

S T. I S I D O R E O F P E L U S I U M
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS USE OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT

by Rev. Constantine M. Fouskas

Glasgow 1961

ProQuest Number: 13850788

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13850788

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

S T. I S I D O R E O F P E L U S I U M
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

(Summary of the Thesis)

"St. Isidore of Pelusium with special reference to his use of the New Testament" is the title of a Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Glasgow by the Rev. Constantine Fouskas, a Graduate of the University of Athens. This Thesis being the result of two years research studies here, is a contribution to Patristic Studies.

The whole work consists of about 100,000 words and is divided into two parts of six chapters each. The first part deals with St. Isidore's life (in five chapters) and with his writings (in one chapter). In the second part there is a detailed account of St. Isidore's use and interpretation of the N. Testament (in five chapters) and a summary of his doctrinal teaching which derives mostly from the interpretations (in one chapter). In more detail, in the present Thesis the following local subjects are examined:

Part I, chap. I : A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE NAME AND CHARACTER OF ST ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM. Section A: The etymology of the name, the use of the affix -δοπος(c), persons known under this name, the name Isidore of Pelusium and historical references to him. Section B: Isidore's virtues as illustrated in his Letters, the reputation, standing and influence of Isidore and tributes to him. Chap. II: ST ISIDORE'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND ENVIRONMENT. Section A: General situation, doctrinal controversies and consequent developments, Monasticism and Patristic Literature. Section B: Isidore and Alexandria, Isidore and Pelusium and Isidore's Family. Chap. III: EXAMINATION OF DATES AND PLACES. In this chapter everything related to Isidore's dates and places is systematically examined. Some concrete results are stated. Chap. IV: EDUCATION AND SCHOLARSHIP. Section A: Studies and teachers of Isidore. Section B: Isidore and ancient pagan writings (attitude to and use of) and his knowledge of Church Fathers and Writers. For the borrowings from or similarities of Isidore to both Classics and some Church Fathers lists are given. Chap. V: MATURITY. The questions whether Isidore was a Poet, Rhetor or Religious Teacher, Priest, Monk and Abbot are examined here. Chap. VI: ST ISIDORE'S WRITINGS. Section A: Six supposed lost works of Isidore's which were not written by him. Identification of the short treatise of Isidore "Περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι Εὐαγγελιστὴν" with the letter III, 154. Proof that the "Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας" considered so far as lost, is extant.

Section B: The number, authenticity and characteristics of the letters. A list of the MSS of Isidore's letters and of their editions, accompanied by short descriptions is given.

Part II: Chap. I: ST ISIDORE AND THE SCRIPTURES. What Isidore tells us about the Scriptures in general and about the relations between the two Testaments. Chap. II: ST ISIDORE AND THE TEXT OF THE N. TESTAMENT. A textual classification of Isidore's N. T. passages is attempted and a textual criticism of the N. T. done by Isidore is illustrated. Chap. III: ST ISIDORE AND HIS USE OF THE N. TESTAMENT. List of N. T. passages interpreted by Isidore. List of additional passages not interpreted but cited by him. For both lists adequate references are given. Some material appropriate for an "Introduction" to the N. T. is quoted here. Chap. IV: ST ISIDORE AND THE INTERPRETATION OF THE N. TESTAMENT. In this chapter Isidore's rules for and methods and types of interpretation are examined and illustrated by many examples. Chap. V: GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS on the material cited and examined and on Isidore's attitude towards literal and allegorical interpretations. An evaluation of Isidore's interpretative skill is attempted. Chap. VI: SUMMARY OF ST. ISIDORE'S DOCTRINAL TEACHING, deriving mostly from the interpretations. Everything which Isidore says on Theology in general, the Holy Trinity, Cosmology, Anthropology, Original Sin, Mariology, Soteriology, Eschatology, the Church and the Sacraments is here systematically and summarily shown.

In the Thesis almost everything which has been said by other Scholars is examined comparatively, brought up to date and in some cases corrected. Greek, Latin, English, French and German bibliography is used and the sources are sufficiently investigated. Several points related to Isidore appear for the first time as Patristic opinions or treatments in the present Thesis. About two hundred extensive passages from Isidore's Letters are translated into English for the first time and used in the Thesis. Many hundred references to Isidore's letters are given throughout the Thesis apart from the hundreds of references to works of other Scholars. The whole Thesis may be characterized as a systematic, comparative and comprehensive Patristic Dissertation on St. Isidore of Pelusium, contributing something useful also to N. Testament Studies.-

=====

I gratefully dedicate this Thesis

To All my Teachers

Who in Boyhood and Manhood equipped, inspired
and helped me to produce it.

C O N T E N T S

Abbreviations	vii
Bibliography	viii
Preface	xii

P a r t I

S T I S I D O R E O F P E L U S I U M

Chapter I. A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE NAME AND CHARACTER OF ST ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM	I-25
--	------

A) T H E N A M E

1. The etymology of the name Isidore	I
2. The use of the affix -δωπο(ς)	I
3. Persons known under the name Isidore:	
a) Mentioned by St. Isidore himself, in his letters	2
b) Other persons who have this name	2
c) Saints who bear this name	4
4. St Isidore of Pelusium	5
5. Historical references to St Isidore of Pelusium	6

B) H I S C H A R A C T E R

1. St Isidore's letters as illustrated in his letters	9
2. The reputation, standing and influence of St. Isidore	15
3. Tributes to St Isidore:	
a) Ancient (6th-14th cent.)	19
b) Modern (18th cent. onwards)	21
c) Hymnology of the GOC	24

Chapter II. ST ISIDORE'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND ENVIRONMENT	26-48
---	-------

A) T H E B A C K G R O U N D

1. General situation	26
2. Doctrinal controversies and consequent developments	27
3. Monasticism	30
4. Patristic Literature	31

B) T H E E N V I R O N M E N T

1. St Isidore and Alexandria	33
2. St Isidore and Pelusium:	
a) Ecclesiastical situation	37
b) Political and social situation	43
3. St Isidore's family	48

Chapter III. EXAMINATION OF DATES AND PLACES	49-58
1. Dates	49
2. Places	52
Chapter IV. EDUCATION AND SCHOLARSHIP	59-92
A) EDUCATION	
1. Studies	59
2. Teachers	61
B) SCHOLARSHIP	
1. St Isidore and ancient pagan writings:	
a) St Isidore's attitude towards Paganism and pagan writings in general	66
b) St Isidore's use of ancient pagan writings.....	68
2. His knowledge of Fathers and Church Writers	81
Chapter V. MATURITY	93-107
1. Poet	93
2. Rhetor or religious Teacher?	94
3. Priest	97
4. Monk and Abbot	101
Chapter VI. ST ISIDORE'S WRITINGS	108-143
A) THE 'LOST' WRITINGS	
1. Witnesses	108
2. 'De Nativitati Domini'	109
3. 'Concerning Faith'	109
4. 'Ὅσοι εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου συνεγράψαντο'	110
5. 'Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου Ἐρωτήσεις καὶ Ἀποκρίσεις'	110
6. Poems	111
7. 'To Cyril of Alexandria'	111
8. The two extant Ἀῶγοι	111
a) The 'Λογίδιον περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰμαρμένην'	114
b) The 'Ἀῶγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας'	115
B) THE EXTANT LETTERS	
1. Number and authenticity of the letters:	
a) The Number	120
b) The authenticity	124
2. Characteristics of the Letters:	
a) External Form	127
b) Language and Style	129
c) The Content	132
3. MSS, Codices and Editions of the Letters:	
a) MSS and Codices	134
b) Editions	141

