angels inside the tomb; after them, again, the Saviour, as before. In the dawn twilight there were { } two others seen, "men" as Luke calls them, not inside the tomb; then, after all of them, the young man, seen by those who arrived after sunrise. Now, if they had all talked of one occasion, and had put down the same place, but were putting before us epiphanies that are not the same, there would in that case have been reasonable grounds for criticism. If, however, they made distinctions between the times, and also assigned a particular place to each time, it follows<sup>17</sup> that the appearances they recorded are also **different**. It would also have been open to criticism if they had all mentioned one epiphany and said that one angel had been seen, or unanimously said that it was two angels, or, again, two men, or one young man, but then changed the times or not described the same places. As it is, though, what they say remains accurate and irreproachable, in introducing different sightings at various times and places, with those who saw them being also various: the first two women are not

---

15. Correcting τερήρητο to τετήρητο.

16. Cf. QMar. 4.2.

17. Omitting δέ before διαφόρους.

τὰς τούτων θεωροὺς πάλιν διαφόρους, ἐτέρας μὲν τὰς δύο πρώτας, παρὰ τὴν δευτέραν· καὶ τὰς τρίτας δὲ ὡσαύτως ἐτέρας τῶν τετάρτων.

Αὐτίκα δ' οὖν μετὰ τὴν τοῦ νεανίσκου πρὸς τὰς τελευταίας γυναικας ὅμιλίαν, ᾧν τὰ ὀνόματα οὐκ ἐμφέρονται, ἐπιλέγει ὁ Μάρκος· “Καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ·” αὗται μὲν οὖν τοιαῦται καὶ ἔμφοβοι, καὶ λίαν δειλαὶ, ὡς μηδὲ πεισθῆναι τῷ νεανίσκῳ φάντι πρὸς αὐτάς· “Υπάγετε καὶ εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ἰδοὺ προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·” τούτων γὰρ ἀκούσασαι τῶν λόγων, τούναντίον διεπράξαντο· αἱ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ ἀποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνήματος ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔνδεκα. Ὄμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀπαγγέλλουσα ἃ ἔώρακε. Μόναι δὲ αἱ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ πασῶν ὕσταται ἐλθοῦσαι, καὶ ἀληθῶς ὄψισθεῖσαι, ὡς μετὰ ἀνατολὴν ἡλίου ἐπιστῆναι, οὕτε τὸν Σωτῆρα θεάσασθαι καταξιοῦνται, οὕτε τὸν ἄγγελον τὸν ἔξαστράπτοντα, οὕτε τοὺς δύο τοὺς εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος, οὕτε τοὺς δύο τοὺς παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ ἄνδρας· ψιλὸν δέ τινα νεανίσκον εἶδον περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν, ἀναλόγως τῇ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν σμικρότητι τὴν ὄπτασίαν ιδοῦσαι· καὶ τοῦτον δὲ λευχείμονα τῆς ἑορτῆς χάριν θεασάμεναι, ὅμως ἐθαυμάσθησαν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐταῖς ὁ Μάρκος· καίτοιγε ἐπὶ τῶν προτέρων μηδαμοῦ τοῦ θάμψους ὠνομασμένου.

the same as the second one, and similarly the third group are not the same as the fourth.

Quite apart from that, immediately after what the young man said to the final group of women, whose names are not given,<sup>18</sup> Mark adds: “When they heard that, they ran away and said nothing to anyone, because they were afraid”. That is what these women were like, then: frightened, and excessively pusillanimous, so that they did not actually believe the young man when he said to them: “Go and tell his disciples and Peter: ‘Look, he is going ahead of you to Galilee’”. They heard these words—and then did just the opposite! Whereas the women in Luke went back from the tomb and reported all these things to the eleven; and similarly the one in John goes to the disciples to report<sup>19</sup> to them what she has seen. It is only those in Mark, the last ones to arrive—latecomers indeed, getting there only after sunrise—who are not found worthy of seeing either the Saviour or the dazzlingly-bright angel, nor the two inside the tomb, nor the two men in Luke. It is merely some ordinary young man that they saw, with a white robe on. The sight they see is one that corresponds to their own small-mindedness; yet even on seeing this person dressed in white for the festival, they were still amazed, as Mark attested of them, whereas at no point was there any mention of astonishment in the case of the earlier ones.

18. This is puzzling. The corresponding sentence of *To Marinus* 4.2, and the text of fragment Nicetas-Marinus 8 in Mai both agree with the received text of Mark 16.1, which does give the women’s names: Mary Magdalene; Mary, James’s mother; and Salome. Interestingly, Codex Bezae omits these names at that point in Mark, though its text follows directly from 15.47 in which the first two of them are named; while Codex Sinaiticus omits the whole of 15.47 and “when the sabbath was over” in 16.1, but has the rest of 16.1, which includes the three names.

Is it possible that the MS used by Eusebius here is a witness to a fourth, presumably the earliest, tradition, which contained neither of the lists in the received text of Mark but just read, e.g., “Some women bought spices...”? In that case, the epitomator of *To Marinus* 4 will have known what is now the received text and changed this passage in accordance with that; and the epitome used by Nicetas will have been either inconsistent or interpolated in fr. 8 with the word ὄνομαστι. Surprising though this suggestion is, it would seem even more surprising for Eusebius to make a mistake over this point.

19. Correcting ἀπαγγέλουσα to ἀπαγγελοῦσα.

Τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν δὲ σχολάζουσαν καὶ προσκαρτεροῦσαν, εἰκὸς οὐ μόνον τὰς πρώτας ὄψεις τεθεᾶσθαι τῶν αὐτῇ μόνη ὁφθέντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ ταῖς λοιπαῖς γυναιξὶν ἐωραμένον νεανίσκον. Ταῦτὸν δ' ἂν εἴποις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν ἴστορίας, ὃς μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξιν τῶν πολλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ μετὰ τὴν θέαν τῶν ὁφθέντων αὐταῖς δύο ἀνδρῶν διηγεῖται λέγων· “Καὶ ἀπόστρεψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήγγελαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔνδεκα·” οἷς ἐπιφέρει, “Ἡσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία,” καὶ τὰ ἔξης. Οὐκ ἀπεικός μὲν γάρ ἦν, καὶ νῦν πάλιν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν πάλαι προαφιγμένην καὶ παραμείνασαν εὐτόνως παρὰ τῷ μνήματι εὑρῆσθαι, ὅτε πολλαὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας συνελθοῦσαι γυναικες ἀπήντων ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον φέρουσαι τὰ ἀρώματα, ὥστε καὶ αὐτὴν ἄμα ταῖς λοιπαῖς τοὺς δύο ἀνδρας τεθεᾶσθαι, καὶ τῶν λόγων αὐτῶν ἀκηκοέναι· εἴτα σὺν ταῖς πολλαῖς ἐπανελθεῖν καὶ διηγεῖσθαι τοῖς ἔνδεκα.

Δύναται δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ὁ λόγος, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ταῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας γυναιξὶν ἀπονεῖμαι, λέγω δὴ τὴν εἰς τὸ μνῆμα ἄφιξιν, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀρωμάτων κομιδὴν, τὴν τε γενομένην αὐταῖς τῶν δύο ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφάνειαν, καὶ τοὺς τούτων πρὸς αὐτὰς λόγους· τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀπαγγελίαν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἔνδεκα μηκέτι παρ' αὐτῶν μόνον γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ παρὰ πασῶν, ἐκάστης ἢ τεθέατο διηγημένης· ἐν αἷς πάλιν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν εἶναι μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ αὐτὴν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀπαγγέλλουσαν τὰ ἰδίως μόνη αὐτῇ ἐωραμένα.

**Η'.** Ἐγὼ δὲ κάκεινο ζητῶ, πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ Μάρκῳ εἴρηται, ώς ἄρα διαγενομένου τοῦ Σαββάτου ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Λουκᾷ πρὸ τοῦ Σαββάτου τοῦν' ἐπράξαν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Παρασκευῇ.

Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τοῖς προτέροις συμπεπλεγμένον ζητήμασι, τῆς ὁμοίας ἐκείνοις τύχοι ἀν ἐρμηνείας· ἀποδεικνύντων δὲ ἡμῶν μὴ εῖναι τὰς αὐτὰς, ἀλλ' ἑτέρας μὲν τὰς πρὸ τοῦ Σαββάτου ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Παρασκευῇ, καθ' ἦν πέπονθεν ὁ Σωτὴρ, περὶ τὴν κηδείαν ἀσχοληθείσας, ἑτέρας δὲ τὰς μετὰ τὸ Σάββατον· σαφῶς γάρ ταῦτα Λουκᾶς μεμαρτύρηκε κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πάθους ταῦτα πεποιηκέναι, οὐδαμῶς ὀνόματος γυναικῶν μνημονεύσας, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς γυναῖκας εἰπών τὰς συνελθούσας αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· ὁ δὲ Μάρκος ὀνομαστὶ τρεῖς μόνας ἀνέγραψε καθ' ἑαυτὰς

Presumably the Magdalene, who had the perseverance to go on staying there, saw not only the first sightings, seen by her alone, but also the young man in Mark, seen by the rest of the women. One would say the same of Luke's account, as well: after the arrival of the numerous women, and after the sight of the two men who appeared to them, he continues his story in the words: "And returning from the tomb they reported all these things to the eleven", adding "There were Mary of Magdala..." and so on. It would not be improbable for the Magdalene, who had already been there for some time and had stayed there persistently, to have been found again at the sepulchre this time, when the large number of women who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee arrived with the spices; thus she, too, would have seen the two men at the same time as the rest, and heard what they said, and would then have been with the group when they went back and told the eleven about it.

Alternatively, the text can also mean that the first stages should be assigned to the women from Galilee—I mean the arrival at the tomb, the bringing of the spices, the epiphany of the two men to them, and what they said—but the report to the eleven could have been done not just by them, but by all the women together, each recounting what she had seen. Again, the Magdalene would then have been included with the rest, and herself also reported what she personally had seen on her own.

8. Another problem I am enquiring into is this: How is it that in Matthew it is stated that it is in fact when the sabbath was over that they prepared spices, whereas in Luke they did so before the sabbath, actually on the day of preparation?

Being bound up with the previous questions, this too would receive similar elucidation. We have shown that they were not the same women: those occupied with the funeral before the sabbath, actually on the day of preparation on which the Saviour's passion took place, were one group, but those after the sabbath were another. Luke has clearly testified that these women did this on the actual day of the passion. He mentions no women at all by name, but simply says "the women who had come with him from Galilee". Mark, however, recorded just three of them by name<sup>20</sup>

---

20. This conflicts with fragment Nicetas-Marinus 7; see n. 18, p. 199. If Eusebius's text of Mark did not have the women's names, the word ὄνομαστι here ("by

πρόνοιαν πεποιημένας τῶν ἀρωμάτων, οὐ τῇ Παρασκευῇ, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διαγενέσθαι τὸ Σάββατον· ἔτέρας δὲ εἶναι ταύτας παρὰ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾶ, καὶ τὰ ἔξῆς ἐπαγόμενα δείκνυσιν. Αὗται μὲν οὖν γυναικες παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ τὸν νεανίσκον ὁρῶσι καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, ὃς καὶ φησιν αὐταῖς· “Μὴ φοβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνόν· ἡγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὥδε.” Ταῖς δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ δύο ἀνδρες ἐπέστησαν ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ, καὶ ἔτέρας προφέρονται φωνὰς λέγοντες· “Τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν;” καὶ τὰ ἔξης· καὶ αἱ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ ἀκούσασαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπαγγεῖλαι τὰ παρηγγελμένα οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἴπον· αἱ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ πορευθεῖσαι ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς ἔνδεκα· ὡς διὰ τούτων ἀπάντων συνάγεσθαι, μὴ τὰς αὐτὰς εἶναι· διὸ μηδὲ ὑφ' ἕνα καιρὸν πεποιηκέναι τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα.

**Θ'.** “Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς. Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.” Ἐνταῦθά τις ἀπορήσει πῶς τοῖς ἔνδεκα μαθηταῖς ὁμοῦ συνηγμένοις μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπιστὰς ὁ Κύριος κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν καὶ κατὰ Ἰωάννην συμφώνως ταῦτα ἀπομνημονεύσαντας, οὐκέτι παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις ταῦτα πράττων οὐδὲ φάσκων ἀναγέγραπται.

“Οτι τὴν αὐτὴν ὁπτασίαν οἱ δύο συνέγραψαν εὐαγγελισταὶ κατὰ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὥραν τε καὶ ἡμέραν γενομένην, παραστῆσαι δεῖ πρότερον. τοῦτο δ’ ἀν γένοιτο φανερὸν ἐπιτηρήσαντί σοι ἀκριβῶς τὴν Γραφήν. Ο μὲν γὰρ Ἰωάννης προειπὼν, “Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν Σαββάτων ἔρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι ἐώρακε τὸν Κύριον καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ,” ἔξῆς ἐπισυνάπτει λέγων. “Οὕσης ὄψιας ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν, ἥλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἶπεν, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.” Ωστ’ εἶναι σαφὲς ἐκ τούτων ὅτι κατ’ αὐτὴν τὴν Κυριακὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ὄψιας ἦν πεπραγμένα τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννην· καὶ κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν ἡ αὐτὴ ἡμέρα καὶ ὥρα εὑρεθήσεται· λέγει γοῦν καὶ αὐτός· “Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν Σαββάτων ὅρθρου βαθέος, ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἥλθον αἱ γυναικες.” Εἴθ’ ἔξῆς, ὅτι ἰδοῦσαι ἀγγέλους, ἐπανῆλθον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἡ τεθέαντο. Πέτρος δὲ σπεύσας ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἀπαντᾷ, καὶ τὰ ὅθόνια θεωρεῖ· καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὅρθρου βαθέος ἐγένετο, τῇ ἀναστασίμῳ ἡμέρᾳ. Λέγει δὲ ἔξῆς ἐπισυνάπτουσα ἡ Γραφή· “Καὶ

as having provided spices by themselves, not on the preparation but after the sabbath was over. That these were not the same ones as those in Luke is also shown as follows: these women, in Mark, see the young man sitting on the right, and he says to them: “Do not be afraid: you are looking for Jesus the Nazarene. He has risen; he is not here”; but for those in Luke it is two men in dazzling clothes who stand in front of them, uttering different words: “Why are you looking for the living among the dead?” and so on. Further, those in Mark were told to report the message to the disciples, but said nothing to anyone; whereas those in Luke did go and report to the eleven. From all these points it can be gathered that they were not the same women; and that is why the time that they did what is recorded of them does not coincide, either.

9. “While they were talking like this, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them and said to them ‘Peace be with you’”. At this one might be perplexed as to how it is that when the eleven disciples were assembled together after the resurrection and the Lord appeared to them, as Luke and John agree in mentioning, the record of his subsequent actions and words is not the same<sup>21</sup> in both.

We must first establish that it is the same appearance that the two evangelists have described, taking place on one and the same day and time. This would become obvious once you look carefully at the text. John begins by saying: “And on the first day of the week Mary of Magdala comes and reports to the disciples that she has seen the Lord, and that this is what he said to her”. He then adds: “Late that day, when the disciples were together, Jesus came and stood in their midst, and said: ‘Peace be with you’”. It is thus clear, from that, that it was late on the Lord’s day, the actual day of the resurrection, that the events in John had taken place. The same place and time will be found in Luke, as well; he too says: “On the first day of the week, in the dawn twilight, the women went to the sepulchre”, and continues that they saw angels, returned, and reported what they had seen to the disciples; also that Peter rushed to the tomb, reached it and saw the linen wrappings. Now, that happened in the dawn twilight on the day of the resurrection. The text then goes on to add the words: “And look, on

---

name”) must be an interpolation, perhaps originating in a puzzled marginal comment by a reader of the manuscript of, or used by, Nicetas.

21. Correcting ταῦτά to ταῦτά.

ἰδοὺ δύο ἔξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἥσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην.” Οὗτοι δὲ ἥσαν οἱ περὶ τὸν Κλεόπαν· οἵς συνεισελθών εἰς τὴν Ἐμμαοῦν, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλόγησε, καὶ ἐπιδιδοὺς αὐτοῖς, ἀφανῆς ἐγένετο. Εἴτ’ ἐπιλέγει· “Καὶ ἀναστάντες ὑπέστρεψαν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ εὗρον ἡθροισμένους τοὺς ἔνδεκα.” Εἴτα ὅμιλούντων αὐτῶν ἔστη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν μέσῳ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, “Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν,” καὶ τὰ ἔξῆς. Δέδεικται τοίνυν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λουκᾶ, ὃς ἡ αὐτὴ ἐτύγχανεν ἡμέρα, καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ δὲ ὥρα συνίσταται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ τοὺς περὶ Κλεόπαν εἰς τὴν Ἐμμαοῦν γενέσθαι, κἀκεῖθεν ἐπανεληγυνθέναι εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἥδη που πάντως ἐσπέρας καταλαβούσης· εἴτα τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν γεγονέναι.

Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἡ αὐτὴ παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις πέφηνεν ὄπτασία, φέρε ἵδωμεν ὅπως ἔτερα μὲν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ εἴρηται πράξας καὶ λαλήσας ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἔτερα δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ. Ὄμοιώς μὲν οὖν παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις λέλεκται, ὡς ἄρα μέσος αὐτῶν στὰς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, “Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.” Ἀφωρισμένως δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ πρόσκειται ὅτι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν, καὶ τὰ ἔξῆς. Ἄλλ’ εἰ καὶ μὴ τοσαῦτα εἴρηται παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἔξῆς πάλιν παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις συνάδει. Παρὰ μὲν γάρ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ μετὰ τὸ, “Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν,” ἐπιλέγεται, “Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ.” Οὐ φέρεται δὲ ἡ αἰτία παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, ὃς ἂν ἥδη λελεγμένη παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ· ἦν δὲ αὕτη τὸ νομίζειν αὐτοὺς πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν· ὅτι γε μὴν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ μαρτυρήσας ὁ Ἰωάννης, σύμφωνος ἄν εἴη τῷ καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν παραθεμένῳ. Τούτοις ἔξῆς, ὁ μὲν Λουκᾶς φησιν, “Ἐτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐχετέ τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε; Οἱ δὲ ἀπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὄπτοῦ μέρος.” Ταῦτα δὲ Ἰωάννης οὐ συνέγραψεν. Ἐνθα γενομένοις ἐπιστῆσαι προσήκει τὸν νοῦν, ὃς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς, τὰς σεμνοτέρας καὶ θειοτέρας πράξεις τε καὶ διδασκαλίας τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διὰ τοῦ Ἰωάννου τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἀπεμνημόνευσε, τὰ δὲ ἀνθρωπινώτερα διὰ τῶν λοιπῶν συνέγραψεν, ὃ δὴ καὶ νῦν πεποίηκεν. Ως γάρ ἐνόμισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ιδόντες τὸν Σωτῆρα, μὴ αὐτὸν θεωρεῖν ἀλλὰ πνεῦμα, καὶ ὡς ἡπίστουν αὐτῷ, καὶ μετὰ τὸ δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἀναγκαίως, ἔτι ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν,

that very<sup>22</sup> day, two of them were making their way to a village". This was Cleopas' party; Jesus went with them to Emmaus, and there took bread, blessed it, gave it to them, and disappeared. Luke then continues with: "They got up and went back at that very time to Jerusalem, and found the eleven assembled"; then, while they were conversing, "Jesus stood in their midst and said to them 'Peace be with you'", and so on. Well, then, it has been shown from Luke, as well, that it was in fact the same day; and that it was also the same time is established from the fact that it was all on the one day that Cleopas' party reached Emmaus and had come back from there to Jerusalem, which must presumably by then have been after evening had come on; and it was then that the epiphany took place.

Thus it has become evident that it was the same appearance in both. Now then, let us see how it is that the Saviour is stated to have said and done one set of things in Luke, and another in John. For a start, in both alike it is said that he did stand in their midst and say: "Peace be with you". Separately, however, there is the addition in Luke that they thought it was a spirit that they were seeing, and so on; yet, even though John has not stated as much, the sequel is nevertheless concordant in both, because after "Peace be with you" it goes on in John with "and with these words he showed them his hands and his side". The reason is not there in John, as being already stated in Luke,<sup>23</sup> but it was the same one:<sup>24</sup> that they thought it was a spirit that they were seeing. Anyhow, John, by attesting that he showed them his hands and his<sup>25</sup> side, would be in accord with Luke, who also added the reason, and subsequently says: "While they were still amazed and in disbelief for joy, he said to them 'Have you anything to eat here?', and they gave him a piece of baked fish"; but John did not include that. As we are on this, it is appropriate to direct attention to the fact that elsewhere, too, it is John that the Holy Spirit has used to relate our Saviour's more solemn and sacred actions and teachings, and the others to record the more mundane matters. That is exactly what he has done here. The disciples had thought, when they saw the Saviour, that it was not he himself that they were seeing but a spirit; they did not have faith in him,

22. Reading ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ as in the gospel text of Luke 24.13. (Mai's text omits the τῇ.)

23. This implies that Eusebius thinks John's gospel later than Luke's, despite his view that John was one of the original twelve.

24. Reading αὐτή for αὕτη.

25. Reading αὐτοῦ for αὐτοῦ.

αἰτήσας τι βρώσιμον, ἔφαγεν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν. Ταῦτα δὲ σωματικώτερα ὅντα, καὶ πολλὴν ἀπιστίαν τῶν ἀποστόλων κατηγοροῦντα, αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ Σωτῆρος συμπεριφορὰν, πείθοντος αὐτοὺς καὶ σαφῶς παριστῶντος ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸς εἶη, τῷ Λουκᾶ ὡς ἂν ὑποδεεστέρω γράφειν τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑπέβαλε· τὰ δὲ κρείττονα καὶ δυνάμεως ἐνθέου παραστατικὰ διὰ τοῦ Ἰωάννου παρίστη, γράφοντος καὶ αὐτοῦ ἔξῆς ταῦτα, “Ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν Κύριον.” εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς πάλιν, “Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν· καθὼς ἀπέσταλκε με ὁ Πατὴρ, κἀγὼ πέμπω ὑμᾶς· καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἀνεφύσησε,” καὶ τὰ ἔξης.

”Ἐχοι δ' ἂν ἀκολουθίαν ὁ παρ' ἀμφοτέροις λόγος, εἰ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾶ πρῶτα πεπράχθαι λογισάμεθα, εἴθ' οὕτως μετ' ἐκεῖνα συνάψομεν τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννην.” Ἐτι μὲν γὰρ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν καὶ τροφὴν ἦτει, καὶ μὴ ἀρκεσθεὶς τῇ βρώσει τοῦ ἰχθύος, καὶ λόγους αὐτοὺς στηρίζει, τῆς προτέρας αὐτοὺς ὑπομιμήσκων διδασκαλίας κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν. Ὄτε δὲ λοιπὸν πεισθέντες ἐπληροφορήθησαν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀληθῶς, καὶ λοιπὸν χαρᾶς ἥσαν μεστοὶ, τότε δευτέραν αὐτοῖς εἰρήνην ἔτέραν καὶ κρείττονα παρὰ τὴν προτέραν δίδωσι, καὶ παρακελεύεται ἐτοίμους εἶναι εἰς τὴν ἀποστολὴν, μονονουχὶ ὄμοιον αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἔσεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ὄμοιον ἔργου ἐπαγγειλάμενος. Εἴθ' ἔξης καὶ ἀκολούθως ἐμπνεῖ αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος, ὡς ἂν δεομένοις τούτου εἰς τὴν ἔξης ἐπιφερομένην ἐπαγγελίαν· αὕτη δὲ ἦν τὸ δύνασθαι ἀφιέναι ἀμαρτίας διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος δυνάμεως.

Καὶ οὕτως ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν εἰς κοινωνὸς ἀπαρτισθῆσται λόγος, τῶν μὲν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ λελεγμένων, σιωπηθέντων παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ· τῶν δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου γραφῆ παραδοθέντων, σιγῇ ταμιευθέντων παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ· καὶ πρώτων μὲν τῶν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ λελεγμένων, ἔξης δὲ ἐκείνοις συναπτομένων τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ· οὕτω τε ἔνα νοῦν καὶ μίαν διάνοιαν σωζόντων τῶν παρ' ἀμφοτέροις. Ταῦτα μὲν ταύτη.

I'. Πῶς δὲ παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἄγγελος ὄφθεὶς ταῖς γυναιξὶ παρήγγειλεν ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι, Ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν

and still did not have faith even after he had had to show them his hands and his feet. For these reasons he asked for something to eat, and ate it in front of them. These are physical matters, implying a deep lack of faith on the apostles' part, and considerateness on the Saviour's in convincing them by clear proof that it really was he; so it was Luke, as being the lesser, that the Holy Spirit prompted to write of them. He establishes the more important matters, those which prove Jesus' divine power, through John, who then also writes: "So the disciples were overjoyed at seeing the Lord. Therefore, he again said to them 'Peace be with you. As the Father has sent me, I too send you'. With those words, he breathed on them..." and so on.

The account in the two of them would be consistent if we were to reckon what is in Luke as having happened first, and were then to add on, after that, what is in John. It was while they were still in disbelief that he both asked for food and, not content with just eating the fish, also used words<sup>26</sup> to strengthen their confidence, by reminding them, according to Luke, of his earlier teaching. Once they were at last fully convinced that it really was he, and were at last full of joy, then for a second time he gives them the "Peace" greeting—a different one, stronger than the previous one—and commands them to be ready for their mission, virtually promising that they too will be like himself,<sup>27</sup> in virtue of their similar task. Then, in accordance with that, he breathes on them a breath of the Holy Spirit, on the ground that they will need him for the next thing Jesus was going to promise them: that was the ability to remit sins by the power of the Holy Spirit.

In this way a single common account will be fitted together from both evangelists, consisting of what is stated in Luke but unmentioned by John, and of what is recorded in writing by John but kept back in silence by Luke. Luke's statements come first, and John's are joined on after them, preserving a single sense and meaning in both their accounts. That is the way to explain this problem.

**10.**<sup>28</sup> How is it that in Matthew an angel was seen by the women and told them to give his disciples the message: "He has risen from the dead and

26. Reading λόγοις for λόγους.

27. Reading αὐτῷ for αὐτῷ.

28. This is a better version of a fragment first published in Mai<sup>1</sup>, pp. 97–98, "from Corderius' *Catena on John* p.450". The Corderius fragment starts at the last sentence of

νεκρῶν, καὶ προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὅψεσθε, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ ὁ νεανίσκος, ὃν εἶδον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, ταῦτα εἶπε ταῖς γυναιξὶ. Παρὰ δὲ τῷ Λουκᾷ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡθροισμένων κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸν τῶν μαθητῶν τῶν ἔνδεκα, καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἀλλήλοις ὑφηγουμένων, ἔστη μέσος αὐτὸς, καὶ προσδιαλέγεται, καὶ ἵχθυος ὄπτοῦ μέρος ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγε. Καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ πάλιν, οὐχ ἄπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον ὥφθη τοῖς ἔνδεκα, πρῶτον μὲν καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἀναστάσεως, δύφιας· εἴτα μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ. Πῶς οὖν κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην τοσαντάκις ὄφθεντος αὐτοῦ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ, κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον καὶ τὸν Ματθαῖον κελεύονται οἱ αὐτοὶ διὰ τῶν γυναικῶν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἀπελθεῖν, ὡς ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψόμενοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ μέλλοντες αὐτὸν θεᾶσθαι ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ;

Ἐτι εἰ μὲν τοὺς ἔνδεκα μόνους μαθητὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡ τῶν Εὐαγγελίων ἡπίστατο γραφὴ, καὶ οὕτως εἶπεν ἄν τις μηδὲν τὸν λόγον λείπειν, εἰ τέως μὲν ἀπιστοῦντας ταῖς τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπαγγελίαις τοὺς αὐτοῦ μαθητὰς θεραπεύων, ἄπαξ καὶ δεύτερον αὐτοῖς λαθραίως κρυπταζομένοις ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐφάνη· ἐν γε μὴν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ οὐκέτ’ ἐπικεκρυμμένως, οὐδὲ ἄπαξ οὐδὲ δεύτερον, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐγκεκλεισμένοις διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σὺν πολλῇ δὲ τῇ παρόρθσίᾳ τὴν θεοφάνειαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς θεότητος τὴν ἔνδειξιν ἐποιεῖτο, παριστῶν αὐτοῖς ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν, ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις, δλ’ ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὀπτανόμενός τε καὶ λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ συναυλιζόμενος, ὡς φησιν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι· καὶ αὕτη μὲν πρώτη λύσις.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν οἱ μὲν ἔκκριτοι καὶ πρῶτοι τὸν τῶν δώδεκα συνεπλήρουν χορὸν, δεύτερον δὲ παρὰ τούτους ἐτύγχανε τάγμα τὸ τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα, περὶ ὧν φησι Λουκᾶς ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ· “Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἐτέρους ἐβδομήκοντα.” τούτων δὲ ἐκτὸς, ὑπῆρχον

is going ahead of you to Galilee; you will see him there”, and similarly in Mark, too, the young man whom they saw sitting on the right-hand side said the same thing<sup>29</sup> to the women; whereas in Luke it was in Jerusalem itself, when the eleven remaining disciples had assembled in the same place and were discussing the topic of his resurrection together, that he himself stood<sup>30</sup> in their midst, talking to them, and ate a piece of baked fish in front of them; and according to John it is again in Jerusalem itself that he was seen by the eleven, not just once but a second time as well: first, late on<sup>31</sup> the actual day of the resurrection, and then eight days later? So how, given that according to Luke and John he was seen that number of times by his disciples in Jerusalem itself, are the same men told in Mark and Matthew, through the women, to leave for Galilee because they would see him there, but were not going to see him in Jerusalem?

If the gospels’ text showed knowledge of only the eleven disciples of the Saviour, even so one would still not say that there was any defect in their account, on the basis that, by appearing once or twice in secret while his disciples were in hiding in Jerusalem, he was acting, for the time being, out of consideration for their disbelief of the womens’ message. In Galilee, by contrast, there was no secrecy about it any more; it was not just once or twice—and they were not shut in for fear of the Jews, but it was with complete freedom—that he made his divine appearance and demonstration of his Godhead with numerous proofs, setting himself before them alive after his passion and “being seen by them throughout forty days, telling them about the kingdom of God and being<sup>32</sup> with them”, as Luke says in Acts. That is a first solution.

However, when the select leaders of the disciples were making up the number of the Twelve, there was in fact a second rank alongside them, that of the Seventy, of whom Luke says in his gospel: “After that, the Lord appointed seventy others in addition”. Quite apart from those, there was

the first paragraph of this fragment from Nicetas and is identical with it apart from a number of omissions and one false reading (*παρουσίᾳ* for *παρησίᾳ*).

29. Reading *ταῦτα* for Mai’s *ταῦτα*.

30. Reading *ἔστι* for Mai’s *ἔσται*.

31. Reading *κατ’* for Mai’s *καί*.

32. The reading here is *συνανλιζόμενος*; a frequent variant in the gospel text is *συναλιζόμενος* “sharing a meal”.

καὶ ἔτεροι πλείους γνώριμοι τοῦ Σωτῆρος, οὓς καὶ ἔφησεν ὁ ἵερὸς Ἀπόστολος λέγων· “Ἐπειτα ὥφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς,” καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οὗτοι τοῦ τῶν μαθητῶν ὄνόματος ἡξιωμένοι ἦσαν, οἵς οὐχ οἶόν τε ἦν ὅμοιοι πᾶσι κατὰ ταύτῳ συνθροισμένοις ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ ὥφθηναι αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, εἰκότως δύο μὲν τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, ὃ τε Λουκᾶς καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης, μόνοις τοῖς ἔνδεκα ὥφθαι αὐτὸν ἀναγράφουσιν ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ. Δύο δὲ τούτων οἱ λοιποὶ οὐ τοῖς ἔνδεκα μόνον σπεύδειν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἅπασι καὶ ἀδελφοῖς ἔφασαν παρακελεύσασθαι αὐτόν τε τὸν Σωτῆρα καὶ τὸν προφανέντα αὐτοῦ ἄγγελον, ἀορίστως καὶ ἀπολύτως τοὺς πάντας δηλώσαντες. Ἀμείνων δὲ καὶ ἀληθεστέρα ἡ πρώτη λύσις.

πλείους τοίνυν αἱ ὄπτασίαι καὶ διάφοροι γεγένηνται τοῖς μαθηταῖς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Καὶ οἱ μὲν τάσδε εἰρηκέναι αὐτὸν φασιν, οἱ δὲ τάσδε καὶ πεπραχέναι· ἔστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ περὶ τοῦ κεφαλαίου λέγοντες, ἀναπληροῦ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ προτέρου ἐλλειφθέντα ὁ δεύτερος.

**IA'.** Φαίη δ' ἂν τις, πῶς ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος πορευθέντας τοὺς ἔνδεκα εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐώρακέναι φησὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης μετὰ τὰς δύο ὄπτασίας τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ τὸ τρίτον ὥφθαι αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἴστορε;

Τρίτον μὲν ἀληθῶς τοῦτο σύμφημι καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν Σωτῆρα ὥφθαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κατ’ αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἀναστάσεως, καθ’ ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ πρωίας αὐτὸν ἐώρακε· ταύτην δὲ τὴν πρώτην ὄπτασίαν καὶ Λουκᾶς ἴστορε. Δεύτερον δὲ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ, δηλαδὴ τῇ ἐτέρᾳ Κυριακῇ, καθ’ ἦν αὔθις ἐπιφανεῖς ὁ Σωτὴρ τὸν Θωμᾶν τῆς ἀπιστίας θεραπεύει, δείξας αὐτῷ τὴν πλευρὰν καὶ τὰς χεῖρας. Ἐπεὶ δὲ κεκελευσμένοι

also an even larger number of other associates of the Saviour, whom the holy ‘apostle mentioned in the words: “He was subsequently seen by over five hundred brethren”. Now, these too had been found to merit the title of ‘disciples’. It would not have been possible for them all to be assembled together in the same place<sup>33</sup> in Jerusalem and have seen him there after the resurrection; so,<sup>34</sup> understandably, two of the evangelists, Luke and John, record that it was only by the eleven that he was seen in Jerusalem, while the other two of them said that it was not just the eleven, but simply all the disciples and brethren, whom the Saviour himself, and his angel who appeared before him, told to hurry to Galilee—making it clear that it was all of them, without distinction or restriction. However, the first solution is the better and truer one.

So, then, there had been several different appearances to the disciples that had taken place after the resurrection, some which some writers say Jesus had talked of, and some which others say he had actually put into effect.<sup>35</sup> There are times when, in their handling of the same<sup>36</sup> theme, the second supplies what the first has omitted.

**11.** One might say: “How is it that Matthew says the eleven had seen Jesus after they had made their way to the hill country of Galilee, whereas John records that the third time he was seen, after the two appearances in Jerusalem, was not “in the hill country” of Galilee, but “by the sea” of Galilee?

I also agree on the fact that this really was the third time the Saviour was seen by the disciples: the first was on the actual day of the resurrection, early on which Mary of Magdala had seen him (that being the appearance Luke also records as the first), and the second was eight days later, that is on the next Lord’s Day, on which the Saviour manifested himself again and, as a remedy for Thomas’ scepticism, showed him his side and hands. However, once they had been commanded to go together to

33. Reading ταῦτο for Mai’s ταῦτό.

34. Supplying οὖν, as required by the syntax.

35. By comparison with Fr.Mar.Supp.13, this sentence has been overcompressed by this epitomator.

36. Supplying αὐτοῦ, on the supposition that it dropped out by homoeoteleuton between τοῦ κεφαλαίου. This is confirmed by the extract from this same chapter to be found in Cramer’s Catena on John, p. 404 (Fr.Mar.Supp. 14)

ἥσαν ἐπὶ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ὁμοῦ ἀπαντᾶν, ἔπραττόν τε μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν οἱ ἔνδεκα τὸ κελευσθὲν, καὶ ὁ καθεῖς αὐτῶν ἐπισυνήγετο, μήπω τῶν ἔνδεκα ἡθροισμένων, ἀλλ' ἔτι μελλόντων, τὸ τρίτον παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, οὐ τοῖς ἔνδεκα φαίνεται, ἀλλὰ μόνοις ἐπτὰ τοῖς ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου δεδηλωμένοις· οὗτοι δὲ ἥσαν Πέτρος καὶ Θωμᾶς καὶ Ναθαναὴλ, δύο τε οἱ νίοι Ζεβεδαίουν, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο· τοῦτο δὴ οὖν τρίτον τούτοις ἀληθῶς ὥφθη, οὕπω ἔνδεκα συνηγμένων. Διόπερ ἀκριβῶς οὐκ ἀποκλείων καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὁ Ἰωάννης τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὄπτασίας, ἐπεσημήνατο, μετὰ τὴν πρώτην καὶ δευτέραν ὄπτασίαν, τὴν τρίτην μόνοις τοῖς κατωνομασμένοις πεποιῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

Οὐκ ἀπεικόδες δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τέταρτον καὶ πέμπτον, καὶ ἄλλοτε καὶ πολλάκις ὥφθαι αὐτόν· διὸ οὐδὲ περιγράφει ὁ Ἰωάννης πάσας τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὰς πράξεις· προιών δὲ ἔξῆς φησι, Καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μετὰ γοῦν τὸ ὥφθαι αὐτὸν τοῦτο τρίτον τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπτὰ, τετάρτην ὄπτασίαν οὐκ ἄν ἀμάρτοις τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ φήσας εἶναι, ἦν ἐν τῷ ὅρει τοῖς ἔνδεκα πεποιῆσθαι ἀνέγραψε. Καὶ μετὰ τούτους οὐκ ἄν σφαλείης ὁμοῦ κατὰ ταυτὸν συνηγμένοις ἅμα τοῖς ἔνδεκα καὶ τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα αὐτὸν ὥφθαι εἰπών. Ό δὲ Παῦλος καὶ ἔτι τούτων πλείοσιν ἐωρᾶσθαι τὸν Σωτῆρα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἴστορεῖ, τοῦτο παρ' ἔτέρων μαθών· “Ωφθῇ γάρ, φησί, Κεφᾶ, εἴτα τοῖς δώδεκα, ἔπειτα πεντακοσίοις, ἔπειτα Ἰακώβῳ, ἔπειτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν, ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων, φησί, κάμιοι.”

Ὦρᾶς ὁσάκις καὶ ὄσοις ὥφθη μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν; Οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ κρυπτομένοις ὥφθη· καὶ πρὸ αὐτῶν τοῖς περὶ Κλεόπαν ἀπιοῦσιν ἐπὶ Ἐμμαοῦν· καὶ πρό γε πάντων, ἀνδρῶν μὲν Σίμωνι, γυναικῶν δὲ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ. Ἐνθεν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν, ἐπεὶ πολλάκις ἔαυτὸν ἐδείκνυ τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἐπιτηρεῖ λέγων, ὡς ἄρα δὶ’ ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὄπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ συναυλιζόμενος, τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ παρεδίδον μαθήματα, παρήνει τε ὄρμᾶν εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, κάκει κηρύττειν Ἰουδαίοις πρώτοις τὸν λόγον· μηδὲ πρότερον ἀναχωρεῖν τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, περὶ ἣ; μικρὸν ὑστερον διαληψόμεθα.

Galilee, the eleven, in company with the rest, were carrying out the command, and every single one of them was gathering together; but before the eleven had assembled—they were still about to do so—he then appears for the third time by the sea of Galilee, not to the eleven but only to the seven indicated by John. These were Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel, Zebedee's two sons, and two of the other disciples; so, yes, that really is the third time he was seen, as the eleven had not yet gathered together. Hence John is being accurate, and not excluding the others also from their appearance of the Saviour, in indicating that, after the first and second appearances, he made his third solely to those named, at the Sea of Galilee.

Subsequently, it is not improbable that he was seen a fourth time too, and a fifth, and many other times as well, which is why John does not write about all of the Saviour's actions; he goes on to say, later, "and Jesus did many other things". Certainly, you would not be wrong to say that after this third appearance of his to those named above, the fourth was the one which Matthew recorded that he made to the eleven in the hill country. After them, you would not be mistaken in saying that he was seen simultaneously by the eleven and the seventy, when they were all gathered together in the same place. Paul also records, having heard about them from others, yet more times that the Saviour was seen after the resurrection: "He was seen by Cephas", he says, "then by the twelve, then by five hundred, then by James, then by all the apostles; and", he says, "last of all, by me".

Do you see how many times, and by how many people, he was seen after the resurrection? Thus he was seen both by those in hiding in Jerusalem, and before them, by Cleopas' party on the way out to Emmaus; and, before everyone else, by a man, Simon, and a woman, the Magdalene. Hence Luke is careful to say, in Acts, that, after he had been showing himself frequently to the disciples, it was in fact throughout forty days that he was seen continually by them, being with them, handing down his teachings about the kingdom of God, and instructing them to set out for Jerusalem and there to begin by proclaiming the word to the Jews; and not to leave the city beforehand, but to await his Father's promise—which we shall be dealing with shortly, as a separate topic.<sup>37</sup>

---

37. Part, at least, of Eusebius's discussion of Jesus' imparting the Holy Spirit to the

Εὐσέβιος ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Μαρίνον τοιάδε φησί· “Καὶ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἑκκλησία δύο βίους νομιθετεῖ καὶ τρόπους...

## SUPPLEMENTA MINORA

## Fr.Mar.Supp. 1. [Not from this work]

Mai<sup>2</sup> p. 298 (PG 22:1008) prints this fragment, which attributes itself to the *To Marinus*.

Another work written by Eusebius son of Pamphilus is *To Marinus*. In that, he says that the church of Christ has two kinds of life-style...

The fragment is an extract compiled from two then-unpublished chronicles, by George Hamartolus and John of Sicily.<sup>38</sup> But despite beginning “Eusebius says, in *To Marinus*”, it is actually from Eusebius’s *Demonstration of the Gospel*, 1.8 (Migne PG 22:76B).

In Mai<sup>1</sup>, p. 374, the fragment printed “From Cedrenus” is the same item.

Also in Mai<sup>1</sup>, p. 90, the fragment printed “From the Suda, s.v. ‘Eusebius’ and s.v. βιος; also from Cedrenus, Paris ed. p.201” is the same material again. As this does not belong in *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, we omit it.

## Fr.Mar.Supp. 2. From a Greek scholiast on Mark quoted by R. Simon

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 299; Migne, PG 22:1008. “From a Greek scholiast on Mark quoted by R. Simon” in *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament*, Rotterdam, 1693, p. 89.<sup>39</sup> The same fragment is also found in Cramer, *Catena on Mark*, p. 266. The Cramer fragment is identical, but for the omission of two nonessential words.

disciples after the resurrection is to be found in Fr.Mar.Supp. 9–10, from a different source.

38. The *Chronicle* of George Hamartolus was printed for the first time by Muralt in 1859 from an unsatisfactory text. This was reprinted by Migne in PG 110 with a Latin translation. It was edited in two volumes by C. de Boor, *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, Teubner, 1904, revised by Peter Wirth 1978. The *Chronicle* of John of Sicily was edited by H. Heinrich, *Die Chronik des Johannes Sikeliota*, Graz, 1892 (diss.).\*

39. The Mai reference to “chapter 6” of “*Historia Critica*” leaves it unclear which of Richard Simon’s various books in various languages on the New Testament this is. Adolf von Harnack (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, 1.2:578) gives the fragment with this reference to the 1693 edition.\*

**β'.** Τοῦτο τὸ προφητικὸν ρῆτὸν Μαλαχίου ἐστὶν, οὐχ Ἡσαίου· γραφέως τοίνυν ἐστὶ σφάλμα, ὡς φησιν Εὐσέβιος ὁ Καισαρείας ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Μαρίνον περὶ τῆς δοκούσης ἐν τοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως διαφωνίας.

**γ'.** Οὐ γὰρ ᾧν ἄξιός τις ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἰουδαίων, ὡς φησιν Εὐσέβιος κεφαλαίῳ τῷ Πρὸς Μαρίνον, τὸ κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου τρόπαιον, τὸν σταυρὸν βαστάσαι· ἀλλ' ὁ ἐξ ἀγροῦ, ὃς μηδὲν ἐπικεκοινώνηκε τῇ κατὰ Χριστοῦ μιαιφονίᾳ.

This prophetic utterance is from Malachi, not Isaiah.<sup>40</sup> It is a copyist's error, as Eusebius of Caesarea says in his work *To Marinus*, on the apparent discrepancies between the gospels about the resurrection.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 3. Possinus, Catena on Mark, p. 343

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 299, Migne, PG 22:1010. "From Possinus' catena on Mark p. 343, where it is about the man from Cyrene carrying the Lord's cross"

Because there was no-one in the city of Jerusalem who deserved, as Eusebius says in *To Marinus* chapter 13,<sup>41</sup> to take the weight of the cross, the symbol of victory over the devil; no, it was the man from the countryside, who had had no part at all in Christ's murder.<sup>42</sup>

40. The text concerned is Mark 1:2: "As it is written in the prophet Isaiah, 'See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you'". It continues (v. 3): "The voice of one crying out in the wilderness: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight'". The quotation in v. 2 is from Mal 3.1; that in v. 3 is from Isa 40.3. The best and oldest manuscripts we have agree with those used by Porphyry and Jerome (see Mai's note, below) in reading "in the prophet Isaiah"; those with the variant reading "in the prophets" (found, e.g., in the Authorised Version) evidently represent a later attempt to solve the difficulty. Matt 3.3 quotes only the Isaiah passage and attributes it so.

Mai gives the following note (1): "The subject is the prophecy 'Prepare the way of the Lord; make his paths straight'. Jerome, in his *Commentary on Matthew*, makes it clear that he has read our Eusebius: 'Given that this testimony is a combination of Malachi and Isaiah, Porphyry enquires how we suppose it is an extract from Isaiah alone. Men of the church have replied very fully to this; but we' [i.e., Jerome himself] 'think that the addition of the name "Isaiah" is the fault of a copyist'. Jerome treats this same question in *Ep. 57 9*".

41. Unless this is a copyist's error, this is evidence for the large quantity of the text of *To Marinus* lost before the final sections on the resurrection, as Mai points out. He notes that fragment Fr.Mar.Supp. 4, from Corderius, clearly shows—again, unless that fragment happens to come from one of the final *Problems*—that in that work Eusebius dealt at least with the passion, as well as the resurrection. He adds a warning that we should not presume that the "Your first question..." at the opening of *To Marinus* means that the book actually started with that problem about "late on the sabbath". In Mai's opinion, it looks as if the epitomator has simply cut to there, omitting a vast earlier amount.

42. Mai note 2: "Ambrose expresses the sense of this Eusebius passage in his *Commentary on Luke* 10.107: 'It is not a Jew who carries the cross, but a foreigner, born abroad'".

**δ'.** Εὐσέβιος ὁ Καισαρεὺς, ὁ Παμφίλου προσαγορευόμενος, ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Μαρίνον ἐπὶ τοῦ Σωτηρίου πάθους καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως Ζητήσεσι καὶ ἐπιλύσεσι, καὶ ταῦτα προϋθηκεν εἰς ἔξετασιν, τὸ τὸν μὲν θεῖον εὐαγγελιστὴν Μάρκον εἰπεῖν ὡραν εἶναι τρίτην καθ' ἣν ἐσταυρώθη Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν· τὸν δὲ θεολογικώτατον Ἰωάννην κατὰ τὴν ἔκτην ὡραν γράψαι προκαθεσθῆναι τὸν Πιλάτον ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἐν τῷ λιθοστρώτῳ τῷ καλουμένῳ, καὶ ἀνακρίνειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν·

καὶ φησι γραφικὸν εἶναι τοῦτο σφάλμα, παροραθὲν παρὰ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπογραψαμένων τὰ Εὐαγγέλια· τοῦ μὲν γάρ γάμμα στοιχείου τὴν τρίτην ὥραν σημαίνοντος, τοῦ δὲ ἐπισήμου τὴν ἔκτην, καὶ πολλὴν ἐμφέρειαν

## Fr.Mar.Supp. 4. Corderius, Catena on John, p. 436

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 299–300; Migne, PG 22:1010. “From Corderius’ *Catena on John* p.436”. Also found in Cramer, *Catena on John*, p. 389. Cramer’s text confirms Mai’s two conjectures but is otherwise inferior.

Here is one of the subjects put forward for enquiry in *Gospel Problems and Solutions, to Marinus*, by Eusebius, known as son of Pamphilus, of Caesarea: that the divine evangelist Mark said that the time at which Christ, our God and Saviour, was crucified was the third hour; but that John, the supreme theologian,<sup>43</sup> wrote that it was at the sixth hour that Pilate took his seat out on the dais, at the place called the Stone Pavement, and passed sentence on Jesus.

He says it is a textual error, overlooked<sup>44</sup> by the original copyists of the gospels. The letter gamma,<sup>45</sup> he says, means the third hour, but the episemon<sup>46</sup> means the sixth; and, as these characters have a close resem-

43. Mai note 3: “I had also been reading this *Problem* about the 3rd and 6th hours in a Vatican MS, formerly the property of Cardinal Sirletus, from which I have incorporated an emendation—though this MS is itself not without faults of its own. The same *Problem* is also found in Paris MSS, according to Harlesius in *The Library of Fabricius* vol. 7 p. 402”.

44. This, παροραθέν, is the most convincing of the variant readings in the extant versions of this passage. The others are in Fr.Mar.Supp. 13: παραγοραθέν, a word not otherwise found, which might have been taken to mean “mispurchased”; and the emendation there by Cramer, παραγραφθέν “miswritten”.

45. The Greeks used letters for numbers, so Γ, the third letter of the Greek alphabet, meant 3 or 3rd.

46. This word, τὸ ἐπίσημον (literally “the sign”), is a name given at this period to the figure for 6. Originally the sixth letter of the alphabet had been F (then called “digamma”, from its appearance of one Γ superimposed on another), with the sound of English w; when that sound ceased to be audible in Greek it dropped out of the alphabet but kept its place as a numeral. This passage suggests that by the early centuries A.D. it had already developed, in some handwriting, toward the curved form now printed as ζ (compare the ease with which a carelessly-written L may be mistaken for C). We are very grateful to Prof. P. Easterling and Dr. C. Láda for time-consuming research, among manuscripts of the relevant date, that confirms this. With a wealth of supporting detail, Dr. Láda writes: “I feel quite confident that Eusebius was entirely right about the possibility of a scribal mix-up or misreading of these two letters”. However, even allowing that it might here be a copyist’s error, Eusebius’s explanation cannot hold good, as Pilate’s passing sentence at the Stone Pavement cannot have been simultaneous with the crucifixion, outside the city.

έχόντων πρὸς ἀλλήλους τούτων τῶν χαρακτήρων, κατὰ πλάνην τὸ γάμμα στοιχεῖον τὸ τῆς τρίτης ὥρας δηλωτικὸν, κυρτωθείσης τῆς ἀποτεταμμένης εἰς μῆκος εὐθείας, εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἐπισήμου μεταχωρῆσαι σημασίαν, τοῦ τῆς ἔκτης ὥρας δηλωτικοῦ· τῶν γὰρ τριῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, τοῦ τε Ματθαίου καὶ Μάρκου, καὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ συμφώνως λεγόντων, ὡς ἀπὸ ἔκτης ὥρας σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἔως ὥρας ἐνάτης, πρόδηλον ὡς ὁ Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς Ἰησοῦς πρὸ τῆς ἔκτης ὥρας, πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι τὸ σκότος, ἐσταύρωτο, δηλαδὴ κατὰ τὴν τρίτην ὥραν, ὡς ὁ Μάρκος ἴστορησε· καὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τὴν ὥραν τρίτην εἶναι ἐπισημηναμένου, καὶ τῶν ἀπογραψαμένων τὸ γάμμα μεταθέντων εἰς τὸ ἐπίσημον.

**ε'.** Ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρία τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ· ταύτην Εὐσέβιος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Μαρίνον ἑτέραν λέγει Μαρίαν παρὰ τὴν θεασαμένην τὸν νεανίσκον· ἦ καὶ ἀμφότεραι ἐκ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ἦσαν.

**ζ'.** Εὐσέβιος φησιν ὁ Καισαρείας, ὡς Μαρία μὲν ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα· οὐκ αὐταὶ δέ εἰσιν αἱ πρωὶ ἐλθοῦσαι ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀλλ' ἄλλαι ἀνώνυμοι· πολλαὶ γὰρ ἦσαν αἱ συναναβᾶσαι τῷ Σωτῆρι ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· ὅθεν οὐδὲ νύκτα παραγίνονται, ἀλλὰ πρωὶ, καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ· ὡς γὰρ μετὰ ἀνατολὴν ἡλίου ἐπιστᾶσαι οὐδὲ τὸν Σωτῆρα θεάσασθαι καταξιοῦνται· οὐδὲ οἴόν τε ἦν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν μετὰ τοσαύτας θέας, ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος, ἀπορεῖν καὶ ἀγνοεῖν τίς ἀποκυλίσει τὸν λίθον.

blance to each other, a bulge in the elongated vertical stroke of the letter gamma, for the third hour, shifted it into the meaning of the episemon, for the sixth. As the three evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke say unanimously that it became dark over the whole earth from the sixth hour till the ninth, it is quite clear that the Lord and God Jesus had been crucified before the sixth hour, before it became dark—that is, at the third hour, as Mark recorded—and that John likewise indicated the third hour, but the copyists altered the gamma to the episemon.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 5. Possinus, *Catena on Mark*, p. 364

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 300; Migne, PG 22:1010. “From Possinus’ *Catena on Mark*, p. 364”. Cf. *To Marinus* 2.8 and 3.4.

“He appeared first to Mary of Magdala”. Eusebius, in *To Marinus*, says this was a different Mary from the one who saw the young man—or else, they both came from the Magdala district.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 6. John Xiphilinus, unpublished Sunday sermon

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 300; Migne, PG 22:1012. “From the patriarch John Xiphilinus’ unpublished Sunday sermon on the women bringing spices, from a Vatican ms, p. 160”.<sup>47</sup> Cf. Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 8.

Eusebius of Caesarea says that Mary of Magdala and James’ Mary prepared spices, but it was not they who came “early in the morning, after sunrise”, but other, unnamed, women, there being numerous women who came up with Jesus from Galilee. That is why they came early in the morning, not during the night; and why, after being told to give the message to the disciples and Peter, “they ran away without saying anything to anyone, because they were frightened”.

---

47. According to *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon* (3:618–19), there are fifty-three extant Sunday sermons by Xiphilinus, and an edition of the first twenty-five exists: S. Eustratiades, ed., Ὁμιλίαι εἰς τὰς κυριακὰς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ I, Trieste, 1903. Unfortunately, it proved impossible to obtain a copy of this volume.\*

**ζ'. Εύσεβίου 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, καὶ<sup>1</sup> τρίτην τὴν Μαγδαληνήν· τινὲς δέ φασιν ἔξ αὐτῶν δύο εἶναι Μαγδαληνάς· μίαν μὲν, τὴν ὡψὲ Σαββάτων παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ, ἑτέραν δὲ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ πρωίας ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἐλθοῦσαν, ταύτην δὲ εἴναι τὴν καὶ Μάρκῳ δηλουμένην, ἀφ' ἣς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπτὰ δαιμόνια· ὡς γὰρ οὕσης καὶ ἑτέρας, φησὶν, οὐ τοιαύτης Μαγδαληνῆς, ἑτήρησεν ὁ Μάρκος τούτο εἰπών· “Αναστὰς δὲ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν Σαββάτων ἐφάνη Μαρία πρῶτον τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἣς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπτὰ δαιμόνια.” Καὶ ταύτην ἵσως εἴναι τὴν ἀκούσασαν, Μή μου ἄπτου, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα κάκείνη ἀπὸ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ὠρμᾶτο, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ ὅμοια καὶ αὐτῆς ἡ θεία κατηγορεῖ Γραφή· εἰ δὲ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν Μαγδαληνὴν φήσειέν τις, καὶ οὕτως ἀληθεύοι ἂν τὰ ίερὰ Εὐαγγέλια, κατ' οὐδένα λόγον διαφωνοῦντα· τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ Μαρίαν τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν εἰσάγονται μὴ ἀπτομένην πρότερον τοῦ Κυρίου, ὅτε ἔκλαιε καὶ ἤπιστει· καὶ ἀπτομένην 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 ἤπιστει.

---

1. The word τῇ must be inserted here.

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

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 300–301;<sup>48</sup> Migne, PG 22:1012. “From Anastasius of Sinai Question 153”.<sup>49</sup> 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;<sup>50</sup> 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 appeared<sup>51</sup> 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,<sup>52</sup> 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. Mai<sup>2</sup>, 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 prejudge 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.

η'. Εύσεβίου ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Μαρίνον.

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐπαπορεῖν πάλιν, πῶς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ὥφθαι τὸν Κύριον τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐν τῷ ὅρει, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Τιβεριάδος, ἐροῦμεν ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἄπαξ καὶ δίς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις ὥφθαι αὐτόν. Διὸ τετάρτην ὀπτασίαν οὐχ ἀμάρτοις τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ φήσας εἶναι, ἢν οὐ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, οὐδὲ τοῖς ὀπτανομένοις, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὅρει τοῖς ἔνδεκα πεποιῆσθαι ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Ματθαῖος, εἰπών· “Οἱ δὲ ἔνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὸ ὅρος, οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν.” Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἄν σφαλείης εἰπὼν ὁμοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν συνηγμένοις αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἔνδεκα μαθηταῖς ἄμα καὶ τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα ὥφθαι αὐτόν. Οἱ δὲ Ἀπόστολος καὶ ἔτι τούτων πλείσιν ἐωρᾶσθαι τὸν Κύριον μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἴστορει, λέγων· “Οτι ἐγίγνερται τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς Γραφὰς, καὶ ὥφθη Κηφᾶς, ἔπειτα τοῖς δώδεκα, ἔπειτα ὥφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ.”

Ὀρᾶς ὁσάκις καὶ ὄσοις ὥφθη μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν; Οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ κρυπταζομένοις διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ πρό γε πάντων ἀνδρῶν Σίμωνι τῷ Πέτρῳ, γυναικῶν δὲ ταῖς ἀμφὶ τὴν Μαγδαληνήν· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς φησι· “Δι’ ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὀπτανόμενος καὶ συναυλιζόμενος αὐτοῖς, τὰ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ παρεδίδουν μαθήματα.”

Fr.Mar.Supp. 8. Anastasius of Sinai, *ibid.*

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 301–2; Migne, PG 22:1012–14. “Also from Anastasius, *ibid.*” Cf. Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 11. An fragment identical with this throughout was published by Mai<sup>1</sup>, pp. 99–100 as “from a Vatican MS”.

From Eusebius’ work *To Marinus*.

On the further problem of how, in Matthew, the Lord was seen by the disciples in Galilee “in the highlands”, whereas in John it was by the sea of Tiberias, we shall say that it was not just once or twice that he was seen, but several times. And so you would<sup>53</sup> not be wrong to say that the appearance in Matthew was the fourth one, which Matthew wrote that Jesus made to the eleven in the hill country, not by the sea of Galilee, nor to the others who had witnessed his appearance by the sea.<sup>54</sup> The eleven disciples made their way to the hill country where he had told them, saw him there, and worshipped him; and you would not be mistaken in saying that he was subsequently seen by those very eleven disciples, gathered together in the same place<sup>55</sup> at the same time as the seventy, as well. And the apostle recounts that the Lord had been seen after the resurrection by still more people than those, in the words: “he had risen on the third day, according to the scriptures, and was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve; then was seen by over five hundred brethren at once”.

Do you see how many times and by how many people he was seen after the resurrection? Thus, both by those in Jerusalem, in hiding for fear of the Jews, and, before any other man, by Simon Peter, and before any other woman by the Magdalene and her party. Hence Luke says: “He was seen continually throughout forty days and was with them, handing down his teachings about the kingdom of God”.

## Fr.Mar.Supp. 9. Anastasius of Sinai, Question 148

Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 302; Migne, PG 22:1014. “Also from Anastasius of Sinai, Question 148”. Cf. Fr.Mar.Supp. 10.

53. Supplying a needed ἄν before ἀμάρτοις.

54. Supplying some such words as ἄλλοις τοῖς παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν between τοῖς and ὄπτανομένοις.

55. Reading κατὰ ταῦτο for κατ’ αὐτό.

**Θ'.** Εὐσεβίου ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς Μαρῖνον.

Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ ἐμπνευσθὲν Πνεῦμα ἄγιον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, λυτικὸν καὶ συγχωρητικὸν ἦν πάσης ἀμαρτίας· τὸ δὲ ἐπηγγελμένον τὸ βαπτισθῆσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ μετασχεῖν δυνάμεως ἐνεργημάτων, ἐνεργητικῆς μὲν τῶν μελλόντων δι’ αὐτῶν ἀποτελεῖσθαι θαυμάτων, ἐνστατικῆς δὲ καὶ καρτερικῆς τῶν μελλόντων αὐτοῖς ἐπανίστασθαι κινδύνων. Πρὸ γὰρ ταύτης τῆς δυνάμεως κηρύττειν αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν οὐκ ἐβούλετο, ἀλλ’ ἐκδέχεσθαι καὶ περιμένειν αὐτὴν ἐξ ὑψους μετασχεῖν. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος τὸ χάρισμα ἰδίως ἀφορίζων τῶν λοιπῶν ἐνεργειῶν τοῦ ἄγίου Πνεύματος ἐδίδασκε λέγων· “Ἄλλω δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων.” Καὶ ἡ προφητεία φησί· “Κύριος δώσει ρῆμα τοῖς εὐαγγελιζομένοις δυνάμει πολλῆ.” Ἡς δυνάμεως ὅτε μήπω μετεῖχον, ἥρνήσαντο αὐτὸν οἱ πάντες καὶ ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ πάθους· ὅτε δὲ μετέσχον αὐτῆς, πάντες ταῖς ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίαις τε καὶ ὄμοιογίαις διέπρεψαν.

ἀνακαινίζων γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ἦν ἀπώλεσε χάριν ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ταύτην πάλιν ἀποδιδούς, ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν μαθητῶν λέγων, “Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἄγιον.”

**ι'**. Εὐσέβιος δὲ ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν τῇ πρὸς Μαρῖνον ἐπιστολῇ οὕτως ἔξηγεῖται τὸ προτεθὲν, ὅτι διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα. Καὶ πάλιν· ἐκάστῳ δίδοται ἡ φανέρωσις πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον. “Ω μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δίδοται λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλω δὲ λόγος γνώσεως κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· ἔτερω δὲ πίστις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ

On p. 303 in Mai<sup>2</sup> there is mention of a further unnumbered fragment “from Xiphilinus”. Mai states that this is almost identical to this fragment, from “He did not want...” down to “...confessions of him”.

From Eusebius *To Marinus*

...And the Holy Spirit that was breathed by Christ into his disciples was that of remission and forgiveness of all sin; but what had been promised them was that they would be baptised in Holy Spirit, and would share the power of doing mighty deeds. This would produce the miracles they were going to be able to accomplish; and would counteract, and strengthen them against, the dangers they were going to encounter. He did not want them to make their proclamation to the nations before this power; instead, he wanted them to bide their time and await its being allotted to them from on high. The apostle, too, distinguished this gift of grace as being something separate from the remaining workings of the Holy Spirit, with the teaching: "...and to another, the working of miracles"; and the prophecy says: "The Lord will give utterance with much power to those giving the good news". When they did not yet share this power, at the time of his passion, they all denied him and took offence; but once they did share it, they all won renown for their witness for Christ, and for their confessions of him.

What the Lord was doing, with his words "Receive Holy Spirit", as he breathed it over the disciples' faces, was renewing man, and returning to him once again the grace he had lost since God's breathing it into him.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 10. Macarius Chrysocephalus

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 302–3; Migne, PG 22:1014–16. "From Macarius Chrysocephalus' *Florilegium*, in Villoison, *Anecdota*, vol. 2, p.74".<sup>56</sup>

Eusebius son of Pamphilus, in his *Letter to Marinus*, expounds this subject as follows. "There are varieties of gifts", according to the apostle, "but the same Spirit"; and again: "To each is given his manifestation, for the common good. To one, through the Spirit, is given the utterance of wisdom; to another the utterance of knowledge, according to the same

---

56. De Villoison, *Anecdota Graeca*, 1781, 2:74–75. The fragment begins nine lines from the bottom of p. 74. It is given from f.199<sup>r</sup> of MS Marcianus 452.\*

Πνεύματι, ἄλλω δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, ἄλλω δὲ προφητεῖαι, ἄλλω δὲ διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, ἔτέρῳ δὲ γένη γλωσσῶν· πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ ἐν μὲν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἵδια ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται.” Σαφῶς γάρ διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Πνεύματος, πολλὰς εἶναι παρέστησε δυνάμεις, διαφόρων πραγμάτων ἐνεργητικάς.

“Ορα τοίνυν μήπως ἐνταῦθα ἔξουσίαν τινὰ μερικὴν καὶ χάριν πνευματικὴν δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς· οὐχ ὥστε νεκροὺς ἐγείρειν, καὶ δυνάμεις ποιεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὥστε ἀφιέναι ἀμαρτήματα· διάφορα γάρ τὰ χαρίσματα τοῦ Πνεύματος. Διὸ καὶ συνάπτει λέγων, “Ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἀμαρτίας, ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς;” καὶ τὰ ἔξῆς· δεικνὺς ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ εἶδος τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων αὐτοῖς ἐδωρήσατο. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα κατελθόν, καὶ τῶν σημείων καὶ παντὸς ἐτέρου χαρίσματος τὰς δυνάμεις δὴ καὶ ἐνεργείας αὐτοῖς ἔχορήγησε.

Διὰ τοῦτο ἐνταῦθα μὲν ἄνευ ἄρθρου εἶπε, “Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἄγιον,” δηλῶν ὅτι μερικήν τινα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνέργειαν δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς· περὶ δὲ ἐκείνου φησί· “Λήψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς.”

Εὔσεβιος φησὶν ὁ Καισαρείας ὡς Μαρία μὲν ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν· οὐκ αὐταὶ δέ εἰσιν αἱ πρωῒ ἐλθοῦσαι ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀλλὰ ἄλλαι ἀνώνυμοι· πολλαὶ γάρ ἦσαν αἱ συναναβάσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· αὗται δὲ αἱ κατὰ Μάρκον ἐλθοῦσαι ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, καὶ ἀτελέστερόν πως διέκειντο. δθεν οὐδὲ νύκτωρ παραγίνονται ἀλλὰ πρωΐ· καὶ ἀκούσασαι δὲ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἔφυγον,

Spirit; to someone else, in the same Spirit, faith; to another, working of miracles; to another, the recognition of different spirits; to someone else, kinds of tongues. And it is one and the same Spirit that activates all these, while distributing them individually to each, as he wishes". The apostle has clearly demonstrated to us that through one and the same Spirit there are numerous powers, producing different effects.

Consider, then: Is not the authority and spiritual grace that God has given them, at this point, perhaps a particular, partial one?—not so that they can raise the dead and do miracles, but so that they can forgive sins, because "the gifts of the Spirit are various". That is why he adds the words: "If you forgive anyone's sins, they are forgiven them..." and so on, showing that that is the type of spiritual gift he has given them. However, after the ascension the Spirit himself came down, and did then also provide them with the powers for signs, and for every other gift.

That is why, at this point, he said "Receive Holy Spirit", without "the". He was making it clear that what he was giving them was only a certain partial working of the Spirit; whereas his words "You will receive the power of the Holy Spirit coming upon you" refer to the Spirit himself.

#### ADDITIONAL FRAGMENTS

The numbering of the *Supplementa Minora* has been continued for these fragments that are not present in Mai<sup>2</sup>.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 11. Possinus, Catena on Mark, p. 365

Mai<sup>1</sup>, pp. 94–95. "From Possinus *Catena on Mark*, p. 365". Cf. Xiphilinus p. 160 (Fr.Mar.Supp. 6) and Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 7.2.40. Almost identical to Cramer, *Catena on Mark*, p. 446.

**Eusebius of Caesarea says that Mary of Magdala, James' Mary and Salome prepared spices to go and anoint Jesus, but it was not they who came "early in the morning, after sunrise", but other, unnamed, women, there being numerous women who came up with Jesus from Galilee. These were the ones who according to Mark came after sunrise, and had a somewhat less satisfactory attitude; that is why they came early in the morning, not during the night; and why, after being told to give the**

καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον. Ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ· μόναι γὰρ αὗται ἐλθοῦσαι καὶ ἀληθεῖ ὅψει πεισθεῖσαι ώς μετὰ ἀνατολὴν ἡλίου ἐπιστῆναι, οὕτε τὸν σωτῆρα θεάσασθαι καταξιοῦνται, ἢ τὸν ἄγγελον τὸν ἔξαστράπτοντα, οὕτε τοὺς δύο τοὺς ἕσω τοῦ μνήματος, οὕτε τοὺς δύο τοὺς παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾶ ἄνδρας· ψιλὸν δέ τινα νεανίσκον εἶδον περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν, ἀναλόγως τῇ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν σμικρότητι τὴν ὄπτασίαν ἰδοῦσαι· ταῦτα οὖν, φησί, περὶ ἑτέρων ὁ Μάρκος ἴστορει γυναικῶν ἀνωνύμων· οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶον τε καὶ τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν μετὰ τοσαύτας θέας ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἀπορεῖν καὶ ἀγνοεῖν τίς ἀποκυλίσειε τὸν λίθον.

Εὖσεβίου.

"Ισως φαίεν τινὲς, πῶς τῆς κουστωδίας φυλαττούσης δρομαῖοι ἥρχοντο Πέτρος τε καὶ Ἰωάννης, καὶ εἰσήρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον;

ἐροῦμεν ὅτι τοῦ σεισμοῦ γενονμένου, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τελεσθείσης, ἀνεχώρησαν οἱ στρατιῶται ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἄπαντα τὰ γενόμενα· καὶ οὕτω τῆς στρατιωτικῆς φρουρᾶς ἐλευθερωθέντος τοῦ μνήματος ἡδυνήθησαν ἀπαντῆσαι καὶ εἰσελθεῖν, ἀκούσαντες παρὰ Μαρίας τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς ώς οὐδείς ἐστιν ἐκεῖ τῶν ἐναντίων, σχολάζειν δὲ τὸν τόπον τοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν ἀφικνουμένοις τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως· αὕτη γὰρ ἦν μάλιστα ἡ αἵτια τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ ἄγγέλου· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριν ἀπεκίνει τὸν λίθον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν ἵνα ἀπελάσῃ, τὰς δὲ ἐρχομένας ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν δεξιωσάμενος, τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐταῖς καταγγεῖλη καὶ τούτου μάρτυς Ματθαῖος λέγων, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσείσθησαν οἱ τηροῦντες, καὶ ἐγενήθησαν ώς νεκροί· φθάνει μὲν γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον ἀναστὰς ὁ σωτὴρ, οὐδὲ ἀναμένει τὴν ἀποκίνησιν τοῦ

**message to the disciples and Peter, “they ran away without saying anything to anyone, because they were frightened”. It is only these{.}who came and who were convinced by a true sight,<sup>57</sup> as getting there only after sunrise, and were not found worthy of seeing either the Saviour or the dazzlingly-bright angel, nor the two inside the tomb, nor the two men in Luke. It is merely some ordinary young man that they saw, with a white robe on. The sight they see is one that corresponds to their own small-mindedness.** That, then, is what he says Mark recounts about different, unnamed, women—because **it would not have been possible that, after such great sights, the Magdalene should after sunrise be perplexed, and not know who would roll back the stone.**

Fr.Mar.Supp. 12. Corderius, Catena on John, p. 450

Mai<sup>1</sup>, pp. 95–97. “Partly from Corderius’ *Catena on John* p. 450, and partly from a Vatican MS”. Cf. Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 1 and Nicetas-Marinus 4.

From Eusebius

Some people will<sup>58</sup> perhaps say: How is it that Peter and John “came at a run and went into the tomb”, when there was a guard on watch?

We shall say that after the earthquake had taken place and the resurrection had been accomplished, the soldiers withdrew, to tell the high priests all that had happened; and so, as the tomb had been left free of the military guard, they could reach it and go in, having heard from Mary of Magdala that none of the enemy were there, **leaving the field free for those coming to see the Saviour’s resurrection. That was the main reason for the angel’s appearance. It was not, of course, to bring about the resurrection that he was moving the stone away; {...} one purpose was to drive the men off, and the other was to receive the women coming to see, and announce the resurrection to them.** As witness, {.} Matthew’s words are: “The watchers were shaken from sheer fright, and became like dead men”. You see, the Saviour’s resurrection actually preceded the angel; he does not wait for the rolling-back of the

57. This nonsense represents the mistaken “correction” ἀληθεῖ ὄψει πεισθεῖσαι for ἀληθῶς ὄψισθεῖσαι “latecomers indeed”, Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 7.2.

58. Not accepting Mai’s emendation of ξρουσὶ to φαίεν.

λίθου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτου πρὸ τὴν θύραν κειμένου, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀρχιερέων σημάντροις κατεσφραγισμένου, τῶν τε φρουρῶν κυκλοῦντων τὸν τόπον, ἀφανῆς ἔξηει τοῦ μνήματος, τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν πεποιημένος θεικῇ δυνάμει, καθ' ἣν ὥραν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, καὶ καθ' ὃν ἐπεσημήνατο τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν καιρόν· καὶ ἐγήγερτο τοῦ λίθου μεμενηκότος ἐπὶ σχήματος ἀγαθῶν δὲ ἄγγελος ἀνθρώποις παρῆν ἄγγελος οὐδὲν μὲν τῇ ἀναστάσει διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας συμβαλλόμενος, τὰ πολλὰ δὲ τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων διακονούμενος σωτηρίᾳ· διὸ καὶ ἔξεστραπταὶ τὴν μορφὴν, καὶ σημεῖον παρεῖχεν ἀγαθῶν, λευχείμονα δεικνὺς ἑαυτὸν, καὶ πρῶτος τῆς σωτηρίου ἔօρτῆς ἀπαρχόμενος.

Τὸ δὲ πῶς δύο παρὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην μαθητῶν ἐλθόντων, περὶ ἐνὸς ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐμνημόνευσεν, οὕτω λυθείη·

πολὺς ἦν ὁ Πέτρος ἀεὶ τῇ προθυμίᾳ· διὸ καὶ πρῶτος τολμᾶ εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον σὺν τῷ ἐτέρῳ μαθητῇ· εἴτα ἀναχωρεῖ θεασάμενος καὶ πιστεύσας· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Λουκᾶν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπιστούντων μαθητῶν ταῖς λεγούσαις γυναιξὶν, μόνος αὐτὸς πιστεύσας πάλιν δρομαῖος ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον παραγίνεται.

"Ισως ἐροῦσι τινὲς, πῶς τῆς κουστωδίας φυλαττούσης, δρομαῖοι ἥρχοντο Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης, καὶ εἰσήεσαν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον; ἐροῦμεν ὅτι τοῦ σεισμοῦ γενομένου καὶ γενομένης τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀνεχώρησαν οἱ

**stone, but even while it is still in place over the entrance, sealed with the high priest's seal, and while the sentries are still ringing the area, he leaves the tomb, unseen: he had made his resurrection from the dead by divine power, no-one knew when, at a time <none><sup>59</sup> of the evangelists has indicated. {...} With the stone still in position, he had {} risen again, unnoticed by anyone, no-one knew when. {...} The angel was there as the bringer of the good news to mankind; he was not contributing anything to the resurrection by his presence, but was playing his great part in mankind's salvation. This is why his appearance was dazzlingly bright, and he was presenting a sign of good news as he revealed himself, dressed in white, and was the first to celebrate the Saviour's resurrection.**

**The question of how it is that Luke mentions only one of the disciples {}, when in John there are two who came, Peter and John, would be solved as follows.**

**Peter was always strong in his enthusiasm, {...} and that is also why {} he is, with the other disciple, the first with the courage to go and enter the tomb. {...} He then left, {} when he had seen {...} and believed. According to Luke the other disciples disbelieved the women when they talked {}; he again, the only one to believe {...}, ran back and reached the grave {}.**

Fr.Mar.Supp. 13. Cramer, *Catena on John*, pp. 399–402

It has been assumed that where Eusebius is named in the following catenae, the passage cited from him extends only to the end of that verse of the gospel being commented on or to where a new author is named. Numbers in brackets give the biblical chapter and verse.

From Cramer, *Catena on John*, pp. 399–402. Cf. Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 1 and Corderius p. 450 (Fr.Mar.Supp.12).

[John 20:3]. Some will perhaps say: "How is it, given that there was a guard on watch, that Peter and John came at a run and went into the tomb?" We shall say that when the earthquake took place, and the res-

---

59. This word, essential to the sense and present in the text of Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 1, is missing in this version.

στρατιῶται ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἄπαντα τὰ γενόμενα, καὶ οὕτω τῆς στρατιωτικῆς φρουρᾶς ἐλευθερωθέντος τοῦ μνήματος, ἡδυνήθησαν ἀπαντῆσαι καὶ εἰσελθεῖν, ἀκούσαντες παρὰ Μαρίας τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς, ὡς οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ἐκεῖ τῶν ἐναντίων.

Πῶς κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν καὶ Ἰωάννην τοσαυτάκις ὀφθέντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον καὶ τὸν Ματθαῖον, κελεύονται οἱ αὐτοὶ διὰ τῶν γυναικῶν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἀπελθεῖν, ὡς ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψόμενοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ μέλλοντες αὐτὸν θεωρεῖν ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ;

καὶ φαμὲν, ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι δύο Εὐαγγελισταὶ τῶν ιβ' ἥσαν τὸν χορὸν συμπληροῦντες, καὶ ἔφασαν ὡφθαι αὐτοῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ κεκρυμμένοις, οἱ δὲ ἔτεροι δύο, ὁ Ματθαῖος καὶ Μάρκος οὐ τοῖς ιβ' μόνον ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα φανῆναι ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, καθώς φησι καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ, “μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἐτέρους ἐβδομήκοντα.” πλείους τοίνυν αἱ ὀπτασίαι καὶ διάφοροι γεγένηνται τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῖς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ οἱ μὲν τάσδε, οἱ δὲ τάσδε ἀναγράφουσι, καὶ οἱ μὲν τάδε εἰρηκέναι αὐτὸν φασιν, οἱ δὲ τάδεκαὶ πεπραχέναι.” Ετι δὲ ὅτι καὶ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίου λέγοντες, ἀναπληροῖ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου λεχθέντα ὁ δεύτερος.

urrection took place, the soldiers withdrew to report to the high priests everything that had taken place; and, as the tomb was thus freed from its military guard, and they had heard from Mary of Magdala that none of the enemy were there, they were able to reach it and go in.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 14. Cramer, *Catena on John*, pp. 404–6

From Cramer, *Catena on John*, p. 404–6. Cf. Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 10.

[John 20:20]. So how, given that according to Luke and John Jesus was seen that number of times by his disciples in Jerusalem itself, are the same men told in Mark and Matthew, through the women, to leave for Galilee because they would see him there, but were not going to see him in Jerusalem?

And we say that the other two evangelists were members **of the twelve, making up the number**,<sup>60</sup> and they said that Jesus had been seen by them when they were in hiding **in Jerusalem**; but the other **two**, Matthew and Mark, said that he had appeared in Galilee **not**<sup>61</sup> only **to the twelve** but to the seventy, as Luke also says in his gospel: “After that the Lord appointed seventy others in addition”. {...} So, then, there had been several different appearances to the disciples that had taken place after the resurrection, and some writers record some of these and others, others; there are some things which some writers say Jesus had talked of, and some which others say he had actually put into effect. There are<sup>62</sup> times when, in their handling of the same theme, the second person supplies what his predecessor has said.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 15. Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, pp. 7–8

From Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, pp. 7–8. Cf. Latin frag., Ambrose par. 46.

60. This phrase occurs in a quite different context in Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 10.

61. This directly contradicts what is said in Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 10. The epitome of the present passage appears to have skimmed too quickly over the original to understand it, although in the final paragraph his version is superior to that in Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 10.

62. Reading ἔστι δὲ ὅτε for ἔτι δὲ ὅτι, as in Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 10.

’Ιεχονίαν δὲ γράφει, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν Βασιλειῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Ἱερεμίου εἰληφώς τὸ ὄνομα· διὸ φησὶν, “Ιωσίας ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν.” Βούλόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν προφήτην σε ἀνελθεῖν, ἐπισκέψασθαι τε τὰ περὶ Ἰεχονίου παρ’ αὐτῷ κείμενα. περιέχει δὲ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον.

“ἡτιμώθη Ἰεχονίας ώς σκεῦος· οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ χρεία· ὅτι ἔξερρίφη αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔξεβλήθη εἰς γῆν, ἣν οὐκ ἤδει· ἄκουε λόγον Κυρίου· τάδε λέλεικτω, γράψον τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον ἐκιήρυκτον ἄνθρωπον· ὅτι οὐ μὴ αὐξηθῇ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ ἀνὴρ, καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου Δαβὶδ ἄρχων ἔτι ἐν τῷ Ἰούδᾳ.” τούτων εἰρημένων ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν ταῖς Βασιλείαις, οὐ περὶ Ἰωακεὶμ, ἀλλὰ περὶ Ἰεχονίου· εἰς δὲ ἣν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς· διωνυμίᾳ χρώμενος τὸν γενεαλογούμενον πρὸς ἐμοῦ φημὶ αὐτὸν δὴ Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰεχονίου τοῦ ἡτιμωμένου τοῦ γένους σκεύους, τοῦ ἀχρήστου, τοῦ ἀπορριφέντος· οὗ οὐ μὴ αὐξηθήσεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος ἄνδρα ἔφησεν ὁ λόγος, ώς ἂν μειζόνως ἀπορήσειας περὶ τῆς τούτων αἰτίας· τί δεῖ ... μάθοις ὅτι καὶ ... αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ, ὃν τινά φημι οὐ γεγονέναι τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις διαφανῶν.

[Matt 1:11]. He writes the name as Jechoniah, taking it not from Kingdoms but from the book of Jeremiah. That is why he says “Josiah was Jechoniah’s father”, meaning that you should refer back to the prophet and consider what is put down by him about Jechoniah. It contains this passage:<sup>63</sup>

“Jechoniah has **been dishonoured, like a pot for which there is no use, because {he has been thrown away, himself and his seed,** and he has been exiled to a land he did not know. **{Hear the word of the Lord:**<sup>64</sup> write that this man is a person banished, because there shall surely not grow **from his seed** a man **sitting on David’s throne**, ruling any more in Judah”. That is what is said in the prophet, not in Kingdoms; and not about Jehoiakim, but about Jechoniah—though they are one and the same person, under two names. That being so, I say that the person whose descent is being traced from him,<sup>65</sup> Jesus himself,<sup>66</sup> the Christ of God, is from the seed of the dishonoured Jechoniah, the useless kind of pot that has been thrown away, from whom the word said that there would surely not be any man to grow from his seed—just to make you all the more perplexed about the reason for this! What is the need ...<sup>67</sup> you would learn that ...<sup>67</sup> Joseph himself, who, I remark, had not been born into a family distinguished in the world.

Fr.Mar.Supp. 16. Cramer, *Catena on Matthew*, p. 251

This fragment is also reproduced in two fragments printed in *Anecdota Matthaei* pp. 62–64 and 67–69. The first is the same as Cramer, pp.

63. Reading τόπον for τρόπον.

64. Two words found here in Cramer’s text, no part of the Jeremiah passage, are τάδε λέλεικτω. The latter is not possible as a Greek word at all: the impossible accent suggests that the printer has used ω for ο, and if one assumes that he also misprinted κ for π, a possible sense arrived at for τάδε λέλειπτο would be: “These words had been omitted”. One may speculate that a reader had observed that the copy in front of him lacked part of the quotation from Jeremiah and had written it in the margin with those two words as a note and that a subsequent copyist had duly inserted the missing words but mistakenly included the note as well.

65. Reading αὐτοῦ for ἐμοῦ.

66. Reading αὐτόν for αὐτό.

67. Some irrecoverable words are missing from the text here. The copyist of this passage must have been having a bad day.

Πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὁψὲ σαββάτων φαίνεται ἐγηγερμένος ὁ Σωτὴρ, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Μάρκῳ πρωΐ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου;

τὸ ὁψὲ σαββάτῳ μὴ τὴν ἐσπερινήν ὥραν νομίσῃ τις τὴν μετὰ ἡλίου δυσμὰς λέγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ βραδὺ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς νυκτός· ὅντω γάρ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς ὥρας εἰώθαμεν λέγειν καὶ ὁψὲ τοῦ καιροῦ, καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς χρεῖας, οὐ τὴν ἐσπέραν δηλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ σφόδρα βράδιον σημαίνοντες. καὶ γάρ ὥσπερ διερμηνεύων αὐτὸς ἔαυτὸν ὁ Ματθαῖος, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν ὁψὲ σαββάτων, ἐπήγαγε “τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων.” δηλῶν τὴν ὥραν καὶ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς μετὰ τὸ σάββατον νυκτὸς τὸν ἀμφὶ τὴν ἔω τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ σαββάτου· “τῇ γάρ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ” φησὶ, δηλαδὴ ὥρᾳ, τὸ λοιπὸν ἥδη ἐπιφωσκούσῃ καὶ ἐπιφαινούσῃ τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, ᾗ τις ἦν ὁψὲ, καὶ πόρρω λοιπὸν ἐλαύνουσα τῶν σαββάτων.

ἔθος γάρ ἦν τὴν ὅλην ἑβδομάδα σάββατον καλεῖν, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας σάββατον ὀνομάζειν, οἷον μία σαββάτων, καὶ β' καὶ γ' καὶ δ' σαββάτων, ὅθεν σύμφωνοι εἰσὶν καὶ ἐν τούτῳ οἱ Εὐαγγελισταί.

251–53 line 22, and differs only by three or four insignificant words. The second is practically identical to the remainder of the text in Cramer.

Most of the fragment is also contained in a long footnote by Mai<sup>2</sup> on p. 265, and in Migne, PG 22:953–54, as abbreviated from the catena of Combefis.<sup>68</sup> The material in the footnote is the same as Cramer from the comma in line 4 of p. 254 to the full stop in line 24 of p. 255.

For explanation of the ambiguity of “sabbath”, see note at head of *To Marinus* 2.

Cf. *To Marinus* 1.

**How is it that the Saviour’s resurrection evidently took place, in Matthew, “late on the sabbath”, but in Mark “early in the morning on the first day of the week”?**

Cf. *To Marinus* 2.

One is not to think “late on the sabbath” means “the evening-time following {...} the sunset”, but “late on, and far into the night {...}”. In the same way, we ordinarily use the expressions “late in the day”, “late in time”, and “later than it should have been” when we are not talking about the evening, or the time after sunset, but when what we mean by this idiom is “very late indeed”. You see, Matthew, acting, as it were, as his own interpreter, said after his “late on the sabbath” the words “as it was becoming light towards the first of sabbath”, making both the time and the occasion clear: during the night after the sabbath, about dawn on the first day of the week. He is evidently saying “at the time when it was already just beginning to dawn, and to glimmer towards the Lord’s day”—that being late, and running already a long way on in the sabbath [or in the week; literally “of the sabbaths”].

{...} It was customary to call the whole week “sabbath”, and to express all the days using the same word, for example “the first of the week, {...} “the second” {...}, “the third” {...}, and “the fourth” {...}. {...} Hence, here too, the evangelists are in accord.

---

68. Francois Combefis, *S. Patris nostri Asterii Amaseae episcopi, aliorum plurium ... Ecclesiae graecae patrum ... orationes & homiliae* (Graecolatinorum patrum bibliothecae novum auctarium 1; Paris: Bertier, 1648), 1:779–91.\*

Ο γὰρ Ματθαῖος τὸ ὄψὲ σαββάτων τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐπιφώσκοντα εἰς τὴν ἔω τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρας, ὡς εἴρηται, ὀνόμασεν· ὃν περ ὁ Μάρκος “πρωΐ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων” εἶπεν· εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου μετὰ ἡλίου δυσμάς εὐθέως ἐσπέρας γενομένης ἀπονησίζεσθαι. ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὅντως ἡ συνήθεια ἐν ταῖς ἑκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ κεκράτηκεν, ἀλλ’ ἡ νυκτὸς ἐπιλαβούσης, ἡ αὐτῷ μεσονυκτίῳ, ἡ περὶ τῶν ἀλεκτόρων βοᾶς,

ἄλλως τε δὲ εἰ κατὰ τὴν ἐσπέραν τοῦ σαββάτου ἡ ἀνάστασις γέγονε καὶ ὁ σεισμὸς, πάντων ἐγρηγορότων ἔτι, πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἥσθοντο οἱ πάντες; Πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἂν συνδρομὴ ἐγεγόνει ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα, Ἀγγέλου δοφθέντος ἐσπέρας, καὶ τὸν λίθον ἀποκυλίσαντος τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; καὶ οἱ φρουροὶ δὲ τοῦ τόπου, τὸ τάγμα τὸ στρατιωτικὸν καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι σὺν αὐτοῖς φυλάττοντες τὸν τάφον, πῶς οὐ παραχρῆμα τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπήγγελλον τὰ πραττόμενα· μάλιστα ὅτε αὐτοὶ δι’ ἔαυτῶν τῇ προτεραιᾳ ἐπιστάντες, ἡσφαλίσαντο τὸν τάφον, σφαλίσαντες τὸν λίθον μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας; ἀκόλουθον γὰρ ἦν ἀνατραπέντος τοῦ λίθου παραδόξως, παραχρῆμα σπεῦσαι τοὺς φρουρούς, καὶ τὰ πραχθέντα δηλῶσαι, τῆς ὥρας αὐτοῖς ἐπιτρεπούσης. οἱ δὲ καὶ διδάσκονται τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων διαφημίσαι εἰς ἄπαντας “ὅτι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς ἐλθόντες, ἔκλεψαν αὐτὸν, ἡμῶν κοιμαμένων.” ὅ δὴ καὶ χώραν οὐκ ἔχει πλάττεσθαι αὐτοὺς, εἰ τῇ ἐσπέρᾳ ἐγήγερτο.

διὸ οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι τίς, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη σημαίνεσθαι· ἐνθα ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία μόνη πρωΐ ἔτι οὖσης σκοτίας, καὶ πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον ἐπιστᾶσα τῷ μνήματι, καὶ μὴ εύροῦσα τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Σωτῆρος, κλαίει· διὰ τὸ μηδένα τέως γνῶναι περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ. τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ ὥρας μέρος εἶναι δεύτεροντὸν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ χρόνον, καθ’ ὃν τρίτον ἐπιστᾶσα ἡ αὐτὴ Μαγδαληνὴ ἄμα τῇ ἄλλῃ Μαρίᾳ τοῦ μνήματος, οὐκέτι κλαίει, ὡς ἂν, παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη, τεθεαμένη τοὺς Ἀγγέλους καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Σωτῆρα· τὰ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ καὶ τῷ Μάρκῳ, ἐτέρουν καιροῦ ἂν εἴη δηλωτικὰ, παρ’ ὃν

Matthew, as has been said, called the time when it was becoming light towards the dawn of the Lord's day "late on sabbath"; that is just what Mark meant by "early on the first of sabbaths". If that were not the case, **we should have been ending our fast immediately after sunset in the evening of the sabbath day.** {...} Actually, though, that is not **the custom** that has prevailed among the churches of God; instead, it is either when night has set in, or actually at midnight, or else at cockcrow. {...}

Particularly, if it had been in the evening that the resurrection took place, and the earthquake, with **everyone** still **awake**, how could they **all** have been unaware of it? How would there not **have been a rush to the tomb**, if the angel had been seen in the evening and had rolled back the stone from the entrance of the tomb? And the watchers at the place—the military detachment, and the Jews with them, guarding the tomb—surely they would immediately have been reporting<sup>69</sup> what had been going on to the high priests and the Jewish authorities? Especially when those had been there on their own account the day before, securing the grave and sealing<sup>70</sup> the stone in company with the guard? **The sequel to the miraculous pushing-back of the stone would have been for the guards, had it happened at a time which allowed them to do so, at once to hurry and reveal what had been done.** In fact, though, they are actually instructed by the high priests, on the next day, to spread to everyone the report: "His disciples came and stole him during the night, while we were asleep". If his resurrection had taken place during the evening, there would certainly have been no scope, even, for that fiction of theirs.