150 151 152

Chapter I. ST ISIDORE AND THE SCRIPTURES IN GENERAL	I45-I58
1. Preliminary Note	I45
2. St Isidore's profound knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.....	I46
3. The Holy Scriptures in general:	
a)The Holy Scriptures are called Διαθήκη and the reason	I47
b)Why have the Holy Scriptures been written? ...	I48
c)Metaphorical expressions for the H.Scriptures .	I48
d)Authority of the H.Scriptures	I49
e)Arrangment and inspiration of the H.Scriptures	I50
f)The simplicity and lucidity of the Holy Scri- ptures	I51
g)The reading of the Holy Scriptures	I52
4. Relations between the two Testaments:	
a) One Authority for both	I53
b) Agreements between both	I54
c) The preparatory character of the O.T.	I54
d) Differences in instruction given by both	I55
e) The superiority of the N.T.	I55
Chapter II.ST ISIDORE AND THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT	I58-I69
1. Textual classification of St Isidore's N.Testa- ment passages	I58
2. Textual Criticism of the New Testament	I65
Chapter III. ST ISIDORE AND HIS USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	I70-I87
1. Passages interpreted by St Isidore	I70
2. Additional N.T. passages cited by St Isidore ...	I81
3. Various material appropriate for an 'Introducti- on to the N.Testament	I83
Chapter IV. ST ISIDORE AND THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	I88-231
1. Rules given by St Isidore:	
a)Concerning the Interpreters	I88
b)Concerning the Interpretation	I89
2. Methods of Interpretation:	
a)Interpretation of the New Testament by referen- ce to the Scriptures	I92
b)Interpretation of the New Testament by referen- ces to exterior evidences	I96

3. Types of Interpretation :	
a) Literal Interpretations	198
b) Allegorical Interpretations	206
c) Combination of Literal and Allegorical Interpretations	213
c) Unsuccessful Interpretations	222
Chapter V. GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS	231-237
1. On the material cited and examined	231
2. On St Isidore's attitude towards Literal and Allegorical Interpretation	233
3. Evaluation of St Isidore's Interpretations	235
Chapter VI. SUMMARY OF ST ISIDORE'S DOCTRINAL TEACHING	238-267
1. Theology in general	239
a) Is the knowledge of God possible?	239
b) What and how can we learn of God?	239
c) What is God?	240
d) Proofs of the existence of God	241
2. The Holy Trinity:	
a) In general	241
b) The Father	242
c) The Son:	
i. The $\alpha\delta\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\alpha\mu\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ of the Son from the Father	243
ii. The Deity of Christ	244
iii. The equality and consubstantiality of the Son with the Father	245
iv. Christ the Man	246
v. The two Natures of Christ	247
d) The Holy Spirit	249
3. Cosmology	250
4. Anthropology	251
5. Original Sin	253
6. Mariology	254
7. Soteriology	256
8. Eschatology	258
9. The Church	259
10. The Sacraments:	
a) In general	260
b) Baptism	261
c) Confirmation	263
d) Eucharist	263
e) Priesthood	264
f) Repentance	265
g) Marriage	266

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

ASS	: Acta Sanctorum, ed. by the Bollandists, Antwerp-Brussels
AV	: Authorized Version
Bess	: Bessarione, Rome
Byz	: Byzantion, Brussels
BZ	: Byzantinische Zeitschrift, Leipzig-Munich
CC	: Coptic Church
CE	: The Catholic Encyclopedia, N. York 1907-14
CSCO	: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Louvain
DCB	: Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines, ed. by W. Smith-H. Wace, London 1877-88
DCG	: J. Hastings: Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Edinburgh 1912-3
DTC	: Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, ed. by Vacant-Mangenot-Amann, Paris
E	: ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, Τημερινοῦς Τόμος Α. 'Αλεξάνδρου, 'Αθήναι 1958
EH	: Ecclesiastical History
EO	: Echoes d' Orient, Paris 1897-1942
GCS	: Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Leipzig 1897ff
GOC	: The Greek Orthodox Church
HThR	: Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge Mass.
HThS	: Harvard Theological Studies, Cambridge Mass.
JThS	: Journal of Theological Studies, London-Oxford
Life	: M. Smith: An unpublished Life of St Isidore of Pelusium in E pp. 429-38
LTK	: Lexicon fuer Theologie und Kirche, Freiburg
Mansi	: J. D. Mansi: Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio, Paris-Leipzig 1901-27
MG	: J. P. Migne: Patrologia Graeca
ML	: " " Latina
NS	: Νέα Σιών, 'Ιερουσαλήμ
NSHE	: The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ed. by E. M. Jackson, N. York-London
NT	: New Testament
ODCC	: The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. by F. L. Cross, London 1957
OT	: Old Testament
Par	: Paradosis, Freiburg
PhW	: Philologische Wochenschrift, Leipzig
PWK	: Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll: Realencyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart
RCC	: The Roman Catholic Church
RED	: A Religious Encyclopædia or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal and Practical Theology, Edinburgh
REThK	: J. J. Herzog: Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Leipzig
SIF	: Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica, Florence
TQ	: Theologische Quartalschrift, Tübingen

VC : Vigiliae Christianae, Amsterdam
ZKG : Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte, Stuttgart

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

A) Primary Sources:

St Isidore's Letters, in MG 78, 177-1646
Amartolos G.: Chronicon IV 102-3 MG 110, 728-40
Anastasius Sinaita: Guide A MG 89, 145, 156
Apophthegmata Patrum, in MG 65, 221
Ephraem of Antioch, in Photius Bibliotheca 232 MG 103, 1104
Evagrius Scholasticus, E.H. I, 15 MG 86 (Part II) 2461-4
Faundus of Hermianae: Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum Libri
XII ad Justinianum Imperatorem, Lib. II cap. IV ML 67, 571f
Gobarus Stephen, in Photius Bibliotheca 232 MG 103, 1104
Josephus: Works, Engl. Translation by W. Whiston, Edinburgh 1865
Kallistus Nicéphorus, E.H. XIV 28 and 53 MG 146, 1246-57
Life, in E pp. 429-38
Menologium Graecorum, 4th February MG 117, 293-96
Photius: -Letters, book II, let. 44 to Amfilochius of Kyzikus,
MG 102, 861
-Bibliotheca, cod. 228 ed. Berolinii 1884, 406H p. 247 and
" MG 103, 963
cod. 232, MG 103, 1104
Severus of Antioch: -Liber contra impium Grammaticum, in CSCO
SS Syri Ser. 4 vol. VI ed. J. Leebon 1938
-The sixth book of the letters of Severus,
ed. by E.W. Brooks, vol. II part II Oxford 1903
Strabo: Geographica, ed. G. Kramer, vol. III Berlin 1852
Suidas, Lexicon, ed. L. Custerus, Cambridge 1705 vol. II p. 150
Synodicon adversus Tragoediam Irenaei, MG 84, 583 and 587

B) Secondary Sources:

Aigrain R.: Quarante-Neuf Lettres de S. Isidore de Péluse, Paris 1911
Altaner B.: a) Hat Isidoros von Pelusion einen λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας
und einen λόγος περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰσαρμένην
verfasst? in BZ vol. 42 (1943-9) pp. 91-100
b) Patrology, Engl. Translation by H.C. Graef, Edinburgh
1960
Alzog J.: Grundriss der Patrologie, Freiburg, 1866