Thus one would not be incorrect in saying that the first stage of our Saviour's resurrection is indicated in the place in John, where "early in the morning, while it was still dark" Mary Magdalene is standing alone at the tomb, for both the first and the second time, and is in tears at not finding the Saviour's body, because no-one yet knows of his resurrection; and that the second stage of the same period is the time in Matthew at which that same Magdalene is at the tomb for the third time, with the other Mary, and is no longer in tears, as having (in John) seen the angels and the Saviour himself. The accounts in Luke and Mark { } would refer to another stage, at which several other women

---

69. Reading ἥγγελλον for the impossible ἥγγελον.

70. Accepting Cramer's conjecture σφραγίσαντες for σφαλίσαντες.

πλείους ἀπαντῶσι γυναικες ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν· τὴν γὰρ Μαγδαληνὴν Μαρίαν μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν διεστῶσαν ἀπηντηκέναι νομίζω. ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ παρατυχεῖν, καὶ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον καθ' ἔαυτὴν μόνην, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας. οὕτω δ' ἂν ἡ αὐτὴ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἐθεάσατο, καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ. οὐκ ἀπελιμπάνετο γὰρ οὐδὲ ἀπέστη τοῦ τόπου, ὅθεν καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἑώρακεν· παρῆν γὰρ καὶ παρέμενε, καταπεπληγμένη τὰ τεθεαμένα, ποθοῦσα δὲ πρὸς τοῖς πρώτοις δευτέρων καὶ τρίτων θεοφανιῶν ἀξιωθῆναι, ὅθεν καὶ ἐτύγχανε μετὰ ταῦτα, διαφόρως μὲν πλειόνων γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἀφικνουμένων, καὶ ἄλλως τε ἄλλως αὐταῖς ἀγγελικῆς ὁψεως παραφαινομένης, αὐτῆς δὲ ἐφ' ἐκάστης θέας παρατυγχανούσης. οὕτω γοῦν τῶν παρὰ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν Εὐαγγελισταῖς ἀναγεγραμμένων θεωρὸς ἐγένετο ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ, διὸ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐμνημονεύθη.

### ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΥ.

Πῶς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία μετὰ τῆς ὁμωνύμου ἑωρακέναι ἐκτὸς τοῦ μνήματος ἐπικαθήμενον τῷ λίθῳ ἔνα μόνον Ἀγγελον εἴρηται, κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ἰωάννην εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος Ἀγγέλους δύο θεωρεῖ καθημένους· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Λουκᾶν, δύο ἄνδρες ἀπήντων ταῖς γυναιξὶ· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Μάρκον νεανίσκος ἦν αὐταῖς ὁ ὄρώμενος;

τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ προηγοῦνται, ὅθεν καὶ δύο Μαρίαι ἄρτι τὸν Ἀγγελον ἐπιστάντα, καὶ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλικότα κατειλήφασιν. ὕστερον δὲ πέπρακται τὰ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, δύο Ἀγγέλων εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ὀφθέντων, ἐτέρων ὄντων παρὰ τὸν ἔξω πρὸ τοῦ μνήματος ἐπὶ τῷ λίθῳ καθεζόμενον παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ· οἱ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ, δύο ἄνδρες ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ ὀφθέντες, διὰ τὰ τῆς ἑορτῆς σύμβολα, καὶ ὁ παρὰ

were present at the sighting; I regard the Magdalene { } as having been there, standing a long way off from them, being present at the same place and during the same period on both the first and second occasions, the first time alone, and then with the other Mary. In this way the same Mary of Magdala would have been seeing both what is in Matthew and what is in John; she was not missing from what is recorded in the others, because she did not leave the place from which she had also seen<sup>71</sup> what is in the others, but was there, and stayed there as the sightings took place—stunned, and longing to be granted a second and third divine appearance, as well as what happened the first time. And that is what she did subsequently experience, when several other women arrived at the tomb at different times, with one angelic sight presenting itself to them on one occasion and another on another, but being herself present at each sight. Thus the Magdalene witnessed what all four evangelists have recorded, which is why she was mentioned in them all.

Cf. *To Marinus* 4 and Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 5–7.

From the same Eusebius:

How is it that in Matthew Mary of Magdala, with her namesake, is said to have seen only one angel outside the tomb, sitting on the stone, and { } that according to John she sees two angels, sitting inside the tomb; while according to Luke two men met the women, and according to Mark it was a young man that was seen by them { ... } ?

The incident in Matthew, in which the two Marys have come upon the angel who had recently appeared and rolled back the stone, comes first. John's incident has taken place later on, with the two angels seen inside the tomb: these are not the same as the one who, as Matthew says, was seen outside, sitting on the stone in front of the tomb.<sup>72</sup> The two men in Luke, seen in dazzling clothes (because those are indications

71. Reading ἐωράκει for ἐώρακεν.

72. From here to the<sup>72</sup> below on p. 247, Cramer's passage corresponds to much of what is found toward the end of Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 5, continuing directly into Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 6. This part of the text must derive from the same source as that printed in the long footnote to *To Marinus* 4, p. 265 in Mai<sup>2</sup>. In all but one (for which, see note 76) of the dozen or so places where there are differences of reading, the text in that footnote is superior and has been followed here without further comment.

τῷ Μάρκῳ δὲ νεανίσκος λευκήν περιβεβλημένος, τῷ τὰ φαιδρὰ καὶ δεξιὰ ταῖς γυναικίν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι· πάλιν ἔτεροι ἀν εἰεν καὶ αὐτοὶ, ἀλλήλων τέ, καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς πρώτοις. διὸ οὐδὲ Ἀγγέλους αὐτοὺς οὗτοι ὡνόμασαν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὁπτασιῶν ἐμνημόνευσαν, τοῖς κρείττοσιν ἦ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς, Ματθαίων καὶ Ἰωάννη, ἄτε δὴ Ἀποστόλοις, τὰ κρείττονα γράφειν καὶ ἴστορεῖν παρακεχωρηκότες, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὰ δεύτερα διηγούμενοι, ἀντανεπλήρουν τὰ παρ' ἐκείνοις σεσιγημένα, ἢ δὴ δεύτερα ἦν καὶ μακρῷ λειπόμενα τῆς τῶν προτέρων ἴστορίας· οὕτω τοῦ Ἅγιου Πνεύματος διανείμαντος τὰς πρεπούσας ἐκάστω καὶ καταλλήλους διηγήσεις.

Αἱ γοῦν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾶ, ὅρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἐλθοῦσαι γυναικες, φέρουσαι ἃ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα, ἔτεραι ἀν εἰεν τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίων καὶ Ἰωάννη· οὐ γάρ ἀν ἔχοι λόγον τὰς τοσαῦτα προτεθεαμένας Μαρίας ἄρτι πρῶτον ἀρώματα φέρειν, ὡς μήπω τὴν ἀνάστασιν μεμαθηκύιας· διὸ εἴποιμεν ἀν ἐτέρας εἶναι τὰς παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ δηλουμένας τῶν πρώτων. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἴστορεῖ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς λέγων, “καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευὴ, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε. Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ γυναικες, αἵτινες ἥσαν συνανεληλυθίαι αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,” καὶ τὰ ἔξης· ἵδον δείκνυσιν ὅτι ἔτεραι ἥσαν αὗται, διὸ καὶ οἱ ὄφθέντες ἔτεροι ἥσαν παρὰ τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν δεδηλωμένους· οὔτε γάρ εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ὑπῆρχον κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην, οὔτε ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον καθεζόμενοι, ὡς ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίων Ἀγγελος. ἄλλως τε δὲ οὐδὲ Ἀγγέλους αὐτοὺς ὡνόμασεν ὁ Λουκᾶς, δύο δὲ ἄνδρας, πλὴν ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ, διὰ τὰ τῆς ἑορτῆς σύμβολα. καὶ οἱ λόγοι δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ πρὸς τὰς γυναικας ἰδιάζουσιν· καὶ γυναικες δὲ πλείους ἥσαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη μόνη, οὐδὲ αἱ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίων Μαρίαι δύο. περὶ δὲ τῆς μιᾶς Μαρίας τῆς παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννη περὶ τὸν ὅρθρον, ἔτι σκοτίας οὖσης ἐπιστάσης τῷ μνήματι, καὶ ἵδούσης τὸν λίθον ἡρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου, ἦν τινα καὶ Μαγδαληνὴν ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς ὄνομάζει, ὑπόνοιά τις ὑπεισέρχεται, ἄλλην τινὰ Μαδαληνὴν εἶναι, μηδὲν τῶν ταῖς δυσὶ Μαρίαις ἐωραμένων, τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίων μνημονευομένων, γινώσκουσαν. εἰ δὲ μία καὶ αὐτή ἐστιν ἡ παρὰ τοῖς

of the festival), and also the young man in Mark, also wearing a white robe for giving the women the bright, propitious good news, would, these too, be different both from each other and from those in the first two. That is why these writers do not call them “angels”, either. They also did not mention the appearances of the Saviour, but stood aside for the more important ones than themselves, Matthew and John, as being apostles, to write the account of the more important matters, while themselves narrating the secondary incidents {...}; they filled in, instead, what those had said nothing about. These were secondary matters indeed, falling far short of the earlier writers’ account in importance. Thus the Holy Spirit assigned to each the appropriately corresponding narratives.

Then the women who, in Luke, came to the tomb in the dawn twilight, and brought the spices they had prepared, would not be the same ones as those in Matthew and John. It would be illogical for the Marys, who had previously witnessed such great things, to be bringing spices only now, as if they had had no{.} information by then about the resurrection. For that reason we would say that the women shown in Luke were different from the earlier ones; the evangelist himself puts that into his account, in the words: “And it was the day of preparation, and sabbath was growing light. Women who had come with him from Galilee followed...” and so on. Look! He is showing that these were different women, and that is why those seen by them are also different from those we have been shown earlier; **they were neither inside the tomb, as in John .}, nor sitting on the stone, like the angel in Matthew. {...}** In any case, Luke did not actually call them “angels” at all, but “two men”, even though they too were in dazzling clothes, because those are indications of the festival; and what they say to the women is also peculiar to Luke. For another thing, **there were more women, not just the one in John, nor the two Marys, as in Matthew.** About the Mary on her own at dawn, in John, because<sup>73</sup> she stood at the tomb in the dark and saw the stone had been removed from the grave,—the Mary that the evangelist calls the Magdalene—a surmise tentatively suggests itself that she is a different Magdalene, knowing nothing about what the two Marys mentioned in Matthew<sup>74</sup> had

---

73. Unless the epitomator, or a copyist, constructed ὅτι with a participle, a finite verb is missing from the text.

74. The words “mentioned in Matthew” are missing from the text printed in Mai’s footnote to p. 265.

Εύαγγελισταῖς ἀμφοτέροις μνημονευομένῃ, προηγεῖσθαι ἀνάγκη τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἱστορίαν τῆς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν Μαγδαληνὴν τὸ πρῶτον μόνην ἐλθοῦσαν, τὸν δύο Ἀγγέλους εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος καθεζομένους ἰδεῖν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δεύτερον ἐπιστᾶσαν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Μαρίας, τὸν ἐπικαθήμενον τῷ λίθῳ Ἀγγελον ἐωρακέναι. Τούτων δὲ τῶν δυοῖν ἐκδοχῶν τὴν προτέραν ἀληθεστέραν εἶναι ἡγοῦμαι, ἔτερας οὕσης τῆς παρὰ Ἰωάννῃ Μαρίας παρὰ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ καν τὸ ἐπίθετον αὐτῇ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ ἐπιγράφηται· δύο γεγονυιῶν ὡς εἰκὸς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Μαγδαληνῆς. τούτου γὰρ δοθέντος, πᾶσα ἀμφισβήτησις λυθήσεται· ἔτερων μὲν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ μνημονευομένων γυναικῶν, ἔτερας δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, καὶ ἔτερου ὄντος καὶ τοῦ Ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον καθεζομένου, καὶ ἔτερων τῶν δύο Ἀγγέλων τῶν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος ὁφθέντων, ἔτερου δὲ καὶ τοῦ χρόνου, ἔτερων δὲ καὶ τῶν λόγων, τοῦ τε Ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ λίθου καθεζομένου, καὶ τῶν Ἀγγέλων τῶν εἴσω τοῦ μνήματος θεωρηθέντων. Κατὰ δὲ τὸν Μάρκον, λίαν πρωῒ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου. ίδον πάλιν ἄλλαι αὗται, καὶ ἐν ἔτέρῳ καιρῷ, αἱ καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· “τίς ἡμῖν ἀποκυλίσει τὸν λίθον;” καὶ ὅτι εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ, ἄνδρες ἀλλ’ οὐκ Ἀγγελοι, οὕτω καὶ νῦν οὐκ Ἀγγελος ὡνόμασται, οὐδὲ ἀνήρ, ἀλλὰ νεανίσκος, ὥστε καὶ ταῦτην ἀφωρισμένην εἶναι τὴν διήγησιν, καὶ τὸν ὁφθέντα ἔτερον, καὶ τὰς ἀφικομένας ἄλλας, καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ὄμοιώς ἄλλον, τὸν μετὰ ἡλίου ἀνατολάς.

Τεσσάρων ὄντων τῶν Εὐαγγελιστῶν, ἵσαριθμοι καὶ αἱ παρ’ αὐτῶν τούτοις ἀναγραφεῖσαι φαίνονται ὄπτασίαι, οἵ τε καιροὶ τέσσαρες, καὶ οἱ καθ’ ἔκαστον καιρὸν ὁφθέντες ἴδιάζοντες, ὄμοιώς δὲ καὶ αἱ θεώμενοι διάφοροι, καὶ οἱ τῶν ὁφθέντων αὐτοῖς λόγοι ἀλλάττοντες. Πρῶτος μὲν γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ “ὅψε σαββάτων” λεγόμενος· τέταρτος δὲ καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἱστορηθεὶς, μέσοι δὲ ὁ τε παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, καὶ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ· καὶ οἱ ὁφθέντες κατὰ καιρὸν ἴδιάζοντες. ἐφάνη μὲν γὰρ ὁψὲ σαββάτων Ἀγγελος εἴς, ἐκτὸς τοῦ μνήματος, καθ’ ὃν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτήρ. ὅρθρου δὲ βαθέως, ἔτεροι, οἱ κατὰ

seen. However, if it is one and the same woman who is mentioned in both evangelists, the account in John must be preferred to that in Matthew, to the effect that it was the same Magdalene who first came on her own and saw the two angels sitting inside the tomb, and then was there again with the other Mary, and saw the angel sitting on the stone. Of these two interpretations, I regard the former as being the truer: that the Mary in John is different from the one in Matthew, even if she is also given the appellation “Magdalene”—there having been, as is quite plausible, two women from the same place, Magdala.<sup>75</sup> That granted, any debate will be resolved: it is one set of women who are mentioned in Matthew, a different woman in John; and the angel sitting on the stone is different from the two angels in John seen inside the tomb. Now, according to Mark “they come to the tomb very early in the morning on the first day of the week, after sunrise”. Look! These are others again, { } on a different occasion. These are the ones who were also saying to themselves: “Who will roll back the stone for us?”. {...} <sup>76</sup> And that they saw a young man—just as in Luke’s case, men not angels—so here too he has not been called “an angel”, nor “a man”, but “a young man”, so that this narrative, too, is distinct:<sup>76</sup> the one seen is different, the woman who came are others, and the occasion is, similarly; { } that is, “after sunrise”<sup>72</sup>

From here to the end, the text is closer to that of Nicetas (Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 7) than to that of *To Marinus* 4, except for the last clause.

**There are four evangelists, and also a corresponding number of appearances to these to be found recorded in them. There are four occasions, and those seen on each occasion are to be distinguished from each other. Similarly, the women who saw them are different; and the words spoken by those they saw vary. First was the occasion in Matthew, described as late in the sabbath; the fourth and final one was the young man recounted in Mark, after sunrise. Between these are those in John and Luke. { } Those seen are peculiar to each occasion: one angel appeared out of the tomb late on the sabbath, after<sup>77</sup> whom the Saviour**

75. Μαγδαλῆς for Μαγδαληνῆς.

76. The ragged syntax of this sentence (<sup>76–76</sup>) suggests some carelessness, but in the previous one “Look!” (ἰδού) seems likely to be what Eusebius wrote.

77. Correcting καθ' ὅν (“according to whom”) to μεθ' ὅν, as in Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 7.

τὸν Λουκᾶν δύο ἄνδρες ὧνομασμένοι, οὐκ εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος ὀφθέντες· ὕστερος ἀπάντων ὁ νεανίσκος, καὶ πρὸ τούτου καὶ τῶν παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ οἱ δύο, οἱ εἰσω τοῦ μνήματος.

Λίαν θαυμάζω καὶ ἐκπλήττομαι τὴν ἄνοιαν τῶν ζητούντων, δι’ ᾧν αἰτίαν ὁ Χριστὸς πρὸ τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη. Εἰ μὲν γάρ φασιν αὐτὸν μηδ’ ὅλως ἐγηγέρθαι, τίνος ἔνεκεν περὶ χρόνου ἀκριβολογοῦνται; Εἰ δ’ ἐγηγέρθαι μὲν, θāττον δὲ ἡ ἐπηγγείλατο, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγηγέρθαι, καὶ τὸ πάντως ἡληθευκέναι αὐτὸν συναποδεδείχθαι νομιζέτωσαν.

Τὸ γάρ ἀδύνατον καὶ ὅν καὶ δοκοῦν, ὅσον πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενειαν, φημὶ, κατορθώσας, οὐκ ἂν περὶ τὸ δυνατὸν ἔξησθένησεν, εἰ καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα τὸ μὲν βραδέως ἀναστῆναι, ἀσθενείας, τὸ δὲ ταχέως, δυνάμεως μεγίστης τεκμήριον καθέστηκεν. Ἐχρῆν μὲν αὐτούς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοὺς μυρίους τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν θεῶν καταλόγους ἀφανίσαι, τά τε εἰδωλεῖα πάντα καταστρέψαι, καὶ τοὺς ἀνοσίους βωμοὺς τοὺς ὑπ’ ἀνθρωπίνων αἴματων φοινισσομένους σβέσαι, καὶ τὸν μὲν διάβολον ἐκνευρίσαι, τοὺς δὲ δαιμόνας φυγαδεῦσαι, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀνήμερα φῦλα τιθασεῦσαι, τοὺς δὲ Ἰουδαίους μεγίσταις συμφοραῖς περιβαλεῖν, καὶ τοὺς πιστεύσαντας αὐτῷ

**himself also. {...}.**<sup>78</sup> **In the dawn twilight there were {.} two others seen, “men” as Luke calls them, not inside the tomb; after all of them, the young man;**<sup>79</sup> and before him, and before those in Luke, there were the two inside the tomb.<sup>79</sup>

Fr.Mar.Supp. 17. Isidore of Pelusium, Letter 212

The entire letter is given here, from Migne, PG 78:651–53. Cf. *To Marinus* 4.5 and 6.

The same material is also found in *Anecdota Matthaei*, pp. 64–65, with a few small variations that do not affect the sense, some of them ungrammatical. All three of the variants recorded by Migne in his edition of Isidore of Pelusium are found in the *Anecdota Matthaei* text.

I am constantly being surprised, and astonished, at the stupidity of people who ask questions about the reason for Christ’s resurrection having taken place in less than the three days. If what they are saying is that the resurrection never actually happened at all, why are they quibbling about timing? But if it is that it did happen, but sooner than he had promised, they should take it as proved, as a corollary of the fact that it happened, that he was telling the complete truth.

He accomplished, I say, something both apparently and actually—as far as human weakness is concerned—impossible; so he would have shown no weakness in a matter that was possible. Even if it were granted that a delay in his resurrection might have been a sign of weakness, its having happened quickly is a sign of the utmost strength. He has deleted the thousands-long lists of Greek gods, demolished all their idol-temples, extinguished their unholy altars constantly crimsoned with human blood, disabled the devil, routed the demons, tamed wild tribes, brought huge disasters down on the Jews, and taken those who have believed in him up to heaven and beyond. Consequently, what they should have been doing

78. This text has inadvertently omitted all the words between the two uses of the phrase “the Saviour himself” in Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 7.

79. This clause “and before him ... tomb” is in *To Marinus* 4 but absent from Fr.Nicetas-Marinus 7. Eusebius’s rather idiosyncratic order of listing the four evangelists’ facts, correctly reproduced by the epitomator in *To Marinus* 4, has evidently confused both this epitomator and the one whose work was used by Nicetas, in different ways.

ύπερ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναγαγεῖν, προσκυνῆσαι τὴν θείαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀήττητον δύναμιν, καὶ μὴ περὶ ὡρῶν διαφέρεσθαι. Τὰ γὰρ μέγιστα καὶ κρείττονα λόγου οὐκ ἄν ύπὸ μικρῶν ἀνατραπείη.

Πλὴν ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ περιουσία πολλὴ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν χωρῆσαι τὸ πρᾶγμα πειράσομαι. Ἀκροβολισμοῦ τοίνυν ἔνεκεν εἰρήσεται πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄρα εἰ̄ χρεώστην τινὰ ἐπαγγειλάμενον τῷ οἰκείῳ δανειστῇ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας πληρώσειν τὸ χρέος, πρὸ τῆς προθεσμίας πληρώσαντα θεασοίμεθα, ὡς ψευσάμενον κρινοῦμεν, ἢ ὡς πλέον ἀληθεύσαντα θαυμασόμεθα; Ἐγώ μὲν οἶμαι τοῦτο, πάντως δὲ καὶ αὐτοί. Τί τοίνυν ἄτοπον, εἰ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἔφησε μὲν τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεσθαι, θάττον δὲ ἀνέστη, ἵν’ ἔαυτοῦ μὲν δείξῃ τὴν δύναμιν, τοὺς δὲ φυλάττοντας νεκρώσῃ, καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπιστομίσῃ; Τὸ μὲν γὰρ θάττον ἀναστῆναι ἔγκλημα οὐκ εἰχε· τὸ δὲ βράδιον, ὑποψίας ἔγεμεν. Ἐχρῆν γὰρ παρακαθημένων αὐτῶν καὶ φυλαττόντων γενέσθαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ὡς εἴγε παρελθουσῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ ἀναχωρησάντων τῶν φυλαττόντων ἐγένετο, ὑποπτὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἔμελλεν εἶναι.

Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀνέστη, πῶς ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι αὐτοῦ τοιαῦτα σημεῖα ἐπετέλεσαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι; Πῶς δ’ οὐκ ἄν εἴεν ἀξιόχρεοι μάρτυρες, οἱ διὰ μυρίων κινδύνων καὶ θανάτων τὴν ἀληθείαν τῆς ἀναστάσεως πιστωσάμενοι, καὶ οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλ’ οἰκείῳ αἵματι τὴν μαρτυρίαν σφραγίσαντες;

Εἰ δὲ καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καταγενέσθαι χρὴ, ἐκεῖνο ἄν εἴποιμι· Τῇ τρίτῃ εἴπεν ἀναστήσεσθαι. Ἐχεις τὴν Παρασκευὴν, ἔχεις τὸ Σάββατον, ἔως δυσμῶν ἥλιου, καὶ μετὰ τὸ Σάββατον ἀνέστη, ἐκατέρων μὲν ἀψάμενος, τὴν δὲ μέσην πληρώσας. Ἐν τρισὶ γὰρ εἴπεν ἀναστήσεσθαι, οὐ μετά τρεῖς ἡμέρας. Λύσατε γὰρ, φησί, τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. Καὶ ὁ προφήτης δὲ προχρησμῶδῶν, Τότε ὁ θάνατος πενθήσει ἰσχυροτέρω θανάτῳ δεθεὶς, ἔλεγεν. Υγιάσει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστησόμεθα, καὶ <ζησόμεθα> ἐν αὐτῷ.

Εἰ δὲ τὸ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας προβάλοιτο, εἴποιμι, ὅτι τῷ

is not quarrelling over times but worshipping his invincible divine power. Things of the highest importance, surpassing reason, are not to be subverted by minor matters.

However, as truth has all the weight on its side, I shall try to proceed to the actual issue. As a preliminary skirmish, the question will be put to them: **If we should see a debtor who has promised his own banker to pay his debt in full after three days, and he has paid it in full before the settlement-day, are we going to judge him as having told a lie or admire him as having told the truth all the more?** The latter, I suppose; and so, certainly, would they. What, then, is wrong if Christ, likewise, said he would rise again on the third day but actually rose more quickly, in order to show his own power, stun the guards, and silence the Jews? An early resurrection was **irreproachable; later, though, was fraught with suspicion.** The resurrection had to take place when they were sitting there on guard, because if it had taken place **after** the days had elapsed and **the guards had gone**, it was likely to be **suspicious.**

On the other hand, if he did not rise again, how did the apostles achieve such miracles in his name? How could they not be trustworthy witnesses, after establishing credence for the truth of the resurrection through myriads of dangers and deaths, sealing their testimony not in ink but in their own blood?

If we must get right down to detail,<sup>80</sup> this is what I would say: "He said he would rise again on the third day. You have the day of preparation; you have the sabbath, till sunset; and after the sabbath he rose again". Thus he overlapped the two outer days, and had the whole of the middle one. It was "in three days" that he said he would rise again, not "after three days". "Destroy this temple", he says, "and I will raise it in three days"; and there is the prophet's prediction: "Then death will mourn, locked in a stronger death.<sup>81</sup> He will heal us after two days; on the third day we shall rise again, and live in him".

If they were to challenge us with "three days and three nights", I would

---

80. The text of *Anecdota Matthaei*, pp. 64–65, here reads ".right down to counting the days...."

81. The source of this first sentence is obscure; the rest is from Hos 6.2.

ἄψασθαι αὐτῶν, πεπλήρωκε τήν ἐπαγγελίαν. Μία γὰρ ἡμέρα λέγεται τὸ τῶν τεσσάρων καὶ εἴκοσι ὥρῶν διάστημα. Καὶ εἴτε ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ, εἴτε ἐν τῇ τελευταίᾳ τούτων τις τεχθείη, ἡ ἄν θάνη, αὕτη αὐτῷ ἡμέρα λογίζεται. οἶον εἰ μέλλοντος ἡλίου δύνειν τεχθείη τις, εἴη δὲ ἐκείνη ἡμέρα πρώτη τοῦ μηνὸς, αὕτη αὐτῷ λογίζεται. Εἰ δὲ καταδύντος ἔτερος τεχθείη, ἡ δευτέρα.

Πῶς οὖν μιᾶς μόνης, τάχα δὲ οὐδὲ μιᾶς ὥρας μεταξὺ γενομένης, ὁ μὲν λέγεται τῇ πρώτῃ, ὁ δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ τετέχθαι; “Οτι πᾶσι δῆλον καθέστηκε καὶ σαφὲς, ὅτι τῷ ἄψασθαι μόνον ὁ μὲν τὸ παρεληλυθός, ὁ δὲ τὸ ἐπιόν, ἡμερονύκτιον ἐπληρώσατο, τὸ διά εἰκοσιτεσσάρων ὥρῶν συμπληρούμενον.

Εἰ τοίνυν καὶ ἡ ἀκριβὴς τῶν χρὸνων κατανόησις τοῦτο βοᾶ, τί μάτην κόπτουσιν ἔαυτοὺς οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν μὴ ἡληθευκέναι ἰσχυριζόμενοι;

say: "By overlapping them, he has fulfilled his promise". The period of twenty-four hours is called "one day"; and whether a person were to be born (or, if he dies) during the first hour or the last, that is the day counted as his. For example, should someone be born just before sunset, and that happened to be the first day of the month, that is counted as his birthday; but should someone be born after sunset, his birthday is the second.

How is one's birthday called the first, and the other's the second, when there is only one hour, or perhaps even less, between them? Because it is clear and obvious to everyone that one of them, by just overlapping part of the previous day, and the other by overlapping the next, has completed a full day-and-night of twenty-four hours.

Well, then, if that is what is shouted aloud by an accurate understanding of chronology, why are those who insist that the truth has not been told cudgelling themselves to no purpose?



## LATIN FRAGMENTS

Translated by David J. D. Miller

The Latin fragments are taken from both *To Stephanus* and *To Marinus*.

## CONTENTS

1. From Ambrose, Commentary on Luke ..... 258
2. Fourteen Fragments from Jerome's Commentary on Matthew..... 294

1. Latent quidem diuina mysteria ..., sed tamen ex ceteris factis atque praeceptis domini salutaris possumus intellegere et hoc perpensionis fuisse consilii, quod ea potissimum lecta est, ut dominum pareret, quae erat desponsata uiro. Cur autem non antequam desponsaretur inpleta est?

Fortasse ne diceretur quod conceperat ex adulterio. ... 2. ... Quin etiam locupletior testis pudoris maritus adhibetur, qui posset et dolere

1. FROM AMBROSE, COMMENTARY ON LUKE<sup>1</sup>

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 304–8, but omitted from Migne, PG 22. The sections, numbered as in Mai, are from Ambrose's work; gaps in the numbering show portions that Mai omitted.<sup>2</sup>

Note: in this fragment, translated from Latin, all but the few most familiar biblical names have been given in the Latin form.

## From Book 2

**1–3.** The divine mysteries are, admittedly, concealed; but still, from the rest of our Saviour Lord's actions and teachings, we can understand that there was also a deliberate purpose in the choice of the woman to give birth to the Lord: specifically, one who was engaged to a husband. Why, though, was she not made pregnant *before* the engagement?

It was perhaps to avoid its being said that her conception was the result of an act of adultery. Moreover, it brings in her husband as a quite substantial witness to her chastity; one who would be able, without realis-

1. The text was edited as Ambrosius, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* (ed. C. Schenkl, CSEL 32.4, 1902). Schenkl was reprinted in Sources Chrétiennes 45 and 52bis (ed. Tissot, 1976) and by M. Adriaen in Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 14 (Brepols, 1957). An English translation was published as *Commentary of Saint Ambrose on the Gospel according to Saint Luke*, translated by Sister Ide M. Ni Riain (Dublin, 2001). The translation was first made using Mai and then revised using Schenkl, whose text is printed opposite, with ... to mark Mai's omissions.\*

2. Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 303, ends the Greek with the following note: “The supplements we have given so far are those in which Eusebius's work is quoted, with approval, specifically as *To Marinus*. In the following pages we shall show, at least partially, the extent to which the Eusebian *Problems*, both *To Stephanus* and *To Marinus*, are preserved in St. Ambrose's commentary on the Gospel of Luke and also in Jerome's on Matthew. Also to be consulted are Augustine's *Agreement of the Gospels* and *Gospel Problems*; the anonymous *Problems of Old and New Testaments*; pseudo-Chrysostom, or Titus of Bostra; and John of Thessalonica, also on *Gospel Problems*. All these writers seem to have drawn, in many and copious ways, from the Eusebian well. In the preface, we have reviewed many more of those who have probably plundered, or at least imitated, the Eusebian *Problems*, and it is from these ancient writers that both mediaeval and modern commentators have felt free to derive their solutions.”

iniuriam et uindicare obprobrium, si non agnosceret sacramentum. Quid quod etiam fides Mariae uerbis maior adsciscitur et mendacii causa remouetur? Uideretur enim culpam obumbrare uoluisse mendacio innupta praegnas. Causam autem mentiendi indesponsata habuit, desponsata non habuit, cum coniugii praemium et gratia nuptiarum partus sit feminarum. 3. Non mediocris quoque causa est, ut uirginitas Mariae falleret principem mundi, qui cum desponsatam uiro cerneret, partum non potuit habere suspectum. Fallendi autem principis mundi fuisse consilium ipsius domini uerba declarant, cum apostoli iubentur tacere de Christo, cum sanati prohibentur gloriari de remedio, cum daemones praecipiuntur silere de dei filio.<sup>1</sup>

1. De generationibus dicturi, quarum nonnullam uidemus in euangelio secundum Matthaeum uel in hoc, cuius interpretationem habemus in manibus, esse distantiam,

quoniam non est credibile aduersantia sibi sanctos uiros potuisse dicere, de gestis praesertim domini salutaris, quanto studio possumus non dixisse eos discrepantia demonstremus.

3. Cur autem Ioseph magis quam Mariae generatio describatur, cum Maria de sancto spiritu generauerit Christum et Ioseph a generatione domini uideatur alienus, dubitare possemus, nisi consuetudo nos instrueret scripturarum, quae semper uiri originem quaerit. Sic enim habes: Phares fuit filius Iuda principis tribus. *Hic generauit Esrom et Esrom generauit Aram et Aram generauit Aminadab et Aminadab generauit Naasson....* Uiri enim persona quaeritur, qui etiam in senatu et

---

1. QSt. 1.\*

ing the mystery, to resent injustice and free her from opprobrium.<sup>3</sup> And what about the further point that greater credibility is gained for what Mary had to say, and any motive for lying is removed? If she were pregnant without a husband, it would look as if she had wanted to cover up guilt by lying. Without a fiancé,<sup>4</sup> she would have had a motive for telling a lie; but with one, she had no such motive, as giving birth is a woman's reward for marriage—the blessing conferred by her wedding. There is also the not unimportant purpose of preventing the prince of this world from being aware of Mary's virginity: seeing her engaged to a husband, he could not be suspicious about the birth. That the deception of the prince of this world was intended is shown by the Lord's own words when the apostles are told to say nothing about Christ, when the healed are forbidden to brag about their cure, and when the devils are commanded to be silent about the Son of God.

### From Book 3

**1.** We are about to speak of the genealogies, on which we observe a considerable difference in the gospel according to Matthew or in Luke, the commentary on whom we have at present in hand.

As it is not to be believed that the holy men could have made mutually conflicting statements, especially in the record of our Lord and Saviour, let us use our best endeavours to show that their statements are not discrepant.

**3.** Given that Mary was Christ's mother by the Holy Spirit, and that Joseph is seen as unconnected with the Lord's birth, we could be perplexed about why it is that Joseph's descent is put down rather than Mary's, were it not for scriptural custom, which informs us that it is always the man's descent that is in question. You have, for instance: "Phares was the son of Judas, the chief of the tribe; he was Esrom's father, Esrom was Aram's, Aram was Aminadab's, Aminadab was Naasson's," and so on; it is the man's

3. That is, even if he did not know the true reason for her pregnancy, he could protect her from being unjustly defamed, for losing her virginity without being married or having the definite prospect of marriage.

4. We owe the correct reading here to Schenkl's edition; Mai's "causam autem mentiendi indesponsata non habuit, cum..." makes nonsense of the argument.

reliquis curiis ciuitatum generis adserit dignitatem. Quam deforme autem, si relicta uiri origine origo feminae quaereretur, ut uideretur patrem non habuisse ille totius mundi populis praedicandus!

4. <sup>2</sup> Sed etiam alibi diuerso ordine generationem doceamus esse decursam, ne hic quoque euangelistae discrepare uideantur, qui ueterem ordinem sunt secuti. Sic enim habes: *fuit homo ex Arath, et nomen eius Elcana, filius Hieremiel, filius Heli, filius Ozi.* Uides et a patribus ad filios et a filiis ad patres originis descriptionem uetere more contextam, uides ubique familiam per uirorum generationes esse decursam: noli mirari si Matthaeus ab Abraham usque ad Ioseph, Lucas a Ioseph usque ad Adam et deum generationum ordinem percucurrit. <sup>3</sup>Noli mirari quod Ioseph origo descripta est. Etenim secundum carnem natus usum debuit sequi carnis et qui in saeculum uenit saeculi debuit more describi, maxime cum in Ioseph origine etiam origo sit Mariae. Nam cum uir iustus fuerit Ioseph, utique ex tribu sua et ex patria sua accepit uxorem nec potuit iustus facere contra id quod lege praescriptum est. Sic enim habes quia unusquisque in hereditatem tribus suae patriae adhaerebunt filii Israhel nec de tribu ad tribum transibunt et omnis filia, quae habet hereditatem tribuum filiorum Israhel, uni ex populo et ex tribu patris sui erit uxor. Itaque et census tempore ascendit Ioseph de domo et de patria Dauid, ut profiteretur cum Maria uxore sua. Quae ex eadem domo et ex eadem patria professionem defert, utique eiusdem tribus et eiusdem patriae se esse designat.

5. Cognata quoque Mariae inducitur Elisabet, primo quod omnes Iudaei cognati, quemadmodum et apostolus docuit dicens: *optabam enim anathema esse ipse pro fratribus meis cognatis secundum carnem, qui sunt Israhelitae.* Cognatae ergo, quia ambae Israhelitae erant, simul et cognatae,

---

2. QSt. 2.\*

3. QSt. 1.\*

person that is in question. That is also what establishes a family's status in the senate, and in the governing bodies of other cities. How unseemly, then, would it be for the man's descent to be left aside and the woman's researched, making it look as if the One who was to be preached to the peoples of the whole world had no father!

4. To preclude another possible impression that the evangelists were in disagreement, let us also explain that this is not the only place in which a genealogy has been run through in the opposite direction; they were following ancient practice. For example, you have: "There was a man of Arath, and his name was Elcana, son of Hieremiel, son of Heli, son of Ozi". You see that there is ancient precedent for the compiling of genealogies from sons to fathers, as well as from fathers to sons, and you see that the family is in all cases taken along through the male line; do not be surprised if Matthew runs through the line of descent from Abraham downwards to Joseph, but Luke from Joseph upwards to Adam and God; do not be surprised that it is Joseph's descent that is recorded. After all, One born after the flesh ought to follow the usage of the flesh, and he who came into the world ought to be recorded in the world's way. This is especially so considering that Mary's descent is also contained in Joseph's. Since Joseph was an upright man, that meant that he must have taken a wife from his own tribe and homeland; he could not act uprightly against what was laid down by the law. Similarly, you also have it that the sons of Israel, every one of them, will adhere to the inheritance of his homeland's tribe, and will not cross over from one tribe to another; and that every daughter with an inheritance in the tribes of the children of Israel will be the wife of a man from her father's people and tribe. Thus, at the time of the census, Joseph, "from the house and homeland of David, went up to make his declaration with his wife Mary": a woman who gives in her declaration "from the same house and the same homeland" must be marking herself as belonging to the same tribe and the same homeland.

5. Further, Elisabeth is presented as a kinswoman of Mary's. This is, firstly, because all Jews are related, as the apostle has told us in the words: "I would have wanted to be accursed for the sake of my brothers, related according to the flesh, who are the Israelites". Thus they are related as being both Israelite women; at the same time, they are related as being both from the tribe of Judas. You have learnt that Mary was from the tribe

quia ambae erant ex tribu Iuda. Didicisti ex tribu Iuda Mariam, disce et Elisabet. Nam *exsurgens Maria in diebus illis abiit in montana cum festinatione in ciuitatem inquit Iudae et intravit in domum Zacchariae*. Cum enim iuxta tribus suas Moyses habitare unumquemque praescripserit, utique cum in ciuitate Iudae manserit, erat et in tribu Iuda, maxime cum ex genere Elisabet fuerint sacerdotes, quorum deus portio est. Simul quam pulchrum, ut cum illa praenuntium Christi, Christum ista generauerit et altera de sancto spiritu conceperit, altera sancto repleta spiritu prophetauerit, secundum carnem quoque uideantur fuisse cognatae quae secundum deum spiritualis cognitionis consortio non carebant!

Quodsi omnis feminae caput uir secundum sanctum apostolum et sunt duo in carne una secundum legem diuinam, utique hi qui una caro erant et unus spiritus qui poterat fieri ut uiderentur patriam et tribum habere diuisam? Accedit illud quod etiam angelus Gabrihel de domino praenuntiauerit quod *dabit illi dominus sedem Dauid patris sui*. Certum est igitur etiam Mariam de Dauid generatione manasse.

6. Simul etiam discimus nihil referre quo ordine generationis series exprimatur, cum iter hinc atque inde sit peruium. Cur autem sanctus Matthaeus ab Abraham generationem enumerare cooperit Christi, sanctus uero Lucas a Christo usque ad deum perduxerit explanandum uidetur. Sed prius cur sanctus Matthaeus, cum ab Abraham cooperit generationis ordinem, non ita posuerit : 'liber generationis Abrahae' sed: *liber generationis Iesu Christi, fili Dauid, fili Abraham* et cur hos duos potissimum nominauerit nequaquam praetereundum puto. Non enim otiose fidelissimi auctores generis eliguntur, ut intellegamus quod in ipsa generatione carnis spiritualis magis successio requiratur; duo sunt enim isti uiri, in quos manauerunt promissa diuina.

of Judas; learn that so too was Elisabeth.<sup>5</sup> “For Mary arose in those days and went away with haste to the hill country, to a town,” he says, “of Judas, and entered the house of Zachariah.” Since Moses commanded every person to live within their own tribes, Elisabeth must inevitably, given that she was still in a town of Judas, have been in the tribe of Judas—especially as there were priests, whose “portion is God”, in her family. At the same time, what a fine thing it is, when one woman was the mother of Christ’s forerunner and the other of Christ, and when one conceived by the Holy Spirit and the other was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, that these women, who in divine terms were not without a spiritual relationship, should also be seen as related in human terms!

If, according to the apostle, every woman’s head is her husband, and under divine law they are two people in one flesh, then how could those who were one flesh and one spirit possibly be seen as having a separate homeland and tribe? There is also the fact that the angel Gabriel, too, announced: “The Lord will give him the throne of his father David”. It is thus certain that Mary, as well as Joseph, was descended from David’s line.

6. At the same time we also learn that it makes no difference in which order the line of descent is expressed, as a route can be traversed in both directions. However, what does seem to need explanation is why St Matthew began his list of Christ’s genealogy from Abraham, whereas St Luke took his on from Christ to God—but, before that, why St Matthew, in beginning his genealogical list from Abraham, did not put “The book of the descent from Abraham”, but “The book of the descent of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham”; and I think I should certainly not omit the question of why he particularly mentioned those two. It is not for nothing that it is those who had the greatest faith who are chosen as the founders of the race; it is so that we may understand that even in a descent according to the flesh, a succession according to the Spirit is the more important requisite: those are the two men to whom the divine promises came down.

---

5. Mai’s note: “Ambrose here differs somewhat from Eusebius, whose opinion is nevertheless the truer, that Elisabeth was from the tribe of Levi, as she was a priest’s wife.” He refers for Eusebius’s opinion to a scholion on Luke, Fr.St. 14.

7. Prior Abraham, qui ante Moysi legem et ante populum Iudeorum propria derelinquens, cognoscens deum meruit fidei testimonium, quia *credidit deo et reputatum est ei ad iustitiam*, qui etiam a deo accepit oraculum dicente sibi: *exi de terra tua... et benedicentur in te omnes tribus terrae*. Vides ergo congregations gentium et sacrosanctae ecclesiae coetum oraculo diuino huic primo esse promissum. Et ideo is auctor generis debuit designari, qui instauranda ecclesiae sponzionem primus emeruit.

8. Dauid quoque merito et ipse auctor generis declaratur, quia cum iureirando responsum quod ex ipso secundum carnem Christus futurus esset accepit; sic enim scriptum est: *iurauit dominus Dauid ueritatem, et non paenitebit eum: ex fructu uentris tui ponam super sedem meam et alibi : semel iurauit in sancto meo, si Dauid mentiar; semen eius in aeternum manebit, et sedes eius sicut sol in conspectu meo et in Paralipomenis... etc.* Per Esaiam quoque ...<sup>4</sup>

9. Omnia conuenire de Christo euidentibus signatur oraculis, nec posse diuinae fructum potentiae ad Salomonis gratiam deriuari, qui Dauid filius fuit, cuius finis haud dubie cognoscitur; ... Numquid in saeculum regnauit Salomon, qui annis tantummodo quadraginta regnauit? *Ego ero inquit ei in patrem et ille mihi in filium — quis est ille proprius dei filius nisi cui dictum est: filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te?* ... At uero Salomonem errasse ideo fortasse tam grauiter, ne errarent homines et ad ipsum crederetur manasse promissum, diuinorum serie cognouimus lectionum: aedificauit enim templum Astartae idolo propter amorem mulieris et indignatus est dominus in Salomonem. ... uides quoniam promissi series Christum spondit.

---

4. The biblical quotations have been abbreviated as in Mai's edition.\*

7. The earlier is Abraham. Before the law of Moses, and before the people of Israel, he abandoned what was his own and, for acknowledging God, earned the testimonial to his faith that “he believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness”. He also received a prophecy from God, who told him: “Leave your land, … and all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in you”. So you see that it was first to him that the gatherings of the nations and the assembly of the holy church were promised, by the divine prophecy. That was why it was right for him to be designated the founder of the line; it was he who was the first to deserve the promise of the new foundation of the church.

8. David, too, is deservedly declared to be another founder of the line, because he received, with an oath, the response that according to the flesh, Christ would be born “from him”. This is the text: “The Lord swore the truth to David, and he will not repent: ‘I will set upon my<sup>6</sup> throne one from the fruit of your loins’”, and in another place: “I have sworn once on my holiness; if I should lie to David…! His seed will remain for ever, and his throne be like the sun in my sight”. In Chronicles also, … etc. By Isaiah, also … etc.<sup>7</sup>

9. It is manifest from the plain prophecies that they all refer to Christ, and that the fulfilment of the divine power cannot be deflected in favour of Solomon. He was David’s son, but his end is known for certain. Solomon did not reign “for ever”, did he? He reigned for just forty years. “I will be to him as a father,” he says, “and he will be to me as a son”; who is it that is God’s own Son, but the One to whom it was said: “You are my son, today I have begotten you”? No! The very reason why we have found, from reading the scriptures in sequence, that Solomon went so seriously astray, is perhaps to avoid people’s going astray in the belief that it was to him that the prophecies come down: for love of a woman, he built a temple for the idol of Astarte, and God “was angry with Solomon”. You see that it was Christ who was pledged by the successive stages of the promise.

6. Here and in the same quotation in section 42, p. 282, Schenkl and Tissot both print *meam* “my”, though Tissot translates “ton” (“your”). Mai’s reading is *tuam* (“your”), in line with the biblical text of Ps. 132.11.

7. Mai’s note: “I had guessed long ago, in my first edition (102 n. 1), that if a more complete text of Eusebius should one day be found, these passages from Chronicles and Isaiah would also be to be seen in Eusebius’s text; we now see that that did in fact happen, in the fuller fragments of Eusebius p. 274” (Fr.St. 9–10).

10. Et ideo istos duo generis auctores euangelista de legit, unum qui promissum accepit de congregatione populorum, alterum qui de generatione Christi oraculum consecutus est. Et ideo licet ordine sit successionis posterior, prior tamen quam Abraham in domini generatione describitur, quia plus est promissum accepisse de Christo quam de ecclesia, quoniam ecclesia ipsa per Christum. Ergo unus princeps generis secundum carnem, alter princeps generis secundum spiritum, alter secundum seminis gratiam, alter secundum populorum fidem ; potior enim qui saluat eo qui saluatur. ...

11. Unde et Lucas ad deum putauit originem eius esse referendam, quod uerus Christi generator deus sit uel secundum ueram generationem pater uel secundum lauacri regenerationem mystici auctor muneris. Et ideo non a primo generationem eius coepit describere, sed posteaquam baptismum eius explicuit, auctorem omnium deum per baptismum cupiens demonstrare, Christum quoque a deo ordine manasse successionis adseruit ...