- Balanos D.: a) Ἰσίδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης, Ἀθήναι 1922
b) Πατρολογία, Ἀθήναι 1931
- Bardenhewer O.: a) Patrology, Engl. Translation by T.J. Shahan, Freiburg 1908
b) Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur, vol. IV 1924
- Baring-Gould: Lives of the Saints, London 1878
- Bareill G.: Isidore de Péluse, in DTC VIII (1924) pp. 84-97
- Bartelink G.J.: Θεωμάκηλος et les Synonymes chez Isidore de Péluse, in VC vol. 12 (1958) pp. 227-31
- Batiffol P.: Anciennes Littératures Chrétiennes: La Littérature Grecque, Paris 1897
- Baur C.: Duplicate in Mignes Patrologia Graeca, in TQ vol. 100 (1919) pp. 252-4
- Bayer Leo: Isidors von Pelusium Klassische Bildung, in Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte, ed. by A. Ehrhard-J.P. Kirsch, Paderborn vol. 13 (1915)
- Bihlmeyer K.: Kirchengeschichte, Paderborn 1951, 1st part
- Bober: De Arte hermeneutica S. Isidori Pelusiotaе, Cracoviae 1878
- Bouvy L.A. Edm.: a) De Isidori Pelusiota Libri Tres, Nemausi 1884
b) S. Jean Chrysostome et S. Isidore the Péluse, in EO vol. I (1897-8) pp. 190-201
- Bright W.: The Age of the Fathers, vol. II, London 1903
- Campbell J.M.: The Greek Fathers, Norwood Mass. 1929
- Capo N.: a) De S. Isidori Pelusiotaе epistolarum recensione ac numero quaestio, in SIF vol. IX (1901) pp. 449-66
b) De Isidori Pelusiotaе epistolarum locis ad antiquitatem pertinentibus, in Bess. vol. VI (1901-2) pp. 342-63
- Cayré F.: Patrologie et Histoire de la Theologie, vol. I Paris 1953
- Ceillier R.: Histoire Générale des Auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques, vol. 13 Paris 1747
- Cheethan S.: A History of the Christian Church, London 1905
- Cross F.L.: Isidore of Pelusium in ODCG, London 1957
- Diamantopoulos N.A.: Ἰσίδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης in N.S. vol. 20 (1925) pp. 737-51; vol. 21 (1926) pp. 99-115; 288-303; 449-66; 538-45; 610-27; 664-74.
- Duchesne Luis: Early History of the Christian Church, Engl. Transl. by C. Jenkins, vol. III, London 1924
- Ellies Du Pin: Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, vol. III part II, Paris 1702
- Eustratiades S.-Arcadius: Catalogue of the Greek MSS in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mount Athos, in HThS vol. 41, Cambridge 1924
- Fehrle E.: Zatschluss und Rhythmus bei Isidoros von Pelusion, in BZ vol. 24 (1924) pp. 315-19
- Fessler Jos.: Institutiones Patrologiae, vol. II Oeniponte 1860
- Filaret of Tsernicov: Ἱστορικὴ διδασκαλία περὶ τῶν Πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, vol. III Greek Transl. by N. Pagidas, Jerusalem 1887

- Fleury M.L' abbé: *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. III London 1729
- Fruechtel L.: a) *Isidoros von Pelusion als Benuetzer des Clemens Alexandrinus und anderer Quellen*, in PhW vol. 58 (1938) pp. 62-4
 b) *Neue Quellennachweise zu Isidoros von Pelusion*, *ibid.* pp. 764-68
- Glueck P.B.: *S. Isidori Pelusiota Summa Doctrina Moralis*, Wirceburgi 1848
- Grégoire H.: *Les Sauterelles de S. Jean-Baptiste*, in Byz. vol. V (1929-30), pp. 109-128
- Gregory R.C.: *Canon and Text of the N. Testament*, Edinburgh 1907
- Hardy E.R.: *Christian Egypt: Church and People*, N. York 1952
- Hase Ch.: *A History of the Christian Church*, Engl. Translation by Ch. Blumenthal-C. Wing, N. York 1856
- Hook W.F.: *Ecclesiastical Bibliography*, vol. 6 London 1850
- Heumann C.A.: *Dissertatio Inauguralis de Isidoro Pelusiota et ejus epistolis*, in *Dissertatio*, Göttingae 1737, p. 1-29
- Kenyon G.F.: *Recent developments in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible*, London 1933
 - *The Text of the Greek Bible*, Duckworth 1937
 - *Our Bible and the ancient Manuscripts*, London 1958
 - *Handbook to the textual criticism of the N. Testament*, London 1901
- Kidd B.J.: *A History of the Church*, vols II-III Oxford 1922, 28
- Kihn H.: *Patrologie*, vol. II Paderborn 1908
- Krueger G.: a) *Isidore of Pelusium*, in NSHE vol. 6 (1910) pp. 46-7
 b) *A Decade of research in early Christian literature (1921-30)* in HThR, vol. 26 (1933)
- Krumbacher K.: *Ἱστορία τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Λογοτεχνίας*
 Greek Translation by G. Soteriades, Athens 1897, vol. I
- Kurtz: *Church History*, vol. I, Engl. Translation by MacPherson, London 1894
- Lake E.K.: *Further notes on the MSS of Isidore of Pelusium*, in JThS vol. 6 (1905) pp. 270-82
- Lambros Sp.: *Catalogue of the Greek MSS of the Mount Athos*, Cambridge 1895, vols I and II
- Leclercq H.: *Isidore of Pelusium*, in CE, vol. VIII
- Le Quien: *Oriens Christianus*, vol. II Paris 1740
- Lietzmann H.: *From Constantine to Julian*, Engl. Translation by L. Woolf, London 1950
- Lundstroem V.: *Di Isidori Pelusiota epistolis recensendis praeclusiones*, in *Eranos* vol. 2 (1897) pp. 67-80
- Moeller W.: a) *Isidore of Pelusium*, in RED vol. 2 (1883) p. 1123
 b) *Isidoros von Pelusium*, in RETHK vol. 9 pp. 444-7
- Niemeyer H.A.: *De Isidori Pelusiota vita, scriptis et doctrina*, Halle 1825, reprinted in Migne (MG) 78 pp. 15-102
- O' Leary De Lacy: *The Saints of Egypt*, London 1937
- Quasten Joh.: *Patrology*, vols I-III; vol. III Utrecht 1960
- Redl G.: *Isidore von Pelusion als Sophist*, in ZKG, vol. 47 (1928) pp. 325-332

- Rudberg Stig Y.: Codex Uspaliensis Graecus 5, in *Eranos* vol. 50 (1952) pp. 60-70
- Schaff Ph.: History of the Christian Church, Nicene-Post Nicene Christianity, vol. I Edinburgh 1884
- Schenk: Isidoros von Pelusion, in *PAK* vol. 9 part II (1916) p. 2068-9
- Schmid P.A.: Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium, in *Par.* vol. 2 (1948)
- Schroeckh J.M.: Christliche Kirchengeschichte, vol. I7 Leipzig 1777
- Simon Richard: Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. Testament, Rotterdam 1693
- Smith Morton: a) The MS Tradition of Isidore of Pelusium, in *HThR* vol. 47 (1954) pp. 205-10
b) An unpublished Life of S. Isidore of Pelusium, in *E* pp. 429-38
- Smith W.-Wace: Isidorus Pelusiota, in *DCB*, vol. III, London 1888
- Souter Alex.: *Novum Testamentum Graecae*, Oxonii 1956
- Spyridon-Eustratiades: Catalogue of the Greek MSS, in *HThS* vol. XII, Cambridge 1925
- Staehlin O.: Clemens Alexandrinus in *GCS* vol. 4 (1934)
- Tillemont: Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire eccl. de six premiers siècles, Paris 1711, vol. XV
- Tixeront: Précis de Patrologie, Paris 1918
- Turner C.H.: The letters of St Isidore of Pelusium, in *JThS* vol. 6 (1905) pp. 70-86
- Vaphides Phil.: *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία*, Constantinople 1884
- Westcott B.F.: A general survey of the history of the Canon of the N. Testament, London 1896 (7th edition)
- Westcott B.F.-Hort F.: The N. Testament in the original Greek, vol. I (the text) London 1909; vol. II (introduction) London 1881. (1)

I. The other books we have consulted on particular points are referred to in the footnotes throughout the work.

P R E F A C E

Saint Isidore of Pelusium is one of the noblest, the most illustrious and the most important Fathers of the Church. His long life and excellent education and especially his generally recognized sanctity, his comprehensive and Orthodox teaching, his interpretative abilities and his fervent zeal for the Church, influenced many important ecclesiastical and political Figures of his age and purified the hearts of countless Christians. In the Egyptian desert where many Monasteries grew up to bear witness of the complete victory of Christianity over idolatry, Isidore was a spiritual oasis. For the Christians, Clergymen or laity, in the towns, St Isidore was the prophetic voice to 'bare record of the word of God and of the testimony of Jesus Christ' (1). To everyone Isidore was a man of authority, a man of God, who always had something to offer 'for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ' (2). And that is why the GOC, the RCC and the OC venerate Isidore as a saint, as a 'chosen vessel'.

But unfortunately, little is known of St Isidore's life and letters, even today. The greatest part of his most edifying teaching is hidden not only to ordinary Christians but even to Theologians. This is especially true for English Readers who have not had the opportunity to read either Isidore's letters in an English translation or his life and teaching written in English. Except for three noteworthy articles concerning only the MSC of St. Isidore's letters and some short notes in Dictionaries and manuals of Church History, nothing else is written in English about St Isidore. It is however encouraging that recently J. Quasten devoted to Isidore five pages in his excellent Patrology, although the account of Isidore's teaching there, is far too brief.

The present Thesis tries to fill this gap. Being the result of two years research at the University of Glasgo, this Thesis deals with the life of St Isidore and with his use and interpretation of the N. Testament. In addition, a summary of Isidore's doctrinal teaching which derives from the interpretations is given.

Everything related to Isidore as a historical person is examined here, brought up to date and corrected. Several points with regard to Isidore's life are treated here for the first time (3). Other points which have also been examined by other Scholars, have here an entirely new form and we may say that they appear in es-

-
1. Rev. I, 2
 2. Ephes. 4, 12
 3. Chap. I section A par. 2 and 3; section B, par. 3c. Chap. IV section B par. 2. Chap. VI section A par. 8

sence for the first time⁽¹⁾. Of special mention must be our suggestion of a short treatise of Isidore's entitled: ' Ἡρόδω Ελληνικαί ' which was until now thought to be lost and which we prove as extant.

The second part of the present work gives a detailed account of Isidore's use and interpretation of the N. Testament. Here also several points appear for the first time or almost for the first time⁽²⁾. Of special mention must be chapters II and VI, for, as they stand, they appear almost for the first time and chapter IV for the rich illustrations of Isidore's interpretations.

In composing the present Thesis we have availed ourselves of many books and periodicals listed in the bibliography. For every borrowing, important or not, accurate references are given in footnotes. Generally speaking, in composing the first part, we found useful and used mainly the special monographs of Balanos, Bayer, Bouvy, Diamantopoulos and Niemeyer and the special articles of Altaner, Cape, Fruechtel, Lake, Lundstroem, M. Smith and Turner. In the composition of the second part, we have to mention mainly two books. That of Dober and that of P. A. Schmid for part of the sixth chapter. Unfortunately we had not the opportunity to see Joasaph's work. From the remaining Patrologies, Church Histories and Dictionaries (they usually do not give important information; the more recent copy the older ones), we mention here the articles or accounts of Bareill, Batiffol, Coillier, Filaret, Kihn, Leclercq, Schenk, Smith-wace and Tillemont. But there is no doubt that we learn much from all these articles. For many purely patristic points, we used the Patrologies of Altaner, Bardenhewer and Quasten. For general historical information we used mainly the works of Duchesne, Kidd and Lietzmann.

The text of Isidore's letters we used is that of MG volume 78 and as it is printed. In several cases, when we thought it necessary, we preferred a different text, depending mainly on the footnotes of this edition. Let it be noted here that these footnotes helped us on many occasions. The translation of dozens and dozens of passages of Isidore's letters cited in this Thesis is done for the first time from the original Greek into English. Duchesne, Fleury and Quasten give incidentally an English translation of two or three passages. Biblical quotations are cited according to the AV. For quotations from other Fathers, reference is given in the appropriate place.

1. e.g. Chap. III par. I and 2; chap. IV, par. 2

2. Chap. I par. 3 and 4; chap. II par. I and 2; chap. III par. 2; chap. IV par. 1b, 2a, 2b, 3c, 3d; chap. VI par. 2b, 2ci, 2cii, 2d, 4, 5, 9, 10.

On the completion of our Thesis and in submitting it for adjudication, we would like to pay our thanks to the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Glasgow for accepting us as a research Student and permitting us to submit our work early in our third academical year; To our Supervisors, the Rev. Dr John Foster, professor of Ecclesiastical History and the Rev. Dr. William Barclay, Lecturer in the N. Testament Language and Literature and in Hellenistic Greek, who so kindly accepted to supervise our work and who helped us on many occasions. Our thanks are also due to our former Professors, Dr P. Bratsiotis and Dr Constantine Bonis of the University of Athens; to the Rev. Dr. George Florovsky, professor of the University of Harvard and to the Rev. Dr T. Torrance, professor of the University of Edinburgh, for their help, encouragement and some useful suggestions.

We should be ungrateful indeed if we did not record here our warm thanks to two friends: Mrs and Mr Hector MacMillan, M.A. teachers in Glasgow, who not only helped us in improving our English but also in assisting us with the many grammatical difficulties of the English Language. Finally we would like to thank the Librarian of the University Library R.O. MacKenna and all his Staff for bringin us from abroad many books necessary for our work and the Librarian of Trinity College Rev. J. Mackintosh for his help and kindness.

The unsatisfactory edition of St Isidor's letters in MG on the one hand and the informal nature of letters themselves on the other hand, caused him to be little known and his teaching to be hidden. We hope this Thesis may stimulate the interest not only of Theologians but of ordinary Christians, to have a personal experience of the beauty and edification of the letters of St Isidore and, through him, to admire the hidden treasure of the Greek Fathers, who 'shine as lights in the world' ⁽¹⁾ and to glorify the Father of lights for 'every good gift and every perfect gift is from above' ⁽²⁾.

-
1. Phil. 2, 15
 2. James 1, 17

P a r t I

S T . I S I D O R E O F P E L U S I U M

Chapter I

A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE NAME AND CHARACTER OF ST. ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM

A) THE NAME

1. The etymology of the name Isidore

The Greek corresponding to Isidore is 'Ισιδωρος. In this name we recognize two parts: 'Ισι and δωρος. The first part is undoubtedly a form of the name of the Egyptian goddess 'Ισις⁽¹⁾, so known and worshipped in Egypt in ~~the~~ antiquity. The second part is an affix which with the first part makes a proper name: 'Ισιδωρος. Since the second part of this name means 'gift', we easily understand that this name means a gift from or to the goddess Isis⁽²⁾. The objection that Isidore's parents being Christians could not give ~~to~~ their son such a name is not so strong, because either this name is due to Isidore's God-father whom we do not know or he was called after his grand father's name as it happens today, or most probably, because there was a wide spread custom at that time to put such names with the affix -δωρο(ς) and his parents did not bother so much about the meaning of the name.

2. The use of the affix - δωρο(ς)

Even today there is the habit of getting names with the affix-prefix or suffix-δωρο(ς), especially among Greek people and in the Greek Language; e.g. Αερδωρος or Αερδωρα, Θεδωρος or Θεδωρα. But in ancient times this custom was more familiar and more widespread. To illustrate this, we refer to such names which can be found in ancient Greek writings⁽³⁾. Thus we find the names: 'Αθηνδωρος, 'Αιανδωρος, 'Απολλδωρος, 'Αρδωρος, 'Ανδωρος, 'Αρτεμδωρος, 'Ασπεδωρος, 'Ανδωρος, Γερητοθεδωρος, Διδωρος, 'Αλευσδωρος, 'Αερδωρος,

2. of C.A. Heumann: Dissertatio de Isidoro Pelusiota et ejus epistolis, Göttingae 1737, p.2 note a

4. A daughter of Thaumae and Electra, messenger of the gods, is also named Isis, but it is unlikely that the prefix of the name Isidore, especially for Egypt, is derived from this Isis.

3. See e.g. S.D. Byzantios: Αξιόκον ἐπίτομον τῶν ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι συγγραφεύσιν ἀπαντῶντων κυρίων ὀνομάτων, Athens 1852

Δῆρος, Ἐρμῶδωρος, Ἐστιῶδωρος, Εὐδωρος, Εὐδῶρα, Εὐδῶρη, Ζηνῶδωρος, Ἡλιῶδωρος, Ἡρῶδωρος, Θεῶδωρος, Θεοδωρίδας, Θεοδωρίς, Ἰσῶδωρος, Ἰσμηνοῶδωρος, Ἰσμηνοῶρα, Κασσιῶδωρος, Κηφισσῶδωρος, Κλεοῶρα, Μανῶδωρος, Μηνῶδωρος, Μητρῶδωρος, Νικῶδωρος, Νυμφῶδωρος, Ὀλυμπιῶδωρος, Πάνδωρος, Πανῶρα, Πεισῶδωρος, Πολυῶδωρος, Πολυῶρα, Πολυῶρη, Πτοιῶδωρος, Πυθῶδωρος, Στυμῶδωρος, Στυμῶδωρος, Τροφιῶδωρος, Ὑπατιῶδωρος, Χριστῶδωρος, etc. It is characteristic that three sisters, martyrs and saints (feast day 10 September) of the GOC who suffered martyrdom in 304 are named Μηνοῶρα, Νυμφοῶρα and Μητροῶρα!