12. Hic quoque aliqui solent serere quaestiones, quod Matthaeus ab Abraham usque ad Christum quadraginta duas generationes enumerauerit, Lucas uero quinquaginta, et quod per alias personas Matthaeus, per alias Lucas generationem manasse descripserit. In quo iam potes illud probare quod diximus quia, cum alios Matthaeus maiores dominici generis, alios uero Lucas in ordine generationis texuerit, ab Abraham tamen et Dauid reliquos auctores generis uterque signauit.

13. Quod uero per Salomonem Matthaeus generationem deriuandam putauit, Lucas uero per Natham, alteram regalem, alteram sacerdotalem Christi familiam uidetur ostendere. Quod non ita accipere debemus, quod alterum altero uerius, sed alter alteri pari fide et ueritate concordet. Fuit enim uere et secundum carnem regalis et sacerdotalis familiae, rex ex regibus, sacerdos ex sacerdotibus. Licet oraculum non de carnalibus, sed de caelestibus exprimatur, ...

**10.** That is why the evangelist chose these two as the founders of the line: they are the one who received the promise of the gathering of the nations, and the one who obtained the prophecy of Christ's being from his line. That, too, is the reason why, despite his coming later in order of succession, David is put before Abraham in the genealogy. It is a greater thing to have received the promise of the Christ than of the church, the church itself being through Christ. Therefore one is chief of the line according to the flesh, and one is chief of the line according to the Spirit; one by virtue of his seed, the other by the faith of the nations. The One who saves has precedence over the one who is saved.

**11.** That is also why Luke thought his origin should be taken back to God, as God is the true progenitor of Christ, his father whether in the sense of true generation, or as the giver of the mystic gift in the regeneration of immersion. It is also for that reason that Luke does not begin by giving the genealogy at the outset: it is only after presenting the baptism that, wishing to show that through baptism God is the Creator of all, he put the fact that Christ also was descended from God in line of succession.

**12.** At this point some usually bring up the problems that Matthew listed forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ, but Luke fifty; and that Matthew recorded the descent by way of one set of persons, Luke through another. In this you can now test the validity of what we have said, because although Matthew wrote of one set of ancestors of the Lord's line, and Luke, in his order of the generations, a different set, they each designate the remaining founders of the line from Abraham and David.

**13.** In the fact that Matthew thought the genealogy should be taken through Solomon, but Luke through Nathan, it can be seen that one is showing the royal family, and the other the priestly one.<sup>8</sup> We should not take it that one is truer than the other, but that they are in harmony with each other, with equal trustworthiness and truth. Even though the prophecy is expressed as being about heavenly matters, not physical ones, he truly was, physically as well, of both a royal and a priestly family: a king from kings, and a priest from priests.

---

8. This interpretation is strongly contradicted by the extract from Africanus transmitted as *To Stephanus* 4.

14. Nec mireris si ab Abraham plures secundum Lucam successiones usque ad Christum sunt, pauciores secundum Matthaeum, cum per alias personas generationem fatearis esse decursam; potest enim fieri ut alii longaeuam transegerint uitam, alterius uero generationis uiri inmatura aetate decesserint, cum uideamus conplures senes cum suis nepotibus uiuere, alios uero uiros statim filiis obire susceptis.

15. Illud quoque aduertimus, quod sanctus Matthaeus Iacob, qui fuit pater Ioseph, filium Matthan esse memorauerit, Lucas uero Ioseph, cui desponsata erat Maria, filium Heli, Heli autem filium Melchi esse descripsерit. Quomodo unius duo patres, id est Heli et Iacob? Quomodo etiam duo paterni aui, Matthan et Melchi? Sed si sequaris, inuenies quod iuxta praescriptum legis ueteris duo fratres diuersos filios uterinos ex una uxore generauerint. Traditur enim Matthan, qui a Salomone genus duxit, Iacob generasse filium et uxore superstite decessisse, quam postea Melchi accepit uxorem, ex qua generatus est Heli. Rursus Heli fratre sine liberis decadente copulatus est fratris uxori et generauit filium Ioseph, qui iuxta legem Iacob filius dicitur, quoniam semen fratris defuncti frater iuxta legis ueteris seriem suscitabat. Ita duorum filius dictus est, ...

16. Non absurdum autem uidetur quod ... quater denas generationes diuidendas sanctus Matthaeus putauit, ab Abraham usque ad Dauid, a Dauid usque ad transmigrationem Babylonis, a transmigratione Babylonis usque ad Christum, in quo uices mutationum pariter designauit. Ab Abraham enim usque ad Dauid tempora sine regibus fuit populus Iudeorum — regnum enim iustum a Dauid coepit — deinde per reges actum genus omne est Iudeorum et intemerata usque ad transmigrationem eorum regna manserunt; post transmigrationem uero in occasum degenerantis populi nobilitas circumcisa uergebat. ...

17. Plerique etiam mirantur cur Thamar mulieris famosae, ut illis uidetur, Matthaeus commemorationem in dominica generatione contexen-

**14.** Nor should you be surprised if there are more stages of succession from Abraham to Christ according to Luke, and fewer according to Matthew, given that you admit that the genealogy runs through different persons. It can be that some lived a long life, but men in the other line died young. As we can see, a number of the old are still alive along with their grandsons, while other men die immediately after they have had their sons.

**15.** We also observe that St Matthew gave Joseph's father Jacob as the son of Matthan, but Luke wrote that Joseph, to whom Mary was engaged, was the son of Heli, and Heli of Melchi. So, how can one man have two fathers, Heli and Jacob? And how two paternal grandfathers, Matthan and Melchi? However, should you follow it up, you will find that, in accordance with the provision of the ancient law, there were two separate uterine brothers, fathered by two brothers from the one wife. The tradition is that Matthan, descended from Solomon, had a son, Jacob, and died survived by his wife; Melchi subsequently married her, and had by her a son, Heli. Heli, in turn, when his brother died without issue, married his brother's wife and fathered a son, Joseph, who is legally called the son of Jacob. This is because, by succession under the ancient law, a brother "raised up the seed" of his deceased brother. Thus there were two men of whom he was called the son.

**16.** It does not seem unreasonable for St Matthew to have thought the generations should be divided up into sets of fourteen<sup>9</sup> (from Abraham to David, from David to the Babylonian exile, and from the Babylonian exile to Christ), in doing which he has assigned equal numbers of successions. From Abraham to David the Jewish people had no kings; the kingdom proper started with David.<sup>10</sup> After that the whole Jewish race was governed by kings, and their rule lasted unbroken until the exile. After the exile, as the people was sinking towards its fall, the nobility of the circumcision was in decline.

**17.** Another thing that surprises some is why Matthew thought that mention of Thamar, a woman they regard as infamous, should be included

---

9. The text reads "quater denas", which should mean "forty" (four sets of ten). The translation takes the required figure as "quaternas denas".

10. Mai's note states: "This detail is absent in Eusebius; it is apparently a gloss of Ambrose's."

dam putauerit, cur etiam Ruth, cur eius quoque mulieris, quae Uriae uxor fuit et occiso marito in Dauid nuptias conmigravit, cum praesertim Sarrae et Rebeccae et Rachel, sanctorum feminarum, nusquam fecerit mentionem. ...

18. Primum enim si ueris intendas animum, non haec mulier [Thamar] tam famosa quam iusta; non enim temporalis usum libidinis requisiuit, sed successionis gratiam concupiuit; erat enim deforme liberos non habere, quod etiam legum ciuilium fuit auctoritate multatum. Promiserat eam filio suo Iudas et diu pactarum foedera distulerat nuptiarum. Per moram promissi defunctus est sponsus. ... Dolens se sine filiis remansisse dolum studio generationis commenta est et Iudam consilio praeuertit, ut se eidem offerret ornatam, posteaquam defunctam eius cognouit uxorem. Uides ubique mulieris uitam probari, quod non alienum praeripuit torum, non meretricio studio quasi meretrix ornata est; non enim uagam captauit libidinem, sed diu socii fraudata promissis ex ea familia quam delegerat conuerso dolo fructum uoluit successionis adipisci. Quis itaque castior? Illa quae tamdiu exspectauit promissum an ille qui amorem ferre non potuit oblatum? Illa quae sponsi familiam non refugit an iste qui meretricem putauit? Illa quae horam sui corporis uolentibus non permisit ad copulam an iste qui quod studio coepit erroris ad successionis gratiam castitate mulieris consummauit? ... Denique ipse confessus est dicens: *iustificata est magis Thamar quam ego, propter quod non dedi eam Selom filio meo.* ... Denique numquam postea uirum experta est, ... ille unius horae inpatiens, qui annos a puella exegerat castitatis, ... etc.

19. Sed non ita istam defendimus, ut illum accusemus — immo utrumque excusemus, non autem nos — sed mysterium quod copulae illius fructus expressit; generauit enim mulier Phares et Zara filios, generauit geminos. Unde non otiose Matthaeus utrumque significauit, cum Phares tantummodo commemorationem causa deposceret; *Phares enim genuit Esrom, Esrom genuit Aram,* deinde per ordinem singuli. Cur autem, cum Isaac duos generauerit, Iacob plures, singulorum tantummodo, quos

in the Lord's genealogy. Why of Ruth, too? and why also of the woman who was Uriah's wife and who, after her husband was killed, went over to marriage with David?—particularly as he nowhere made any mention of the holy women Sara, Rebecca and Rachel.

**18.** For one thing, if you put your mind to the true facts, this woman Thamar was upright, rather than infamous. It was not the enjoyment of a transient pleasure that she sought; what she wanted was the gift of progeny. Childlessness was a disgrace. Judas had promised her to his son, and for a long time had put off the solemnisation of the wedding he had agreed on. During his delay in fulfilling the promise, her fiancé died. Distressed by being still without sons, she decided on a ruse, in her eagerness for motherhood; after discovering that his wife had died, she outdid Judas by the strategy of offering herself to him, dressed up. You see that her life is irreproachable at all points: she did not usurp another woman's marriage-bed; it was not for any desire for prostitution that she dressed as a prostitute, because it was no stray passion that she was after. What she wanted, after being for long cheated of her father-in-law's promises, was to turn the deception back on him and win offspring to succeed her, from the family she had chosen. So who was the more chaste: the woman who had so long awaited what had been promised, or the man who could not withstand love when it was offered him? The woman who did not shun her fiancé's family, or the man who thought she was a prostitute? The woman who refused her own body in its prime to those who wished to bond with her, or this man who, thanks to her chastity, completed for the gift of progeny what he had begun out of a desire for wrongdoing? In the end he admitted that himself, by saying: "Thamar is proved more upright than I, because I did not give her to my son Selom". Finally, she never again had to do with a man; he, who had demanded years of celibacy from the girl, could not control himself for a single hour..., etc.

**19.** We are not, however, defending her in such a way as to accuse him; rather, we are to excuse them both—though not we, but the mystery expressed by the fruit of that union. The sons to whom she gave birth were Phares and Zara; she gave birth to twins. Hence it was not for nothing that Matthew named them both, though his purpose demanded mention only of Phares, because Phares was Esrom's father, Esrom was Aram's, then one by one down the line of succession. Now, why, if it were not that there is a mystery about them both, did the scriptural list mention them both, when

successionis dominicae causa poscebat, fecit scripturae series mentionem, horum autem utrumque memorauit nisi quia hic in utroque mysterium est?

20. Tractauimus moralem locum, ... tractemus historicum et mysticum ... cum generaret Thamar, legisti quia unus de utero eius praemisit manum, quam corripiens obstetrix coccum ligauit dicens: *hic exiet prior*. Ut autem reuocauit manum puer in matris uterum, statim exiuit frater eius. Dixit autem obstetrix: *quid incisa est per te saepis?* et uocauit nomen eius Phares. Et post ipsum exiuit frater eius, in cuius manu erat coccum, et uocauit nomen eius Zara. Uides quanta aenigmata mysterium prodant: ...

21. Cur autem alter manum praemisit ex utero, alter genitali praecessit exortu nisi quia per geminorum mysterium gemina describitur uita populorum, una secundum legem, altera secundum fidem, una secundum litteram, altera secundum gratiam? Prior gratia quam lex, prior fides quam littera. Et ideo gratiae typus manum ante praemisit, quia gratiae actus ante praecessit, qui fuit in Iob Melchisedech Abraham Isaac Jacob, qui per fidem sine lege uiuebant; *credidit enim Abraham deo, et reputatum est ei ad iustitiam*. ... praeuenientes enim legem patriarchae sancti praescriptorum uinculis absoluti libera et consimili nobis euangelii gratia fulserunt.

22. ... Prior enim Zara, qui interpretatione significatur oriens; lux enim pietatis ueri splendor orientis est, illius utique qui dixit: *oriens nomen est mihi*, cuius in patriarchis primitus radius lucis inluxit. Hi enim primi uitae suae actum in hoc saeculo praemiserunt, ... Sed media tamquam saepis obiecta legis est obseruatio et quodammodo uita maiorum uidetur incisa, ...

in the case of Isaac, who had two sons, and of Jacob, who had several, it made mention only of the individuals demanded for the purpose of the Lord's descent?

**20.** We have dealt with a moral topic; let us deal with a historical and mystical one. You have read that while Thamar was giving birth, one boy put his hand out from her womb first and the midwife caught hold of it, tied scarlet on it, and said: "This one will come out first"—but he pulled his hand back into his mother's womb, and at once his brother came out. Then the midwife said: "Why was the barrier breached by you?" and gave him the name Phares. His brother, on whose hand was the scarlet, came out after him, and she gave him the name Zara. You see what great enigmas reveal the mystery ... etc.

**21.** Now, why was it that one put his hand out of the womb first, and the other preceded him in the order of their birth, if not because what is being portrayed in the mystery of the twins is the life of the twin peoples? One is the life according to the law, the other that according to faith; one according to the letter, the other according to grace. Grace is before the law, faith is before the letter. And the reason that the type of grace put his hand out first is that grace's way of life, the one which was in Job, Melchisedech, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who lived by faith without the law, came first and foremost. "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness;" because the holy patriarchs, coming before the law and unfettered by the bonds of its commandments, shone with a free grace, like us.

**22.** Zara, translated to mean "rising" [or "east"], was first, because the light of religion is the splendour of the true rising,<sup>11</sup> that is, of course, of the One who said: "My name is the Rising"; that was the light whose ray shone first of all in the patriarchs, for they were the first to make their way of life in this world pre-eminent. But observance of the law was thrust in between, like a barrier, and the life of the ancestors seems to have been in some way breached ... etc.

---

11. Mai's note: "Ambrose seems to have read Eusebius's words φωτὸς γὰρ εὐσέβειας αἱ πρῶται τῆς ἀνατολῆς αἱγαῖ ("because the earliest beams of the rising of the light of religion...") somewhat differently."

24. ... Itaque posteaquam manum reduxit, quasi incisione facta saepis exiuit frater eius, quem quasi medium parietem saepis uel mace- riae apostolus nominauit atque ipse de incisione nomen accepit; Phares enim diuisio est. Unde et Pharisaei nuncupati, eo quod a multorum se coniunctionibus separarent. Beatus autem et multo melius fuisse non incidi saepem, sed unam eandem et indiuiduam permanere, quod fieri potuit, si ei uitae, quae prior manum misit, hoc est actum ostendit suum, consequens fuisse eius uitae militia, quae secuta est. Multo enim melius, si circumcisus populus uitam maiorum uoluisset imitari; sie enim fuisse una saepis, una maceria, una aedificatio priorum ac sequentium. Sed quia primum illum uitae actum posterioris infirmitas non potuit inplere, incisione sine dubio facta saepis eius siue maceriae, quae secundum deum aedificata erat, tamquam medius paries interiectus est, ...

26. Ergo dominus Iesus, qui postea secundum carnem uenit in lucem, ueteris illius munitionem saepis instaurans in maiorum nos actum et antiquam simplicitatem fidei reformauit. Unde de eo et propheta dixit: *uocaberis aedificator saepis.* Tulit enim illum obicem, qui unitatem mentis et corporis seriemque uitae simplicis diuidebat, atque *ipse* factus est *pax nostra qui fecit utraque unum et medium parietem saepis soluens.* Quem parietem exponit apostolus inimicitias esse in carne. Has ergo inimicitias tulit dominus et pacem refudit legemque mandatorum in decretis euacuauit, ... dominus enim sabbati superstitionem tulit sabbati corporalis, et quasi medium soluit legis parietem, qui nos ab ea pietate, quae secundum deum est, decretorum difficultate prohibebat, eo quod iuxta Moysi legem non erat facile atque possibile gentibus militare deo, cum inanis superstitione Iudeorum purum affectum gentium a subeunda obseruatione reuocaret.

29. ... Hic est dominus, cuius in Zara typus ante praecessit, eo quod ex tribu et ex semine illius Zarae dominus Iesus secundum carnem non

**24.** So, after he pulled back his hand, his brother came out, as if a breach had been made in the barrier. The apostle called him the central partition, as it were, of the barrier or wall, and it is from that breach that he received his name: *phares* means “a division”, and that is also the derivation of the name “Pharisees”, because they were separating themselves from associations with the many. It would have been more blessed, and much better, for the barrier not to have been breached, but to have gone on remaining one and the same, undivided; and that could have happened, if the service of the life that followed had been in accordance with the life that first put out its hand—i.e. showed its way of life. Much better, had the people of the circumcision wished to copy the life of its ancestors; for thus there would have been one barrier, one wall, one building consisting of the earlier people and those who followed. But, because the later one’s weakness could not fulfil that first way of life, there was definitely a breach made in the barrier or wall that had been built according to God, as if a partition had been interposed in the middle.

**26.** Therefore the Lord Jesus, who according to the flesh came afterwards to the light, restored the defence-work of that ancient barrier and formed us again into the ancestors’ way of life and their original simplicity of faith. That is why the prophet, too, said of him: “You will be called the builder of the barrier”, because he moved the bar which was breaking the unity of mind and body, and the course of the straightforward life. “He himself became our peace, who made the two sides one” and “undoing the central partition of the barrier.” The apostle explains that this partition is the hostility in the flesh. Therefore the Lord has removed this hostility and restored peace, and has abolished the law of commandments in ordinances. As Lord of the sabbath, he has removed the superstition of the corporeal sabbath, and as it were undone the dividing partition of the law, which was barring us by the difficulty of the commandments from the religion which is according to God. That was because under Moses’ law it was not easy, not possible, for the nations to serve God, since the pointless superstition of the Jews was restraining the nations’ uncontaminated frame of mind from submitting to its observance.

**29.** This is the Lord whose type, in Zara, came first and foremost, because it was from the tribe and seed of that Zara that the Lord Jesus was

solum a femina, sed etiam sub lege generatus est, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret ...

30. ... Ruth quoque sine dubio pari ratione minime praetermissam aestimare debemus, de qua sensisse uidetur apostolus sanctus, cum alienigenarum uocationem gentium spiritu praeuideret per euangelium esse celebrandam, dicens quod *lex non sit iustis posita, sed iniustis*. ... Haec enim cum sit alienigena et Moabitis, praesertim cum lex Moysi prohiberet has nuptias Moabitasque excluderet ab ecclesia — sic enim scriptum est: *Moabitae non introibunt in ecclesiam domini usque ad tertiam et quartam generationem et usque in saeculum* — quomodo intravit in ecclesiam nisi quia sancta et immaculata moribus supra legem facta est? Si enim lex impiis et peccatoribus posita est, utique Ruth, quae definitionem legis excessit et intravit in ecclesiam et facta est Israhelitis et meruit inter maiores dominici generis computari, propter cognationem mentis electa, non corporis, magnum nobis exemplum est quia in illa nostrum omnium, qui collecti ex gentibus sumus ingrediendi in ecclesiam domini, figura praecessit. Hanc igitur aemulemur, ut quia haec moribus hanc praerogatiuam meruit adscindae societatis suae, sicut historia docet, nos quoque propter morum electionem in ecclesiam domini meritis suffragantibus adlegamur.

33. ... Recte igitur sanctus Matthaeus per euangelium gentes ad ecclesiam uocaturus auctorem ipsum dominum gentiliciae congregationis alienigenarum generationem secundum carnem adsumsisse memorauit, ut iam tunc esset indicium quod illa generatio ederet gentium uocatorem, quem sequeremur omnes ex alienigenis congregati relinquentes paterna.

born, not merely of a woman, but also under the law, to redeem those who were under the law.<sup>12</sup>

**30.** On the same reasoning, we should definitely regard Ruth also as on no account to be omitted. It seems that the holy apostle was thinking of her when he foresaw in the Spirit that the calling of foreign nations was to be carried out by means of the gospel,<sup>13</sup> saying: “The law was laid down not for the just but for the unjust”. Ruth was a foreigner, and in particular, a Moabitess, although the law of Moses prohibited such marriages and excluded Moabites from the assembly. (The text is: “Moabites shall not enter the assembly of the Lord to the third and fourth generation, and for ever.”) How did she enter the assembly, if not because the immaculate sanctity of her character put her above the law? If the law is laid down for the irreligious and for sinners, then certainly Ruth is an important example for us. She was outside the law’s prescription, but did in fact both enter the assembly and become an Israelitess, and deserved to be counted among the ancestors of the Lord’s family, chosen on the strength of a kinship of mind, not of body. Thus in her is prefigured the entry of all of us, who have been gathered from the nations, into the church<sup>14</sup> of the Lord. Let us therefore emulate her, so that, as history teaches that it was by her character that she merited this privilege of acquiring her membership, we too, thanks to our characters, may be chosen for admission to the Lord’s church, with the support of our merits.

**33.** It was right, therefore, for St. Matthew, being about to call the nations to the church by means of his gospel, to mention that the Founder of the assembly of the nations, the Lord himself, had, for his birth according to the flesh, adopted a descent from foreigners. This was so that, right at the outset, there should be an indication that that line of descent was to produce the Caller of the nations, whom all of us who are assembled from foreigners were to follow, leaving behind what we had inherited.

---

12. Ambrose is here abbreviating Eusebius’s argument to the point of misrepresentation; see *To Stephanus* 5.8.

13. “The holy apostle” refers to 1 Tim.1.9.

14. Here it is especially important to remember that the Latin word *ecclesia* (Greek ἐκκλησία) is being used both for the Old Testament “assembly” or “congregation” of the Israelites and for the Christian church of the New Testament.

Ergo Ruth, sicut Lia et Rachel, oblita populum et domum patris sui soluens uinculum legis ingressa est in ecclesiam.

35. Quam uero commemoratio eius dominicae prosapiae fuerit inserenda declarat mysterii altioris expressio, qua prophetatum est ex genere eius in Ephratha Christum esse generandum, cum dicitur: *det tibi dominus facere uirtutem in Ephratha, et sit nomen in Bethleem.* Quae est enim uirtus nisi quae per Christum gentium populos congregauit? Quod autem nomen nisi illud quod Bethleem patria domini secundum carnem nascientis est facta? ...

37. ... Dauid, quia praesumtione uirtutis elatus dixerat: ... *ego autem dixi in mea abundantia: non mouebor in aeternum,* statim insolentiae huius poenam se subisse memorauit dicens: *auertisti faciem tuam a me, et factus sum conturbatus,* ... Si ergo Dauid insolentiam damnat, humilitatem induit, recte in historia uxoris Uri magisterium istud adfectandae humili-tatis adsciscitur.

39. Ergo cum Dauid Bersabee historiam non praetermisserit in suis psalmis, ut in ea uel mysterium uel actum perfectae paenitentiae nos doceret, iure uidemus etiam in generationibus dominicis non praetermissam, ... Alterum [mysterium] enim ad ecclesiam pertinet, quod dixit: *ecce audiuiimus eam in Ephratha,* ...

40. De Achab autem satis claret, cui uxor Iezabel, et de Iechonia, de quo satis idoneus auctor est Hieremias maximi reum esse delicti, cui etiam quod habuit nomen eripuit. Et ideo qui Ioachim in Regnorum libris dicitur, Iechonias a Hieremia est nominatus dicente eo: *abiectus est Iechonias ut uas, non est usus in eo, propter quod projectus est ipse et semen eius.* Terra, terra, audi uerbum domini, scribe uirum istum abdicatum, quia non exsurget ex semine eius sedens in throno Dauid, princeps adhuc in Iuda. Eo

Ruth, then, like Leah and Rachel, forgot her people and her father's house, and entered the assembly, undoing the chain of the law.

**35.** Just how truthful<sup>15</sup> it was for mention of Ruth to be included in the Lord's ancestry is made clear by the expression of a deeper mystery, in which it was prophesied that Christ was to be born from her stock, in Ephratha. The words are: "May the Lord grant you to do virtue<sup>16</sup> in Ephratha, and may there be a name in Bethlehem". What "virtue" is that but the one which, through Christ, gathered the peoples? What "name", but the fact that Bethlehem became the Lord's birthplace according to the flesh?

**37.** Because David, in pride at his presumption of virtue, said: "And I said in my abundance 'I shall not be moved for ever'", he immediately mentioned that he had undergone punishment for this insolence, in the words: "You turned your face away from me, and I became dismayed". Therefore, if David condemns his insolence and adopts a humble attitude, it is right for that lesson to be drawn from Uriah's wife, about aiming at humility, to be incorporated in the history.

**39.** Thus David did not omit the Bathsheba episode in his own Psalms, whether to teach us the mystery in it, or the procedure of full penitence. We can therefore see that it was with justice that she was also not omitted from the Lord's line of forebears. The other mystery pertains to the church: as he said: "Behold, we have heard him in Ephratha".

**40.** It is clear enough about Ahab, whose wife was Jezebel;<sup>17</sup> and also about Jechoniah, on whom Jeremiah is a perfectly good authority that he was guilty of a very serious crime; in fact, Jeremiah stripped him of even the name he had. That is why, though in the books of Kingdoms he had been called Joachim, Jeremiah calls him Jechoniah; his words are: "Jechoniah has been discarded, like a useless pot. Because of that, he has been thrown away, himself and his seed. Land, land, hear the word of the Lord: write that that man has been deposed, because no prince sitting on David's

15. Suggesting *vere* for *vero*.

16. At Ruth 4.11, NRSV has "may you produce children in Ephrathah". Older versions have, instead, something like this expression with "virtue", but neither the Septuagint nor the Vulgate text corresponds to the form as quoted here.

17. Mai's note: "Mention of Ahab is lacking in Eusebius, I suppose because the epitomator omitted that part of Eusebius, along with others".

enim regnante Iudeam Babylonii uastauerunt neque postea umquam de semine eius regnum quisquam in Iudea potuit optinere; postea enim populus de captiuitate dimissus sub sacerdotibus et tetrarchis fuit. Unde etiam usque ad Christi generationem mansere tetrarchae, ne ipsi quidem, quantum historia docet, regalis dignitatem generis reseruantes.

42. ... tamen ipsum regem secundum honorem saeculi non accepi-  
mus Christum. Quomodo ergo *ex fructu uentris tui ponam super sedem  
meam?* Quomodo et angelus de eo dicit quod *dabit illi dominus deus sedem  
Dauid patris sui, et regnabit in domo Iacob?* Quomodo regnare promitti-  
tur nec ostenditur? aut quomodo ex semine Iechoniae nullus regnaturus  
dicitur per prophetam? Si enim Christus regnauit, ex semine autem Iechoniae  
Christus est, propheta mentitus est, mentita sunt et oracula. Sed illic  
futuros ex semine Iechoniae posteros non negatur, et ideo de semine eius  
est Christus et quod regnauit Christus non contra prophetiam est; non  
enim saeculari honore regnauit nec in Iechoniae sedibus sedit, sed reg-  
nauit in sede Dauid.

43. Uerum cum ipse Iechonias Dauid sederit sedem, quemadmodum  
soluitur quod dictum est quia Dauid sedem Iechoniae posteri non sede-  
bunt, cum eadem sedis fuisse uideatur amborum? Itaque et nos sedem  
Dauid fuisse negare non possumus, non eandem tamen regis Dauid sedem  
Christus quam Iechonias sedit, immo nec quisquam aliis ex genere Dauid  
sedem eius potuit sedere quam Christus, quia nec in alio aliquo semen  
eius aeternum est, sed in Christo, sicut deus ipse reseruavit dicens: *semel  
iurauit in sancto meo, si Dauid mentiar: semen eius in aeternum manebit,  
et sedis eius sicut sol in conspectu meo.* Quem igitur dicit hic? Non Salo-  
monem utique, non Roboam, non Natham, sed illum de quo solo potest  
dicere: .... *Ipse inuocabit me 'pater meus es tu' et: ponam in saeculum*

throne will ever arise in Judah from his seed". It was in his reign that the Babylonians sacked Judaea, and after that no-one from his seed could ever hold the kingship in Judaea. Later, when the people had been released from captivity, it was under priests and tetrarchs. The tetrarchs lasted from then right up to the birth of Christ; and even they, as history teaches, did not maintain the status of the royal line.<sup>18</sup>

**42.** However, we did not receive even Christ as a king with the honour that the world gives kings. So, how is it that: "I shall set on your<sup>19</sup> throne one from the fruit of your body?" How does the angel, too, say of him: "The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, and he will be king in the house of Jacob?" How is he promised as reigning, but not shown as doing so? How is it that it is said, through the prophet, that no-one of Jechoniah's seed is going to be king? If Christ has become king, and Christ is of Jechoniah's seed, the prophet lied, and the prophecies also lied. But in those there is no denial that there will be later descendants of Jechoniah's seed, and that is how Christ is of his seed; and the fact that Christ became king is not contrary to the prophecy, because he did not become king in the worldly sense of royal honour, and he did not sit on Jechoniah's throne, but he did become king on the throne of David.

**43.** As Jechoniah himself did sit on the throne of David, what is the explanation of the saying "Jechoniah's descendants will not sit on the throne of David", when the same throne seems to have belonged to both? We too cannot deny that the throne was David's; but still, the throne of David on which Christ sat was not the same as the one on which Jechoniah sat. On the contrary, no-one else from David's line could sit on his throne but Christ, because there is no-one else but Christ in whom David's seed is eternal, exactly as God himself revealed: "I have sworn by my holiness; if I should lie to David...! His seed will last for ever, and his throne is as the sun in my sight." Whom therefore does he mean here? Certainly not Solomon, nor Roboam, nor Nathan, but the One of whom alone he can say: "He himself will address me with 'You are my father', and 'I shall put

18. Mai's note: "At this point Ambrose sets out the birth of Herod the Great and the history of his father. This makes me suspect that Eusebius reproduced that topic as well in his *Problems* (only for it to be omitted later by the epitomator) from his *History* 1.7 or from Africanus, as he did in the case of the topic of Joseph's genealogy, *To Stephanus* 4".

19. See note 6, p.267.

*saeculi semen eius et thronum eius sicut dies caeli. ... is est, de quo dicit angelus ad Mariam: ... et uocabis nomen eius Iesum. Hic erit magnus et filius altissimi uocabitur, et dabit illi dominus deus sedem Dauid patris sui, et regnabit in domo Iacob in aeternum, et regni eius non erit finis. ....*

44. ... Excitemus igitur Christum, ipsum interrogemus, ipse respondeat. ... Inuenimus quia regnum domini non est de hoc mundo; ipse enim dixit: *regnum meum non est de hoc mundo*. Qui dicit non esse de hoc mundo regnum suum ostendit esse supra mundum.

45. Illud quoque non praetermittendum putamus, quod a Dauid temporibus usque ad Iechoniam, hoc est usque ad captiuitatem, cum XVII fuerint reges Iudeae, XIII generationes sanctus Matthaeus posuerit et rursus ab Iechonia usque ad Ioseph cum uirilim generationes XII computentur, postea XIII generationes descriptas esse memorauerit. ... Et primum oportet cognoscere ... posse plures esse successiones, pauciores generationes; possunt enim diutius uiuere aliqui et serius generare aut certe penitus exsortes generationis existere. Itaque non quae regum eadem generationum tempora. Unde et Matthaeus eos quos ad generationem non putauit pertinere praeteriit. Nam si propositum esset ei successiones describere, rationabiliter moueremur, cur cum in Regnorum libris et Paralipomenis conueniat quod post Ioram Ochozias regnauerit et Iodam et Amasias, Amasiae autem successerit Ozias, sanctus Matthaeus tres illos reges praeterierit, Ochoziam, Iodam et Amasiam, et post Ioram Iosaphat subiecerit. Sed non eum in regum successione, sed in generatione subiecit, denique generationum relatorem fuisse memorauit. Potuit autem fieri ut et Ioram tardius generauerit et Iosaphat serius percepit regnum atque ita Ioram patri suo, cui in potestate non successit, in generatione successerit.

46. Quod uero post Iechoniam XII generationes enumerasse uidetur euangelista, si diligenter aduertas, hic quoque XIII generationum poteris inuenire rationem; XII enim usque ad Ioseph numerantur, non usque ad Christum, tertius decimus est Christus ... Duos enim Ioachim, hoc

his seed into the age of age, and his throne as the days of heaven." This is the One of whom the angel said to Mary: "And you will give him the name Jesus. He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and God will give him the throne of his father David. He will be king in the house of Jacob for ever, and of his reign there shall be no end."

**44.** Let us therefore call Christ. Let us ask him himself; let him reply himself. We find that the Lord's kingdom is not of this world, for he himself said: "My kingdom is not of this world". He who says that his kingdom is not of this world is showing that he is above the world.

**45.** Another point we think should not be omitted is that St Matthew put fourteen generations from David's times to Jechoniah—that is, to the captivity—when there were seventeen kings of Judaea. Again, he noted that although, in terms of individuals, there were then only twelve generations from Jechoniah to Joseph, he recorded that there were fourteen generations. Firstly, one must realise that that there can be more successions and fewer generations, because some can live longer and have children later, or even live out their lives entirely devoid of offspring. Thus the times of the generations are not the same as those of the kings; hence, too, Matthew left out those he thought irrelevant to the genealogy. The books of Kingdoms and Chronicles agree that Ochozias, Jodam and Amasias reigned after Joram, and that Amasias' successor was Ozias; so, had St Matthew's purpose been to record successions, we should reasonably be anxious about why he left out Ochozias, Jodam and Amasias, and put Josaphat after Jehoram; but it was in the genealogy, not in the royal succession, that he put him there. Finally, he did mention that it was the genealogy he<sup>20</sup> was relating. It was possible both for Joram to have had his children late, and for Josaphat's accession to have been delayed; and so for Joram to have succeeded his father in the genealogy without succeeding to his position.

**46.** As to the evangelist's having apparently listed twelve generations after Jechonias, you will be able, if you should look into it carefully, to find a calculation of fourteen generations in this case also. There are twelve generations, counting up to Joseph, but not to Christ: Christ is the thirteenth. History shows that there were two Joachims—that is, two Jechoniases—

---

20. Inserting "se" after "relatorem", with Mai and some MSS.

est duos Iechonias fuisse historia indicat, unum ante transmigrationem, alterum in ipsa transmigratione generatum, id est patrem et filium. Ergo pater inter generationes superiores est computatus, qui successit Iosiae, filius inter posteriores, qui successit patri, id est nepos Iosiae. Duos autem fuisse Regnorum libri indicant: ... *et imperauit Pharao super Israel*. Vides igitur quod alius fuit Iosiae filius, alius nepos: filius illius ille, cui Hieremias nomen imposuit, nepos iste, qui patris uocatus est nomine. Et bene sanctus Matthaeus a propheta noluit discrepare, ut non Ioachim, sed Iechoniam nominaret. Simul, ... maiorem fructum dominicae pietatis adstruxit, si generis nobilitatem non in omnibus dominus requisiuit, sed de captiuis et peccatoribus congrue nasci uoluit, qui remissionem ueniebat praedicare captiuis.

48. ... qui sunt isti magi nisi qui, ut historia quaedam docet, a Balaam genus ducunt, a quo prophetatum est : *orietur stella ex Iacob*.

50. Haec tibi, frater, de generatione Christi non incognita putaui prolixius prosequenda, ne qui cum ista in euangelio minus adtento animo recenseret, aliquatenus fluctuaret. ....

147. *Mane autem sabbati uenerunt ualde tempore ad monumentum*. Magna oritur hoc loco plerisque dubitatio; nam etsi non uidetur euangelistae dixisse contraria, tamen diuersa dixerunt. Siquidem hic *mane ualde tempore*; Marcus *ualde mane*; Matthaeus *uespere sabbati*; Iohannes *prima sabbati cum adhuc tenebrae essent*, mulieres ad monumentum uenisse dixerunt. Deinde hic duos uiros, Marcus unum iuuenem in albis sedentem, Matthaeus unum angelum, Iohannes duos angelos in albis sedentes uisos

one before the deportation, the other actually born during it; that is to say, father and son. The father, therefore, has been counted among the earlier generations as Josiah's successor, and the son among the latter ones as his father's successor, being Josiah's grandson. That there were two is indicated by the books of Kingdoms: "And Pharaoh ruled over Israel..."<sup>21</sup> You see, therefore, that one was Josiah's son, and one his grandson. The son was the one given that name by Jeremiah; the grandson was the one called after his father. Properly, St Matthew did not wish to disagree with the prophet, so that he called him Jechoniah, not Joachim. At the same time, he enhanced the Lord's religion with greater fecundity, in that the Lord did not seek after nobility from every member of his line, but also wanted, appropriately, to be born from prisoners and sinners, as it was to prisoners that he was coming to preach forgiveness.<sup>22</sup>

**48.** Who are these Magi, if not those who, as one account teaches, trace their descent from Balaam, the one by whom it was prophesied that: "A star will rise from Jacob"?<sup>23</sup>

**50.** I have thought it right to pursue at some length these facts about Christ's genealogy, which are not unknown to you, my brother, in case anyone reading them over in the gospel with insufficient attention might be to some extent at sea ... etc.

From Book 10

**147.** "And on the morning of the sabbath they came very early to the tomb." On this passage a serious doubt arises in many peoples'minds, because, even though the evangelists do not appear to have contradicted each other, they did use differing words: our author said the women came to the tomb "very early in the morning", Mark "very early", Matthew "on

21. 2 Kgs 23.34, 36 and 24.5, 8–10. Mai omits the biblical text that Ambrose quotes in full, putting (*etc., as in Euseb.*).

22. Mai's note: "Ambrose proceeds to pose, and answer, the question of why the evangelist mentions some, such as Joseph, Judah, Simeon, Levi, Nathan, Methuselah, Enoch, Seth, and Adam, but omits others, e.g., Cain. I think all this is taken from Eusebius, though it no longer occurs in the abridged selection of his *Problems*. However, Ambrose's conclusion to his book is in a style certainly reminiscent of Eusebius's concluding address to Stephanus."

23. This fragment is translated from Mai. Schenkl omits it as spurious.\*

esse memorauerunt. Postremo, quod uix enodabile uideatur, Iohannes scripsit dictum Mariae Magdalene: *noli me tangere; nondum enim adscendi ad patrem meum*; Matthaeus occurrisse dominum scripsit Mariae Magdalene et alteri Mariae, et illas accessisse et tenuisse pedes eius et adorasse, euidentissima descriptione digessit.

148. Quomodo ergo soluendum, nisi quatuor euangelistas de diuersis quatuor putes dixisse temporibus; ut et personas alias mulierum, et alias conicias uisiones? Denique aliae cum unguento primo sabbati ueniant, aliae sine unguento uespere sabbati. Istarum nomen exprimitur, illae de Galilaea secutae Dominum designantur.

150. Primum igitur illud spectandum est, quid est quod scriptum est: *uespere sabbati quae lucescit in prima sabbati*, resurrexisse dominum. Sic enim habes, quia *uespere sabbati uenit Maria Magdalene et altera Maria uidere sepulcrum, et ecce terrae motus factus est magnus*. Non enim die sabbati, sed post sabbati diem, nocte utique resurrexit. Denique quae mane uenerunt, licet ualde tempore, tamen iam dominum resurrexisse cognoverunt.

151. Sic igitur temperandum est, ut neque mane dominica quae est prima post sabbatum, neque sabbato resurrectio facta credatur. Nam quomodo triduum completeretur? non ergo uesperascente die, sed noctis uespere resurrexit. Denique graecus sero dixit, hoc est ὅψε. Sero autem et

the evening<sup>24</sup> of the sabbath”, and John “on the first of the sabbath, when it was still dark”. Our author then mentioned that two men were seen, Mark one man in white, seated, Matthew one angel, and John two angels in white, seated. Finally—a point that would seem hardly possible to disentangle—John wrote that Mary of Magdala was told: “Do not touch me, because I have not yet ascended to my Father”; Matthew wrote that the Lord met Mary of Magdala and the other Mary, and he set out a very clear description of how they went up to him, clasped his feet and worshipped him.

**148.** How, therefore, is this to be solved, but by supposing that the four evangelists were talking about four different occasions? One could thus infer that there were both different individual women, and different appearances. The conclusion is that some women come with their unguent on the first day of the week [“of the sabbath”], and others, without unguent, on the evening of [or late on] the sabbath. Those are expressly named; the others are designated “women who had followed the Lord from Galilee”.

**150.** So then the first thing to consider is what the text means by saying that the Lord rose again “late<sup>25</sup> on the sabbath, the day dawning on the first of the sabbath”. What you have is that “late<sup>25</sup> on the sabbath, Mary of Magdala and the other Mary came to see the sepulchre, and behold, a great earthquake took place”—because it was not, of course, on the day of the sabbath that the Lord rose again, but in the night after the sabbath day. The conclusion is that the women who came in the morning, very early though it was, did nevertheless realise that the Lord had by then already risen.

**151.** The way to combine them is to believe that the resurrection took place neither early on the Lord’s day, the next day after the sabbath, nor on the sabbath, because how would the full “three days” be made up? Therefore he rose again not as the day was growing late, but late<sup>26</sup> at night. In

24. Latin *uespere sabbati*, the primary meaning of which is “on the evening of the sabbath”; but see n. 25 below.

25. The Latin has *uespere sabbati*, literally “on the evening of the sabbath”, but *uespere* could simply mean “late”. Hence Ambrose’s struggle, in the next paragraph, to clarify what he thinks is meant by *uespere* in the text of his Latin Bible.

26. Here again *uespere* is used (see previous note), although in all the remaining uses of “late” in this paragraph, the word used is the unambiguous *sero*. As *uespere*

horam signat in occasu diei, et cuiusque rei significat tarditatem. ... Est et sero tempus noctis profundum.

152. Unde et mulieres ad monumentum accedendi habent facultatem, iam utique custodibus quiescentibus. ... Postremo etiam principes sacerdotum congregati cum senioribus nocte id factum esse confirmant, dicentes custodibus: *dicite quia discipuli eius nocte uenerunt, et furati sunt eum, nobis dormientibus ...*

153. ... si plures Mariae, plures fortasse etiam Magdalena, cum illud personae nomen sit, hoc locorum.

154. Denique alteram esse cognosce. Illa admittitur pedes domini tenere, tangere dominum ista prohibetur. Illa angelum uidere meruit, haec primo quod uenit neminem uidit. Illa discipulis dominum resurrexisse nuntiauit, ista raptum esse significat. Illa gaudet, haec plorat. Illi in gloria sua iam Christus occurrit, haec adhuc mortuum quaerit. Illa dominum uidit et credidit, haec non potuit agnoscere cum uideret. Illa fideli adorabat in spiritu, haec dubio maestificabatur affectu.

155. Merito nimirum prohibetur tangere dominum; non enim corporali tactu Christum, sed fide tangimus: *nondum enim*, inquit, *adscendi ad patrem meum*; hoc est, nondum tibi adscendi, quae uiuentem cum mortuis quaeris ...

161. Itaque quid intersit inter illam et hanc Mariam, scriptura distinguunt. Illa occurrit ut Iesum uideat, haec retrorsum conuertitur: illa salutatur, haec redarguitur Denique sie habes: *dicit ei Jesus, mulier. Quae non credit, mulier est, et adhuc corporei sexus appellatione signatur.*

conclusion, the Greek said “late”, ὡψέ [opse], that is; but “late” denotes both a time, at the end of the day, and a delay, in any matter: “late” is also the depth of the night.

**152.** Hence, too, the women had the opportunity to come up to the tomb, as by that time, of course, the guards were asleep. Finally, the chief priests, in their conclave with the elders, also confirm that it took place at night, by what they said to the guards: “Say that his disciples came at night and stole him while we were asleep”...etc.

**153.** If there was more than one Mary, perhaps there was also more than one Magdalene, since the former is a personal name, the latter a place-name.

**154.** Learn, conclusively, that there *was* another one. One is allowed to clasp the Lord’s feet; the other is forbidden to touch the Lord. One deserved to see the angel; the other, the first time she came, saw no-one. One gave the disciples the message that the Lord had risen; the other indicates that he has been snatched away. One is joyful; the other weeps. Christ has met one, when already in his glory; the other is still looking for him as dead. One saw the Lord, and believed; when the other saw him, she could not recognise him. One was worshipping him, in a spirit of faith; the other was sorrowing, in a mood of doubt.

**155.** She deserved, evidently, to be forbidden to touch the Lord, because it is not by physical contact that we touch Christ, but by faith. “Because I have not yet ascended to my Father,” he said: “To you,” that is, “I have not ascended, because you are looking among the dead for one who is alive”.

**161.** Thus the scripture makes clear the difference between one Mary and the other. One runs to see Jesus, the other turns back; one is greeted, the other is shown to be mistaken. Conclusively, you have: “Woman!” said Jesus to her”: the one who disbelieves is a woman, and is so designated, by being addressed with her physical gender.

---

can only mean late in the time-of-day sense, not in the sense of delay, this attempt to harmonise the Latin text of the gospels, already strained in Eusebius’s Greek, breaks down, but the break is camouflaged by the change to *sero*.

180. Spiritum autem sanctum uel illis undecim qua perfectioribus insufflauit, et reliquis postea tribuendum esse promittit; uel iisdem ibi insufflauit, hic spopondit. Nec uidetur esse contrarium, cum diuisiones sint gratiarum; *alii enim datur sermo sapientiae etc. alii operatio uirtutum* ... Ergo aliam insufflauit ibi operationem, hic aliam pollicetur; ibi enim remittendorum gratia tributa est peccatorum, quod esse uidetur augustius, et ideo insufflatur a Christo. ... Deus enim solus peccata dimittit. Lucas autem linguarum gratiam describit effusam. Denique ibi habes *accipite Spiritum sanctum.*

182. Cur secundum Matthaeum et Marcum mandat discipulis: *praecedam uos in Galilaeam, ibi me uidebitis:* secundum Lucam uero et Iohannem etiam intra conclave obtulit se uidendum? Et quidem quod se uidendum frequenter obtulerit, et plus quam quingentis fratribus et Petro et Iacobo, etiam apostolico probauimus testimonio. Et Lucas in actibus apostolorum docuit, quod discipulis *manifestauerit se uiuere post passionem suum, in multis argumentis apparens his, et disputans de regno dei.* Ergo quia saepius et diuersis apparuit, cum in Galilaea quando sit uisus, nequaquam praescriptum ac definitum tempus scriptum signauerit, in Hierusalem quando se obtulerit, et diem et horam expresserit; timidiores intra conclaue reuisuntur, fortiores ad montem conuenerunt.