3. Persons known under the name Isidore

a) Mentioned by Isidore himself, in his letters

- 1 α° Isidore the bishop (1)
- 2 β° Isidore the presbyter (2).
- 3 γ° Isidore the deacon (3)
- 4 δ° Isidore the prefect (4)
- 5 ε° Isidore the scholastic (5).
- 6 στ° Isidore (6).

b) Other persons who have this name

- 7 α° Isidore the Confessor, bishop of Hermopolis (7).
- 8 β° Isidore the "Hospitaliter", St Athanasius' companion at Rome and Theophilus' favoured candidate for the See of Constantinople, instead of Chrysostom.
- 9 γ° Isidore the Philosopher (8).
- 10 δ° Isidore of Damiette (9).
- 11 ε° Isidore Charakinos, historian from Charax of Babylonia who lived when Tiberius was reigning (10).
- 12 στ° Isidore the rhetor from Pergamos (11).

-
1. V. MG 78, 1705
 2. I 7, 120, 221-2, 394, II 18, 94-5, IV 26, 123, V 7, 394
 3. V. MG 78, 1704-5
 4. I 299
 5. II 269, III 57
 6. I 278, 458, IV 126, V 477
 7. MG 47, 22 and H.R. Hardy: Christian Egypt, Church and People, N.York 1952 p.87
 8. Photius: Biblioth. 181 and 242 MG 103, 528-32 and 1250-1305
 9. Bossuet (Niemeyer 15 note a; Bober 3; Bouvy 191-3), R. Simon (Histoire Critique des principaux... p.306-14), L. Ellis Du Pin (Nouvelle Bibliotheque... III B p.7-32) and others deal with him as if he were Isidore of Pelusium. They confuse Pelusium rather than Isidore of Tillemont (XV 99 and 847) Ceillier (XIII, 600) etc.
 10. S.D. Byzantios, loc.cit. p.80
 11. ibid.

- 13 ζ° Isidore, son and disciple of Basilides⁽¹⁾.
- 14 η° Isidore, the brother of Plerius⁽²⁾.
- 15 θ° Isidore of Cordova⁽³⁾.
- 16 ι° Isidore, the admiral of Antiochus iii⁽⁴⁾.
- 17 ια° Isidore from Alexandria, winner at the Olympic games, in fighting. Olympias 177 (72 B.C.)
- 18 ιβ° Isidore from Alexandria also, winner at the Olympic games in running. Olymp. 243-4 (193-97 B.C.)
- 19 ιγ° Isidore, a notorious captain of Pirates.
- 20 ιδ° Isidore, a comical actor
- 21 ιε° Isidore, a slave of Cicero
- 22 ιστ° Isidore, a certain athlete
- 23 ιζ° Isidore, one of the false friends and helpers of the prefect of Egypt A. Avillius Flacus
- 24 ιη° Isidore, a Cynic of the emperor Nero
- 25 ιθ° Isidore, an Egyptian leader in the revolution of Bukole, c. 172 A.D.
- 26 κ° Isidore, the son (?) of Lysias
- 27 κα° Isidorus Postumius, an eminent man, prefect between the years 313 and 337
- 28 κβ° Isidore, prefect of Constantinople, 410 A.D.
- 29 κγ° Flavius Anthemius Isidorus, prefect of Illyrikon, 424AD
- 30 κδ° Isidore the Count. (A law of Valentinian of 14-7-444 is discribed to him)
- 31 κε° Isidore the Neoplatonist
- 32 κστ° Isidore the mechanician from Miletos, 6th cent.
- 33 κζ° Isidore the deacon. He lived most probably in the 13th century
- 34 κη° Isidore, a hieromonk, 15th cent.
- 35 κθ° Isidore of Antioch, disciple and friend of Galan
- 36 λ° Isidore, a doctor from Memphis,
- 37 λα° Isidore, the son of Num(enios), from Paros, sculptor
- 38 λβ° Isidore, a famous architect of Justinian, from Miletos
- 39 λγ° Isidore, architect and engineer, nephew of the former
- 40 λδ° Isidore, a martyr from Thessalonika⁽⁵⁾.
- 41 λε° Isidore Boucheras, Patriarch of Constantinople 1347-49⁽⁶⁾.
- 42 λστ° Isidore Xanthopoulos, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1459-63⁽⁷⁾.

-
1. F. Cayre (Patrologie et Histoire.. I p. 122) gives him as the son only of Basilides, and so does E. J. Goodspeed (A History of early Cristian literature, Chicago 1942 p. 85). O. Bardenhewer (Patrology p. 74) and B. Altaner (Patrology p. 141) agree that this Isidore was the son and disciple of Basilides. cf. Schenk in PWK vol. IX p. 2068
 2. H. Quasten. Patrology, Utrecht 1953, vol. II p. 112
 3. O. Bardenhewer (loc. cit. p. 511) says that there never was an Isidore of Cordova
 4. From this Isidore to that marked by the number 39, we are referring to PWK vol. IX (part II) pp. 2060-2081

- 45 α° Isidore, a hymnographer(1)
- 46 λη° Isidore Glavas, Archbishop of Thessalonika(2)
- 48 λθ° Isidore of Tyre(3)
- 46 μ° Isidore, bishop of Chalcois(5)
- 47 μα° Isidore a Monk(5)
- 48 μθ° Isidore the tribune(6)
- 49 μγ° Isidore, a Metropolitan of the Russian Church (d.1464)(7)

c) Saints who bear this name

- 50 α° Isidore the Martyr, feast day 14 May, in the GOC(8)
- 51 β° Isidore of Seville, feast day 4 April, in the RCC
- 52 γ° Isidore the Labourer, a Spanish (1070-1130)(9), in the RCC
- 53 δ° Isidore Martyr, feast day 14 May, in the CC, son of Bandilous and Sophia. He and his father suffered martyrdom in the persecution under Diocletian. Seemingly this Isidore is different from that of the number 50(10).
- 54 ε° Isidore of Takinash Dafnas, feast day 14 March, in the CC. This was a weaver and an intimate friend of Sina who is another saint of the CC. This Isidore suffered martyrdom when persecution was being carried out under Diocletian(11).
- 55 στ° Isidore of Hermopolis, successor to Dracontius, predecessor to Dioscorus, in the CC. He met Melania in 373-4(12).
- 56 ζ° Isidore of Pelusium, feast day 4 February, in the GOC, RCC, CC

Footnotes for the page 3

5. NG 139, 12-164

6. Spyridon-Eustratiades: Catalogue of the Greek MSS, in HThR, vol XII, Cambridge 1925, p.86

7. M.Beas, Eleutheroudakis Lexikon, Athens 1929, vol VI p.826

Footnotes for the page 4

1. Spyridon-Eustratiades, loc.cit. p.274 and Lambros: Catalogue of the Greek MSS of the Mount Athos, Cambridge 1895, vol I p.381

2. Lambros, loc.cit. I p.499

3. Severus of Antioch, Letters I 141, ed. E.W.Brooks

4. ibid. III 354, IV 65, I 53, 55, II 42, 71

5. ibid. I 211

6. ibid. II 42

7. M.Beas, loc.cit. VI 827

8. This saint according to Greek Menai, was a native of Alexandria and an officer in the army. He suffered martyrdom in 251 when persecution was being carried out under Decius, in the island Chios; hence he is known as Isidore of Chios.

9. GE vol VIII p. 169

10. De Lacy O' Leary: The Saints of Egypt, London 1937, p.160

11. ibid.

12. ibid. p.161

D. Balanos⁽¹⁾ following E. Bouvy⁽²⁾, says that "a saint named Andrew who is venerated in the CC on 4th February, is evidently our saint Isidore, with whom he has so many common points". And Bouvy himself following Bollandists⁽³⁾ gives a detailed account of the similarities between these two saints. Thus he says, from the information of ASS, Philippus=Theophilus, Darius=Dorotheus, Andreas=Isidorus, Pharma=Pelusium. But, according to O' Leary⁽⁴⁾, the CC on the 4th of February has the following saints: a) James, son of Alphaeus; b) Justus, Martyr; c) Apollo, Martyr; d) Theocla, Martyr; e) Isidore of Pelusium and f) Philo, bishop of Persians. So, if O' Leary is right, there is no St. Andrew in the CC venerated on the 4th of February. On the other hand in the CC there are the following saints under the name of Andrew: a) Andrew the Apostle, 30 November; b) Andrew a Martyr, 20 September⁽⁵⁾, venerated with Eucaios and Eucapius. They were "men of Lydda, monks in a Syrian Monastery. Hearing of St Macarius the Great, they went to find him and became his disciples in scetis. They were put to death by Julian". c) Andrew, an ascete of De es-Sanad or Monastery of Anba Samuel who removed to the Der es-Sabib (Monastery of the Cross) near Jeme in the Thebaid⁽⁶⁾. Neither Andrew the Apostle nor Andrew the Martyr of the CC have any relation with Isidore of Pelusium. Could Andrew the Ascete of the CC be identified with Isidore of Pelusium? Unfortunately we have not many elements concerning this Andrew. But certainly, not one St Andrew of the CC, if O' Leary is right, coincides with Isidore of Pelusium, at least as Bouvy and Balanos who follows him wish. Some similarities which are very common among many saints do not mean identity.

4. Isidore of Pelusium

Apart from the amount of exterior pieces of evidence with regard to the name of Isidore of Pelusium, there is an interior evidence. Thus, writing to the Monastery in Tabennisia, he says: "ὁ ἐλάχιστος γρ. ἄνθρωπος Ἰσίδωρος"⁽⁷⁾. This is a true and authentic signature. But his second name, that is the surname Πηλουσιώτης presents more interest. We know him as Πηλουσιώτην even from the sixth century, in accordance with Faouddus⁽⁸⁾ and S. Gobarus¹

1. Δημητρίου Σ. Μπαλάνου, 'Ισίδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης', Ἀθήναι 1922, p. 33 note 2
2. E.L.A. Bouvy: Isidori Pelusiota Libri tres, Nemausi 1884, p. 58-62
3. ASS 4th February, vol I p. 479
4. loc. cit. p. 46
5. ibid. 134
6. ibid. 75
7. I 93, 248A
8. Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum II 4, ML 67, 573A

witnesses. Why had Isidore been called Πηλουσιώτης? There are two theories:

The first is represented by Diamantopoulos(1), who says that Isidore had been called Πηλουσιώτης because he was from Pelusium: "The sacred Isidore undoubtedly was from Pelusium and thence he got the surname Pelusiotis"(2). Diamantopoulos tries to strengthen his opinion from the fact that there are many links between Isidore and Pelusium. Thus, he says, the reasons for this conception are: a) More than half of his extant letters were sent to residents of Pelusium. b) The undiminished interest which Isidore always was showing to this city and for its prosperity. c) There is not even one evidence in his letters which could certify that any link existed between him and Alexandria.

According to the second theory, Isidore had been called Pelusiotis, because he became a monk of the Monastery near Pelusium, but he was born elsewhere. This opinion is based on the information we find in Photius who, referring to Ephraem of Antioch (527-545), says: "... Ἀλεξανδρεὺς δὲ τὸ γένος οὗτος ἦν "(3), and is represented by the tremendous majority of older witnesses and modern and contemporary Scholars(4).

Our opinion is that Isidore had been called Πηλουσιώτης because he was born at Pelusium, that is because he was a Pelusiotis. Thus we agree with Diamantopoulos and disagree with all others(5).

5. Historical references to Isidore of Pelusium

Heumann thinks that many people who could bear witness for Isidore, and especially he says that "indeed, the fact that Isidore of Seville keeps silent, loudly cries that nothing was known to him with regard to our Isidore and that he had not ever seen him as a select"(6).

To answer Heumann's objection we should say the following: Firstly, it would not be easy for Gennadius of Constantinople (458-71), being so far from Egypt, to know everything taking place at this time. Apart from that, many commentaries and homilies of Gennadius have been lost(7). So, we cannot say with certainty that Gennadius did not hear of Isidore from the fact only that he does not mention him. Secondly, Isidore Hispalensis, i.e. of Seville, dealt widely with various topics, but very little with ecclesiastical history. He was interested

⊙ keep silent

1. Ἰσίδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης, M.S. 1926 p.105-7

2. *ibid.* p.105

3. *Bibliotheca*, 228 MG 103, 963

4. V. *infra* chap. III par. 2

5. *ibid.*

6. *loc.cit.* p.2-3: "Tacet Gennadius, tacet Isidorus Hispalensis,"



especially in Spain, but Isidore of Pelusium did not live in Spain. Apart from that, in spite of the fact that the main source of the works of Isidore of Seville were the works of the Church Fathers, Isidore of Seville did not use all Fathers. How can we say that everyone who has not been mentioned by Isidore of Seville did not exist or was not worthy of mention? Besides, we have pieces of evidence older than the voice of Isidore of Seville. Thirdly, with regard to the witnesses of Sigebert of Gembloux (d. III2) and of Honorius of Autostodunum (c. II35), we should say that these writers "were content to reproduce notices from Jerome and Gennadius" (1). So their voice is not a voice of authority. And, more important, they are not so ancient, for we have testimonies from the sixth century. After all these concerning Heumann's argument, the result is nothing else "sed nihil ex hoc argumentationis modo conficitur" (2).

We are in possession of a considerable body of testimonies from ancient literature bearing on the life and the work of Isidore of Pelusium. From these testimonies we cite here some from the sixth century only, to help us in understanding Isidore's importance.

Thus, when the Pope Pelagius I (555-61) wrote his treatise "In defensione Trium Capitulorum" in 554, "he made use especially of Facundus of Hermianae" (3). This means that the work 'Pro defensione Trium Capitulorum ad Justinianum imperatorem' composed by Facundus (4), was written before 554, in about 550. In other words we possess a testimony concerning Isidore only one hundred years after his death. And Facundus voice is quite clear and eulogistic: "Nam vir etiam s a n c t i s s i m u s et m a g n a e in Ecclesia Christi g l o r i a e Isidorus presbyter Aegyptius Pelusiota, quem duo millia epistolarum ad aedificationem Ecclesiae multi scripsisse noverunt, qui etiam pro vitae ac sapientiae suae meritis, ut pater ab ipso Cyrillo et honoratus est et vocatus, sic ei scribit, quim potius rescribit..." (5). Apart from this statement, Facundus mentions three letters of Isidore's (6).

Photius preserved for us the testimony of Ephraem the Patriarch of Antioch (527-45), who "διαφόρους ἐξ ἐπιστολῶν διαφόρων χρηστικῶς ἐκφέρει, αὐτὸν κατὰ πάντα συμβαίνουσι ταῖς κατὰ τῶν αἰρετικῶν ὡς οὐκ εὐσεβέσιν ἀποφανομέναις" (7). Let it be noted here that

tacet Honorius Augustodunensis, tacet Sigebertus Gemblacensis"

7. B. Altaner, loc. cit. p. 392

1. ibid. p. II

2. E. Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 2

3. B. Altaner, loc. cit. p. 556

4. ML 67, 573

5. ibid. 573A

6. I 370, 310 and 324

7. Bibliotheca, 228

we can find a certain echo of Isidore's I 418 letter in the fifth letter of Synesius of Cyrene. This letter must have been written between 410 when he became bishop of Ptolemais and Metropolitan of Pentapolis and 414 when he died.

Photius(1) informs us also that he had read a book composed by Stephen Gobarus who was a tritheist. This Gobarus "wrote in Egypt or Syria probably under Justin II, 565-78(2). From the excerpt which is preserved in Photius, we are informed "οὐκ ἔσχεν ὑπολήψεις ὁ εὐλαβεστάτος Ἰσίδωρος ὁ τοῦ Πηλουσίου περὶ Θεοφίλου καὶ Κυρίλλου τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἱεραρχῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, ὡς τοὺς μὲν ἐνεκα τῆς πρὸς τὸν Χρυσόστομον ἀπεχθείας ἐκένιζε, τὸν δὲ ἐπᾶναι τε καὶ ἐθαύμαζε"(3).