183. Denique intra conclave, ostiis clausis, inducit Iohannes discipulos congregatos propter metum Iudeorum: quos non undecim Lucas, sed plures scripsit fuisse: istos autem Matthaeus undecim solos in Galilaea conuenisse non siluit: ... *undecim autem discipuli abierunt in Galilaeam,*

**180.** Now, as to the Holy Spirit, he either breathed it on the eleven, as being those who were more advanced, while promising the rest that the Spirit was to be conferred on them later; or it was on the same ones that he breathed the Spirit on that occasion, having promised it on this. No contradiction is to be seen, given that there are distinctions between the gifts of grace: "For to one is given the word of wisdom, etc., ... to another the working of acts of power, ... etc."<sup>27</sup> So it was one ability that he breathed on them at that time, but another that he was promising them at this. At that time, it was the gift of forgiving sins that was conferred on them, seen as something higher,<sup>28</sup> and so breathed on them by Christ, as it is God alone who forgives sins. Luke, though, is describing the pouring out of the gift of tongues. Conclusively, it is in the later place that you have: "Receive the Holy Spirit".

**182.** Why is it that, according Matthew and Mark, he instructs the disciples: "I shall go before you to Galilee; you will see me there", whereas in Luke and John he actually presented himself to be seen in a room? As a matter of fact we have established, by the apostle's testimony, that he presented himself to be seen frequently, both "to more than five hundred of the brethren" and "to Peter and John". Luke, too, in the Acts of the Apostles, has taught us that "he manifested that he was alive" to the disciples "after his passion, by many proofs, appearing to them, and discussing the kingdom of God". Therefore (given that the writer designated no specifically-defined time at all for his appearance in Galilee, but did state both the day and the time for his presenting himself in Jerusalem), the reason for his appearing several times, and to different people, is that it is the more timid ones who are visited indoors, and the braver ones who met him in the hill country.

**183.** In conclusion, John presents the disciples as gathered in a room with the doors closed, for fear of the Jews; but Luke has written that there was a number of them, not the eleven. Matthew did not fail to remark that it was only the eleven who met in Galilee: "And the eleven disciples left for Galilee, to the hill country where Jesus had arranged for them; they

---

27. The second half of this, representing the words "alii operatio virtutum", are in Mai but not in Schenkl.

28. Ambrose seems to have imperfectly understood Eusebius's view (as quoted by Macarius Chryscephalus, Fr.Mar.Supp. 10) that the gift of tongues was the greater, as being the Holy Spirit himself that is being given.

*in montem ubi constituerat illis Iesus, et uidentes eum adorauerunt ... Undecim quoque discumbentibus discipulis et Marcus in fine apparuisse scribit ...*

184. Unde hoc conuenientius arbitror, quod dominus quidem mandauerit discipulis ut in Galilaea se uiderent; sed illis metu intra conclaue residentibus, primo se obtulisse, postea uero confirmatis animis undecim illos Galilaeam petisse. Vel certe (hoc quoque diligentibus scriptoribus placuisse reperio) nihil obstat si dicamus pauciores intra conclaue, in monte complures fuisse.

1. *Fili David, filii Abraham ....* Ideo, ceteris praetermissis, horum filium nuncupavit, quia ad hos tantum est facta de Christo repromissio ad Abraham *etc.*

2. ... Notandum in genealogia Salvatoris nullam sanctorum assumi mulierum, sed eas quas scriptura reprehendit; ut qui propter peccatores venerat, de peccatricibus nascens, omnium peccata deleret. Unde et in consequentibus Ruth moabititis ponitur, et Bethsabee uxor Uriae.<sup>5</sup>

---

5. QSt. 9.\*

saw him, and worshipped him". It was also to the eleven that Mark, in his ending, writes that he appeared when they were at table.

**184.** From that, I think it more appropriate to take it that the Lord did tell his disciples to see him in Galilee, but presented himself to them, first, when they were staying indoors out of fear; then, though, once they had plucked up courage, the eleven went to Galilee. Alternatively, as I find this too is accepted by conscientious writers, there is nothing to prevent our saying that in the room there was a smaller number of them, and in the hill country a larger one.

## 2. FOURTEEN FRAGMENTS FROM JEROME'S COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW<sup>29</sup>

Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 308–9. Omitted from Migne, PG 22.

### From Books 1–2

**1.** "...the son of David, the son of Abraham", etc. The reason that he named him as son of these, while omitting the rest, is that it was to these two alone that the promise was made about Christ: "To Abraham ...," etc.<sup>30</sup>

**2.** It is noteworthy that in the Saviour's genealogy none of the holy women are included but those on whom scripture had some adverse comment to make. This is so that he who came for the sake of sinners could wipe out the sins of them all, by being born from women who were sinners. That is the reason for putting the Moabitess Ruth, and Uriah's wife Betsabée, into the succession.<sup>31</sup>

---

29. For copyright reasons, the text and translation given here are those of Mai. But the text has been edited as Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Matheum libri IV* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 77; Turnhout: Brepols, 1969). This text was reprinted in E. Bonnard, *Saint Jerome: Commentaire sur S. Matthieu* (SC 242 and 259; Paris: Cerf, 1977 and 1979). All but the smallest differences from the SC text are indicated in the notes. For another English translation, see Thomas Scheck, *Jerome: Commentary on Matthew* (FC 117; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008). Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 308–9, does not number the paragraphs.\*

30. Book 1, 1.2. SC 242:72, ll. 7–12.\*

31. Book 1, 1.3. SC 242:72, ll. 16–20.\*

3. ... Cernis quod secundum fidem historiae tres reges in medio fuerint, quos hic evangelista praetermisit. ... Quia evangelistae propositum erat tres tessarecedecades in diverso temporum statu ponere etc.

4. ... Si voluerimus Iechoniam in fine primae tessarecedecadis ponere, in sequenti non erunt quattuordecim sed tredecim. Sciamus igitur, Iechoniam priorem ipsum esse quem et Ioacim; secundum autem, filium, non patrem: quorum prior per *c* et *m*, sequens per *ch* et *n* scribitur: quod scriptorum vitio et longitudine temporum, apud graecos latinosque confusum est.

5. Hoc loco obiecit nobis Iulianus Augustus dissonantiam evangelistarum, cur evangelista Matthaeus Ioseph dixerit filium Iacob, et Lucas eum filium appellaverit Heli: non intelligens consuetudinem scripturarum, quod alter secundum naturam, alter secundum legem ei pater sit. Scimus enim hoc per Moysen deo iubente praeceptum, ut si frater aut propinquus absque liberis mortuus fuerit, alius eius accipiat uxorem ad suscitantum semen fratris vel propinqui sui. Super hoc et Africanus temporum scriptor, et Eusebius Caesariensis in libris διαφωνίας εὐαγγελιῶν plenus disputarunt.<sup>6</sup>

6. Numera a Iechonia usque ad Ioseph, et invenies generationes tredecim; quarta decima ergo generatio in ipsum Christum reputabitur.<sup>7</sup>

7. Quaerat diligens lector et dicat: quum Ioseph non sit pater

---

6. QSt. 3, QSt. 4, et suppl.\*

7. QSt. 13.\*

3. You observe that according to historical accuracy there were three intervening kings whom the evangelist has here omitted. This is because the evangelist's purpose was to put three sets of fourteen in differing time-spans ... etc.<sup>32</sup>

4. If we decide to put Jechoniah at the end of the first fourteen, there will be thirteen, not fourteen, in the next set. We are therefore to know that Jechoniah I was the same person as is also called Joachim, and that Jechoniah II was the son, not the father. The first of them is written with c and m, the second with ch and n,<sup>33</sup> but by scribal error, over a long time, there has been confusion in the Greek and Latin texts.<sup>34</sup>

5. On this passage the emperor Julian<sup>35</sup> has criticised us for discordance<sup>36</sup> between the evangelists, asking why the evangelist Matthew has said that Joseph was "the son of Jacob", and Luke has called him "son of Heli". He did not understand the scriptural usage whereby one was his natural father, the other his legal father: we know that it was commanded by Moses, at God's behest, that someone whose brother or near relative had died childless should take his wife, for the purpose of reviving his brother or relative's seed. There are fuller discussions of this both in Africanus, the author of *Chronographies*, and in Eusebius of Caesarea, in his books *On Gospel Discordances*.<sup>37</sup>

6. Count from Jechoniah through to Joseph and you will find thirteen generations; the fourteenth generation, therefore, will be reckoned at Christ himself.<sup>38</sup>

7. The careful reader would enquire: "Given that Joseph is not the

32. Book 1, 1:8-9. SC 242:74, ll. 30-34.\*

33. That is, in English Bibles, **Jehoiakim** and **Jehoiachin** (2 Kgs 23.4-24.12). SC puts the letters differently: for c ... m ... ch ... n, they give K ... M ... X ... N.

34. Book 1, 1:12. SC 242:74, ll. 39-45.\*

35. Mai's note (misplaced on p. 308): "We have here the criticism of the emperor Julian quoted in St Cyril's work against the said Julian, book 8, near the beginning."

36. SC "Hunc locum ... dissonantiae", for "Hoc loco ... dissonantiam"; for "On this passage the emperor Julian has criticised us for discordance", put "The emperor Julian has held this passage against us, for discordance".

37. Book 1, 1:16. SC 242:74-75, ll. 46-56.\*

38. Book 1, 1:17. SC 242:75, ll. 61-63.\*

domini saluatoris, quid pertinet ad dominum generationis ordo deductus usque ad Ioseph? cui respondebimus primum, non esse consuetudinis scripturarum, ut mulierum in generationibus ordo texatur. Deinde ex una tribu fuisse Ioseph et Mariam: unde ex lege eam accipere cogebatur ut propinquam: et quod simul censemur in Betleem, ut de una videlicet stirpe generati.<sup>8</sup>

8. Quare non de simplici virgine sed de despontata concipitur? Primum ut per generationem Ioseph, origo Mariae monstraretur: secundo ne lapidaretur a Iudeis ut adultera: tertio ut in Aegyptum fugiens haberet solatum mariti. Martyr Ignatius etiam quartam addidit causam, cur a despontata conceptus sit; ut partus, inquiens, eius celaretur diabolo, dum eum putat non de virgine sed de uxore generatum.<sup>9</sup>

9. Non ab alio inventa est nisi a Ioseph, qui paene licentia maritali futurae uxoris omnia noverat.<sup>10</sup>

10. ... Quomodo Ioseph quum crimen celet uxor, iustus scribitur? sed hoc testimonium Mariae est, quod Ioseph sciens illius castitatem, et admirans quod evenerat, celat silentio, cuius mysterium nesciebat.<sup>11</sup>

11. ... Notandum quod Ioseph filius esse dicatur David, ut Maria quoque de stirpe David monstraretur.<sup>12</sup>

12. ... Oritur in Oriente stella, quam futuram Balaam, cuius successores Magi erant, vaticinio noverat.<sup>13</sup>

---

8. QSt.1.\*

9. QSt. 1.\*

10. QSt. 14.\*

11. QSt. 1.\*

12. QSt. 1–2.\*

13. Fr. Syr. 8.\*

father of our Lord, the Saviour, what is the relevance of a genealogical line taken down to Joseph?" Our answer to that will be, first, that it is not scriptural usage in genealogies to compile the female line, and second, that Joseph and Mary were of one tribe—he was legally obliged to take her from that, as being related—and because they<sup>39</sup> register together in Bethlehem, they must both have been descended from a single stock.<sup>40</sup>

**8.** Why is he conceived by an engaged woman, not an unattached virgin? Firstly, so that Mary's descent could be shown though Joseph's genealogy. Secondly, to avoid her being stoned by the Jews, as an adulteress. Thirdly, so that she would have the comfort of a husband on her escape to Egypt. The martyr Ignatius has added a fourth reason, as well, for the conception's being by an engaged woman: it was, he said, so that the birth should be concealed from the devil, as he would think Jesus born from a wife, not a virgin.<sup>41</sup>

**9.** She was found<sup>42</sup> by no-one but Joseph, who, by the privilege of one almost married, knew all about his future wife.<sup>43</sup>

**10.** How is it that Joseph is described as "upright", given that he was concealing a ground of accusation against his wife? That is evidence in Mary's favour: Joseph, knowing her chastity and in wonderment at the event, is concealing in silence a matter of whose mystery he was ignorant.<sup>44</sup>

**11.** It is noteworthy that Joseph is said to be "son of David", so that Mary could also be shown to be descended from David.<sup>45</sup>

**12.** The star rises in the East, as Balaam, from whom the Magi were descended, knew by prophecy that it would.<sup>46</sup>

39. Reading *censentur* for *censemur*.

40. Book 1, 1:18. SC 242:75, ll. 64–71.\*

41. Ignatius of Antioch, *Ephesians* 19.1. This fragment is from book 1:18. SC 242:76–78, ll. 72–79.\*

42. Sc. to be pregnant.

43. Book 1, 1:18. SC 242:78, ll. 81–82.\*

44. Book 1, 1:19. SC 242:78, ll. 90–93.\*

45. Book 1, 1:20. SC 242:80, ll. 98–99.\*

46. Book 1, 2:1. SC 242:82, ll. 3–4. SC "noverant" for "noverat"; this appears to be a mere misprint.

13. ... Quod diversa tempora istarum mulierum in evangeliis describuntur, non mendacii signum est, ut impii obiiciunt, sed sedulae visitationis officia, dum crebro abeunt ac recurrunt, et non patiuntur a sepulcro Domini diu abesse vel longius.<sup>14</sup>

14. ... Ista accedunt et tenent pedes eius, quia adoraverunt eum. Ceterum illa quae quaerebat viventem cum mortuis, et nesciebat adhuc filium dei surrexisse, merito audit: *ne tangas me, nondum enim adscendi ad patrem meum.*

---

14. QMar. 2.\*

## From Book 4

**13.** The differences in the gospels over the women's timings are not an indication of falsehood, as irreligious people object; they are an example of their conscientiously constant visiting: they leave and return frequently, and they cannot bear to be for long, or far, away from the Lord's tomb.<sup>47</sup>

**14.** These women come close and clasp his feet, because they worshipped him; but the one who was looking among the dead for one who was alive, and was still unaware that the Son of God had risen, is deservedly told: "Do not touch me, because I have not yet ascended to my Father".<sup>48</sup>

---

47. Book 4, 28:1, SC 259:308, ll. 3–7.\*

48. Book 4, 28:9, SC 259:312, ll. 60–64.\*



## SYRIAC FRAGMENTS

Translated by Adam C. McCollum

A Syriac catena is preserved in Vatican MS Syr. 103. This is dated to 25 March 861.<sup>1</sup> The catena, attributed to Severus of Edessa,<sup>2</sup> contains twelve passages attributed to Eusebius. The first eleven are all from *To Stephanus*, the last from *To Marinus*. The texts of Fr.Syr. 7 and 8 were printed by Mai<sup>2</sup> and the remainder by Beyer. In addition, Severus of Antioch and Isho'dad of Merv both quote a passage from *To Marinus*.

The first twelve fragments are numbered as in Beyer, and the others continue the numbering.

The text is based on Gerhard Beyer, “Die evangelischen Fragen und Lösungen des Eusebius in jakobitischer Überlieferung und deren nestorianische Parallelen,” OC 12–14 (1922–24): 30–70, whose text is based on Vat Syr 103 (cf. BM Add 12144). For VII and VIII, the text is from Angelo Mai, *Patrum nova bibliotheca* (8 vols.; Rome: Typis Sacri Consilii Propagando Christiano Nomini, 1844–1871), 4:279–82. For Severus of Antioch: Letter 108 (To Thomas of Germanicea), Ernest W. Brooks, ed., *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch: From Numerous Syriac Manuscripts* (Patrologia Orientalis 14; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1920), 270–72. For Isho'dad of Merv: Margaret Dunlop Gibson, ed., *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv* (5 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 2:•Δ;-Δ;. The texts have been vocalized and edited by Adam C. McCollum.

A more literal translation style has been adopted for the Syriac and other fragments than for the Greek, at the risk of some awkward phrasing.

---

1. Beyer, p. 31. There is also a copy of the Vatican manuscript in British Library Add. 12144, dated 1081.\*

2. See Edward G. Matthews, “The Armenian Commentary on the Book of Genesis Attributed to Ephrem the Syrian” (1996; diss. UMI number 9706884), 34, 42, 84–85, who gives a mid-ninth-century date for Severus.\*

## CONTENTS

Fr.Syr. 1. Beyer, p. 32 .....	306
Fr.Syr. 2. Beyer, p. 34 .....	308
Fr.Syr. 3. Beyer, p. 36 .....	310
Fr.Syr. 4. Beyer, p. 38 .....	312
Fr.Syr. 5. Beyer, p. 40 .....	314
Fr.Syr. 6. Beyer, p. 42 .....	316
Fr.Syr. 7. Mai <sup>2</sup> , p. 279 .....	320
Fr.Syr. 8. Mai <sup>2</sup> , p. 281 .....	322
Fr.Syr. 9. Beyer, p. 51 .....	324
Fr.Syr. 10. Beyer, p. 56 .....	332
Fr.Syr. 11. Beyer, p. 58 .....	334
Fr.Syr. 12. Beyer, p. 68 .....	342
Fr.Syr. 13. Severus of Antioch, Letter 108 (To Thomas of Germanicea) .....	344
Fr.Syr. 14. Ishodad of Merv on Mark 15.25.....	348

لَمْ يَأْتِ بِهِ مُحَمَّدٌ وَلَمْ يَرَهُ إِلَّا مَنْ أَتَاهُ مِنْ فَضْلٍ

وَهُدًىٰ وَرَحْمَةٌ لِّلْعَالَمِينَ وَسَقَمٌ لِّلظَّالِمِينَ

## 1. Beyer ~~Asso.~~

## 2. Beyer 0,02.

<sup>3</sup> Beyer gives this word in the singular, but it must be plural (cf. PS 1341).

## 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,<sup>1</sup> 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'",<sup>2</sup> and also, "A covenant have I established with my Chosen One, and I swore to David my Servant",<sup>3</sup> etc. Further, it is written in Isaiah, "A rod shall go out from the stump<sup>4</sup> of Jesse",<sup>5</sup> 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".<sup>6</sup> 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",<sup>7</sup> and "I will be<sup>8</sup> 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 nearness<sup>9</sup> 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 ܣܼܾ should read ܣܼܾ (Beyer). Ps 131.11 [132.11].

3. Ps 88.4 [89.3].

4. Misprint: ܻܼܾܼܾ for ܻܼܾܼܾ.

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".



was being said in everyone's mouth that he<sup>10</sup> arises from David—because of this Matthew, who was preaching the gospel to the Hebrews, put David first at the beginning of his narrative.

### Fr.Syr. 2

Printed in Beyer, p. 34. This corresponds to QSt 6, Fr.St. 11.

From Eusebius of Caesarea, about why, after he said “the son of David”, he then jumped over to Abraham.

He spoke of David first, as is the mindset of the Hebrews concerning him. Also, thus is it written in the Gospel, that the Jews were saying, “Does not Scripture say<sup>11</sup> the Messiah comes from David and from Bethlehem, where David was [from]?” So, he did not place Abraham before David. The story about him<sup>12</sup> was as one of old, and it was not easily recited in the mouth of everyone; the promise that was his was much older and earlier, and there was no one who called himself the “Son of Abraham”. Because it was promised to the nations that Abraham would be a father in spirit, it says, “In you shall all peoples be blessed”<sup>13</sup> and “You shall be a father to a multitude of the peoples”<sup>14</sup> inasmuch as those peoples who, following the example of Abraham’s zeal, will come to fear God, and shall be worthy of equal blessing. These things being so, it follows that, since Abraham was the father of the fathers of the call to the nations, he should be taken as second to David by the Evangelist, and since they both received promises concerning the call to the nations and concerning the Saviour of the nations, it was right that the one who received the promise concerning the birth of the Saviour of all men should be honoured beforehand in rank more than the one who received the promise of the nations, and the father of nations should be understood as second in the genealogy. So, pleasingly and rightly “the book of Jesus the Christ”<sup>15</sup> is placed first before the father

10. The Christ.\*

11. ﻓـ ﺍـ ﻁـ ﻂـ “Scripture say” added to amend according to John 7.42.

12. Abraham.

13. Gen 13.3.

14. Gen 17.4.

15. Matt 1.1. Both the Greek and the Peshitta have “the book of generation of Jesus Christ”.

حَلْدَأُ وَعَفَّهُ مِعْسَا مِبْحَنًا هِيمَ حَلَّ أَطْرَاحَةً وَحَصَّهُ مِعْسَا. كَمْؤْنَلَا حَلَّهُ حَلَّهُ أَطْرَاحَهُ وَحَقْطَنَا وَحَبَّهُ مِعْسَا مِدَاعَهُمْ. هِيمَ حَسَنَهُ وَفَعَدَ لَكَهُ وَحَلْفَنَهُمْ حَمَلَهُ لَهُنَا لَهُنَا مَلَهُ. فِي حَلَّهُ وَهُوَهُ: كَهُ لَهُنَا كَهُ بَحْلَهُنَا هُنَا. أَلَا حَلَّهُمْ حَمَلَهُ لَهُنَا آتَهُ آتَسَيْهُ وَهُمْ [أَحَدَهُمْ] أَمَدَهُمْ. حَعَدَهُنَا وَهُنَّهُنَا. مَهْلَهُ لَهُنَا وَسِمَا هِيمَهُ لَهُنَا كَهُ بَحْلَهُنَا مَهْلَهُمَا وَهُنَّهُنَا لَهُنَا وَهُنَّهُنَا كَهُ بَحْلَهُنَا وَهُنَّهُنَا

۱۰۵ كُلَّمَا آتَيْنَا لَهُ حِصْنًا مَحْلَقَةً: مَحْلَقًا مِنْ وَاهِبٍ أَوْ لَحْصَهُ لَهُ كُلَّمَا  
۱۰۶، كُلَّمَا مِنْ حِصْنٍ وَسَرَّ حَسْنٍ: كَهُلَّا اُوتَقَأَ أَنْلَا. أَلَّا كُلَّهُ شَهْنَانٌ. وَكَلَافَر٤  
۱۰۷، سَهْنَانٌ، وَكُلَّهُ: أَفْيَ الْمَلَكِ حَبَّهُ وَمَنْهُ تَهْدًا أَوْخَدًا لِنُعْمَهُ كَلَهُ كُلَّهُ مَنْ حَضَرَهُ.

I notice that a number of notes on the Syriac side are repeated to some extent on the English side.

of the fathers in the flesh of the Christ,<sup>16</sup> and second after him that spiritual father of the peoples who are saved by through the Christ. For first is he who saves those who are saved, and, because of this, the Blessed Matthew, after David, did not turn to those who are after him, but to Abraham, because there was no one else who preceded [him]—he was worthy of the promise from God—and also because of the purpose that he<sup>17</sup> intended: to produce the genealogy of our Saviour and to make known to the Hebrews that he arose from the seed of David.

### Fr.Syr. 3

Printed in Beyer, p. 36. This corresponds to QSt 7.

From Eusebius. Why, when Matthew reckoned all the names of the genealogical succession he does not say, “So-and-so fathered So-and-so by So-and so,” except for these three alone: Zarah by Tamar, Boaz by Rahab, and Solomon by the wife of Uriah.

People investigate thoroughly, and they also say, “What is that reason that he has not indicated other names which are before and afterwards in this series of the generational record,<sup>18</sup> and represented the women from whom each had fathered sons, except only those three who fathered sons by women with whom sex proceeded unlawfully, one<sup>19</sup> of whom was a harlot, the others being defiled in name?”

Well, the reason that the Evangelist made these things known to us<sup>20</sup> is that he who comes and arises from the house of David in the flesh did not come for the righteous, but for sinners,<sup>21</sup> and that he might rectify<sup>22</sup> the want of the world. And even when he mixed with a family from which there was an illegitimate seed, he sanctified it, but he did not actually touch

16. I.e., David.

17. Matthew.

18. For the spelling **لَوْلَهُ**, see Luke 2.2 (Sinaiticus).

19. Rahab (Josh 6.17, 25) was the harlot, although Tamar (Gen 38) pretended to be one as well.

20. **لَهُ** is misprinted as **لَه**.

21. Cf. Luke 5.32.

22. **مِلْكُو** is apparently an error for **مِلْكَو**; Beyer translates “damit er wiedergutmachte”.

وَهُوَ مَنْ حَبَّ حَمْدًا: وَحَفَظَهُمَا أَنْسَعَ حَقْنَىٰ مَتَحْدًا<sup>٥</sup> حَلْلًا مَهَا هُدًىٰ هَمَّشَ تَمَسْعَدًا  
وَحَفَظَا: أَكْثَرَهُمْ لَمْحِدًا حَمْدَةٌ. أَسْيَا<sup>٦</sup> حَنْ إِلْمَهَ مَدْحَصَهَا لَمْبِسَدَا وَهُنَّ أَكْثَرُ  
حَمْدَنَا حَمْدَبَه. وَأَسْيَا<sup>٧</sup> لَاهَتْ وَهُنَّ يُؤْبَهُ كَحْبَطَا كَحْمَدَا: وَأَسْيَا<sup>٨</sup> لَاهَتْ وَهُنَّ يُؤْبَهُ  
وَحَمْدُهَا كَحْمَسَا.

وَهُنَّا بِكُلِّ أَمْرٍ مُّلْتَبِسُونَ إِنَّمَا يَعْلَمُ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ  
مَنْ يُنَزَّلُ مِنْ آنِسِنَةٍ فَإِنَّمَا يَعْلَمُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ  
وَمَا يَعْلَمُ إِنَّمَا يَعْلَمُ مَا يَعْلَمُ اللَّهُ أَكْبَرُ

5. Beyer rightly removes the words حِمَاءُ حِمَاءٌ حِمَاءٌ حِمَاءٌ حِمَاءٌ after this word as dit-tography.

## 6. Beyer's text lacks the *syame*.

it, just as the sun, when it lights upon shameful places gives honour to them, but without actually touching them.

#### Fr.Syr. 4

Printed in Beyer, p.38. This corresponds to QSt 11.

From Eusebius. Why Matthew used sections in the reckoning of the generations, when he said that from Abraham to David was fourteen generations, and again thus from David to the exile, and from the exile to the Christ likewise, and did not collect all those together in one reckoning.

Matthew did this: He used division in the reckoning of generations because of the various political systems of the people, those shown from history. For one is the first order, which was from Abraham to David; again another was from David to the captivity; and furthermore, another was from that time to the Christ.

Regarding the one from Abraham to David: They do not seem to have been governed by kings, but chiefs were leading the people. After Moses and Joshua, those who were called judges by them [were leading the people], and theirs was a certain known political system. Jerusalem was yet to be established at that time, as was the temple in it. And therefore, the Evangelist, while continuing in the first narrative up to the beginning of the government by kings, divided the reckoning and delimited the history of those [generations].

The one that is after them: From David to the exile they were governed by kings. Those who reigned from David, those who followed in the division of the nation, and the temple in Jerusalem remained from then to the exile. Therefore he divided this one fittingly and clearly.

Those who were from the captivity to the Christ: A kingdom no longer ruled them, but the rule passed from the tribe of the house of Judah to the priestly lineage, who had dominion over them from the time of Cyrus to the birth of Christ. For this reason he clearly divided them and counted them separately from the others.

هَمْجِيَّا أَوْهَمْ حَلَّاتِنَهُ: وَكَهْ لَلْ بَيْحَدَا دَهْ لَلْ سَهْمَحَا دَلْكَهْ إَكْدَا فَهْ قَهْمَنَا حَبْهُ.

7. In Beyer's text, the *syame* are placed on this word, rather than the previous one.

Therefore it is right to understand that he made these three divisions not without knowledge and consideration.

Fr.Syr. 5

Printed in Beyer, p. 40. This corresponds to QSt 13.

From the same author. Another opinion concerning the aforementioned, why, while seventeen [kings] reigned from the time of David until Jechoniah [Jehoiachim] and the Babylonian exile, Matthew said there were fourteen.

1. Now you should realize, O lover of God, that he did not set out to write based on the successions [of generations]. Perhaps a man would fittingly reproach the writer as one who set down the succession of kings. For in the book of Kings and in the book of Chronicles, three reigned after Joram son of Jehoshaphat, in full one after another: Ahaz, Joash, and Amaziah. And Matthew, passing over the three of them, jumped from Joram son of Jehoshaphat to Uzziah, and people did not see that he had passed over the rest in the interval. If he had followed the method of setting down the generations of kings and successions of one after another, it would be right for us to reproach his teaching as culpable, except that he set out to count generations. And he wrote thus: “fourteen *generations* from Abraham to David and fourteen *generations* from David to Jechoniah and the exile,” but not fourteen *successions*; and rightly from this point [he is free] from any reproach. And if it were not this way, it would have been possible to say, “all those successions from David to the Exile were fourteen,” but he did not say that, but “generations”. For it is not possible to name generations “the time of a man’s life” because it often happens that some people may live a little and are extinguished quickly at the age of an infant. Others might reach that of a child, and others that of an adolescent or an adult. And others prolong their lives to<sup>23</sup> the final limit. Which, then, should someone count as a generation, if this one reaches ten years, that one twenty, that one fifty, another seventy, and one happens to reach even one hundred? For that has been seen not only in former times but also in our days. How can they assign a generation to the lifespan of a man when it happens that [some] might prolong their lives not even to the birth of chil-

---

23. The *syamē* on  should, of course, be struck.

هَذِنَا هُوَ حَدِيقَةٌ وَحَسِنَاتٌ مُّمْكِنَاتٌ أُولَئِكَ هُنَّ حُلُولٌ وَهَذِنَاتِ حَبْلُونَا حَمَّافَةٌ وَإِلَيْنَا هُنَّ مُهَاجِرَةٌ حُلُولٌ وَهَذِنَاتِ حَبْلُونَا حَمَّافَةٌ وَإِلَيْنَا هُنَّ مُهَاجِرَةٌ

۱ اُوْمَهْ لَهْ حَصَّلَهْ كَهْ؛ بُهْمَا بِحَصَّا اَتْبِيْسِ؛ بَحَّا نَدْ شَنَا مَقْبِيْسِ. مَهْ تَهْلَدْا: مَهْ تَهْلَدْا  
مَكْلَلْا نَهْهَا دَهْهَا لَالْعَلْ. مُكْسِلْا بِهْ، مَهْ تَهْلَدْا مَهْ دَهْهَنْا تَلْهَدْهَيْ. اَهْدَلْا بِيَاهْنَهْ اَهْدَلْا  
مَهْ تَهْلَدْا: حَلْكَهْ بِصَهْ بِهْ، كَهْمَهْ كَهْمَهْ دَهْهَنْا: بَهْ مَهْلَهْهَنْهَهْ بِهْلَهْهَهْ. اَكْهَهْ بِحَمَّهْ حَمَّهْ  
مَهْهَهْهَهْ. وَاحْفَهْهَهْ اَلْمَهْهَهْ مَهْ تَهْلَدْا. هَهْ بِهْ اَتْحَصَّهْ. بَهْ طَهْهَهْ طَهْهَهْ طَهْهَهْ طَهْهَهْ  
مَهْهَهْهَهْ. كَهْ اَتْحَصَّهْ مَهْ تَهْلَدْا مَهْ دَهْهَهْ. كَهْلَهْ بِحَصَّهْ بِهْتَهْ. شَنَا مَهْهَهْ. كَهْ تَهْلَدْا  
كَهْتَهْ. بَهْ اَتْحَصَّهْ: مَهْ فِيْسِ بَهْ لَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ بِهْ، كَهْ اَتْحَصَّهْ اَتْحَصَّهْ مَهْ تَهْلَدْا. مَهْ بِهْ فَهْ مَهْهَهْ

<sup>8</sup> Beyer gives this word without *nun*, but it is probably a misprint.

<sup>9</sup>. The word is missing the *yod* in Beyer's edition.

dren? For some, having gotten married before [they reached] twenty years, fathered children, while others [had fathered children] not even when they passed thirty. And there are others who stopped when they had fathered their first children, others who survived until the fourth generation of children, so that they saw grandchildren within fifty years, and yet others in seventy do not beget even one child. How, then, is it right for generations to be counted? From people that lived briefly and fathered children early, or from those who did so slowly? Since, therefore, these things were thus investigated by the Evangelist—in that he did not set out to give successions, but generations—in reckoning the generations he took those names that sufficed to complete fourteen generations.

2. But others give another sense: that it was the Evangelist's design that those three names<sup>24</sup> were left out and not counted, because people say that they were evil, a contemptible family, descending in succession from the seed of Jezebel the Sidonite,<sup>25</sup> the wife of Ahab. According to this view, it is not right, therefore, that the book of our Saviour should be sullied by the memory of these men. For indeed Moses also, when blessing the sons of Israel, excepted Simon, and at times many others in various passages.

#### Fr.Syr. 6

Printed in Beyer, p. 42. Like Fr.Syr. 6, this also corresponds to QSt 13.

Thus in the same kind of examination: [Although] those after Jecho-niah to Joseph are twelve, Matthew said that there are fourteen generations.

We should understand that it often happens that with [people] of long life and many days, the successions of men are small, but the number of generations is given as complete. As someone may say, in a word, that with those from David to the captivity, although those numbered in the succession were seventeen, the generations were shown to be fewer, namely fourteen, so here, too, a succession of twelve men fills fourteen genera-tions, because these twelve perhaps had long lives and many days and were enough to fill fourteen generations. This is one solution to these things.

24. مَقْتُلَةً is a typo for مَقْتُلَةً.

25. لِبَسَلًا is to be read here, rather than لِبَسَلَ.

أَسْتَأْنِيَ قَهْقِهَةَ آسْيَا قَمَّهَ بِ هَبْصَهَ كَمْتَهَا وَمَحْدَهَا سَكَهَ أَذْلَهَ مَعْتَدَهَا

10. Misprinted in Beyer's text as ~~jimmo~~.

You will find another thought accurately in the narrative that there are fourteen, if you count Jesus, who is called the son of Joseph, with the twelve, and then add to them Jechoniah—the one born in Babylon, not the one who reigned in Jerusalem before the exile. For two men had the name Jehoiakim<sup>26</sup> after Josiah: the son of Josiah himself, the one that reigned after him in Jerusalem; and another son of this Jehoiakim. For both of these were called Jechoniah. So that Jehoiakim (a.k.a. Jechoniah), who is the son of Josiah, ought to be counted among the generations before the captivity. But the second son of this Jehoiakim, who is also a Jechoniah, who was the son of the first Jehoiakim and grandson of Josiah, they count him among those after the exile and with the Christ. Thus the number of fourteen generations is completed. The book of Kingdoms testifies that you may know that there were two Jehoiakims: “The lame pharaoh<sup>27</sup> set Eliakim son of Josiah as king over Israel in place of Josiah his father and changed his name to Jehoiakim;” it adds to this, “Jehoiakim was twenty-five years old when he reigned in Jerusalem”.<sup>28</sup> A little later: “Jehoiakim slept with his fathers, and his son Jehoiakim reigned in his place; he was eighteen years old when he reigned, and he reigned in Jerusalem for three months. The name of his mother was Nehushta. He did evil before the Lord, and at that time Nebuchadnezzar came and captured Jerusalem and he carried him and those with him away in the exile to Babylon”.<sup>29</sup> This is the one that is called Jechoniah by Jeremiah.<sup>30</sup> For this reason it was right to count fourteen generations in the generations of those from Jechoniah to the Christ.

Others have used another solution, supposing the years of the captivity to cover two generations.

26. The name is the same only in the Greek version. See the following chart:

<i>Hebrew</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>LXX</i>	<i>Syr. Pesh.</i>
יהוֹיָקִים	Jehoiakim	Ιωακιμ	יְהוּאֵקִים
יהוֹיָכִין	Jehoiachin	Ιωακιμ	יְהוּאֵכִין

27. Neco. On Pharaoh Neco's supposed lameness (this name also in the Peshitta), see L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–1938), 6:378 n. 123.

28. 2 Kgs 23.34, 36.

29. Cf. 2 Kgs 24.6–11.

30. In Hebrew and English the king is here called Coniah, but is Ιεχονίας in the LXX and likewise in the Syriac (Jer 22.24).

وَلِهِ ؟ اهْمَحْصَهُ . حـ ۝ . ؟ اخْتَارَتْهـ ۝ . هـ . ؟ امْنَهـ ۝ . وـ ؟ اِلْكـ ۝ . حِمْسـ ۝  
حـ ۝ لـ ۝ حـ ۝ سـ ۝ رـ ۝ وـ ۝ هـ ۝ . حـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ كـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝  
حـ ۝ لـ ۝ حـ ۝ اـ ۝ هـ ۝ مـ ۝ هـ ۝ . حـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ كـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝  
لـ ۝ اـ ۝ : حـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ هـ ۝ مـ ۝ هـ ۝ . حـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ كـ ۝ دـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝ لـ ۝ اـ ۝

حَلَّا. وَهُوَ لِمَجِدِهِ أَحَدٌ لَا يُنْبَأُ. حَلَّتْ كَوْكِبُمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ مِنْ بَيْنِ  
لَّا يُنْبَأُ مِنْ بَيْنِهِمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ. حَلَّ لَا يُنْبَأُ أَحَدٌ لَا يُنْبَأُ  
لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ. حَلَّتْ كَوْكِبُمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ مِنْ بَيْنِ  
لَّا يُنْبَأُ مِنْ بَيْنِهِمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ. حَلَّتْ كَوْكِبُمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ مِنْ بَيْنِ  
لَّا يُنْبَأُ مِنْ بَيْنِهِمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ لَّا يُنْبَأُ بِهِمْ.

## Fr.Syr.7

Printed in Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 279, with a German translation in Beyer, p. 46. This does not correspond to any of the Greek fragments of *To Stephanus*.

Concerning how we should understand that which Luke said, that the Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judah in a cave and was placed in a manger, while Matthew said that when the Magi came to worship him, they found him in a house, entered it, and brought him gifts there.

First, then, [know] that what Matthew narrates and what Luke wrote of the things that happened at the time of the Christ's birth are different things. The things that Matthew left out and did not say, Luke narrated: what the former did not say, the latter did. Luke records the conception of our Saviour when she<sup>31</sup> received the good news from the angel, and since Joseph went up with Mary, while she was pregnant, to be registered, he went up from Nazareth, the city of Galilee, to Judea, [to] the city of David, which is Bethlehem, since he is also from the house and tribe of David. While they were there, the days for Mary to give birth were fulfilled and she gave birth to her firstborn son and put him in a manger, since there was no [other] place, due to the number of people from the family of David that had gathered to Bethlehem for the census. They<sup>32</sup> did not find any place to stay; they stayed in a cave, and there the time of the holy pregnancy arrived for them. When she had given birth to him, she wrapped him in swaddling clothes and put him in the manger. Shepherds who had heard the good news from angels came to the place and the cave, and they saw the infant lying in the manger and wrapped in swaddling clothes. Eight days afterward they<sup>33</sup> brought the boy up to Jerusalem to be circumcised according to the law, and then they went immediately to Nazareth, their city.

Matthew, on the other hand, has not recorded this story, but another one. He wrote first about his<sup>34</sup> birth, then the coming of the Magi and the murder of the little children, while he did not recall the time of Augustus Caesar when the census took place, nor the matter of the shepherds.

31. Mary.

32. The sentence should probably begin with "Since..." (as in Mai's Latin translation), but there is no such word in the Syriac.

33. Joseph and Mary.

34. Jesus'.

وَلِهِ مُهَلٌّ تَدْحِيْهُ وَالْمُسَاءُ كَطْرَقَهُ.

Understand from this that the time of the coming of the Magi is different from that of the census of David's seed and the coming of the shepherds. The holy evangelists are not opposed to each other, when you observe that Luke brings him<sup>35</sup> up with his parents to Jerusalem eight days after his birth, and from there takes him to Nazareth; Matthew, on the other hand, [starts] from the time two years after that of Luke, when they<sup>36</sup> returned to Bethlehem for holy memory. (We also do this: from the hearing of the holy books,<sup>37</sup> we take pains to visit holy places often and perform our prayers there.) And it is no wonder if those who received in fact<sup>38</sup> the things that happened in Bethlehem at the birth of our Saviour, and at whose hands they were accomplished, not once but many times consider [them]. When they came from Nazareth, as I said, they found a place, void of the assembly and foreign people who had come together for the census—in the place itself, that is, in the city of Bethlehem, there were only its inhabitants—and they went up and stayed in a house of their acquaintances. To this place and at this time the Magi came, after two years. Since the place, Bethlehem, was [then] empty, they found lodging, as we have said. They<sup>39</sup> went up to Bethlehem and found him<sup>40</sup> in a house with Mary his mother, and they worshiped him and brought him gifts.

#### Fr.Syr. 8

Printed in Mai<sup>2</sup>, p. 281, with a German translation in Beyer, p. 48. This also does not correspond to any of the Greek fragments of *To Stephanus*.

From the same [Eusebius], concerning the star that appeared to the Magi.

A certain tradition<sup>41</sup> holds that those who are called Magi are from the sons of Balaam, whom Moses mentions, for he too was a Magus, and makes known concerning himself that he came from the mountains of the east. From his prophecy it was derived that a star would arise and a man

35. Jesus.

36. Jesus and his parents.

37. I.e., when something from Scripture has been read.

38. As opposed to in writing.

39. The Magi.

40. Jesus.

41. Literally “story”.

وَكَذَهُ وَاهْتَدِيَّ: كَهْ حَلَّا وَكَهْ حَلَّا كَهْ حَفَّهُ كَهْ حَفَّهُ كَهْ حَفَّهُ كَهْ حَفَّهُ

11. Mai's text in error has J;; instead of J;.

from the seed of Israel would be born and rule over all the nations, for Moses writes, as if from Balaam himself, “From Mesopotamia Balak, king of Moab, has called me from the mountains of the east”.<sup>42</sup> After that, he says in his prophecy, “A star will arise from Jacob and a chief from Israel, and he will rule over many nations”.<sup>43</sup> These things were preserved among Balaam’s people in books, and hence it follows that we should understand that the Magi that were around in the days of our Saviour, as Balaam had previously prophesied, when they saw the star, were moved to see the king that had been born, of whom the star was giving indication. So they went out and came to Jerusalem, the star indicating the region, the place, and the child: “The star that they had seen in the east was going before them, until it went and stopped above where the child was”.<sup>44</sup> The word “stopped” you should not understand [as meaning] that it had come down from the sky, nor that it stopped on the roof of the house, for whoever might understand it this way is mindless! But since it was a star and made the course clear above them, [it was] as a pointer in the air not far from the earth. And do not think that it was taking<sup>45</sup> the same course as the others, but a specific and irregular course, and it appeared differently in different quarters. It was giving indication to the Magi, as to those familiar with visions like these, where it was right for them to follow. For it went along in different places variously, from place to place, from centre to centre, and from region to region of the sky. When it came to the house, it stopped over it without moving or passing by. They saw the fixed position and immobility of the star—something they had not seen before—and rejoiced greatly.

## Fr.Syr. 9

Printed in Beyer, p. 51. This corresponds to QSt 1.

From Eusebius, the meaning why they count Joseph in the genealogies and not Mary, “from whom the Christ was born”,<sup>46</sup> and on the fact that

42. Num 23.7.

43. Num 24.17.

44. Mtt 2.9.

45. **لَهُ** is an error for **لَهُ** in the printed text.

46. Cf. Matt 1.16.

أَيْلَكْ مِيسُّا حَلَّا وَهُنَّ حَسِيدٌ بِإِلَمَةٍ لَبَابًا لَّهُوا. حَلَّا وَهُنَّ حَسِيدٌ  
أَسْلَدَاصْ حَلَّمَحَا حَكْمَهَا

12. Beyer's text mistakenly has ~~one~~ no.

13. In Beyer's text, there is a metathesis: omo.

the theotokos<sup>47</sup> came from the house of David, and on the verse “Behold, Elisabeth your relative...” written in Luke.<sup>48</sup>

1. First of all, know that this was [at] the direction of God, because people would have reviled the birth of our Saviour and would have reviled and disparaged the holy virgin, and in addition, that the birth of our Saviour, as well as Mary’s virginity, were to be kept quiet and not apparent, and that it was not to be known to many that it was [at] the direction of the Spirit, except to these few [for whom] it was necessary to know: first of all, to Mary, who was in doubt about it and said to the angel, “How can this be?” and he announced to her that her conception was from the Holy Spirit; second, to Elisabeth, through the Holy Spirit, when she cried out, “Blessed are you among women!”;<sup>49</sup> then to Joseph, when he was in doubt in his mind—the holy conception not being known—when the angel announced to him, “Don’t be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for what is born in her is from the Holy Spirit, and he shall be called Jesus and son of the Most High”.<sup>50</sup> And since he considered leading her [away] better than living with her and wanted to release her, and because he was upright he did not want to expose the story, that is, to reveal and disclose<sup>51</sup> it, lest she be in danger from the spite of her people, and they revile the holy conception,<sup>52</sup> the angel said to him, “Don’t be afraid to take Mary as your wife, that is, leading her and keeping her with you.” And in order to confirm him regarding her conception, he referred him to the testimony of Isaiah, who prophesied, “Behold, the virgin will conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel”.<sup>53</sup> And he calls Joseph son of David<sup>54</sup> and not son of Jacob, as he in fact was, since he had in mind the promise given in the scriptures that the Christ would arise from David, and since this was the direction of God, that Joseph should be recorded in the genealogies and not Mary, so that her conception in virginity could be concealed from unbelievers, since it would not have been easily believed

47. “Mother of God.” The Greek term is embedded in the Syriac here.\*

48. Luke 1.36.

49. Luke 1.42.

50. Matt 1.20–21.

51. Reading **وَلْ يَرُدُّوا** instead of the printed text’s **وَلْ يَرُدُّوا**, which makes no sense.

52. The printed text reads “and they pluck out the holy conception”, but it is probably an error (**وَلْ يَسْرُو** for **وَلْ يَرُدُّوا**).

53. Isa 7.14, Matt 1.23.

54. Matt 1.20.

كَهْ لَحْنَا وَسَلَعْ أَصْمَّاً: حَمْبِرْ مَهْ حَنْلَا صَفْلَا لَا حَمْسَلْ. لَهْ لَيْنَهْ كَهْ لَهْ لَيْنَهْ  
كَهْ كَهْ، وَلَهْ لَلَّهْلَهْ: حَنْهْ بَهْلَهْ مَهْ لَهْ كَهْ بَهْ بَهْ! كَهْ بَهْ كَهْ بَهْ كَهْ بَهْ!