Evagrius Scholasticus who wrote an ecclesiastical history in six books on the time between 431 and 594 and who died about 600, asserts concerning our Isidore: "Ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς(4) βασιλείας διέπρεπε καὶ Ἰσίδωρος, οὐ κλέος εὐροῦ κατὰ τὴν κοίτην, ἐργῶ τε καὶ λόγῳ περὶ πᾶσι διαβόητος. Ὅς οὕτω μὲν τὴν σάρκα τοῖς πόνοις ἐξέτηξεν, οὕτω δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῖς ἀναγωγικοῖς ἐπίειπε λόγοις, ὡς ἀγγελικὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μετελθεῖν βίον, στήλην τε ζῶσαν διὰ παντός εἶναι, βίου τε μοναδικοῦ καὶ τῆς εἰς Θεὸν θεωρίας"(5).

Apart from these entirely 'positive' pieces of evidence which so clearly and loudly speak of Isidore, we think that another voice, 'negative' in one point could also testify about Isidore, or rather it could testify in a better way about Isidore. "σεμνή γάρ καὶ ἡ παρὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μαρτυρία(6). This is the voice ~~is~~ of Severus, some time (512-18) patriarch of Antioch who died in 538 and who in his principal work(7) containing more than one thousand citations from the Fathers, denies the authenticity of some Isidore's letters. Severus had some doctrinal reasons for denying the authenticity of these letters and not actually historical ones. He, nevertheless, speaks very clearly of Isidore and praises him highly. Severus speaks of Isidore's birth, occupation, erudition, holiness and of his letters. This information is derived from his 'Liber contra impium Grammaticum' and from his Letters(8). He calls Isidore 'orthodoxus', 'sapiens', 'beatus', 'venerabilis'; He quotes an extract from a letter which he evidently accepts and which

1. Bibliotheca, 232

2. Altaner, loc.cit. p.613.-Bardenhewer, loc.cit.p.544, says that Gobarus wrote about 600

3. Photius, loc.cit.MG 103, 1104C

4. i.e. of Theodosius II, the son of Arcadius (408-449)

5. E.H. I, 15 MG 86, 2461-4. Niceph. Kallistos (E.H. XIV, 53 MG 146, 1252) takes and repeats this information word for word.

6. III 228, 665A.

7. Liber contra impium Grammaticum, III 39 in CSCO ser.4 vol. VI, ed J. Leebon 1938

8. The Sixth book of Letters, vol.II part II p.251

can be considered as the best eulogium ever attributed to Isidore: "Salutatio venerabilis presbyteri Isidori, altaris Christi, vasis ministerii Ecclesiarum, thesauri Scripturarum, patris verborum, gasophylacii virtutem, templi pacis" (1). Severus' voice is a very important document concerning Isidore, since it is the oldest voice we possess, dating from Isidore's lifetime (2). To this we must add Photius' notice that "Severus having been incited to accuse Isidore who is found among the saints and having no grounds for it, creates the accusation that Isidore was Origenist, although Severus himself being vanquished by the truth refutes later this accusation" (3). Let it be noted here that John the Grammarian quotes six of Isidore's letters (I, 102, 310-II, 323, 370, 405) and so does Leontius of Byzantium (I, 101, 303, 323, 360, 405, and IV 166) (4).

These pieces of evidence, omitting the plentitude of newer ones, being strengthened also by the fact that Isidore's letters were collected with a scrupulous care and spread so quickly (5), certify, in spite of Heumann says and of the silence of some witnesses, that Isidore of Pelusium was an important figure, a remarkable writer, an excellent character and a saintly monk and presbyter, well known from his time onwards.

© what

B) HIS CHARACTER

I. Isidore's virtues as illustrated in his letters

a) Isidore was first of all ^{of} a lively and energetic nature. He became a monk, in other words he denied the world and its problems, in order to take more care of his own soul and salvation, but he could never stay alone. Even among the

1. CSKO 4, VI p. 182

2. cf P.A. Schmid: Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium, Paradosis II, Freiburg 1948 p. 6

3. loc. cit. MG 103, II 040

4. cf P.A. Schmid, loc. cit. p. II

5. E. Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 161: "Isidorum arbitror in lucem editum non multo post medium annum quarti seculi hanc magnam sibi auctoritatem collegisse, Theodosio juniore imperium inaugurante". cf Diamantopoulos, loc. cit. p. 739 and C.H. Turner in JThS VI p. 74. With regard to the reading of Isidore's letters in the mediaeval Church, see M. Smith in HThR 47 (1954) p. 209.

monks, even in his cell, Isidore was keenly interested in everything; he felt free to do what he could "for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness", so that those people who were in touch with him "may be perfect throughly furnished unto all goodworks" (1).

b) He left the city with all the problems, joy and troubles which it could give and fled to the monastic life, 'the true or divine philosophy' as he many times said (2). But his interest for the affairs of the inhabitants of the cities and especially of Pelusium never stopped. The general situation of ecclesiastical matters was his concern; the bishop of the shire was his concern also (3); the prefect of Pelusium was his concern (4). His interest included the prosperity of Pelusium, the promoting of the citizens, the behaviour of clergymen who were living in the cities and everything which could be spiritually useful to someone.

c) Isidore heard "what the Spirit saith unto the Churches" (5) and that "he that hath the seven spirits of God and the seven stars" (6) and "he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth" (7) would spue him who "is lukewarm and neither cold nor hot out of his mouth" (8), and that is he decided to be "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord" (9). We understand Isidore's zeal expressed externally, in two ways: First, zeal for the edification of believers. Indeed the most of his letters serve this purpose. Second, zeal for the christian truth, for the "House of God". He, following the teaching of the Church formed in the first Ecumenical Council "which having been inspired by God declared that which was true" (10), taught those asking about God (11), about Christ (12), about the Church and salvation (13), about the Scriptures (14), from which he never separated himself.

⊕ why

-
1. 2 Tim. 3, 16-7
 2. e.g. I, I 177A- I 402, 408AB- III 273, 952B- V 485, 1069AB
 3. See all the letters addressed to Eusebius of Pelusium, MG 78, 1703
 4. I 154, 174, 177, 191, 225-6, 367, 430, 483-90 etc.
 5. Rev. 3.22
 6. ibid. 3, 1
 7. ibid. 3, 7
 8. ibid. 3, 16
 9. Rom. 12, 11
 10. IV 99, 1165A
 11. I 343, II 117, 119, 160, 222, III 71, 196, 149, IV 47, V 359, 368 etc.
 12. I 140, 236, 249, 303, 323, 405, IV 29, 32, 128, 166 etc.
 13. I 66, 204, 228, II 2, 37, 52, 61, 159, 218, 242, 280, III 22, 73, 158, 195 271, 406, IV 13.51, 171, V 162, 327, 459.
 14. V. infra, part II chapter I

He attacked the heretics(1) who were trying to adulterate the truth. He spoke about pagans(2) and Jews(3). He strictly blamed the wicked clergymen(4) "who have thrown themselves into the labyrinth of vice and overthrown not only the divine laws, but even those of Nature"(5), and he tried to drive them to repentance(6). He also attacked the monks(7), who were living without any work, residing in big buildings as Pharaoh(8). Wicked political leaders have not+excluded(9). But of course Isidore took care also of good clergymen(10) and of good political leaders(11) in order to strengthen them in virtue and to present them as good examples to others. All these say that Isidore was not only a lively character, not only that he showed interest for the affairs of Pelusium and of the Church in general, but that he was a courageous and zealous Soldier(12) or rather Officer, of Christ and that "the zeal of His house had eaten him up"(13). As Barcill(14) remarked, Isidore's zeal for the house of God was "verily apostolic".