وَلِلَّهِ الْحُكْمُ وَإِلَيْهِ الْمُرْسَلُونَ ۝

وَكُلَّهُ وَالْأَنْسَلَةَ قَدْ أَرْجَعَهُ حَذَّارَهُ مَصْلَاهُ . أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ وَتَعْلَمَهُ . وَحَادِثًا  
وَكُلَّهُ هَذَا تَلَهُ لَلَّا . أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ مَصْلَاهُ بَهْتَهُ مَهْ كُلَّهُ جِنْتَاهُ . وَهَذَهُ كُلَّهُ  
وَالْمُجْنَبُ كَمَحْنَبُهُ لَلَّا وَجَنْدَهُ . أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ كَمَنْدَاهُ وَجَنْقَطَاهُ كَمَحْنَبُهُ وَهَذَهُ  
كَمَحْنَبُهُ لَلَّا وَجَنْدَهُ . أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ كَمَنْدَاهُ وَجَنْقَطَاهُ كَمَحْنَبُهُ وَهَذَهُ  
وَهَذَهُ تَمْنَدَاهُ لَيْلَهُ مَهْ 17 قَدَهُ . وَوَمْلِهَ مَهْ كَفَهُ أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ كَمَنْدَاهُ وَهَذَهُ  
وَهَذَهُ كَمَحْنَبُهُ لَلَّا وَجَنْدَهُ . كَلَّهُ يَسْنَ حَذَّهُ . كَهْنَهُ مَهْ أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ . لَا كَلَّهُ مَهْ . وَهَذَهُنَا  
وَهَذَهُ حَذَّنَمْ . كَلَّهُ يَسْنَ حَذَّهُ . كَهْنَهُ مَهْ أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَى هَذَهُ . لَا كَلَّهُ مَهْ . وَهَذَهُنَا  
كَحْبَرَا وَجَلْدَهُ كَلَّهُ . أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَاهُ 18 مَصْلَاهُ . كَهْنَهُ مَهْ . لَا كَلَّهُ . وَهَذَهُ رَفِيسَدَا  
كَحْبَرَا وَجَلْدَهُ كَلَّهُ . أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَاهُ مَهْ . كَهْنَهُ مَهْ . لَا كَلَّهُ . وَهَذَهُ رَفِيسَدَا  
أَكْبَرَ بَقْلَاهُ . كَهْنَهُ مَهْ .  
وَهَذَهُ حَذَّنَهُ . كَهْنَهُ مَهْ .

14. Once again, there is a mistake in Beyer's text: م.

15. The word is missing the *alaf* in Beyer's edition.

16. The *dalat* is missing in Beyer's text, but this must be the intended reading, based on his translation.

17. Beyer's text has the masc. suffix.

18. Beyer: Land.

19. Beyer: ~~A~~

by those who heard it, when seeing him as a man suffering like us and not differing at all from a mortal nature. See that after marvels and divine helps they call him the son of Joseph and the son of Mary, saying reproachfully, “Isn’t this the son of Joseph? [Isn’t] his mother Mary, and [aren’t] his brothers James and Joseph?”<sup>55</sup>

Fittingly, then, is Joseph counted in the genealogies as father of the child. Were it not this way, the child would be considered as having no father, since he would have been counted as having no father, and it would not be known that he had arisen from the house of David, and this would bring impiety to many, and due to their ignorance of the matter, they would have reviled the holy birth. So, then, the Word has made use of a secondary method and Joseph is counted<sup>56</sup> in the genealogies as though he were the father of the child.

This was very pious, and with no damage in terms of anything reviling to Mary, and usefully was he declared the son of a carpenter<sup>57</sup> and our brother.<sup>58</sup>

These things took place as a mystery, and they were kept silent in a hidden mystery, things that were properly kept quiet, which would be revealed as the truth at a suitable time, such as the resurrection of our Saviour from the dead, his ascension to heaven, the announcement concerning him as concerning God the Word, and the call to the nations, those who believed him as God when they received the announcement concerning him, and the things pertaining to Mary giving birth and her virginity were acknowledged as worthy of belief. Rightly did the evangelists count Joseph and not Mary in the genealogies. Had they passed over him [Joseph] and counted him [Jesus] from Mary, it would not have been appropriate, and it would have been foreign to the custom of the divine book. He would have been considered a worthless<sup>59</sup> man and without a father—no mean abuse! For this reason he counts Joseph from David, and at the same [time] shows that Mary was born from David, because through the betrothed they can

55. Matt 13,55.

57. Matt 13.55.

58. Heb 2.11-12, 17?

59. Reading L instead of the printed text's L, which makes no sense.

وَهُوَ الْمَعْجَدُ أَسْلَمَهُ وَهُنَّ مِنْ أَهْلِهِ إِذَا هُوَ مَهْدُوا

حَدَّ ظُلْمٌ أَسْبَلَهُ لَهُ أَمْنِيَةً أَسْلَمَهُ حَلَّاً وَحَدَّنَا حَلَّاً حَنَّاهُمْ مَعْتَلِيَةً  
وَمَدَّهُمْ بِالْكَلْمَعَةِ. حَلَّاً وَبُعْثَهُ حَمَّحُلَهُ وَقَتَّلَهُ لَا فَعَنْهُ نَاهَمْ.<sup>20</sup> أَلَا عَفْرَ وَحَسِنَهُ  
وَعَتَّلَهُ وَعَطَطَهُ حَمَّدَهُ. وَأَتَنَمَا لِلْكَلْمَعَهُ كَدِيرَتَهُ وَعَتَّلَهُ وَمَدَّهُمْ بِهِ حَصَنَيَّهُ<sup>21</sup> وَهَذِهِ  
وَإِلَيْهِمْ 106 حَمَّدَهُ.

كَذَّبَهُمْ أَوْ كَفَرَهُمْ بِهِمْ وَأَنْهَا كُلُّ مُجْرِمٍ لَّا يُعَذَّبُ إِلَّا مُؤْمِنٌ<sup>21</sup>

20. The word is missing the *alaf* in Beyer's text.

## 21. Beyer: مُؤمِنٌ.

show the family of his wife, for the Law of Moses commanded that it not be allowed<sup>60</sup> for a man to take a wife from a tribe and family not his own, and recording with the men was sufficient to make known concerning the wife that she was from his family. This was so that an inheritance would not go around from tribe to tribe, but that every man should inherit out of his father's inheritance. Had Joseph not been upright and been witnessed to be such, it might have been thought that he had presumed marriage outside the law. But it is known that he lived according to the law: he is witnessed to be upright and for this reason he took a wife from the family of David and Judah.

2. But if it is said by the angel concerning Mary, “Behold, Elisabeth, your relative...”—it being known that Mary is from the family of Judah, but Elisabeth from the house of Levi—do not be surprised, for the whole nation of the Jews is one race, and all the tribes belong to each other's race. Thus, too, the Apostle bears witness: “I wish that I myself would be anathema in place of my brothers and relatives, Israelites according to the flesh”.<sup>61</sup> In this way Elisabeth also was the relative of Mary.

But perhaps otherwise was she called her relative: namely, since Elisabeth was living in the inheritance of the tribes of Judah, since the Law did not set aside an inheritance for the tribes of the priests, but commanded that they should live among the other tribes. So Zechariah and Elisabeth were living in a city of the tribes of Judah, from which Mary came.

Again, it is perhaps from the similarity of their manners that they are said to be related, on account of which they were both counted worthy of direction bringing salvation, in that one received the Saviour and the other the messenger of the Saviour. They were counted worthy of the same Spirit and for this reason especially they participated in a divine relationship.<sup>62</sup>

60. Reading **፲** instead of the printed text's **፳**, which makes no sense.

61. Rom 9.3.

62. Beyer states that this fragment is followed in the catena by extracts from Severus (of Antioch) and George, bishop of the Arab tribes. The presence of the latter source tells us that this catena was compiled in Syriac, not in Greek.\*

❖ ﻪـ ﺔـ ﻢـ ﻪـ ﻢـ

۷۰۔ وَيَوْمَ هُنَّا مُحْكَمٌ حَقْتَهْدِلَا. وَكَهْ دَنْتَرْ. وَهَنْتَأْ لَهَدْ أَهَنْهَهْ. وَيَمْهَا كَهْ  
۷۱۔ وَاتْلَأْ إِلَهَهَهْ. كَهْدَهْ آمْهَنْهَهْ حَلَّهْ مَهِسْلَا: دَهْهَهْ ۵۵۵۰ مَهِسْلَا سَبْهَهْ حَفْهَهْ بَعْهَهْهَا  
۷۲۔ كَهْبَهْ أَهَنْهَهْ. وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: مَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا.  
۷۳۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: مَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. أَهَرْ كَهْ ۵۰۵۰  
۷۴۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: مَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. نَهْهَهْ وَادْهَهْهَا  
۷۵۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: كَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. وَادْهَهْهَا  
۷۶۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: كَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. جَاهِلَهْهَا مَهْهَهْهَا  
۷۷۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: كَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. جَاهِلَهْهَا مَهْهَهْهَا  
۷۸۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: كَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. حَمْهَهْهَا مَهْهَهْهَا  
۷۹۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: كَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. حَمْهَهْهَا مَهْهَهْهَا  
۸۰۔ وَجَهْهَهْ كَهْهَهْ ۳۰۰۰ مَهِسْلَا: كَهْهَهْ حَيْهَهْ بَيْهَهْهَا هَلْهَهْلَا. حَمْهَهْهَا مَهْهَهْهَا

## Fr.Syr. 10

Printed in Beyer, p. 56. This corresponds to QSt 1.9.

From Eusebius, on the fact that Joseph is recorded in the genealogy and not Mary.

On the fact that Joseph is recorded in the genealogies and not Mary, thus they say: “The head of the woman is man”, as the Apostle has written<sup>63</sup>; and “The two shall become one flesh”, as the Law had said beforehand<sup>64</sup>. A woman betrothed to a man, if she sins, bears the penalty of adultery, since she was the body of her betrothed, and the head indicates the man. And how is it not, that when the head is recorded, it turns out that the body is recorded with it too in the genealogies? Mary, since she had by this time been joined to Joseph, is rightly recorded with him, since a betrothed woman holds the position of a man’s wife. Moses wrote this: “If he says that a virgin betrothed to a man has been corrupted, and it happened to her while she was betrothed, she receives punishment as an adulterer, but if she was not married and not spoken for by a man, he leaves her from any punishment”<sup>65</sup>.

And hence Mary, since she was betrothed to Joseph, [...],<sup>66</sup> especially since [she was] from the same tribe and from his family. The testimony of Gabriel confirms all this, that it is from David’s line that he descends, in that he said, “The Lord God will give him the throne of David his father”,<sup>67</sup> and Luke fittingly said, “Joseph went up from Galilee of Nazareth to be inscribed [in the census] in the city of David with Mary, because he was from the house and family of David, with Mary his betrothed”<sup>68</sup>.

63. 1 Cor 11.3.

64. Gen 2.24.

65. Cf. Deut 22.23–29.

66. The text is not clear here. Beyer suggests “she was included together with him” on the basis of the Greek.

67. Luke 1.32.

68. Luke 2.4–5, paraphrase.

**﴿كُلُّ مُتَّهِيٍّ هُنَّا وَحْدَهُمْ ۚ وَلَا هُنَّ عَلَىٰ هُنَّ بِهِمْ أَنْقَبُونَ﴾**

٥٥٦) وَمُحَمَّدٌ أَوْ هَذِهِ أَوْ حَقْلَادُهَا قَبْرًا وَأَمْ سَكَنًا: مَأْكُولًا. ٥٥٧) فَزْرَ  
أَسْكَنَهُ أَوْ حَنَّهُ وَمِنْهُ أَوْ فَزْرَهُ أَوْ حَنَّهُ لَحْرَفَةٍ. ٥٥٨) أَوْهُمْ  
أَوْهُمْ كَعْبَةٍ. ٥٥٩) حَلْمَانٌ حَلْمَانًا مَهْ حَلْمَانَهُ حَلْمَانَهُ. ٥٦٠) أَوْهُمْ  
أَوْهُمْ كَعْبَةٍ. ٥٦١) حَلْمَانٌ حَلْمَانًا مَهْ حَلْمَانَهُ حَلْمَانَهُ.

22. Beyer has a *qof* for *kaf* in this word.

23. The word lacks *syame* in Beyer's text.

24. This is Beyer's correction, where the manuscript has و هـ.

Fr.Syr. 11

Printed in Beyer, p. 58. Section 1 corresponds to QSt 2, Fr.St. 1, and Fr.St. 13, section 2 to QSt 3 and Fr.St. 2, section 3 to QSt 3.3 and Fr.St. 3–5, section 4 to QSt 4.2 and Fr.St. 7–8.

Concerning the genealogy numbers of Matthew and Luke, that on that account some people are in doubt<sup>69</sup> and say that they are contrary to each other.

1. For it is right for people to say that the evangelists should match each other in their recording of the genealogies, but that Matthew begins up from Abraham and finishes by bringing the record down to Joseph, but Luke begins and does not stop with Abraham, but with Adam and with God. Therefore there are many names that Luke mentions which are not mentioned by Matthew, very numerous indeed. It would have been right, they say, either for them to write with agreement of wording [between them] and the same things, or for one to begin from where the other left off. Now I see that Matthew brings the genealogy down from David, Solomon, and the sons of Solomon to Jacob and Joseph, while Luke [brings it down] from David and Nathan—the same that is the son of David—from Nathan to Heli and Matthat, which is contrary to the [names] of Matthew. To these things we say, strengthened by God: one brings down the genealogy from above, the other goes up from below, and it is not right for us to reproach [either of them] in anything, since they [both] have walked the same road. While some ascend the road, others descend it, [but] no one says that they have walked on a different road!

This solution is regularly found in the Holy Books, such as: "These are the generations: this Perez was the son of Judah, chief of the tribes, and Perez was the father of Hezron, Hezron the father of Aram, Aram the father of Aminadab",<sup>70</sup> and so on, little by little, going down [the line], but in the other way, going up [the line], with Elkanah, then, the father of Samuel.<sup>71</sup> What does Scripture say in the genealogy? "A man from 'Watchman Hill', from the Mount of Ephraim, whose name was Elkanah, son of Jeroham,

69. Beyer's text should read *مَوْلَى* rather than *مَوْلَةِ*.

70. Ruth 4.18.

71. 1 Chr 3.10–11. Beyer correctly reads “Samuel” here for “Solomon” of the manuscript.

﴿رَبِّنَا إِنَّا مُهَاجِرٌ حَمْلًا وَسَهْلًا لَا حَارِثًا آسِنُوا. وَمَهْلَكَةٌ إِلَيْنَا حَتَّى وَوْدَبَ، وَمَهْلَكَةٌ وَسَحْمٌ. لَا حَارِثًا حَتَّى. أَهْلًا حَتَّى. نَمْهُونَهُ حَتَّى. وَنَزَّلْنَاهُ حَتَّى. حَمْلًا حَتَّى. شَهْلَمْلًا حَتَّى. أَسْلَا حَتَّى. وَجَهْلَمْلًا كَلْمَلَهُ حَتَّى. حَمْلَمْلًا حَتَّى. كَلْمَلَهُ حَتَّى. وَجَهْلَمْلًا آتَلَهُ وَجَهْلَمْلًا كَلْمَلَهُ كَلْمَلَهُ أَفْلَهُ حَلَمْلَهُ حَلَمْلَهُ كَلْمَلَهُ﴾.

25. These two words are printed without a space in Beyer's text.

26. The word has no *syame* in Beyer's text.

27. Again, the word has no *syame* in Beyer's text.

son of Elihu, son of Tohu, son of Zuph the Ephrathite".<sup>72</sup> Again, in the book of Chronicles in another way, "Solomon was the son of David, Solomon's son was Rehoboam, Abijah was his son, Asa was his son, Jehoshaphat was his son, Joram was his son, Uzziah was his son [sic], Jotham was his son, Ahaz was his son",<sup>73</sup> and according to Matthew's method all the way to Jechoniah and the Babylonian exile. From this, understand that like these Luke agrees, even though he goes up [the line] from below.

2. Now we turn to other matters, those concerning Solomon and Nathan. Luke says thus: "Jesus was thought to be the son of Joseph, the son of Heli, the son of Melki".<sup>74</sup> Matthew gives an opinion different from that of Luke, but counts [thus]: "Matthan," he says, "was the father of Jacob, Jacob the father of Joseph".<sup>75</sup> Now that which is thought [to be the case] is one thing, that which is thus true is another. Had Luke, like Matthew, established that Joseph was the son of Heli and Melki, there would be a real contention between them. But now when Matthew establishes [the case], Luke does not contend against him, but he gives an opinion that was held by many. Now there were many opinions concerning the Messiah held by the Jews, and they all bring him back to David on account of the promises of God to him long ago: some of them are persuaded that the Messiah is from David, Solomon, and the race of kings, while others, as zealous, flee from this [opinion], as though there are the accusations against those who are kings in it, since Jechoniah<sup>76</sup> was renounced by Jeremiah, and since it was said that no progeny of his would arise to sit on the throne of David.<sup>77</sup> For this reason Luke follows a new path, that of those from David and Nathan, his son, and not from Solomon. They also say that Nathan prophesied, as it is also written in the book of Kingdoms,<sup>78</sup> and from the sons of Nathan they establish that the Messiah was born, and they count Joseph from there in the genealogies, and Luke in the narrative about these things

72. 1 Sam 1:1.

73. Beyer's text has the words ܐܲܰ ܠܻ! written without a space.

74. Luke 3.23–24. The biblical text, in fact, has "the son of Matthat, the son of Levi" between the names of Heli and Melki.

75. Matt 1.15–16.

76. See above, frag. 6.

77. Cf. Jer 22.30.

78. It is not specifically said that "Nathan prophesied", but he is called "Nathan the prophet" many times.

وَكُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>28</sup> هُلُمْ: كُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>29</sup> حُلُمْ: كُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>30</sup> تُحْلَمُهُ: كُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>31</sup> وَأَنْتَ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>32</sup> هُلُمْ: كُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>33</sup> حُلُمْ: كُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>34</sup> تُحْلَمُهُ: كُلُّهُ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>35</sup> وَأَنْتَ مُحْمَدٌ<sup>36</sup>

28. The final letter is mistakenly a *waw* in Beyer's edition.

29. Beyer corrects the text to this word from ago.

30. Beyer corrects the word to *σιν* on the basis of the Greek, but the match is still not exact, and the manuscript reading makes sense as it stands, so it has been kept here.

<sup>31</sup> Beyer's text has a space between the *taw* and *he* of this word.

gives their opinion and not his own,<sup>79</sup> while he grants to Matthew that he should not write an opinion, but as the truth of the [Messiah's] birth is. This is the first explanation.

3. But another understanding concerning this that makes more sense<sup>80</sup> is this: that as Matthew was beginning<sup>81</sup> to record the book of his [Jesus'] birth according to the flesh, it was necessary to make known the succession of the generations from which Joseph, who was of the house of David, descended, in order that his bodily fathers might be known, among whom Joseph was the reputed father of the child. For Matthew was a Syrian and spoke Hebrew, and he handed down the Gospel in Hebrew. For this reason, being among Hebrews, it was necessary for him to make known the genealogy of the house of Judah and David, so that they would not revile the birth of Emmanuel, [by saying] that he had not arisen from the house of David, according to the promise to him. And thus, little by little, he made known [the narrative] concerning his birth, the coming of the Magi, and the flight to Egypt; after this he recorded his baptism. But Luke does not follow this order, but first records the annunciation of Zachariah and the birth of John, the annunciation of St. Mary, the holy birth of the Messiah, the census during the time of Tiberius (which took place at the time of his birth), and then other things little by little, and after that, the preaching of John concerning the baptism of repentance, and then the holy baptism of Jesus, and that heaven opened for him and the Holy Spirit came down and rested on him, and a voice was heard, saying "This is my beloved son, in whom I am pleased"—because with these and similar things it was witnessed<sup>82</sup> and acknowledged that he was the Son of God. Then after that he recorded the genealogy of names different from Matthew, which are not reproached with sinful forebears, since he did not include Solomon and the accursed Jechniah, nor Tamar, nor Ruth, and says with his expression that "Jesus was thought to be the son of Joseph," as one might say that he was thought to be the Son of God and was announced [to be such] by nature, but not (as was thought) [by nature] the son of Joseph, the son of Heli, and he was thought to be the son of Joseph, but he was not [his son] by nature.

79. ﻚ، is a misprint in Beyer's text for ﻚ،.

80. Beyer corrects ﻚـ to ﻚـ.

81. Beyer emends the manuscript's ﻚـ to ﻚـ to match the Greek ὁμολογούμενος, but his emendation does not quite match the Greek, and the Syriac makes sense as it stands, so I have left the manuscript reading.

82. ﻚـ is misprinted in the printed edition as ﻚـ ﻚـ.

32. The word lacks *syame* in Beyer's text.

33. These two words are printed without a space in Beyer's text.

4. Again, another understanding concerning those who are in doubt and say, "How does one say, 'Joseph, son of Jacob, son of Matthan,' and the other, 'Joseph, son of Heli, son of Melki'?"

To this we say: There was a custom among the Hebrews and in Jerusalem, and it became a written law through Moses, that someone who dies without any sons, his brother who [survives] after him or another one of his relatives should take the wife of the man that has died and raise up a son for him, and the son that is born should be called according to the name of the man that has died, and [he will be] his son. This was because the manifest hope for resurrection had not been given yet and they found a likeness to the future promise in a mortal resurrection, so that the name of the one who has left this life would continue, as though he had not departed.<sup>83</sup> This [way of recording] was according to the law he [Moses] commanded. Since Luke followed this method, he recorded and counted those who, according to the law, were sons of those who had died, though another fathered them from [the point of view of] the generation of seed. But Matthew wrote down those from the generation of seed and actual birth. So that what I mean will be clear, I express the difference of the families: when I count the families from David through Solomon upward, the third person is Matthan, who fathered Jacob, the father of Joseph; this is according to Matthew. But [the families] from Nathan through David, according to Luke's version, upward in this way, Melki is third: "Joseph, the son of Heli, the son of Melki." So Melki and Matthan are ancestors of Joseph from different families [*gensē*], but the same tribe. Thus Matthan and Melki at a different time took the same wife and produced sons, brothers from the same mother, because the law did not forbid a widow or divorced woman from belonging to another man. (The name of the wife was, as we have found, Asta.) First, Matthan, who descended in generation from Solomon, fathered Jacob, and when Matthan died, Melki, who is referred in generation to Nathan—who was of the same tribe but another family [*šarbətā*]—when she [Asta] was widowed, he [Melki] married her, as I said, and fathered a son, Heli. Thus we find that Jacob and Heli are from two different families [*gensē*], but are brothers, sons of the same mother, one of whom, Jacob, when Heli his brother had died without sons, took his wife and fathered Joseph from her, who [Joseph] was third, who by nature and literally was his son, but legally the son of Heli, for whom his brother

---

83. The printed text has omitted the space between ﻢ. ﻪ.

٥٦- ؟، حَدَّسْ: ؟، وَعِرْمَ حَدَّهْ آسَهَةَ، أَوْحَادَهْ لَحَصَّا، بُنْهَهْ لَحَصَّا كَهْ مَا أَحَدَهْ مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ،  
؟، مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ، مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ، مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ، مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ، مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ، مَهْهَهْ هَادَهْ،

وَاهْمَحَهُ مَهْمَنًا. فَيَ حَدُّهَا وَأَلْتَعَلَّهَا.

34. Beyer mistakenly has the.

35. Beyer prints this word **ἰλλ**. I have no access to the manuscript, but given the great number of errors in his printed text, I have read the word as above, although another possibility is **ἴλλ**, with little difference in meaning.

### 36. Beyer: لامون

37. Beyer: ~~14000~~.

had raised up offspring. Luke recorded this custom of the law and adds the statement that “he was thought to be,” because “fathered” does not semantically indicate legal birth.

Do not marvel if there are forty generations in one family, but more in another, because some people produce children slowly, some quickly. Often it is possible to see two families, with an old man reaching the third generation, and it happens that he is still young, but called an elder; there is another that is already aged and a father only in terms of producing children, because one family is sparse and another frequent over the course of the revolution of 500 years, more or less.<sup>84</sup> All these generations from David to Joseph, what is remarkable [about them]? That one should be few, seven [in number], and another make an increase. So much on these things.

#### Fr.Syr. 12

Printed in Beyer, p. 68. This corresponds to the fragments Fr.Mar.Supp. 9 (Anastasius of Sinai, *Quaestio* 149) and Fr.Mar.Supp.10 (Macarius Chrysocephalus).

From Eusebius of Caesarea, from the “Book of Problems”.

The Holy Spirit, which was breathed by our Saviour into the disciples,<sup>85</sup> which was given by Him and from Him, was that of adoption,<sup>86</sup> the remission<sup>87</sup> and forgiveness of every sin.<sup>88</sup> That which was promised,<sup>89</sup> however, was not like this, but was something different from it: the gift<sup>90</sup> of power for action. And for this reason He commanded them not to depart from the city, but to wait for the promise of the Father, and this promise was that they would be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days afterwards, and

84. Reading *ܒܪ* for the misprint *ܒܪ*.

85. John 20.22.

86. Rom 8.15.

87. Reading *ܚܾܻܸܻ* for *ܚܾܻܸܻ*.

88. Eph 1:7 (?).

89. Acts 1:4–5.

90. The word as printed is *ܚܼܻܸܻ*, which means “giver” (fem.) and does not fit well here (the Holy Spirit cannot be meant, as it is masc.). If “gift” is meant—and Beyer translates it thus—this is either a new word (unlikely) or a misprint, probably for *ܚܼܻܸܻ*. There are several other errors in this text, so the latter possibility is most likely.

وَهُدْهُمَا. لَا حُلَّةٌ تَكُونُ مُكْفِلاً. هَذِهِ الْأُعُوْجُ، كُلُّ مِنْهُ مُكْفِلاً؛ ٥٥. وَحِسْبٌ وَهُمْ  
حَذِيبَةٌ. حَسْلَانٌ مُكْفِلاً وَلَا يُؤْتَدُ: وَحِلْمَيْبٌ وَهُوَ حَذِيبٌ مُكْفِلاً؛ ٥٦. وَمَسْحَصَنْتَانٌ مُكْفِلَانْتَانِ  
وَكَهْمَلَانِ مُكْفِلَانِ وَكَبَرَانِ وَكَبَرَانِ حَكْسَهَهُ ٥٥٥ كَبَرَانِ مُكْفِلَانِ وَهُوَ  
وَهُنَّهُمْ حَذِيبَهُمْ. حَرْ حَيْمَعٌ أَحْسَبَهُ حَسْلَانًا. أَنَّا وَهُمْ سَاهِدُهُمْ حَسْلَانًا؛ ٥٧. احْسَبْ  
تَكُونُ مُكْفِلَانِ وَقِيلَهُمْ حَذِيبَهُمْ. حَرْ حَيْمَعٌ أَحْسَبَهُ حَسْلَانًا. أَنَّا وَهُمْ سَاهِدُهُمْ حَسْلَانًا؛ ٥٨. احْسَبْ  
هُنَّهُمْ حَذِيبَهُمْ. حَرْ حَيْمَعٌ أَحْسَبَهُ حَسْلَانًا. أَنَّا وَهُمْ سَاهِدُهُمْ حَسْلَانًا؛ ٥٩. احْسَبْ

all of them, by virtue of the fact that they had been baptized in one Spirit, would be partakers together in the effectual power of the miraculous deeds which were to be done by them, and that is steadfast and enduring in the face of the dangers which were to come upon them. And these things were fulfilled at the end time, the days of Pentecost. When they were all gathered together in a house, the Spirit came and the house was filled with it and it baptized them in it, for this is the kind of baptism He declared: “You yourselves will be baptized, etc.”.

### Fr.Syr. 13

This fragment is found in the letters of Severus of Antioch,<sup>91</sup> Letter 108 (To Thomas of Germanicea). Text and English translation printed in E. W. Brooks, *Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch*, 270–72.<sup>92</sup> This fragment corresponds to Fr.Mar.Supp. 4, from the catena of Corderius on John, p. 436.<sup>93</sup>

Eusebius of Caesarea, too, who is called “Pamphili,” and whom we have mentioned a little bit above, when he was writing to a man called Marinus concerning questions about our Lord’s suffering and resurrection, made no indication at all about this addition mentioned by us, as though it were unknown and not recorded in the books of the Gospel. But in these letters to Marinus on our Lord’s suffering and resurrection—[Marinus] had asked him for an explanation—he explained in the letters as follows: Mark the divine Evangelist said it was the third hour at the time that Christ, God our Saviour, was crucified, but John the divine (he said) recorded that it was at the time of the sixth hour that Pilate sat on his *bema* at the place called the stone pavement and was judging Christ. Concerning this, Eusebius said<sup>94</sup> it was the error of a scribe who was not paying attention as he copied the

91. For a general overview of Severus of Antioch’s life and works, with bibliography, see Angelo di Berardino, ed., *Dal Concilio di Calcedonia (451) a Giovanni Damasco (+750): I padri orientali* (Patrologia 5; Genova: Marietti, 2001), 197–202. For an English translation, see idem, *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to John of Damascus (750)* (trans. Adrian Walford; Cambridge: Clarke, 2008). Severus was writing in Greek, but the letter is preserved only in Syriac.

92. Both Brooks and Gibson translated the respective passages into English; the present translation is, of course, based on a fresh and close reading of the Syriac text.

93. Mai<sup>2</sup>, pp. 299–300.

94. This passage to the word “letter” is published in Greek in Cramer, *Cat. in Luc. et Jo.*, p. 389 (cf. Corderius, *Cat. in Jo.*, p. 436; PG 22:1009). (Fr.Mar.Supp. 4)

﴿أَنْ يُؤْتِيَ الْحُكْمَ إِلَيْهِ مَنْ شَاءَ مِنْ أَنفُسِهِ فَإِنَّمَا يَعْلَمُ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ بِهُوَ أَعْلَمُ﴾.

38. I have added the *syame*.

Gospel. For the letter *gāmal*<sup>95</sup> [is] the one which indicates three hours, but the letter called ἐπίσημον in Greek indicates the number of six hours, and these two letters are similar in Greek. When the scribe, hurriedly wanting to write “three,” he turned it backwards<sup>96</sup> a little bit, and it was [then] found to be six, because—in that the letter had been turned backwards—it was thought to be the letter indicating six. Since, then, the three Evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke, together as from one mouth have said that from the sixth to the ninth hour there was darkness in all the land, it is known that our Lord and our God Jesus Christ was crucified before the time of six hours, when it was dark, that is, [sometime] from the third hour, as the blessed John recorded. We mean that three hours is like the sign,<sup>97</sup> because those who wrote previously, as we have said, changed the letter.

It is also right to include in this letter of ours a certain part from what was said in full by Eusebius on these things. Thus he said: “We do not agree with just anyone, but with the Evangelist who testifies, Mark: for it happened that there was an error of the scribe, so that he changed the letter by lengthening it, and the three was thought to be a six, on account of the similarities of the two letters that indicate three and six. If, then, it is said by John that it was the Friday of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the time was about the sixth hour, and Pilate said to the Jews, ‘Behold your king!’ with the rest [of what he wrote], the [letter] for three should be read instead of that for six, since the beginning of his trial was at that time, for they crucified him at the middle of the hour or once it was completed, so it will be found that in that hour they judged him and crucified him.”

If you look for and find the volume written by him [Eusebius] to Marinus for an explanation of these things, you will find the author’s precision concerning them.

95. The Syriac name is used, but of course the Greek letter *gamma* is meant.

96. That is, he turned the tail of the *gamma* back a little, so that Γ (the sign for three) becomes ζ (the sign for six).

97. I.e., the ἐπίσημον. This seems to be the sense (Brooks differently), with the Syriac word *nišā* (sign, mark, etc.) standing for the Greek word ἐπίσημον (same meaning).

39. This reading follows two manuscripts cited in Gibson's apparatus; the given text has ~~as~~.

40. Again, this is a variant. Gibson's text has ~~L~~<sup>o</sup>o?.

41. Gibson: \usurp{?}.

42. Just the abbreviation (e) is written in Gibson.

## Fr.Syr.14

This fragment is found in the commentary of Ishodad of Merv<sup>98</sup> on Mark, under Mark 15.25.<sup>99</sup> This was printed and translated by Margaret Gibson.<sup>100</sup> It is the same material as Fr.Syr. 13 and corresponds to Fr. Mar. Supp. 4, from the catena of Corderius on John p.436.

Eusebius also bears witness to this<sup>101</sup> in his letter on the suffering of our Lord that he wrote to Marinus: “John’s ‘at the sixth hour’ is a scribal error, because the copyist was not paying attention as he copied the Gospels, for the letter which [stands for] the third hour and in Greek is called ἐπίσημον, looks like [the sign for] the sixth hour, and as the copyist, in a hurry, wanted to write ‘three’, he erred and bent the letter back around a little bit, and it was found [to be] ‘six’. As, therefore, the three Evangelists, as with one mouth, say, ‘From the sixth hour to the ninth hour it was dark in all the land,’ it is known that our Lord was crucified before the time of the sixth hour, at which time there was darkness, that is, from the third hour, and it is not possible that, while darkness was spread over all the land, the soldiers could divide his clothing for lots, that the crucifiers and other passers-by could revile him, and that they could give him wine mixed with bitter herbs to drink, etc.”

98. See William Wright, *A Short History of Syriac Literature* (London: Black, 1894), 220–21; Anton Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1922), 234. For his mention in Abdisho’s Catalog (with notes), see Giuseppe Simone Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticano* (3 vols.; Rome: Typis Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1719–1728), 3.1:210–12.

99. Cf. Matt 27.45, Luke 23.44, John 19.14.

100. Gibson, ed., 2:Δ;-Δ;

101. Ishodad introduces the discussion as follows: “...it was the third hour when they crucified him.’ Some people think this is a discrepancy on Mark’s part, since Matthew and Luke said he was crucified at the sixth hour, while John said ‘at the sixth hour Pilate sat on his *bema* at the place called the stone pavement and said to the Jews, ‘Behold your king!’’ But Mark alone said that he was crucified at the third hour.” After discussing how this may be resolved, he then quotes Eusebius.\*



## COPTIC FRAGMENTS

Translated by the UCL Coptic Reading group  
convened by Carol Downer

The Coptic catena on the gospels, edited by Paul de Lagarde,<sup>1</sup> contains a number of passages attributed to "Eusebius". It is unlikely that all of these are from the *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, or even by Eusebius of Caesarea, rather than Eusebius of Emesa or other authors of the same name. But it seemed better to include them all, rather than make a selection.

A large number of pages are missing from the original manuscript of the catena.<sup>2</sup> An Arabic translation was made from it before these losses. See the section on Arabic fragments for more details.<sup>3</sup>

1. Paul de Lagarde, *Catena in evangelia Aegyptiacae quae supersunt* (Göttingen, 1886).

2. British Library Oriental 8812, formerly Parham 102. See Bentley Layton, *Catalogue of the Coptic Literary MSS in the British Library* (London, 1987), no. 249 (= pp. 389–94). Evelyn White signals the existence of a couple of leaves of a second manuscript in *The Monasteries of the Wadi 'N Natrun* (New York, 1926), 1:198–99.

3. The manuscript begins as follows: Τεμνητά πίτε πιεγαστέλιον εθογαβ κατα ματθεον ἐβολήτεν δαπηηγη πίσαθ ουος πήφωστηρ πίτε Τεκκλησια, παι ετα φηνογή ερογωπι ἐρων, ἐθρον χωέθρη μίφοναι φογαι πήρητον κατα πεττομι ερος.

πχωμ είσις ή ινσογς πχριτος πχηρι ήλανιδ πχηρι ήλεραλ.

"The interpretation of the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew from several doctors and luminaries of the church whom God illuminated so that they might expound the verses one by one in due order.

The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham” (Matt 1.11).

## CONTENTS

Fr.Copt. 1.	Matt 1.16, de Lagarde, p. 2, ll. 30–37.....	354
Fr.Copt. 2.	Matt 1.18–25, de Lagarde, p. 3, l. 28–p. 4, l. 3 .....	354
Fr.Copt. 3.	Matt 11.28, de Lagarde, p. 33, l. 36–p. 34, l. 8 .....	356
Fr.Copt. 4.	Matt 28.1, de Lagarde, p. 80, ll. 24–32.....	358
Fr.Copt. 5.	Luke 1.26, de Lagarde, p. 118, ll. 10, 24, 34 .....	359
Fr.Copt. 6.	Luke 1.39–40, de Lagarde, p. 119, l. 32–p. 120 l. 2 .....	362
Fr.Copt. 7.	Luke 1.41–45, de Lagarde, p. 120, ll. 2–13.....	362
Fr.Copt. 8.	Luke 1.46–50, de Lagarde, p. 120, ll. 13–19.....	364
Fr.Copt. 9.	Luke 1.57–79, de Lagarde, p. 122, ll. 1–14.....	364
Fr.Copt. 10.	Luke 1.69–79, de Lagarde, p. 122, l. 14–p. 123, l. 6 .....	366
Fr.Copt. 11.	Luke 1.80, de Lagarde, p.123, ll. 6–21 .....	368
Fr.Copt. 12.	Luke 2.1–7, de Lagarde, p.123, l. 22–p. 124, l. 40 .....	370
Fr.Copt. 13.	Luke2.22–3, de Lagarde, p. 125, ll. 1, 12–37.....	374
Fr.Copt. 14.	Luke 19.29–48, de Lagarde, p. 168, l. 13–p. 169, l. 9 .....	376
Fr.Copt. 15.	Luke 20.9–19, de Lagarde, p. 169, ll. 10, 11–21, 21–24....	378
Fr.Copt. 16.	John 21.1, de Lagarde, p. 230, ll. 34–36 .....	380
Fr.Copt. 17.	John 21.15–17, de Lagarde, p. 231, ll. 21–29 .....	380

ιακωβ λε αφχφο πίωσηφ πραι **μιμαριά**. εγσεβιοс. εθεε οу **ματθεοс** εργενεάλοσιп πίωσηφ ρωс κε πψηρι πίακωβ πε, ουοг λονκас λε ρωп κе **нлі**; **и**н **зар** εν<sup>т</sup>έфоуи<sup>н</sup> є<sup>г</sup>реп<sup>н</sup> нογέроу<sup>н</sup> **нкє** **ниегазгєлистис**; **ннесшшапи**. алла ё<sup>п</sup>рін **нлі** афб<sup>н</sup> **на** **нвмал** **нвснф** **енсгїш**, ουοг **афмов** **міпевчх** **сперма**, ουοг **ιακωβ** λε **песон** **афб<sup>н</sup>** **нтевсгїш** **ката** **пиномос**, **афтоунос** **оу<sup>х</sup>ро<sup>ж</sup>** **міпевсон**, **и<sup>ш</sup>нф** κε οүн **п<sup>ш</sup>ри** **н<sup>ш</sup>акωб** πε, **ката** **ф<sup>ш</sup>сіс**, ουοг **п<sup>ш</sup>ри** **н<sup>ш</sup>лі** πε, **ката** **пиномос**.

<sup>1</sup> π<sup>к</sup>и<sup>и</sup>м<sup>и</sup>с<sup>и</sup> **λε** **н<sup>и</sup>коу<sup>с</sup>** **п<sup>х</sup>ристо<sup>с</sup>** **н<sup>е</sup> о<sup>у</sup>п<sup>а</sup>ирн<sup>т</sup>** πε. ё<sup>т</sup>а<sup>н</sup>ω<sup>п</sup> **н<sup>с</sup>а** **т<sup>е</sup>в<sup>м</sup>а** **н<sup>и</sup>шнф**, ουοг **м<sup>і</sup>п<sup>а</sup>тоу<sup>н</sup>коу<sup>н</sup>** **н<sup>о</sup>г<sup>е</sup>роу<sup>н</sup>**, **а<sup>у</sup>ж<sup>е</sup>м<sup>и</sup>** **е<sup>с</sup>е<sup>м</sup>и<sup>ш</sup>оки** **é<sup>в</sup>и<sup>о</sup>л<sup>т</sup>е<sup>н</sup>** **о<sup>у</sup>т<sup>п</sup>е<sup>н</sup>ум<sup>а</sup>** **е<sup>в</sup>о<sup>н</sup>а<sup>в</sup>**. ουοг κе **м<sup>і</sup>п<sup>е</sup>в<sup>с</sup>оу<sup>н</sup>и<sup>с</sup>**, **ж<sup>а</sup>т<sup>е</sup>с<sup>и</sup>м<sup>и</sup>с<sup>и</sup>** **м<sup>і</sup>п<sup>а</sup>л<sup>о</sup>н<sup>у</sup>**.<sup>2</sup> ...

εγσεβιос ρωп κе **м<sup>і</sup>м<sup>о</sup>с**. **л<sup>к</sup>е<sup>в</sup>и<sup>с</sup>** οүн **м<sup>і</sup>п<sup>е</sup>в<sup>с</sup>оу<sup>н</sup>и<sup>с</sup>** κе **ф<sup>а</sup>и<sup>т</sup>** **т<sup>е</sup>** **т<sup>п</sup>ар<sup>т</sup>е<sup>н</sup>о<sup>с</sup>** **é<sup>т</sup>е** **н<sup>с</sup>а<sup>д</sup>и<sup>а</sup>с** **с<sup>а</sup>х<sup>и</sup>** **е<sup>т</sup>в<sup>и</sup>н<sup>т</sup>с** κе **г<sup>н</sup>ип<sup>е</sup> ю<sup>с</sup>** **т<sup>п</sup>ар<sup>т</sup>е<sup>н</sup>о<sup>с</sup>** **е<sup>с</sup>е<sup>е</sup>р<sup>в</sup>о<sup>к</sup>и**, **н<sup>т</sup>е<sup>с</sup>и<sup>м</sup>и<sup>с</sup>** **н<sup>о</sup>г<sup>у</sup>шнри**, ουοг **н<sup>с</sup>е<sup>м</sup>оу<sup>н</sup>т** **é<sup>п</sup>е<sup>в</sup>р<sup>ан</sup>** κе **е<sup>ш</sup>ш<sup>а</sup>н<sup>о</sup>у<sup>н</sup>л**, **é<sup>в</sup>и<sup>н</sup>л** **é<sup>т</sup>а<sup>с</sup>и<sup>м</sup>и<sup>с</sup>** **м<sup>і</sup>п<sup>а</sup>л<sup>о</sup>н<sup>у</sup>**: **г<sup>о</sup>т<sup>е</sup>** **λε** **é<sup>т</sup>а<sup>с</sup>и<sup>м</sup>и<sup>с</sup>** **н<sup>к</sup>е** **т<sup>п</sup>ар<sup>т</sup>е<sup>н</sup>о<sup>с</sup>**, ουοг **ф<sup>ен</sup>** **п<sup>х</sup>ин<sup>т</sup>р<sup>е</sup>ц** **н<sup>а</sup>н** **é<sup>н</sup>и<sup>ш</sup>а<sup>н</sup>é<sup>с</sup>о<sup>в</sup>о<sup>н</sup>**, **е<sup>н</sup>г<sup>у</sup>ш<sup>и</sup>ш** **м<sup>і</sup>ф<sup>и</sup>** **е<sup>т</sup>а** **т<sup>п</sup>ар<sup>т</sup>е<sup>н</sup>о<sup>с</sup>** **и<sup>ш</sup>ас<sup>и</sup>** κе **н<sup>т</sup>о<sup>с</sup>и<sup>п</sup>** πε **п<sup>х</sup>ристо<sup>с</sup>** **п<sup>б</sup>о<sup>в</sup>и<sup>с</sup>**, **ката** **т<sup>ф</sup>е** **и<sup>ш</sup>а<sup>н</sup>и<sup>ст</sup>а** **é<sup>т</sup>а<sup>н</sup>с<sup>и</sup>ш<sup>т</sup>е<sup>м</sup>** **н<sup>т</sup>ото<sup>т</sup>о<sup>г</sup>**

---

1. The numerical **и** 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 δίκαιος/δίκαιώς 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 Luke<sup>1</sup> 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 his<sup>2</sup> 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 the<sup>3</sup> Holy Spirit” and “he did not know her until she brought forth the child”. ...

Eusebius also says this: it was rightly,<sup>4</sup> 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” ...<sup>5</sup> “except when<sup>6</sup> she brought forth the child”<sup>7</sup>: but when the maiden had given birth and because of his sight of<sup>8</sup> 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 ΛΙΚΕΩC.

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 ωΛΤΕCΩC rather than the ἐΒΗΛ ἐΤΑCΩC of the fragment.

8. Or “from his seeing”.

ἵνιαστελος, ηει πικεμαρος, εγει λωροη ηαψ χως ηογή ουος χως ουρο ουος χως ρεψή μπωνθ, ηει πικεαστελος ετχω μιμος ηαψ θει πιχοραμα κε μιπερερχοτ, ιωσηφ, έψεπ μαριά τεκσηιαι έροκ, φη σαρ έτεснамасψ ου έβολθει ουπηεγψα εψοναθ πε - τοτε λοιποη ψιτεη ηαι ηει ηαικεχωουηι αψογωηι δικεως κε θαι τε Τπαρθενοс ετα ήсайас сажи εθвнтс κε ic Τπαρθενοс εсéервоки, ήтесмисι ήηογψири, ουος ήсемонгή έпеауран κе εшшаноуиа.

Διιωηι ζарои, οуон нібен εтθоси ουος έтотп θа ηογετψωи, ουος ձնօկ εθнаժմітон ηատեи. έтι οи εγсевиос. ηեтθоси ηе ηиօյձաи

of the Magi when they brought a gift to him as God and as King and as Life-giver, and because of the sight of the angel too who said to him in a dream “Do not be afraid, Joseph, to take Mary as your wife, for this one whom she will bear is of the<sup>9</sup> Holy Spirit”—then, thereafter, because of these and the other points, he knew her in a fitting way,<sup>10</sup> because this was the maiden of whom Isaiah said “Lo, the maiden shall conceive and shall bring forth a child, and he shall be called Emmanuel”<sup>11</sup>

### Fr.Copt. 3

On Matt 11.28. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 33, l. 36–p. 34, l. 8.

“Come to me, all who are weary and are heavy-laden and I shall give you rest”. And again Eusebius. Those who labour are the Jews, the ones

9. Literally “a”.

10. This is a play on the borrowed Greek word δικεω = δικαιώς.

11. The text could also be translated in other ways because of ambiguity in the meaning of certain words and suffixes. This may account for the difference in the rendering of the Arabic version, made from the Coptic. However it should be born in mind that the Greek of Matthew reads “he did not know her”, without any qualifying corollary. I give another possible translation with alternative readings, highlighting the changes, and putting into italics words that may be ambiguous in the Coptic:

*But* Eusebius says this: it was *with reason*, then, that “he did not know her”, that she was the *maiden/virgin* of whom Isaiah says, “Lo, the *maiden/virgin* shall conceive, and shall give birth to a child, and he shall be called Emmanuel” … “except when she brought forth the child”: but when the maiden *had* given birth and *through/because of his vision* of the shepherds *who/as they proclaimed*, “This one to whom the *maiden/virgin* has given birth, he is Christ the Lord”, just as they had heard from the angels, and also (*through/because of*) the Magi when they brought a gift to him as God and as King and as Life-giver, and (*through/because of*) the angel too who said to him in a dream “Do not be afraid, Joseph, to take Mary as your wife, for this one whom she will bear is of the (a) Holy Spirit”—then, thereafter, because of these and the other points, he knew her/*it justifiably/with reason*, that she/*this* was the maiden of whom Isaiah said “Lo, the maiden shall conceive and shall bring forth a child, and he shall be called Emmanuel”.

There seems to be a play on the word δίκαιος, which was used to describe Joseph in Matt 1:19. The word order of the original, with δικεω in the second instance in a different position from its position at first occurrence, is surely intended for emphasis. Nor does δικεω mean “truly”, as given in the Arabic translation.

ΝΑΙΕΤΘΟΣΙ ΘΕΝ ΝΕΝΘΒΗΝΟΙ ΝΝΙΘΥΓΙΑΔ ΝΕΜ ΝΙΧΙΝΤΑΛΕ ΥΟΥΔΙΩΝΩΥ  
 έπωνι ήτε ΝΙΜΑΣΙ ΟΥΟΖ ΕΤΙΡΙ ΝΝΙΟΥΔΑΖΣΑΖΝΙ ΕΤ ΘΕΝ ΠΙΝΟΜΟΣ.  
 ΝΗΕΤΟΤΠ ΘΕΝ ΝΟΥΕΤΦΩΟΝΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΕΘΝΟΣ ΝΑΙΕΤΟΤΠ ΘΕΝ ΤΕΤΦΩ  
 ΉΤΠΛΑΝΗ ΝΤΜΕΤΨΑΜΨΕΙΔΑΛΟΝ. ΚΕ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΕΘΝΑΙ ΖΑ ΠΒΩΙΣ,  
 ΙΤΕ ΈΒΟΛΘΕΝ ΝΙΟΥΔΑΙ, ΙΤΕ ΈΒΟΛΘΕΝ ΝΙΕΘΝΟΣ, ΥΑΨΤΜΙΤΟΝ ΝΙΑΟΝ ΖΙΤΕΝ  
 ΠΕΨΗΔΑΖΒΕΨ ΉΡΕΨΤΟΥΧΟ, ΈΤΕ ΝΕΨΕΤΟΛΗ ΕΘΟΥΓΑΒ ΝΕ ΉΡΕΨΤ ΜΠΑΝΦ. ΚΕ  
 ΓΑΡ ΘΕΝ ΟΥΜΕΘΜΗ ΠΕΨΗΔΑΖΒΕΨ ΖΟΛΧ: ΈΤΕ ΠΕΨΗΔΑΖΤ ΠΕ ΝΑΤΣΑΡΕΜ  
 ΟΥΟΖ ΝΑΤΘΑΛΕΒ. ΟΥΟΖ ΤΕΨΕΤΦΩ ΆΣΙΩΟΥ: ΈΤΕ ΘΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΕΤΦΩ  
 ΕΘΟΥΓΑΒ ΝΝΙΔΡΕΤΗ ΉΡΕΨΤΑΝΦΟ.

ΠΛ ΡΟΥΓΙ ΔΕ ΝΝΙΚΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ ΕΤΟΟΥΙ ΜΙΦΟΥΑΙ ΝΝΙΚΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ, ΑΣΙ  
 ΝΙΚΕ ΜΑΡΙΑ ΔΙΑΖΔΑΛΙΝΗ ΝΕΜ ΤΚΕΜΑΡΙΑ ΔΝΑΝ ΕΠΙΜΙΖΑΝ. ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΣ.  
 ΠΙΧΙΝΧΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΧΕ ΡΟΥΓΙ ΝΝΙΚΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ ΝΕΜ ΖΑΝΔΤΟΟΥΙ ΕΜΑΨΑ ΜΙΦΟΥΑΙ  
 ΝΝΙΚΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ ΝΕΜ ΕΤΑ ΦΡΗ ΨΑΙ ΕΨΤΜΗΝΙ ΕΝΙΚΕΡΟΣ ΕΤΨΕΒΗΝΟΥΤ ΕΤΑ  
 ΠΙΓΙΟΜΙ Ι ΕΠΙΜΙΖΑΝ ΝΘΗΤΟΥ. ΑΝΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΠΙΜΙΖΑΝ ΝΔ ΝΙΟΠ ΘΕΝ ΠΙΕΖΑΡΧ  
 ΕΤΕΜΙΑΝ: ΕΘΒΕ ΦΔΙ Ά ΦΟΥΑΙ ΦΟΥΑΙ ΝΝΙΚΕΕΝΑΔΓΕΛΙΣΤΗΣ ΣΑΧΙ ΚΑΤΑ  
 ΠΙΚΕΡΟΣ ΕΤΨΕΒΗΝΟΥΤ ΕΤΑ ΠΙΓΙΟΜΙ Ι ΕΠΙΜΙΖΑΝ ΝΘΗΤΨ: ΕΠΙΔΗ ΓΑΡ ΕΤΑ  
 ΠΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΤΩΝΨ ΘΕΝ ΤΦΑΨΙ ΜΠΙΕΖΑΡΧ, ΟΥΟΖ ΑΨΟΥΟΨΨ ΕΜΑΡΙΑ  
 ΔΙΑΖΔΑΛΙΝΗ.

who labour under their<sup>12</sup> sacrificial tasks<sup>13</sup> and proud offerings of young animals,<sup>14</sup> and what(ever) fulfils the commandments that are in the Law.<sup>15</sup> And those who are weighed down by their burdens are the nations, the ones who are burdened by the cargo of error<sup>16</sup> and idol-worship. But on the other hand, to everyone who is under the Lord, whether from the Jews or the pagans, he gives rest through his saving yoke, that is to say, his holy, life-giving commandments. For indeed in truth his yoke is sweet whose faith is unyielding<sup>17</sup> and without flaw. And his burden is light, that is to say, the holy burden of the saving virtues.

#### Fr.Copt. 4

On Matt 28.1. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 80, ll. 24–32. Cf. Fr.Ar. 5, QMar. 2, Fr. Mar. 1, and Fr.Mar.Supp. 16.

“On the evening of the Sabbath,<sup>18</sup> at dawn on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the tomb”. Eusebius: for the saying “on the evening of the Sabbath” and “very early on the first day of the week” and “when the sun rose” give indication of the different times at which the women came to the tomb. For they came to the tomb four times that night: and because of this, each one of the evangelists speaks about the different time at which the women came to the tomb, for it was in the middle of the night that Christ rose and appeared to Mary Magdalene.

#### Fr.Copt. 5

On Lk 1:26. Three fragments are printed consecutively by de Lagarde, p. 118, ll. 10, 24, 34.

12. De Lagarde's text reads *men*, “our”, presumably a mistake for *nev*.

13. Either “works of sacrifice(s)” or “sacrificial tasks”.

14. Or “victims”.

15. A little earlier in the catena, on p. 33, ll. 19ff. of de Lagarde, “the wise Cyril” (of Alexandria) was quoted as saying that the “wise and learned” in Matt 11.25 were the chief priests and Pharisees and the whole people of the Jews.

16. Or “deception”.

17. I.e., not led astray.

18. Or “late on the Sabbath”.

έτι ήθοφ ον εγενεβιος. θεη πιάβωτ κε ουν μιμαχρή ήτε πκινερβοκι ήέλισαβετ ανονωρπ ήγαβριηλ πιαστελος έβολργιτεη φηοντή παζαρεθ έθρεη φηψεηπονγφη ήτπαρθεηνος. έτανωπ λε ήιωσ ήιωσηφ κατα ονοικονομιά μπαραδοζον, κε χηνα θεη φαι ήτε πιμνυστηριον χωπ έπαρχωη ήτε παιέωη, εισακι έροφ ήθοφ πιδιάδολος. θεη πκινθρογ ωπ γαρ ήια Τσεγι. ψαρε ουνον ηιβεη έιι έπταχρο μπιταμοс. ουογ ήτεεβωλέβολ ήκε χηποποιά ηιβεη ήτε ηιεθονογ χέκεη λωικι ήιακι. έπιλη γαρ ήθοφ χωφ πσατανοс έναφή ήγθηφ πε έπιακι ήιιαίας πιπροφητηс θεη πκινθρεη φοс κε χηπε ιс Τπαρθεηνοс εεέερβοκι, ουογ ήτεεμιсι ήιγψηρι, ουογ εηέμογή έροφ κε ειιιανογηλ, εθβε φαι δ πιλογοс εροικονομιη έωπ ήια τεψιαν μαριά ήιωσηφ, ροπως θεη φαι ήτεφερατέηι έφμνυστηριον ήτε τεψοικονομιά εθμεη ήινχαι. ίτα λε πεκε πιεναγτελιστηс κε έταψιεη παφ έθονη ραροс ήκε πιαστελοс, ουογ πεκαφ παс κε χερε, θηεθμεη ήγμοт, πδωιс ηεме.

ήθοφ ον εγενεβιοс. θθεη παισακι αсвωλέбοл ήκε Τληпη ηεм πιικαг ήγηт έταψιωπι ρα ενά χηтен Τάпатη ήτε πιχοφ. έπιλη λε ηε ουνομομαθηс τε Τпарθεηнοс, ουογ πасмокмек μиос πε κε παικινсакι μпайрнή, μписоθмеи έнег ϑεη Τграфи εθонялв: ον αу ήрнή κε ουν πε παιаспасмос; θθεη φαι πасерапориη πε θεη πεсгнт. αλла сатотφ δ πιαστελοс ωλι ήтгоt ήтпориа έβολργароc, ουογ πεκαφ παс μпайрнή θεη ουшетгумеpоc: μперергoт, πεκαφ, μарιá, δрeжиmι γαρ ήиogмoт μпeмeθo μфноnή, ουογ χηппe

Fr.Copt. 5a, de Lagarde p. 118. ll. 10–24

[3.]<sup>19</sup> And once more Eusebius. “In the sixth month of Elisabeth’s pregnancy,<sup>20</sup> the angel Gabriel was sent by God to Nazareth to bring the good news to the virgin”. She was betrothed to Joseph by an extraordinary dispensation, so that in this way the mystery might be concealed from the ruler of this age,<sup>21</sup> by which I mean the Devil. From his betrothal to the woman, everyone knew the validity of the marriage, and every suspicion of those who wanted to find an excuse for “talk” was dissolved. For since Satan himself gave heed<sup>22</sup> to the saying of Isaiah the prophet where he says, “Lo, the maiden will be with child, and will bring forth a son, and he will be called Emmanuel”, because of this the Word made the dispensation for his mother Mary to be betrothed to Joseph, so that through this he (the devil) might not know/might remain ignorant of the mystery of His saving dispensation.<sup>23</sup> Then the evangelist said “And the angel came (in) to her and said to her, ‘Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with you’”<sup>24</sup>

Fr.Copt. 5b, de Lagarde, p. 118, ll. 24–34

And again Eusebius. And so, through this saying, the grief and affliction (of heart) which had befallen Eve through the deception of the Serpent was destroyed.<sup>25</sup> Since the virgin was learned in the Law and was thinking “This saying is such as I have never heard in the Holy Scripture. What sort of greeting then is this?”—because of this, she was at loss in her heart. But at once the angel removed the fearful perplexity from her, and spoke to her gently in these words, “Do not fear, Mary”, he said, “for you have found favour in<sup>26</sup> the presence of God, and behold, you will conceive

19. The Coptic numeral is not actually present in the text because of a lacuna. But it refers to a numbered list of contents given on pp. 115–18. This lists the verses to be discussed in the catena on Luke, with a short description. The third item is “3. On Elisabeth”. The catena proper then begins on p. 118, l. 10. There is a lacuna immediately before then, at the end of the table, so the first two comments are entirely lost.

20. Or “from when Elisabeth conceived”.

21. Or “world”.

22. Impf.

23. Literally “dispensation which is full of salvation”.

24. The remainder of the verse is omitted in the catena.

25. Or “dispersed”.

26. Or “with”.

τεραερβοκι, ήτεμισι ήνωψηρι, ουος ἐρεμοντ̄ ἐπεφραν κε ινσογς: φαι  
Γαρ εφέερ ουηιψτ̄, ουος ενέμοντ̄ ἐροφ κε πψηρι μίφηετβοσι.

έτι ον ευσεβιος. αλλα εκσωτεμ έφαι κε εφέερ ουηιψτ̄,  
μίπερμενι έονχωκεβ ἐθονη ἐτεψμετνοντ̄ μίφρητ̄ ήάριος ηει  
άποληπαριος, ηαιετκω μίμος κε ετα πιλογος ηιαρχη ήσωητ̄ έβολθεη  
Τπαρθεηοс, αλλα άριποιν ευσεβωс ήπισαχι έχεη τεψοικονομιά  
εθοναβ ήρεψτονχο.

Γ αστωηс ήκε ηαριαи θεη ηιέρθοοуη ἐτεψμαγ. αψωε ηαс  
θεη ουηηс έπιαντωοу έονθакι ήτε ιουλα, ουος αψωε έθονη έπηη  
ήζαχαριас, αсераспазесθε ήέλιсаθεт. ευσεβιοс. ηηηιψτ̄ εθηα გა  
ηηεтсвок έχοτερωօց: μίφρηт̄ Γαρ ετα πбωиς ψε ηаq გa ιωանнηс  
έθρεգ ηιամс έβολցիտօվ, φαι շաq πe μίφրηт̄ ήΤπαρθεηοс  
έτաψωе ηαс გa έլιсаθεт τεսցուցեηис. ουος ηιայ ήրηт̄ έλιсаθεт  
τεսցուցեηис τe; εθեе κe θai ηен οу έβολθεη πարօք ήձարաη ηει  
λεηi, Τпарθеηос ձe οу έβολθεη πարօք ήձարաη ηει ιουլաс: λεηi  
(p.120) κe οуηη ηει ιουլաс con թ e έβολθεη ογιωт ηει ουηмаг, έτe  
ιакաв πe ηει λiд.

αλλα πeχe πieνaгaгeлиcтнc κe αψωպi, έτaссωтeм ήкe  
éлiсаθeт eпaспaсmoc մiմaриaи, aփkim ήкe pимaс θeη οuթeլiհi θeη  
tecneхi. ήθoց oն εuсeбiоc. κe Γaр ձ iωանнηс նi մiпiпeնuմa εθoνaв  
iсken eр θeη θneхi ήtε tεψmaн: eθeе φai aփkim θeη οuրaшi շiтeп  
tpaրaկaնcic մiпiпeնuմa εθoնaв. օθeен ηeи tkeéлiсаθeт έtacmioг  
éвoлtheп paмiпeնuմa ρw ήoγaт մiпaրaկaնtoп, aсawy έpψwι θeη  
oуηiψt̄ ήcмiη οuгoг peхaс κe tεcmaрaѡoтt̄ ήtø θeη piгjóмi, οuгoг  
qcmiарaѡoтt̄ ήкe poчtaг ήtε tεnexi. φai οу έвoл θaн nni pe, κe  
ήtε θmaи մiпabwic i շaրoи; շiтpe Гaр iсken έtacψwapi ήкe tcmi  
mpeасspасmoc θeη naшaшk, aփkim ήкe pимaс θeη οuթeլiհi θeη

and bear a son, and call his name Jesus. For he will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High".

Fr.Copt. 5c, de Lagarde, p. 118, ll. 34–38

And again Eusebius. But when you hear this: "He will be great", do not think that he is lesser with regard to His godhead as Arius and Apolinarius [*sic*] do, those who *do* allege that (*sc.* he is less) inasmuch as the Word took the beginning of creation<sup>27</sup> from the Virgin, but (who) think piously of this saying in terms of his holy dispensation for salvation.

Fr.Copt. 6

On Luke 1.39–48. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 119, l. 32–p. 120 l. 2.

"In those days Mary (Mariam) arose and went with haste into the hill country, to a city of Judah, and she entered the house of Zacharias and greeted Elisabeth". Eusebius. "The great ones will be under those who are less than they": for just as the Lord came "under" John to receive baptism from him, this too was the way of the Virgin when she took herself "under" Elisabeth her kinswoman. And *how* is Elisabeth her kinswoman? Because she is from the stock of Aaron and Levi, and the Virgin is from the stock of David and Judah: Levi [p. 120] and Judah are two brothers from a single mother and father, namely, Jacob and Leah.

Fr.Copt. 7

On Luke 1.42–46. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 120, ll. 2–13.

But the evangelist says that it happened that when Elisabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the child moved in exultation in her womb. Here again Eusebius: for John too received the Holy Spirit even from the womb of his mother, and because of this he moved in joy from the stirring of the Holy Spirit. Likewise Elisabeth also was full of this one same spirit, the Paraclete, and cried out in a loud voice saying, "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! How could this happen to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, when the sound of your greeting came to my ears, the child leapt in joy in my womb.

---

27. Or "life".

ΤΑΝΕΧΙ. ὠΟΥΝΙΑΤΣ ήΘΗÉΤΑΣΝΑΓ̄ ΧΕ ΠΧΑΚÉΒΟΛ ΝΑΨΑΠΙ ήΝΗÉΤΑΥΣΑΧΙ  
ΜΙΣΩΟΥ ΝΕΜΑС ÉΒΟΛΩΓ̄ΤΕΝ ΠΒΩΙС.

Ήθοφ ον εγεβίος. εσσωτεμ χε ουη έναιμακαρίσμος ετσιμαρωντ ήχε ἡπαρθενος, πασθεληλ πε φεη πεσπνευμα φεη ογενφροσγη μίπνευματικον, ασωω ἐπωι εσκω μίσος χε ἀ ταψγχη βίσι μίπνωιс, ουοշ ἀ παπνευμα θεληλ ἐκεν φνογ̄ πασωτηρ, χε αψκογψτ ἐγρη ἐκεν πθεβιό ήτε τεψβωκι: χηππε γαρ ισκεν ἡνογ σεναερμακαριζη μίσοι ήχε ηγενεά τηρογ.

## Δ ΕΘΒΕ ΠΧΙΜΕΙΣΙ ΗΙΩΑΝΝΗΗС.

Δ πισνογ μοδέβολ ήτε ἐλισαβετ ἐθρες μισι, ουοշ ασμισι ηγψηρι. ουοշ αγωτεμ ήχε ηη ἐτε μίπκωτ μίπεση νεμ πεccυτσεηηс χε ἀ πνωιс ερ πεψηαι ήηηψτ νεμαс, ουοշ παγραψι νεμαс τηρογ πε. εγεβίος. ίτα Δε ον φεη πχινθρογ μιси ηιωανηηс, ουοշ ήτογсονβητη κατα φνомос μίσωγчс, έναγмонг̄ ἐροφ πε ἐφραη μίπεψιωτ ざχαριαс. αλλα ἐπιδη νε ἀ πιατσελοс κηη ἐερψорη πήνωρπέβολ ήζαχαριαс πε εθβε φραη ήιωανηηс, ἐταψερέτηη ήογпипакиc, αψεψαι χε ιωανηηс πε πεψραη. ἀ ρωψ Δε ουωη, πεκαψ ήτχοт ήτχοт νεμ πεψλас, ουοշ παψсахι πε εψсмог ἐφног̄. αλλα πεκε πιεγατσελистηηс Δε ον χε ἐταψмог ἐβολφεη ογппеуmа εψօցաv ήχε ざχαριαс εθβε φи ἐρε ἡπαρθενοс παшасы, αψερπροφηтeуηη εψкω μίσος χε զմարωνտ ήχε πνωιс φног̄ μίпicрaнl, χε αψкeи πψимi. αψiрi ήօցωт μίпeվlaoc.

Blessed is she who has believed that the fulfilment of those things which were spoken to her by the Lord would be accomplished.”

### Fr.Copt. 8

On Luke 1.46–50. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 120, ll. 13–19.

Here again Eusebius. As the Virgin heard these blessed felicitations, she rejoiced in her spirit with spiritual joy, and cried aloud saying, “My soul has magnified the Lord, and my spirit has rejoiced in God my Saviour, because He has looked upon the humility of his handmaid, for behold from henceforth all generations will call me blessed”.

### Fr.Copt. 9

On Luke 1.57–79. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 122, ll. 1–14.

#### 4. Concerning the birth of John.<sup>28</sup>

“The time was completed for Elisabeth to give birth and she brought forth a son; and the people who lived around her house and her kinsmen heard that the Lord had shown his great compassion to her and they all rejoiced with her”. Eusebius.<sup>29</sup> Then again when John was born and they were circumcising him according to the Law of Moses, he was going to be called by his father’s name, Zacharias [*sic*]. But when the angel had intervened in time to reveal to Zacharias the name (of) John, he asked for a tablet, and wrote, “His name is John”. And his mouth was opened and he cried out at once with his tongue, and spoke, praising God. But again the evangelist said that Zacharias was filled with the<sup>30</sup> Holy Spirit concerning the one whom the Virgin would bear, and prophesied, saying, “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people”.

---

28. The numeral “4” and the heading are in de Lagarde and refer back to the numbered list at the start of the catena on Luke.

29. Line 5.

30. Literally “a Holy Spirit”.

έτι ον εγενεσίος. όως έτι εε πεμαφ φεν πεψηή πάκε τπαρθενος θμαγ μίπωις, αφερπροφητευιν πίπαι πάκε ζαχαριας εθε φη έρε τπαρθενος εθοναβ παμασφ, κε ἀληθως πάθοφ πε πόωις φηνή μίπιεραη λ φηέταψκεμ πψηη ουος αφίρι πίονγωφ μίπεψλαος. ουος αψτογνος ουταπ πάπορεμ παη φεν πηή πάλαγιλ πεψάλου κατα φηηή έταψαχι έβολφεν ρων πίπεψηρφητης εθοναβ ιψκεν πενερ. εψμογή ουη έπιεωτηρ φηέταψη έβολφεν παροξ πάλαγιλ κατα σαρζ κε ταπ πάπορεμ, φαι ετα πιπροφητης ερψωρπ πίαχι εθεψητη ιψκεν πενερ. ουηνορεμ έβολφεν πενχαχι πεμ έβολφεν πενχικ πίονον πίβεν εθμοσή μίμον. έιρι πίονηαι πεμ πεμιοφ ουος έερ φψενή πίτεψλιάθηκη εθοναβ. πενχαχι δε ουη πιδιάθολος πε πεμ πεψλεμωη ετψωογ, παιεθμοσή μίπενωηθ ουος εγκωφή ησα πεντακο πίσνου πίβεν, έαψηαχμεν έβολψητοτογ πάκε πχριστος πεννογή έθε πιάναψ έταψωρκ μίμοφ πάλβρααμ πενιωτ εψχω μίμοφ κε πάθρη ηθητη ενέδισμογ πάκε πιψηλη τηρογ ήτε πκαχι, ουος οη κε αιχακ πίωτ έκεη ουψηψ μίεθνος. έληνορεμ έβολφεν πενχικ πίπενχαχι, έψεψψη μίμοφ φεν ουτογνο πεμ ουψεθμη μίπεψμίθο πίπενχεροογ τηρογ. πάθοκ δε, πιάλογ, ενέμογή έροκ κε πιπροφητης ήτε φηετβοσι: χηαερψωρπ γαρ μίμοψη μίπεμθο μίπωις έεεψτε πεψμωητ, έψη πίονέμη ήτε φηορεμ μίπεψλαος φεν ουχωέβολ ήτε ςαπνοβι. έβηλ γαρ πάψωρπ ήτε πιρωμη πορεμ έβολφεν πενχικ πίπεψχαχι, μίπαψψκεμχομ πίψεψψη μίψηνογή φεν ουτογνο πεμ ουψεθμη. ουηπροφητης δε οη πε ζαχαριας, αφερπροφητευιν ρω οη εθε πεψψηρι μίπροφητης φαιεθηαμωψη φα τψη μίπωις έεεψτε πεψμωητ. φψωητ γαρ μίπωις πε τψεταηι, θαιετή πίονέμη ήτε φηορεμ πίπηεθηαδητς φεν ουχωέβολ ήτε πονηνοβι. εθε (p. 123) πιψετψενχητ ήτε φηαι μίπενηογή φεν παιέτεψηαψη έρον πάθητογ κε ἀπατολη έβολφεν πηισι, έερογωιη πίπηετχεμι φεν πχακι πεμ τψηηβι μίψμον,

## Fr.Copt. 10

On Luke 1.69–79. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 122, l. 14–p. 123, l. 6.

And again Eusebius. When the Virgin, the mother of the Lord, was still with him in his house, Zacharias prophesied thus about the one whom the holy Virgin would bear, that truly he was the Lord God of Israel who had visited and redeemed his people. “And he has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant, as he spoke through the mouths of his holy prophets of old...”<sup>31</sup> He is therefore calling the saviour, the one who has come from the seed of David according to the flesh, (the) “horn of salvation”. This is the one whom the prophets spoke about formerly from of old, [p. 122] “... a salvation from our enemies and from the hands of all who hate us, to show mercy ... to our fathers, and remember his holy covenant”. Our enemies, then, are the Devil and his wicked demons, those who hate our life and continually seek after our destruction, although Christ our God has delivered us from them through the oath which he swore to Abraham our father when he said, “Through your seed will all the nations of the earth be blessed”,<sup>32</sup> and again, “I have set you as father over many nations”.<sup>33</sup> “We have been saved from the hands of our enemies to serve him ... in holiness and righteousness before him all our days. But you, little child, shall be called the prophet of the Most High, for you shall go before the Lord to prepare his ways, to give knowledge of salvation to his people through forgiveness of sins”. Unless first of all a man<sup>34</sup> is saved from the hands of his enemies, he has not been able to<sup>35</sup> serve God in holiness and righteousness. But Zacharias was also a prophet and prophesied himself about his (own) son as a prophet who would go before the Lord to prepare his ways. For the way of the Lord is the repentance which will give knowledge of salvation to those who will receive it through remission of their sins. “... through [p. 123] the kindnesses of the compassion<sup>36</sup> of our God (from those) which he,<sup>37</sup> the dayspring from on high, will visit upon us, to give light to

---

31. Luke 1.69–70.

32. Gen 22.18.

33. Gen 17.4.

34. Literally “the man”.

35. I.e., “cannot”.

36. Or “compassionate kindnesses”.

37. *xe*

έπχινσογτεν ονειδαλαγκ έφιμωιτ ήτε Τχυρηνη. ευμοντ δε έροψ  
κε ἀνατολη έβολθεν ποισι, εθε κε έταφι έπικοσμος έφολθεν ποισι,  
ουος ἀνατολη πε πειραν κατα παχι μιπροφητης.

πιάλον ότε αφαιρεί ουρανός αφάμμαρη φέν πιπνευμα, ουρανός παραγμή πε φέν πιώσαφεν ψά πιέχοον πίτε πεφογωνηθέβολ ψά πισρανή. έπιδη ουν φέν πκιπθρού μίσι μίπχριστος φέν βηθλεεμ πίτε τιουνλεά κατα πασχι μίππροφιητης, ίτα ότε ανή πήκε πιμαγος έβολ σα πειεβτ έιερογυαλημ ενγωμή κε αφ θων φηέταγμασαφ πογρο πίτε πιογλάδι, ήρωλης ότε ουν έταφωτεμ, ουρανός έταφωτηπ φέν ογλιβι πήχητ, αφογωρητ έθωτεβ πάλον πιβεν ετ φέν βηθλεεμ πεμ πεσδην τηρογ ισχεν ρομπι σποντή πεμ σα πεσητ. φέν παι κε ουν αφογωρητ έθωτεβ μίπκειωανης πψηκρι πίζαχαριας. ουρανός έτε ειμπεφκεμφ, αφογωραγμη έθωτεβ πίζαχαριας φέν ρως πήτσηφι. έλισαβετ ουν έτασέμι κε σεκωτή πίσα πεσψηκρι έθοθθεφ. αστωνης, ασβι μίπιάλον, ασψη πας έθονη έπψαφε, ασχοπς φαρατον πίπιτων πεμ πιπετρα, ουρανός πασεργυγπομενην πεμ πιάλον φέν πψαφε ψατεφαιρι πίκονχι κονχι φέν τιγνλικιά. ουρανός ετα πβωις κεμ πεσψημ φέν πιμα έτεμημαν, αφόρι πήκε πιάλον φέν πψαφε ψά πιέχοον πίτε πεφογωνηθέβολ ψά πισρανή.

those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death, and to guide our feet into the way of peace.” He is called *the dayspring from on high* because he came to the world from on high, and his name is *dayspring* according to the word of the prophet (i.e., Zacharias).

### Fr.Copt. 11

On Luke 1.80. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 123, ll. 6–21.<sup>38</sup>

“And the child grew and became strong in the spirit, and stayed in the desert places until the day of his revealing to Israel”. Therefore after the birth of (the) Christ in Bethlehem in Judaea according to the word of the prophet, there came then wise men from the East to Jerusalem seeking the place where had been born the king of the Jews. After Herod had heard this and his mind had been infected with madness,<sup>39</sup> he sent to kill every boy in Bethlehem and all its surrounds aged two years and below. It was at the same time then that he sent to kill John, the son of Zacharias, too, and when he did not find him, he gave orders to kill Zacharias with the edge of the sword.<sup>40</sup> So, Elisabeth, when she heard that they were searching for her son in order to kill him, arose and took the boy, and went off into the desert where she hid herself among the mountains and rocks, and waited<sup>41</sup> there with the child in the desert until he gradually grew older in years.<sup>42</sup> And when the Lord came for her there,<sup>43</sup> the boy dwelt in the desert until the day of his manifestation to Israel.

---

38. This text follows the previous fragment immediately without a new authorial *lemma* but may not be Eusebian, although the slight gap in the Coptic indicates only a new verse of scripture.

39. Literally “had been afflicted with madness of heart”.

40. Cf. Luke 11.51; there was evidently an early tradition that this was the same Zacharias who perished between the altar and the sanctuary.

41. Or “abode”.

42. Literally “age/youth”.

43. Literally “visited her”.

ε εθβε Ἁπογραφη ἐτασψωπι θεν πσνου γάνγογκτος πνγρο.

πιάγιος εγγεβίος. ἐπιλη ετα πβωις εργηγχοριν ἔθρογ σφητγ  
 χωρι φεν ταπογραφη ἡτοικογμενη, κε ριμα φαι ῥτεψτογβο  
 ἡτοικογμενη τηρι շրτεν τεψάπογραφη εθμεψ ῥνχαι, ουρο  
 ῥτεψεράπογραφην ἡτοικογμενη τηρι ῥσωρ, ἐαψεψ φραη  
 ῥπηπιστος ἑτε ῥψητс сатота φεν πχωм ῥпннётонф φεν πиψнн,  
 παιέταγнаг† ἐροψ շրտен πριωиψ մпеψенаггeлиои εθօнав. ἑταψ  
 λε ἐջրի շωρι նжкε πկεաշнփ ում մարιձ ἔթրօн սђе πօրդր, ουρο  
 φեն πжищерօн ֆօց էвннծeeմ, էօնваки նтe ձարιձ. ἑti օнн εүхн  
 φեն πима ἑтепшшаг, այմօշէնօլ նжкε ունջօու նтe ՚парթенօс  
 ՚еթրէ մици, ουρο ձсмici մпiψнрi պiյօրp մiմici, ουρο ձскoнձaլaվ,  
 ձсхaվ φեն օнօցօնց, κε օнн նe մiմoнtօn մa մiմa պe φեն  
 πшанoнoց. նթօց օн εγγεбіоs. օy ՚зар նe ՚եтaվxօc աn κe ՚еcպօրp  
 մiմici, εθвe κe մiпeմici ՚кeօnցai մeнeпcвaվ, ձлla պiյօրp մiմici,  
 ՚eтe φai պe պiյօրp մiմici մiфiwt ՚лаxaѡn ՚nнeѡn ՚tнrօn: շրտ  
 ՚iтeպtem օнai մeнi կe օнրaшi ՚iյiյiem պe ՚եтaմaсq նжкε  
 ՚пarթenօс, εθвe φai ձcкo կe ՚еcպօրp մiմici մiфiнt ՚rօ օn ՚eт  
 ՚eрe ՚fiwt ՚xw մiմoc ՚евнtq շրտен ՚iշnшnпoձoс ձaրiձ կe ՚iթօq  
 ՚eպeմoнt ՚eろo կe ՚iթօk պe ՚aiwt, [p. 124] οuրo ՚aнok ՚шa ՚пaхaվ  
 ՚iյaմici ՚eբoցi ՚aзгreп ՚iօnրaѡn ՚tнrօn ՚te ՚pkaցi. φai կe օнн,  
 այմօn† ՚eրo կe ՚aձmici, ՚шa կe ՚iթօq պe ՚еcպօրp մiմici մiфiwt  
 ՚лаxaվ մiпcѡnT ՚tнrօ, ՚eպeրkataչiօi կe օнн ՚еթրօn մaсq ՚iкeн

## Fr.Copt. 12

On Luke 2.1–7. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 123, l. 22–p. 124, l. 40.

5. Concerning the census which took place in the time of the emperor Augustus.

The holy<sup>44</sup> Eusebius: Then the Lord consented to be inscribed himself in the census<sup>45</sup> of the world, so that in this way he might purify the whole world through his salvatory registration,<sup>46</sup> and so that he might register the whole world under<sup>47</sup> himself, having at once written the names of the faithful in it (the world) in the book of those who live in the heavens, those, that is, who have believed in him through the proclamation of his Holy Gospel. “And Joseph too went up himself with Mary that her name might be inscribed, and when they reached Bethlehem, a city of David ... while they were still staying there, the days were fulfilled for the Virgin to give birth, and she brought forth the child, the first-born, and wrapped him in swaddling-clothes, and laid him in a manger,<sup>48</sup> because truly there was no room for them in the inn”. Here again Eusebius:<sup>49</sup> What he meant<sup>50</sup> was not that it was her first-born son, because she did not bear another son<sup>51</sup> after him, but the first-born, the one who was the first-born of the Father before all ages, (and) so that there should be not a single thought that it was a phantom-man that the Virgin bore, because of this he said “the first-born”, just as indeed the Father says concerning him through the psalmist David: “While he will say to me ‘You are my father’”, [p. 124] and “I myself shall appoint him as first-born, exalted before all the rulers of the earth”<sup>52</sup> This one then was called first-born as he was the first-born of the Father before all creation, but thought it fitting that he be born on earth like a little child, and be placed in a manger for the animals, because, (as) he said, there was no room for them in the inn. Because of us then, on

44. Or “Saint”.

45. Or “register”.

46. Literally “which is a source of salvation/full of salvation”.

47. Or “after”.

48. Or “stable”.

49. See de Lagarde, ll. 33–34.

50. Literally “said”.

51. Or “child”.

52. Ps 89.27, 28.

πικαρή μίφρητή ήνοικοντι ήλλον, ουσιος ἐθρον ώτον φεν ουονονχη  
 ήτεβην, κε ουνι μίμοντον μα μίμαν, πεκαφ, φεν πιμανονοσ: Εθεντεν κε ουν φα ηηέταγτενθωνον ένιτεβηνωνι, ουσι ανίμη  
 μίμων χιτεν ηηάθος ήλλοσον ουσι μίπαραφγισις έταγάμαση  
 έκεν Τμετρωμι τηρε Εθε Τπαραβασις, αφερκαταζιόιν έθρον χαφ  
 φεν ουονονχη ήτεβην, κε χιπα φαι ήτεφώλι μίμαν έπτηρη  
 μίπιχτη ήτεβην, φαιέταφωπι μίμον χιτεν Τμετωμωείλωλον.  
 μίμοντεφ μανογοσ λε, Εθε κε άνον τηρεν μίπισνον έτεμμαν  
 ένανοι πε μίμανψωπι μίπιδιάβολος νεμ νεψλεμων ετχωον χιτεν  
 τσορμες ήΤμετωμωείλωλον. ηηαλένεων λε ον ετρωις έπονόση  
 ήέσων εντμηνι ηηη ένηηαλένεων ήλοσικον ετ φεν Τεκκλησιά,  
 παι ρω ον εθρωις έβολριχεν πονόση ήέσων εθε ηιογωνψ  
 ήηοήτον ήρεψφεθψγχη, έτε ηηερετικος ετσον νε. ηηαλένεων  
 κε ουν μίπαιρητ, ψαρε πωον μίπωις ερογωιη έρωον, ουσι  
 ήτε πεψατσελος όχι έρατη έχρη έχωον εψηορεμ μίμων φεν  
 πονθληψης τηρον, Εθε κε εγχιωψ μίπχιημι μίπχριστος έβολφεν  
 Τπαρθενος εθοναβ μαριά αβνε σπερμα ήρωαι, ουσι ενδιμωιτ  
 ήηιέσων ήλοσικον έθονη ήψαιρι εθηανες ήτε ηηδογμα εθοναβ  
 ήτε πιναρήτ ετσογτωι ετχηκέβολ. ουσι αψωπι, πεκαφ, ήογχοτ  
 φεν ουγχοτ ήχε ουμηψ μίμετματοι ήτε τψε νεμ πιαγτελος  
 ενχωα έψηοντη ενχω μίμος κε ουώον φεν ηηετбоси φηοντη νεμ  
 ονχηρηη χικεν πικαρη νεμ ουτματ φεν πιρωαι. ήθον ον ενεσεψιοс.  
 έπιδη κε ουν μίπονχκεμκοм ήχε πιαγτελος έερβοηθηη έπγενοс  
 ήλλαм έταφερεсιέ χιτεν Τμετωμωείλωλον, ουλε ον ήθον  
 πινομοс ουλε ηηηρφηηс, έβηλ έψηέταγμасу έβολφεν Τπαρθενοс  
 εθοναβ μαριά, Εθε φαι παγτώον μίψηοντη πε φεν ταίλοζολογιά  
 μίπαιρητ ενχω μίμος κε ουώον φεν ηηετбоси φηοντη, έτε φιωτ  
 πιπαητοκρατωρ πε, νεμ ονχηρηη χικεν πικαρη, έτε πεψμονοσεηηс  
 ήψηρη πε, έταφι χικεν πικαρη έερ πιρωαι ήψηρηη νεμ πεψιωτ, νεμ  
 ουτματ φεν πιρωαι, έτε πεψηεγμα εθοναβ πε, έταφτματ έψωπι  
 φεν πιχτη ήηηηстос χιτεν πιωμс εθοναβ ήτε πιογαζεμμιс. έπιδη

behalf of those who were like the beasts and resembled them in the dumb passions and the monstrous growth<sup>53</sup> which prevailed over the whole of mankind because of the Fall, he thought worthy to be laid in a manger for the beasts, so that through this he might remove altogether the heart of beasts<sup>54</sup> which had taken root in us through the worship of idols. But “He had no place to stay”<sup>55</sup>—because all of us at that time were in the inn<sup>56</sup> of the devil and his evil demons through the error of idol-worship. The shepherds, moreover, who watch over their flock of sheep are a sign to us of the shepherds guided by reason who exist in the church, those who watch over their flock of sheep because of the rational wolves who ravage souls, namely the filthy heretics. It is thus, then, that the glory of the Lord shines upon<sup>57</sup> these shepherds, and his angel stands before them to preserve them in all their afflictions—because they proclaim the birth of the Christ from the holy Virgin Mary without human seed, and guide the sheep endowed with reason into the good sheepfold of the holy dogmas of the faith which direct us to the goal. “And there was”, he said, “of a sudden a great multitude of the heavenly host with the angels, singing to God and saying, ‘Glory (to) God, the most High,<sup>58</sup> and peace on earth and goodwill among men’”. And again Eusebius.<sup>59</sup> Since then the angels could not help the race of Adam which had gone astray through the worship of idols, nor again could the Law nor the Prophets, but only the one who was born of the Holy Virgin Mary, for this reason they gave glory to God in this doxology in such a manner, saying “Glory to God the Most High”, which means the Father, the Ruler of All, and “Peace upon earth”, which is to say His only-begotten Son who came upon earth to set men at peace with his Father, and “Goodwill among men”, that is his Holy Spirit, which has brought about goodwill in the hearts of the faithful through the holy baptism of regeneration. Then again Christ was received in a stable for animals, the

53. Or “cancer”.

54. Literally “beastly hearts”.

55. An inn = a place to stay.

56. Or “dwelling-place”.

57. Or “enlightens”.

58. Or “in the highest”. The text as quoted seems to be deficient here, as it apparently reads “among/in the Highest” (pl.), with “God” in apposition to “Highest”, whereas the standard Bohairic text clearly adds “to God”. Thus, one might have assumed a scribal omission of **ιν** (to); however, the text before us here is repeated almost immediately below, again without **ιν** (to) before φηούτε (God).

59. See de Lagarde, p. 124, l. 25.

Δε ον αγκιστι μίπχριστος θεν ουγονορη φήτεβη, πισα ετ ου ήθητη  
ήχε ουέρε ηει ογιω: πιοναι μεν γαρ ψτογβηοντ κατα πιομος,  
πιχετ δε οη, φερσγιμενη φεν φαι μιφλαοс ήπιεθηοс ηει ζανθεβ  
μιμηγ έβολθεν φλαοс ήπιογλαι έταγνορει εθβε φηέταγχαρ  
θεν πιογονορη φήτεβη εθβε φη έτε φωη ήογκαι, ιησους πχριστος  
πενδωιс.

Ἔ εθβε πισεβι φήτε πονωιс. ...<sup>3</sup>

ουορ ετα πιέχοον μορέβολ φήτε πογτονβο κατα φνομοс  
μιμωγчс, αγενη έχρη έιερογαληι έταχοφ έρατη μιπνωιс κατα  
φρητ ετσφηοντ φεν πιομοс φήτε πονωιс κε ζωοντ ηιβεν εθηδογωη  
ήτοφ φήτε τεφμαγ, εγέμορφ έροφ κε πεθοναβ μιπνωιс. εγσεβιос.  
ουορ καη ουγανκαθαροс πε ουορ φη άι πψωι φήτονβο ηιβεν ζως  
ηογт, αλλα αφερσγιγχарιп έπαιχετ εθητεη φα ηηέтои ήάбни  
ουορ ετθολεв φεν φнови φήтпаравасис φήτε πεηωρп φίωт ήлдам,  
κε ζηна φεν φαι φήтпефтонвон ουορ φήтпeферάгiзiп μiмoн φiкeсoп  
ζiтeп pеcпnеuмa εθoγaв έtаçtнiç nан фa ηiпicтoс ζiтeп piжakveи  
φήтε πiouγaгeиici. κe μηи aгγaнmici ήпiкoγxи ήлдaoнi, κaн μeи  
ζaнaдhoвi нe κaтa pсвoк φήтoуgчnikiä, aллa мiпaнeр έвoлe έθωλeв  
κaтa pсаxи ήiвb, κaн οuéхooн ήoγωt πe πoγaнф ζiхeп pikaгi.  
éwap κe οuη aгγaнmbi мiпaиiс φήтe πiouγaгeиici, aгγaнm iиiaи  
éptiкrφ ήθωλeв ηiвeн φήтe tpaдaвasiс ήлдam, οuοr лoipoп aдрe  
tψyчh ηeи picawma aяapti φeн tmeтkaθaroс ήtе tāpаthiа ηeи  
tаfhaθarciä ήtе pimadж ήлдam, pеnбoиc iиcouс pчxriсtоc pеnсaтh. r  
éptiкh oи ζaоuт ηiвeн eθhдoгuωn ήtоf ήtе tеfmaг, aгγaнm  
épwoг κe pеθoнaв μiпbωiс, κaтa фrнt εtсfhоnт φeн фnомoс  
μiмoгчс. aллa мiпeгli ήzωoут aжeиkoи ήoγωn ήtоf ήtе

3. The section starts on line 1 with the heading given. The next ten lines are an extract from Titus of Bostra on Luke 2.21. Eusebius begins at l. 12.

place in which an ox and an ass were found: for the one is pure according to the Law, while the other brings together through this the people of the nations, as well as great crowds from the people of the Judaeans who have been saved because of this one who was laid in a manger for animals, (that is) because of this one who is the means<sup>60</sup> of salvation, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Fr.Copt. 13

On Luke 2.22–23. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 125, ll. 1, 12–37.

6. Concerning the Circumcision of the Lord. ...

“And when the days were fulfilled for her purification according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord according to what is written in the Law of the Lord, that every male that opens the womb of his mother shall be called ‘holy to the Lord’”. Eusebius. And although as being God He was all-pure and above every purification, nevertheless he submitted to this too for our sake, we<sup>61</sup> who are polluted and stained through the sin of the Fall of our first father Adam, so that by this means he might purify us and make us worthy again by his Holy Spirit which he has given to us the faithful through the bath of regeneration. And truly if we are (re-)born as little children—even if some are without sin because of the smallness of their age, and have not yet become stained according to the word of Job,<sup>62</sup> (and) even if they have spent<sup>63</sup> only a single day of their life upon earth—still if they have received the bath of regeneration they are altogether freed from every stain of the fall of Adam, and thereafter the soul and the body dwell in the purity of the passionlessness and incorruptibility of the second Adam,<sup>64</sup> our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Then again,<sup>65</sup> “Every male child which shall open the womb of its mother shall be called holy to the Lord, according to what is written in the law of Moses”<sup>66</sup> But there never was a male-child who could

---

60. Or “source”.

61. Or “those”.

62. Job 14.5.

63. Literally “there is”.

64. 1 Cor. 15.45.

65. Line 28.

66. Exod 13.2; Num 8.16–17.

τεφιαν ἐβηλ ἐπχριστος μιμαγατη, εθε κε ὁ ἡιβεν ἥτε πιχιόμι, τκοινοιά μιπιγαμοс εθογωη μιшоу гъворп, пхристос ле нтюи ётағоруши нтоти нтпарағенес албне койногиа нтдамос. ѿтеп фан фад ағмасын тиероғ ке нағареос, ёте пеғонуғозем пе ке пеғонуғади миңбашис. оғод ёт нонуғонуғашашы, пекада, катада фрнти ётағжос ғи фномоц миңбашис ке оғашашы нтбромпашади е мак ғи нтбромпти.

### ΣΗ ΕΘΒΕ ΠΙΣΗΧ.

εγεεвиос. πισηχ κε оғод ағбн нтгъякви миңиладос нтніеθнос ётағжанни ёроғ нжк пбвиш ғитен пгжайш миңиендағзғелюн εθογади. ніллювони ле етсак ғахашағ ағбн миңтүпос нтніапостолос εθογади. ке ғар εθве токметатакакиа ағмасын тиероғ миңайриғи: ніллювони, пекада, ал оғод нтетен нжай нонуаш мишау; ніхад нжайт ле он нем нівай нтє нівени ағбн миңтүпос нтніарети нтє пипнеңмада εθογади, наіётажөре пгжнт нтніпистос оғады ғэготе пихиан ғитен нілрети нтє пипнеңмада εθογади. нігбас ле он ётағжербашоруғ ёкен писиҳи нісбашони εθογади не нендағзғелікен ётағжатоғ ғэгнти нтніпистос.

օғод ағергнтис нжк фиинш нтє пимағитиңс εγρажды εγсемоу ёғнодын тиероғ мишоц ке ғасшаршоут нжк фиенниноғ ғен фран миңбашис: оғжирнн ғен тфе, оғод оғшоғ ғен ннегбоси. ғанонон нтє пифарисеос ёвюлғен пиминш пекшоғ ке фреғтсбаш, әріептиман нтпекмамағитиңс. оғод пекада ке ғжай мишоц ннштен ке әрекшан наі жаршоғ, сенапашшебол нжк нншни. ёти он εγεεвиос. ағмасын тиероғ ле он ёғлалос нтніеθнос ке ѡни, εθве ке нағонуғашт нтнішни пе ғаш оғнти.

open the womb of its mother except Christ himself, because every womb of woman-kind<sup>67</sup> is opened first of all by marital-intercourse, but it was Christ himself who opened the Virgin's womb *without* intercourse of marriage. "Whence this one was called the Nazorean, which in translation is 'holy to the Lord'". And also he said, "They made their offering, as is said in the law of the Lord, 'a pair of turtle doves or two young pigeons'".

#### Fr.Copt. 14

On Luke 19.29–48. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 168, l. 13–p. 169, l. 9.

#### 68. Concerning the colt.

Eusebius: The colt, then, upon which the Lord was mounted according to the testimony of the Holy Gospel represents<sup>68</sup> the people of the nations, while the children who go before Him are the type of the holy apostles. For, once more, he called them "children"<sup>69</sup> because of their innocence: "Children", he asked, "Do you have anything here to eat?" Again, the olive-branch and the date-palms represent the virtues of the Holy Spirit which cause the hearts of the faithful to want to fear the storm<sup>70</sup> through the virtues of the Holy Spirit. The cloths which they spread over the colt are the holy evangelical counsels which have been implanted in the hearts of the faithful.

"And<sup>71</sup> the group<sup>72</sup> of disciples began to rejoice and praise God saying, "Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord; peace in heaven and glory in the highest". And some of the Pharisees from the crowd said, "Teacher, rebuke your disciples". But he replied, "I tell you, if these are silent, the stones will cry out". Again too Eusebius: He is calling the gentiles<sup>73</sup> stones, because they worship the stones as divine.<sup>74</sup>

67. Literally "the women".

68. Literally "has adopted the likeness/part of", presumably a *gnomic* perfect.

69. Literally "like this".

70. ξιών: freezing storm or snowstorm.

71. Line 23; cf. Luke 19.37–40

72. Or "crowd".

73. Or "pagans". Literally "people of the nations".

74. Or "god".

χως δε ἔταψθωντ, αψην γέτβακι, αψημι ἐχρηι ἔχως εψκω  
μιμος χε ἐναρεέμι ψωι πε φεν παιέχοοντ πάτεχιρηνη, τνογ δε  
αγχωπ ἐβολρδα νεβαλ: χε σεναι ἐχρηι ἔχω πίκε ψανέχοοντ, σενατακτε  
καψ ἐρο πίκε νεκαχι, ουγο ψενακωτ ἐρο ουγο ψεναζεχχωκι κα κα  
πιβεν, εγρωψτ μιμο ἐπεσητ νεμ νεψηρι πήθητ. ἔτι ον εγσεβιοс.  
αψημι δε ον οικονομικως ἐχρηι ἔχεν πτακο πίερογσαλημ νεμ ἔχεν  
θμετηναψτχητ πίπιογδαι, χε μενενса ναιшнини τηρογ ἔταγναγ  
έρωωγ πίπογναλ παλιν ον μπογογεμψθογ ἐπχιητασθωογ.

σεναι ἐχρηι ἔχω, πεκαψ, πίκε ψανέχοοντ, ουγο ψενατακτε καψ ἐρο  
(p. 169) πίκε νεκαχι, εγρωψτ μιμο ἐπεσητ νεμ νεψηργ πήθητ. ἔτι ον  
εγσεβιοс. κε γαρ μενενса δ προμπι πίτε τεψάναλγψψιс δ πιρωμεοс  
δι πίερογσαλημ, αγψοψ, αγψωτεв πίχαпиηψ πίογдai πήθηтс.

ουγο ἔταψψε ἐψιογη ἐπιερφει, αψερχηтс πίχιονгіе вол  
πіннеттéвол, εψκω μιмос νωογ χε сђноут χε πаки, εнéмоут ἐροψ  
χε ουκι μпросенчх, πівітвтеп δе ḅретенайп πівнв пíсопи. πіввов δе  
οн не піннеттéвол ουγο ἔτοι πíшвт ἐпізбнонгі πітe фноут, еаψгитoу  
еboлtвen πeψhi οuгoз aψkωrψ píпitvпoс eт фeн pieрfеi, eтe пiсyпiөnд  
пітe пiшасi нe нeм nісnoq пітe пiвiлi нeм nіварhт.

ο εθbe тpарaбoлh пітe пiаgáлoлi нeм nioчiн.

півoq οn εγсeбiоc. піввov ρω οn нe nioчiн, οuгoз piagáлoлi pe

“And when he drew near, he saw the city and wept over it, saying: ‘If you yourself only realised on this day the things pertaining to your peace, but now they are hidden from your eyes. But the days will come upon you when your enemies will build a rampart against you, and will surround you and hedge you in on every side and will cut you right down and your children within you’”<sup>75</sup> And again Eusebius: He wept pointedly<sup>76</sup> over the destruction of Jerusalem and the hard-heartedness of the Jews<sup>77</sup> because after all these signs which they had seen with their own eyes, they had not repented to the point of converting themselves.

“The time will come upon you”, he said, “when your enemies will build a rampart against [p. 169] you and raze you to the ground and your children within you”<sup>78</sup> And again Eusebius: Indeed, forty years after his Ascension, the Romans took and destroyed Jerusalem, slaughtering multitudes of Jews within it.

“And when he came into the temple, he began to throw out those who were selling (there), saying to them, ‘It is written: “My house shall be called a house of prayer”, but you have made it a den of thieves’”<sup>79</sup> These again were those who were selling and acting as traders in the things of God, whom he then threw out of his house, so rendering null and void the symbols<sup>80</sup> that were in the temple, which is to say, the customary offerings<sup>81</sup> of calves, and the blood of rams and goats.

#### Fr.Copt. 15

On Luke 20.9–19. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 169, ll. 10, 11–21, 21–24.

70. Concerning the parable of the vineyard and the tenants/farmers.

This is again Eusebius: They themselves<sup>82</sup> are the farmers, and the

75. Luke 19.41–44.

76. οἰκονομικῶς: or possibly “with divine knowledge” or “as universal architect”?

77. Literally “Judeans”.

78. Luke 19.43–44.

79. Luke 19.45–46.

80. Or “types”.

81. Literally “the custom”.

82. The Jews?

πινομος ἔταφτηι πωογ շրτεη աանչո. իտ օյն էտափօյարպ շարաօո նույօրպ միրօֆիթիс էթրօ ն նույտանց նտ պինոմոс, շանօցօն մեն, անջօթեօն, շանկեչաօնու ձե, անջինու էշաօն. իտ ափօյարպ նշանկեչաօնու: պալու անիր պաօ միպարիդ. ափօյարպ ձե օմօիաս նշանկեչաօնու: անյաօյգօն օյօշ անջօթեօն. էպժաէ ձե էտափօյարպ միպեվյիր, անտաօնոն էշրի էշագ բայ բայ միմօս չե իս ֆալ պ պիկլիրոնոմօс, մարենժօթեօն օյօշ նտենալ նտեվկլիրոնոմիд. օյ չե օյն պետեվնա ձի նույնի էտեմմաց նչե բնաօс միպաջալօն; ձլլա պեխաօ միպարիդ չե ուկակօс, սենատակաօ նկակօс, օյօշ բնաջալօն, սենատիկ նշանկեօնիн. էտ օն բայսեօис. էտ ուեթօնօс ու նհեռնադ միույտաց թեն բշօն նտիկ. օյօշ ունկադ պ նիւ տակօգ, բայ չե էտազքե տամարածօն բայնտօն: նթօգ ձե ազերանաչարին ուն էնօլթեն նիւ էտեմմաց.

բայսեօис շագ չե միմօս. կե նար, պեխագ, ափօյօնց էնումաթիթիс թեն յերօնածնու նտօն թ կատա պաչի նիւանոնիс, թեն ժալիլեա ձե ափօյօնց էպիթ նձուտօնօс ուն շանկեմից օն էնօլթեն ուն միմաթիթիс.

...<sup>4</sup> բայ բայ ազյայու մենենց պիշալէնօլ բայ միմօս չե սւան ֆայանոնիс, չւեւ միմօ; պետրօ չե օյն թեն պայնթերեց սուն բայմետաօնոն միմու միմօց օյկետ միպեվերտօնալ միֆրիդ նյօրպ, նտեւ հօս չե սւ, պանաօ, ժւեւ միմօկ նմայա: ձլլա ազսետ շաբ ունեն

---

4. Fragment 16 is followed by the Coptic text of John 21.1–11, in the received Bohairic text apart from some small differences in spelling (e.g., επιπλάνωс for επενδύτիс, his coat or outer garment, in v. 7), but with the omission of “When Simon Peter heard that” in v. 7, and the addition of “And” at the beginning of v. 8. Then follows a lacuna of almost nine lines. But the quotation must have continued to v. 17, since, when the text resumes, we are in the midst of a comment on John 21.15–17. There is no lemma for a new author, and it seems that this fragment also belongs to Eusebius.

vineyard is the Law which He gave to them through Moses. So then when He sent them the first prophets that they might receive<sup>83</sup> the fruits of the Law, some of them they killed,<sup>84</sup> whilst others again they stoned. Then he sent others whom they once more treated in the same way. He sent others in like manner whom they treated with contempt and killed. Finally he sent his son, whom they set upon, saying, “Look, this is the heir! Let us kill him and take away his inheritance”. What then will the Lord of the vineyard do to those farmers? But it has been said that the evil will perish in evil manner; and (so) the vineyard will be given to other farmers.<sup>85</sup> Yet again Eusebius: And *they* (these others) are the nations, the ones who will bear fruit in the season of its fruiting. And they sought after his destruction, because he had told this parable about them: but he withdrew from those parts.

#### Fr.Copt. 16

On John 21.1. Printed by de Lagarde, p. 230, ll. 34–36.

Eusebius also says this. Moreover, he said, he revealed himself a second time to his disciples in Jerusalem according to the word of John, while in Galilee he appeared to the eleven apostles with a number of others as well<sup>86</sup> from the seventy disciples.

#### Fr.Copt. 17

On John 21.15–17. Printed by de Lagarde p. 231, ll. 21–29.

Because of this, after they had finished breakfast,<sup>87</sup> he asked again, “Simon, son of John, do you love me?” Peter therefore, in knowledge of his own weakness, no longer answered as boldly as before, but said “Yes, Lord, I love you exceedingly”. But he put everything after God, and said, “Lord,

---

83. Or “pluck”.

84. Or “wounded”.

85. Or “tenants”.

86. Literally “some crowds”.

87. Lit. after the finish, sc. “of breakfast”.

ἵσα φηογή ουος πεκαψ κε ποωις, ἥθοκ ετσωονη ἤχωβ πιβεη, ἥθοκ ετέμι κε ἡμει ἱιιοκ. ἐπιδη γαρ, πεκαψ, ακχολτ ἔβολ ἤτη ἱιοπ, ἀνοκ χω ἡηαψεηκ ἤτη ἱιοπ κε χηει ἱιιοι, χηηα φαι ἥτεсоуаиχέбоλ ἤκε τπροθесic ἥтекниψή ἤάγапи ेфоуи ेрои. ιτα λε πеке ииисовс наψ κе ձմոи հնաէсвօг.<sup>5</sup>

---

5. The text of this fragment is immediately followed by a comment attributed to Cyril of Alexandria, indicating that the previous comment is not his. On p. 232 of de Lagarde, we have St. Cyril's comment on John 21.18–9 about Christ's prophecy of the death of Peter, in which Cyril repeats the familiar legend of St. Peter's crucifixion upside-down in Rome, followed by a comment on vv. 20–23 which once more ends in a lacuna. Thus it is conceivable that a further extract from Eusebius originally appeared in this last section of St John.

you know everything; you know that I love you". For he [Christ] implied "Since you denied me three times, I too shall ask you three times whether you love me, so that through this the declaration of your great love for me may be made manifest". Then Jesus said to him, "Feed my sheep".<sup>88</sup>

---

88. The text continues "And again Cyril..." who thus seems *not* to be the previous commentator. The manuscript ends with the following colophon given on p. 232 of de Lagarde:

††θο ιc †μετανιά δρι παλλενί πάσαπη, ροπος ὑτε παδωις ιησους  
πχριστος ιαι ηηι ιειιωτεν δηοκ φα πιταλεπωρος έταφεθαι θεολ  
πογιρι πιατιιψα ιιιιοναχος ὑτε †γλαυρα εθοναβ ὑτε πιηψ† αββα  
ιιακαριος ... τεφηαζμεκ έθολθα πψηπι ὑτε ιιιιολαςιc. δηηη δηηη  
ειεψωπι ειεψωπι. χρη τοη αγιο ιιρτ χε.

Lo, I pray that you may pardon and think kindly of me so that my Lord Jesus Christ may pity me along with you. I am the wretched one Theod ... Pousiri [Theodosius or Theodorus of Busiris?], the undeserving monk of the holy laura of Abba Makarios the Great ... ... that he will deliver you from the shame of punishment. Amen, Amen, may it be, may it be. ... Era of the holy martyrs (year) 605 [i.e., ca. A.D. 890].



# ARABIC FRAGMENTS

Translated by Adam C. McCollum

The Arabic fragments are translated from the edition with Italian translation of Francisco Javier Caubet Iturbe, SS.CC.<sup>1</sup> The page numbers of the translations are given in brackets.

The catena actually comments on all four gospels and is a translation of the Coptic catena given earlier. But the Arabic text is unmutilated and so gives us additional fragments. These are indicated with an †.

Iturbe edited only the portion of the catena concerned with Matthew's gospel. The remainder of the catena, on Mark, Luke, and John, remains unedited.\*

---

1. F. J. C. Iturbe, *La cadena arabe del evangelio de San Matheo* (2 vols.; Studi e Testi 254 [text] and 255 [Italian translation]; Vatican City: BAV, 1969, 1970).

## CONTENTS

Fr.Ar. 1. Iturbe, p. 8 (9) .....	388
Fr.Ar. 2. Iturbe, pp. 9–10 (11) .....	388
Fr.Ar. 3 †. Iturbe, p. 15 (18).....	390
Fr.Ar. 4 †. Iturbe, p. 27 (31–32) .....	390
Fr.Ar. 5. Iturbe, p. 251 (268).....	392

فاما يعقوب فانه ولد يوسف  
او سابيوس يفسر

لم قال مثى وذكر نسية يوسف انه ولد يعقوب ولوقا قال انه ولد هالي هل يتضاد الانجيلان بعض لبعض معاذ الله ولكن من اجل ان هالي تزوج بامراة ومات عنها ولم يخلف ولدا فتزوجها يعقوب اخوه على حكم التوراة ليقيمه زرعا لأخيه واولادها يوسف في يوسف الان هو ولد يعقوب بالطبيعة وهو ولد هالي على الناموس

او سابيوس القيسراني يفسر

بالحقيقة ما عرفها انها العدرى التي تكلم شعيا النبي من اجلها وقال هذه العدرى تحبل وتلد ابنا ويسمى عمانوئيل حتى ولدت الغلام فعرف انها تلك وذلك لما ولدت العدرى ونظر الى الرعاة وهم يبشرون بالذى ولدته العدرى انه المسيح الرب وبافضل من ذلك لما سمع تسبيح الملائكة ومشاهدة المجنوس وقد اتوا بالقرايبين مثل الله وملك ومعطي الحياة الذي مات من اجلنا كما قال له الملائكة في المنام لا تخف يا يوسف ان تأخذ 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”<sup>1</sup> Eusebius interprets it as follows:<sup>2</sup> Why did Matthew say, mentioning the kinship of Joseph, that Jacob was his father, while Luke<sup>3</sup> 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 Law<sup>4</sup> 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 Law<sup>5</sup>.

## 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”<sup>6</sup>—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,<sup>7</sup> for the child born from her is holy, and from the Holy Spirit”.<sup>8</sup> 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 *haṭībah*, “fiancée”.

8. Matt 1.20.

هذا وغيرها عرفها بالحقيقة انها العدرى التي تنبى عليها اشعيا وقال هذه العدرى  
تجبل وتلد ابنا ويدعى اسمه عمانوويل

### او سابيوس يفسر

من اجل المجوس انهم اقاموا مدة طويلة يسيرون من المشرق و بلد فارس الى ان اتوا  
الى بيت لحم والموضع الذي كان فيه الطفل ولأن الامر يدل انه من زمان طويل  
شاهدوا النجم فاضطهدتهم الامر السابق من علم الله ان يتبعوه الى ان يجدوا الطفل  
المولود وهكذا كان لم يزل النجم يسير بين ايديهم من بلدتهم الى ارض فلسطين  
لان فلسطين هي شرقي يروشليم ولهذا المعنى قال الانجيل ان مجوسا وافوا من  
المشرق الى اورشليم يقولون اين ملك اليهود المولود

الذى بيده الرفش لينقى اندره ويجمع قممه في الاهراء واما التبن فانه يحرقه بالنار  
او سابيوس يفسر

اذاما الريح هبت بقوة عملت الفعلة بالنفس فاما الريح الهابة جدا فهي التجارب  
التي تاتي على النفس فإذاوا هي وجدت نفسا خفيفة كحفة التبن ولم تتنفس من  
التجارب بالصبر والهدوء طرحت في النار التي لا تطفئ الى الابد فاما الذي يأخذ  
الغلبة على الرياح الهابة التي هي التجارب فهي تتنفس بالحقيقة مثل القمح  
المخزون في الاهراء هي ملکوت السما

Virgin about whom Isaiah had prophesied, saying: “This Virgin will conceive and bear a son, and his name will be called Emmanuel”.<sup>9</sup>

### Fr.Ar. 3 †

Printed by Iturbe, p. 15 (18). On Matt 2.1. Absent from de Lagarde.

Eusebius interprets as follows:<sup>10</sup> Concerning the Magi, they spent a long time travelling from the east, the country of Persia, until they came to Bethlehem and the place where the child was, because the fact shows that they were watching the star a long time and the previous command from the knowledge of God compelled them that they should follow it until they found the child who had been born. Thus the star continued going before them from their country to the land of Palestine, because Palestine is east of Jerusalem. And with this meaning, the Evangelist said that the Magi arrived from the east to Jerusalem, saying, “Where is the one born king of the Jews?”

### Fr.Ar. 4 †

Printed by Iturbe, p. 27 (31–32). On Matt 3.12. Absent from de Lagarde.

“...in whose hand is the shovel to cleanse his threshing floor and gather his wheat into the granary, but he will burn the straw with fire” (Matt 3:12).

Eusebius<sup>11</sup> interprets as follows: When the wind blows forcefully, it does so on the soul. The wind that blows a lot is the temptations that come against the soul, and when it finds a soul that is light like straw and has not cleaned itself from temptations with patience and tranquillity, it [the soul] is thrown into the never-ending fire. As for the soul that is victorious over the blowing winds, which are temptations, it is clean indeed, like wheat stored in the granary, that is, the kingdom of heaven.

9. Note that the wording is slightly different here than in the previous quotation of the verse.

10. Iturbe (18 n. 1) notes that there is discussion of the star in the *Demonstratio evangelica*, book 9, but not in the words given here.\*

11. Iturbe (31 n. 6) remarks that this passage does not match anything known from Eusebius's works, and it certainly does not have ring of other material from Eusebius in the catenae.\*

او سابيوس يفسر من اجل قوله في عشية السبت الذي هو صبيحة الاحد جاءت مريم المجدلانية و مريم الاصغر لينظرن القبر

قال القول في عشية السبت الذي هو صبيحة الاحد بكرة والقول ايضا عند طلوع الشمس يعني الاوقات المختلفة التي اتين النسوة فيها الى القبر لانهن حين الى القبر اربع مرات في تلك الليلة فلذلك كتب كل واحد من الانجيليين في الاوقات المختلفة التي اتين النسوة الى القبر لان الرب قام في ليلة الاحد في غير وقت معروف و ظهر لمريم المجدلانية والنسوة الاصغر

## Fr.Ar. 5

Printed by Iturbe, p. 251 (268). On Matt 28:1. Fr.Copt. 4, de Lagarde p. 80, ll. 25–32. Cf. QMar. 2, Fr. Mar. 1, and Fr. Mar. Supp. 16.

Concerning the verse (Matt 28:1), “On the evening of the Sabbath, which is Sunday morning, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to see the grave,” Eusebius interprets as follows: The verse, “On the evening of the Sabbath, which is early Sunday morning,” and the verse (Mark 16:2), “at the rising of the sun,” mean the different times when the women came to the grave, for they went to the grave four times that night. Therefore, each of the evangelists wrote about the different times the women came to the grave, because the Lord rose [from the dead]<sup>12</sup> in the night [early] Sunday [morning] at an unknown time and appeared to Mary Magdalene and other women.

---

12. Iturbe adds that one manuscript actually reads “from the grave” here.\*



# THE LETTER OF LATINO LATINI TO ANDREAS MASIUS

Translated by David J. D. Miller

Latino Latini<sup>1</sup> (1513–1598) is the last writer to refer to what seems to be a copy of the full text of Eusebius' *Gospel Problems and Solutions*. He tells us that Cardinal Sirleto had heard of the discovery of a manuscript in Sicily.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, the text was never published, and the manuscript is lost.

The letter in which Latini mentions the manuscript is quoted by Mai.<sup>3</sup> In the full text, the letter lists first a text by Pseudo-Eustathius. The text slightly suggests that the Eustathius and the Eusebius were bound together. In many older catalogues of manuscripts, only the first text in a manuscript volume that contains several is mentioned. Perhaps the Eusebius might yet be found somewhere in a manuscript of Pseudo-Eustathius? Interestingly, a copy of the Eustathius made in southern Italy in the same year as this letter does exist in Madrid.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. For Latini, see Pierre Petitmengin, “Latino Latini (1513–1593): Une longue vie au service des Peres de l'église,” in *Humanisme et Église en Italie et en France méridionale: 15. siècle-milieu du 16. siècle* (Collection de l’École française de Rome 330; Rome: École française de Rome, 2004), 381–407.\*

2. The humanist Giovanni Aurispa went to buy Greek manuscripts in Constantinople in the early fifteenth century. He bought so many that the citizens complained to the emperor. He tells that he sent a shipment of patristic manuscripts from Constantinople to Sicily, although none of these are known today. When he returned to Venice in 1423, he brought with him eight hundred manuscripts, many very old and of the highest value to modern philology. Is it possible that the Sicilian Eusebius was sent there by Aurispa? See Charles L. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), 37.\*

3. Mai<sup>1</sup>, p. xii. “Sirletus scire te vult, in Sicilia inventos esse libros tres Eusebii caesariensis de evangeliorum diaphonia, qui ut ipse sperat brevi in lucem edentur”. The reference is given in Mai<sup>1</sup> by a misprint as *Op.* (= *Ep.*) *Tom. II*, p. 116, and reprinted faithfully in Mai<sup>2</sup> and Migne.\*

4. Friedrich Zoepfl, *Der Kommentar des Pseudo-Eustathios zum Hexaëmeron* (Altestamentliche Abhandlungen 10.5; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927), 10: “Cod. Matrit. gr. 124, a collection-manuscript, written by Antonius Calosyna in 1563, contains in the first place (f. 2ff) the ps.Eust. Commentary.” The notes refer to Juan de Iriarte, *Regiae Bibliothecae Matritensis codices Graeci manuscripti*, vol. 1 (Madrid, 1769), 501–2; and J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Hamburg, 1804), 9:134–35. Zoepfl mentions Latini’s words below and adds: “This raises the question of whether there is a connection between the Matr. 124 and the manuscript mentioned by Latinius, especially when the Latin title in the manuscript is written in an Italian hand.” The modern shelf-mark is Madrid. BN. 4852.\*

The printed text<sup>5</sup> is hard to obtain, so it is reproduced here in full with a translation. Presumed misprints have been corrected without comment.\*

---

5. Latinus Latinius, *Epistolae, conjecturae, et observationes sacra, profanaque eruditio-*  
*natae: Ex Bibliotheca Cathedralis Ecclesiae Viterbiensis a D. Magro ... collectae*  
... (2 vols.; Rome, 1659–1667). The letter is in 2:116–18.\*

L.Latinus Andreeae Masio s.

Cum XIV. Kal. Septembris litteras tuas accepissem, atque ad rescribendum aliquid putassem me quotidie fore paratum, numquam tamen adhuc, id est antequam tabellarius ad vos profecturus statim esset, adduci ad id officium praestandum potui; tantum enim vel ingravescens aetas vel longa scribendi intermissio potest, ut vix credas me tam vehementer esse mutatum. Abundo certe, mi Masi, otio; nam Patroni mei causa bis tantum calamum in manus sumpsi, ex quo tempore me ad eum contuli. Sed non desunt tamen quae vel mea vel aliorum causa semper agam. Ea autem sunt eiusmodi, ut me a scribendi consuetudine prorsus alienarint. Nec mihi instructissima illa, quam praedicas, bibliotheca, cuius curae praefectus sum, impedimento adhuc fuit, aut illecebrae; librorum enim ditior aliquanto sum quam census ferat, atque in eis si me non oblecto, gaudeo tamen supra quam credi possit, amicis meis, qui saepe ad me adeunt, esse domi scriptorum celebriorum monumenta, unde si quid in sermone accidit, peti statim sine ulla mora possit.

Somniavi ego aliquando fore, ut aliquid mihi otii liberioris fortunaeque pinguioris accederet, eaque spe fretus multa in id tempus perficienda distuli, interim ad colligenda mihi ad eam rem instrumenta intentus tantum atque occupatus. Sed nihil me fecellit somnium; somnium fuit merum. Nunc leviter quae in quotidianis congressibus dubitationis aliquid afferre videntur, persequor, et in restituendis multorum scriptorum locis libenter operam studiumque pono. Qua in re non desunt mihi quotidie difficillima monstra, praesertim in Plinio, in quo uno post reliquos putavit sibi Manutius noster turpe futurum, si qua plurimum potest ingenii subtilitate ac variarum rerum cognitione tam celebrem necessariumque scriptorem aliquando tandem non iuverit. Multa autem sunt, ut pulchre nosti, quae etsi minima apparent, et cuivis etiam paene

Latino Latini to Andreas Masius, greeting.

Having received your letter on August 19, I kept thinking that I would be ready any day to write something in reply; but in fact I have never been able to fulfil that duty till now—that is, until the letter-carrier was on the point of leaving for the journey to you.<sup>1</sup> So strong are the effects of either the increasing burden of age, or my long break from letter-writing, that you would hardly believe how markedly I have changed. I do have plenty of time off, my dear Masius, because since attaching myself to my patron<sup>2</sup> I have only twice picked up my pen on his behalf; but still there is no lack of things for me to do, either on my own behalf, or on others', and their nature is such that they have completely estranged me from the habit of writing. The very well-equipped library you mention, of which I am in charge, has so far been neither an impediment nor a temptation to me: I am a good deal richer in books than my status would allow, and, if I am not enjoying myself among them, I take an unbelievable degree of pleasure in the fact that my friends, who come to see me frequently, have copies at my house of the works of the more distinguished authors. Thus anything that crops up in conversation can be pursued at once, with no delay at all.

I did have a dream that one day I would have rather more free time and a rather fatter purse; it was from trust in that hope that I have put off the completion of many tasks till that day, concentrating busily meanwhile solely on making a collection of materials for the purpose. I was not at all taken in by the dream, though; a dream is all it was. As things are, I am just following up, in passing, points seeming to involve some uncertainty that arise from my everyday encounters. I also take pleasure in the pains-taking work of emending passages in a number of authors. This involves a plentiful daily supply of quite intractable monsters, especially in Pliny: at last, after all the rest, Pliny is the one on whom our friend Manutius has concluded that it would be a disgrace for him not to use all the fine intelligence at his command, and all his expertise in all sorts of subjects, in coming eventually to the aid of an author so distinguished and so essential. As you know very well, there are numerous points which may seem trivial, and entirely familiar to anyone, even a virtual beginner, but which

---

1. The word for “you” is plural, implying that the carrier has letters for others at the same destination.

2. Latini was a poor man who earned his living by working as a Latin secretary. His patrons were a series of wealthy and important cardinals.\*

tyroni notissima videntur; tantam tamen cum in intelligendo tum etiam in explicando difficultatem habent, ut nullo modo, post tot virorum in restituendo illustrandoque Plinio labores, satisfacere sibi quisquam iure possit, nedum aliis probare quid sibi auctor multis in locis velit; videlicet tanta est codicum varietas, tantaque rerum plurimarum hoc tempore vel obscuritas, vel ignorantia. Laborat igitur Manutius, codicunque collatione, quod ipse per se potest, sedulo praestat; cum autem eiusmodi aliquid occurrit, in quo haerendum necessario sit, advocat undique auxilia; ad opem ferendam inter alios invitor ego quoque. Confero si quid habeo libenter, atque ita mihi tempus abit.

Sed haec fortasse longius. Nunc ad litteras tuas, quibus paucis respondebo.

Sirletus mihi rem de Ionatae Targum plane explicit. Scito igitur eum librum Latine versum a Iosue initium habere, atque inde quos canonicos Hebraei habent, omnes continere praeter unum Danielem, qui Caldaice scripsit. Is liber olim a Basilio Zancho quingentis fere denariis emptus fuit, atque ex ea animi significatione data, Marcellus secundus tanti hominem aestimavit, cum adhuc Cardinalis esset, ut vere litterarum cultorem, sciendique cupidissimum unum omnium Basilium iudicarit.

Habes de Ionata. De Septuaginta autem, nisi prius aliquid documenti de tuis Syris dederis, utemur antiquorum iure consultorum formula, Ut possidetis.

Sed quid cum Patre Octavio agendum tibi sit, ut Hebraeorum in tempore ratione traditam sententiam atque decreta tuearis, plane non video. Id unum perspicio, tantum tibi negotiis in ea re fore, ut Octavio

are actually very hard, both to understand and to explain. The result, even after so many men's labours in restoring and illustrating Pliny, is that there are numerous passages on which there is no way that anyone can justifiably satisfy himself of the author's meaning, let alone convince others of it; this is because there is so much variation between manuscripts, and in the modern age there is such obscurity about very many of his topics, or ignorance of them. Manutius is thus hard put to it. What he can do on his own in the way of collating manuscripts, he performs assiduously; but when something crops up on which, inevitably, he is stuck, he summons reserves from all quarters, and I too am among those invited to assist him. I am glad to make any contribution I can—and that is how my time disappears.

Well, that is perhaps too long on all that. Now for your letter; I shall reply in brief.

Sirletus has given me a clear explanation on the matter of the Targum of Jonathan, so I can let you know that the book concerned is a Latin translation. It starts at Joshua, and from then on contains all the books regarded by the Hebrews as canonical with the sole exception of Daniel, who wrote in Aramaic. It was bought some time ago by Basilius Zanchus, for about 500 denarii—and on the strength of that evidence for the man's disposition, Marcellus II, when still Cardinal, had so high an opinion of him as to adjudge Basilius *the true lover of scholarship and real enthusiast for knowledge, beyond all others.*

That is Jonathan for you. Now, as to the Septuagint, unless you are beforehand in providing some evidence from those Syrians of yours, we shall use the ancient jurists' formula *Uti possidetis.<sup>3</sup>*

I really do not see what line you must take with Father Octavius in order to maintain the Hebrews' rational and traditional view on chronology, and their convictions, on their chronology. The one thing I see very well is that you are going to have so much trouble in satisfying him on this that he will serve notice of being about to prove the contrary to you, whether you like it or not: firstly that there are many subjects on which

---

3. "As you are in possession", a legal formula used to settle a dispute on the basis that each side keeps what it currently has.

satisfacere possis, ut contra is se tibi etiam invito probaturum denuntiet, cum in multis nihil scire aut sapere gentem iam pridem profugam, tum in temporibus colligendis nihil omnino certi tradidisse; ita ut si posthac ab eorum ineptiis (ut appellare solet) stare te senserit, verendum maxime sit, ne quem semper antehac inter rarioris eruditionis acriorisque iudicii viros numerare ac praedicare honorifice consuevit, nunc de ea opinione deductus aliter de te sit existimaturus.

Sed redeo ad Sirletum (nam nugatorem illum, quem turpitudinis causa non nomino, de quo plurimus in Urbe sermo, dum intra pallium totus latebat, dies ipsa revelavit). Is igitur a me tuo nomine peramanter salutatus agit tibi gratias singulares, teque vicissim salutat, cupitque bellissime valere. **Scire etiam te vult in Sicilia inventum esse Eustathii Antiocheni Episcopi librum de mundi creatione, id est de sex dierum operibus, unde Basilii plurima videantur sumpta esse; praeterea libros tres Eusebii Caesariensis de Evangeliorum diaphonia, qui omnes, ut ipse sperat, brevi in lucem prodibunt.**

Amulius Cardinalis nihil postulat, nisi quod tuo commodo fieri facillime possit. Quare omnem curam, et sollicitudinem tibi remittit, tacite fortasse id ipsum reputans quod tu te mihi disertissimis verbis perscripsisti, quam ego litterarum tuarum particulam illi ostendendam esse non censui. Salutat is te et Tranensis Cardinalis ex animo atque suavissime, itemque Cyrillus, cuius ego viri consuetudine ita delector, ut nullius certe congressu et confabulatione magis afficiar.

Sed lassus, mi Masi, sum. Valebis itaque, et meo nomine uxori Henricisque plurimam salutem dices.

Roma XVIII. Kal. Octobris 1563.

that long-homeless race has no knowledge or sense, and secondly that on comparative chronology their traditions contain nothing certain whatsoever. He has always been accustomed to count you as one of the men of particularly rare erudition and keen judgement, and to talk of you with respect; but if he found that in the future you are still adhering to their “absurdities” (as he habitually calls them), it would be much to be feared that he will be led to change his mind about you, and henceforward think otherwise.

To return to Sirletus, however—because the silly ass, too low for me to name, who has been much talked about in the city while he was hiding right under his cloak, has been shown up by the light of day. I gave Sirletus, then, the friendliest greetings in your name. He thanks you very much indeed, and sends his you his greetings in return, with best wishes for your health. **He also wants you to know about the discovery in Sicily of a book by Eustathius,<sup>4</sup> bishop of Antioch, *On the Creation of the World* (i.e., on the works of the six days), which is apparently the source of a great deal in Basil;<sup>5</sup> also of three books by Eusebius of Caesarea on discordance between the gospels. He hopes these will all soon be published.**

Cardinal Amulius is not asking for anything that could not be very easily done, at your own convenience. He therefore returns all your concern and solicitude, tacitly perhaps with the very point in mind that you made to me in such full and elegant terms in your letter—that portion of which I did not think I should show him. He sends heartfelt and very cordial greetings, as does the Cardinal of Trani. So too does Cyril, a man whose intimate friendship gives me such pleasure that there is no-one whose company and conversation mean more to me.

However, my dear Masius, I am tired. So keep well, and give my very best greetings to your wife, and to the Henrys.

From Rome, September 14, 1563

---

4. The work is the *Commentary on the Hexameron* of Pseudo-Eustathius (CPG 3393), supposedly of the early fourth century and in fact of the fifth century.\*

5. Basil the Great. In fact Pseudo-Eustathius uses Basil's *Commentary on the Hexameron*.\*



## TABLE OF EDITIONS AND PAGE NUMBERS

References to the *Quaestiones* in the literature often refer to fragments by the PG column reference or refer to Mai's editions. To simplify the task of locating such passages using this volume, the following table of references is given.

### EDITIONS

Matthaei	C. F. von Matthaei, <i>Anecdota Graeca</i> , vol. 2, Moscow (1775)
Mai <sup>1</sup>	A. Mai, <i>Scriptorum veterum nova collectio</i> , vol. 1, pars prior (1825).
Mai <sup>2</sup>	A. Mai, <i>Novae patrum bibliothecae</i> vol. 4 (1847)
Cramer	J. A. Cramer, <i>Catena in evangelia S. Matthei et S. Marci</i> (1840) and <i>Catena in evangelia S. Lucae et S. Joannis</i> (1841).
PG 22	J.-P. Migne, <i>Patrologiae Graecae cursus completus...</i> , vol. 22 (1857), cols. 877–1016.
Beyer	Gerhard Beyer, “Die evangelischen Fragen und Lösungen des Eusebius in jakobitischer Überlieferung und deren nestorianische Parallelen,” OC 12–14 (1922–1924): 30–70
Iturbe	F. J. C. Iturbe, <i>La cadena arabe del evangelio de San Matheo</i> , 2 vols. Città del Vaticano: BAV (1969, 1970). <i>Studi e Testi</i> 254–55.
Zamagni	Claudio Zamagni, Eusèbe de Césarée, <i>Questions Évangéliques</i> , Sources Chrétiennes 523 (2008). This is a revised version of the editor's doctoral thesis but does not include the copious and useful commentary in the thesis.

		Mai <sup>1</sup> page	Mai <sup>2</sup> page	PG 22 column	Zamagni page	Cramer page	Notes
CONCORDANCE							
QSt 1	1-13	219-226	880-892	81-103			
QSt 2	13-16	226-228	892-893	103-7			
QSt 3	16-20	228-230	893-888	108-117			
QSt 4	21-23	231-232	900-901	117-121			
QSt 5	23-25	232-233	901-904	122-5			
QSt 6	25-27	234	904-905	126-9			
QSt 7	27-34	234-239	905-912	129-143			
QSt 8	34-38	239-242	912-916	143-151			
QSt 9	39-40	242-243	916-917	151-155			

QSt 10	41–44	243–245	917–921	155–161
QSt 11	44–45	245	921	161–163
QSt 12	45–48	246–247	921–924	164–169
QSt 13	48–51	247–249	925–928	169–175
QSt 14	51–52	249	928	175–177
QSt 15	52–56	249–252	928–932	177–183
QSt 16	57–60	252–254	933–936	184–193
QMar 1	61–63	255–257	937–940	194–199
QMar 2	64–72	257–262	940–948	200–215
QMar 3	73–77	262–264	948–952	216–223
QMar 4	77–82	264–267	952–957	223–231

	Mai <sup>1</sup> page	Mai <sup>2</sup> page	PG 22 column	Zamagni page	Cramer page	Notes
Fr. St. 1.1-12	—	268-277	957-971			<i>Ad Stephanum</i> , from Nicetas
Fr. St. 13	—	277	972-974			ex Possini catena in Matt. tom I p. 12
Fr. St. 14	—	277-278	974			ex catena inedita in codice vaticano
Fr. St. 15	—	278	974			ex Possini catena in Matt. tom I. 8
Fr. St. 16	—	278	974			ex catena inedita in codice vaticano
Fr. St. 17	—	278	974-976			ex Possini catena in Matt. tom I. 8
Fr. St. 18	—	278	976			ex Possini catena in Matt. tom I. 10
Fr. St. 19	85-87	—	—	—		ex Anastasio sinaita q. VIII.
Fr. St. 20	88-89	—	—	—		ex catena inedita in codice vaticano
Fr. St. 21	—	—	—	—		Mt. 10

Fr. St. 22	—	—	—	Mt. 12
Fr. St. 23	—	—	—	Mt. 13
Fr. St. 24	—	—	—	Mt. 15
Fr. Mar. 1.1–11	—	283–298	984–1006	— ex chronicis ineditis Georgii Harmartoli et Iohannis siculi.
Fr. Mar. Supp 1	374	298	1008	— ex Suida ... item Cedrenus.
Fr. Mar. Supp 1A	90	—	—	Mk. 266 ex scholiaste graeco ad Marcum apud R. Simonium... NT cap. vi. ex Possini catena in Marcum p. 343
Fr. Mar. Supp 2	—	299	1008	— ex Corderii catena in Iohannem p. 436
Fr. Mar. Supp 3	—	299	1010	— ex Possini catena in Marcum p. 364
Fr. Mar. Supp 4	91–93	299–300	1010	Jn. 389 ex Ioh. Xiphilino in homilia inedita p. 160
Fr. Mar. Supp 5	—	300	1010	—
Fr. Mar. Supp 6	—	300	1012	—

	Mai <sup>1</sup> page	Mai <sup>2</sup> page	PG 22 column	Zamagni page	Cramer page	Notes
Fr. Mar. Supp 7	—	300–301	1012	—	—	ex Anastasio sinita quaest. CLIII.
Fr. Mar. Supp 8	99–100	301–302	1012–1014	—	—	ex eodem Anastasio ibidem
Fr. Mar. Supp 9	—	302	1014	—	—	ex eodem Anastasio quaest CXLVIII
Fr. Mar. Supp 10	—	302–303	1014–1016	—	—	Macarius Chrysoccephalus' <i>Florilegium</i> , in Villoison, <i>Anecdotæ</i> , vol. 2, p. 74
Fr. Mar. Supp 11	94–95	—	—	Mk. 446	Possimus, <i>Catena on Mark</i> , p. 365	
Fr. Mar. Supp 12	95–97	—	—	—	Corderius, <i>Catena on John</i> , p. 450	
Fr. Mar. Supp 13	—	—	—	Jn. 399–402	Cramer	
Fr. Mar. Supp 14	—	—	—	Jn. 404–406	Cramer	
Fr. Mar. Supp 15	—	—	—	Mt. 7–8	Cramer	

Fr. Mar. Supp 16	—	265 (footnote)	953–954 (footnote)	Mk. 251	Cramer, <i>Combefis</i>
Fr. Mar. Supp 17	—	—	—	—	Isidore of Pelusium, Letter 212
Latin fragments	101–106	304–309	Omitted	—	
Syriac fragments	—	—	—	—	1–6, 9–12 printed by Beyer.
Fr. Syr. 7	NA	279–281	976–980	—	
Fr. Syr. 8	NA	281–282	980–982	—	
Fr. Syr. 13	—	—	—	—	E. W. Brooks, <i>Patrologia Orientalis</i> 14, pp. 270–272.
Fr. Syr. 14	—	—	—	—	M. Gibson, <i>Commentaries of Ishodad of Merv</i> , vol. 2.
Arabic fragments	—	—	—	—	All printed by Iturbe.

## INDEX OF REFERENCES

This index contains the main passages discussed, rather than merely those referred to incidentally.

### Matthew

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 1.1–25  | QSt1, QSt2, QSt3, QSt5, QSt6, QSt7, QSt8, QSt9, QSt10,<br>QSt11, QSt12, QSt13 |
| 2.13–15 | QSt16   |
| 13.55   | QSt14   |
| 28.1    | QMar1, QMar2, QMar3, QMar4  |

### Mark

- |         |       |
|---------|-------|
| 16.2, 9 | QMar1 |
|---------|-------|

### Luke

- |         |                        |
|---------|------------------------|
| 1.26–38 | QSt1, QSt15            |
| 3.23–38 | QSt1, QSt2, QSt3, QSt6 |

### John

- |          |       |
|----------|-------|
| 20.1     | QMar2 |
| 20.11–12 | QMar4 |
| 20.17    | QMar3 |

- |                                       |      |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Ignatius, <i>Ephesians</i> 19         | QSt1 |
| Julius Africanus, Letter to Aristides | QSt4 |

## ABOUT THE TRANSLATORS

David J. D. Miller took his degree in Classics and Theology at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he became a Senior Scholar. He is currently teaching Greek to graduate students in the University of Bristol, with a special interest in late antique authors. He has collaborated with Richard Goodrich on the first-ever English translation and edition of Jerome's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, to be published in 2012 by Paulist Press in their Ancient Christian Writers series; and is now translating Justinian's *Novels*, to be provided with a commentary by Peter Sarris and published by Cambridge University Press.

Adam McCollum, recently appointed Lead Cataloger of Eastern Christian Manuscripts at the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, St. John's University (Collegeville, Minnesota), earned his Ph.D. in Semitic Languages and Greek from Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (Cincinnati, Ohio). Author of *A Greek and Syriac Index to Sergius of Reshaina's Version of the De Mundo* and a translated volume of one of Syriac writer Jacob of Sarug's homilies, he also has articles in the journals *Aramaic Studies*, *Le Muséon*, and (forthcoming) *Analecta Bollandiana*.

Dr. Carol Downer MA Hons. (Classics), PGCE, MA, PhD (Egyptology) convened the UCL Coptic Reading group. She taught Classics for many years at Godolphin and Latymer School in Hammersmith. After early retirement she returned to UCL to study for a new MA in Egyptology with focus on Coptic Dialects and in 2004 gained her PhD in Egyptology there, specialising in the Coptic period, with the edition of a Coptic Martyrdom from the Morgan Library in New York, soon to be published. She has been on the panel of Sessional Lecturers at Birkbeck College, London, since 1998, where she teaches Egyptology, Coptic Language, and other related courses.

The Rev. Dr. Piotr Ashwin-Siejkowski is a member of the UCL Coptic Reading group and holds a PhD in Ancient Philosophy, University of Warsaw. He is an Associate Lecturer at the University of Chichester (UK). He has published on Clement of Alexandria (*Clement of Alexandria: A Project of Christian Perfection*, Continuum, 2008; *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, Brill, 2010), early Christianity (*The Apostles' Creed and Its Early Christian Context*, Continuum, 2009; *Early Christian Doctrine and the Creeds*, SCM, 2010), and Neoplatonism (e.g., Porphyry of Tyre, "Against the Christians", Polish translation and edition, WAM, 2006).

Philip Harris, LLB, Barrister is a member of the UCL Coptic Reading group and has an interest in Oriental languages and textual criticism. He has more recently become a student of early Christian languages and texts.

Paula Jervis, BSc. (Botany), MA (Psychology), MSc. (Entomology), BA (Arabic), MA (Linguistics) is a member of the UCL Coptic Reading group and is studying Ancient Egyptian, Akkadian, Coptic, and Classical Greek.

Robert Kirby is a member of the UCL Coptic Reading group and is the librarian at UCL Institute of Archaeology Library, with a degree in Classics and interest in Oriental languages (including Coptic and Arabic).

Basil Stein, BA Hons. (Rand), MA (Oxon.), MA (London) is a member of the UCL Coptic Reading group and read for a degree in Hebrew and Ancient Egyptian at UCL, where he also completed an MA in Coptic and Demotic in 1992, since when he has continued to pursue his Coptic studies.

The editorial staff included Tom Schmidt, Joshua McManaway, and Ambrose Boles.

Many thanks to Bob Buller, who typeset the book.

Roger Pearse, M.A. (Oxon) read Chemistry at Merton College, Oxford, and then had a successful career in the IT industry, latterly as director of his own company. He is best known as the editor of the Tertullian Project website and has commissioned various translations of shorter patristic texts. He commissioned the translations and did whatever editorial tasks were left over.

The publisher would like to thank Gillian Clark, without whom the project would never have started; Dr Claudio Zamagni for inspiring it all; Fr. Dominique Gonnet, S.J.; and Dr Bernard Meunier of the Sources Chrétiennes for generously making it possible to reproduce the text of the Zamagni edition.