+ been

-
- I. e.g. Arius: I 241, 246, 389, 422, II 143, III 27, 334, 342, 402
 Montanism: I 67, 242-3, 245, 449, 500
 Manichaeism: I 52, 102, 245, 413
 Marcio: I 52, 371
 Nestorianism and Apollinarism: I 54, 323, 419
 Origen: II 272, IV 153.
 2. I 54, III 117, 135, 154, IV 23-31
 3. I 18, II 93, 143, III 19, IV 225
 4. Among the bishops the worst whom Isidore in many cases attacked, was Eusebius of Pelusium, possessing the see for half a century. From the other clergymen of Pelusium, the most wicked and notorious was Zosimus (see the letters to them in MG 78, 1703 and 1708). Other clergymen whom Isidore attacked were: Martinianus and Maron, friends of Zosimus, the deacons Chairemon, Palladius, Serinus, Eustathius etc. of G.J.M. Bartelink: *Ἐκδομῆς et ses synonymes chez Isidore de Péluse*, in V.C. vol. XII (1956) p. 229f
 5. II 171, 621C
 6. I 382, II 124, 153, 157-8, 171, 230, 295, III 35-6, 221, 275, V II, 77, 84, 105, 311, 402, 476, 539
 7. Ambrosius (I 392), Lambetius (I 13), Pelagius (I 314), Philip (I 417, Mark (I 173)
 8. I 498, 453A
 9. Isidore blames strictly Gigantius and other Cappadocians (I 158, 281, 351-2, 485-7, 490, IV 197 etc.), Cerynius (I 174-8, 240, 493), Aspiarius (I 275) etc.
 10. eg. Bishop Hermogenes of Rhinocorura (II 101, III 21, 132, V 378, 448, 466), Ammonius (III 178, 245, 270), Lambetius (II 211, 221, III 48, 114, 240) and Theodosius (II 231, III 256, 245, V 494). The presbyters: Aphrodisius (V 28), Theodosius (III 349), the deacon Eutonium (III 87, 247) and the Reader Timothy (II 151, 155).
 11. Ausonius (II 120, I 165, V 428), the Count Hermianus (III 375), Hierax (III 344), Isidore (I 485) and Simplicius (I 225-6).

d) We must mention Isidore's h o s p i t a l i t y as another of his virtues. Thus he, writing to the presbyter Theodosius about a man who was interested in 'the divine religion' exhorts him: "Be a good host to him, so that he, seeing you and the others who are images of the virtue, would embrace the proper love" (1). Isidore's feelings concerning giving hospitality were so strong, as we understand from a letter by which he attacks those who did not give hospitality to those in need. Isidore closes his letter with these words: "If some people being ignorant gave hospitality to angels, you, being not ignorant but knowing, expel angels" (2). As Isidore himself states, "it was his ready custom to welcome everyone going to him and to offer to the visitor the proper speech and rest" (3).

e) "I love t r u t h very much" (4), says Isidore and this is another virtue of his. Was it not truth for which he was struggling throughout his life? Truth was the cause of the hostility of some wicked men against Isidore, because of which he suffered not little (5). Isidore became the enemy of some people, but he was telling the truth (6). We think that Isidore in these cases could repeat that of Paul: "I therefore became your enemy, because I tell you the truth" (7).

f) R e l o a s e from earthly things f r u g a l i t y and p o v e r t y, are some other decorations of the character of Isidore. That is why he says: "If we have been educated by John the Baptist concerning the food and the clothes of the perfect ascetic according to God, then, if it is possible, let us be content with hair raiment; and let us be content as to food, with locusts which are frugal food and give little strength. And if these must be increased for the reason of an illness, let the Abbot's opinion and order be the model of every need and diet and perfection" (8). Isidore was a monk; he was a real

12. Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 156: "Non tamen in sua solitudine ignavus vixit et veterosus, sed miles Christi strenuus extitit".

13. John 2, 17

14. DTC VIII p. 85

1. V 211, 1457C. The word ξεναιός means either him who gives hospitality to someone or him who guides someone.

2. I 150, 284B

3. I 142, 277B: "ὅς δὲ ἐτοίμη ἡ ἡμετέρα συνέθεια πάντας οἴκοι προσέσθαι, καὶ δεξιᾷ μεταδιδόναι ἐπιλείας καὶ ἀναπαύσεως..."

4. II 146, 600BC

5. Therasius was accusing Isidore (I 389). In II 122, 561D, Isidore says "Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν τι ἐκ τοῦ κατηγορησάσθαι κέρδος, οὐδενὶ ἂν παρεχέρησα, καίτοι διὰ τοῦτο π ο λ λ ᾶ κ ι ε ἐπιβουλευθεὶς" II V 131 and 398.

6. III 248, 925D

7. Galat. 4, 16. of II 185, 636B

8. I 5, 184A

monk. "We have accepted the coat and we have sent the cloak and we have pleased you very much who asked for the one raiment of ours, because we have fulfilled the law of the Baptist having not two cloaks⁽¹⁾: And because he had not two cloaks to give one to him in need, he sent some monk named Simon to the deacon Paul who had a dozen cloaks to grant one to the poor Simon⁽²⁾. Some information tells us that Isidore's parents were well-to-do and naturally he would inherit at least some of his parents' riches. But now he has not even two cloaks. He sold that he had and gave to the poor and followed Christ; he denied⁽³⁾ himself and became perfect and therefore he shall have (he has) treasure in heaven⁽⁴⁾.

g) Finally we stress Isidore's *h u m i l i t y*. Isidore writing to the Monastery in Tabennasis, signed himself ἐλάχιστος Ἰσοδωρος, εἰ καὶ μὴ δέσμιος μοναχός, and speaks of his unworthiness ⁽⁵⁾. He is complaining to the Reader Timothy, because he was praising Isidore very much⁽⁶⁾. Refusing the praise attributed to him by the Bishop Hermogenes, Isidore writes: "If we write and send you something good, it is due to the divine Grace, which makes wise even those who are illiterate"⁽⁷⁾. By a lovely humour he also refuses the praise from Eulogius⁽⁸⁾. Let us cite wholly a short letter which will oblige us to admire Isidore's humility: "You perhaps think that I am ready for many sermons and thoughts, but I know very well that I know nothing"⁽⁹⁾. And if something good would be said, it is due to God who many times makes wise those who are illiterate, for the benefit of their hearers"⁽¹⁰⁾. Concerning the refusal of praises of other people to Isidore, there is a good extract which shows that Isidore was rejecting the praises because he had a really humble opinion of himself.

1. I 316, 317D-320A. cf V 164 where Isidore praises Εραμεινονδας' poverty.
2. "Σίματα τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ἡ αἰσούρα (= special cloth made by sheep-skin) συνίσταται γυνυδὺν, ἣν ἀμπέχεται. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀπαρτεῖ πρὸς Αἰγυπτίον, σκεπάζματος δέεται. Ἐγὼ τοίνυν σοι τοῦτον συνιστῶ..." I 475, 441B
3. I 266, 341A: "Ἀρνησαί σεαυτὸν, καὶ ἄρον τὸν σταυρὸν, καὶ φεῦγε ὡς κατ' ἑμέ", he writes to Kratinos.
4. Matt. 19, 21
5. I 93, 248A. Isidore scarcely speaks of himself. cf Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 37-8
6. II 4, 400B: "Ἦέκαυσεν τοίνυν οὕτως ἐκαινῶν τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἀφραίνοντας ὑπτιώσεις· τοὺς δὲ ἐχέφροντας ἐρυθριῶν παραινέσεις". cf also III 382, 1025D and II 210, 652A
7. II 218, 660C
8. III 236, 317A: "Ὁ Εὐλόγιος, ὡς σφόδρα εἰ Εὐλόγιος, ἐκαινῶν ἐμέ καὶ τοὺς κατ' ἐμέ προσηρημένους". cf IV 31, 1084C
9. V, Plato's "Apologia" 21D, where the famous phrase of Socrates: "Ἐν οἷα οἶτι οὐδὲν οἶδα". See also Isidore's V 186, 1437B
10. III 241, 920C

"I have written them, not because I wished to enjoy praises; for you know how much I refuse them. Because, if I was liking praises, then I should count all those whom I have persuaded to embrace virtue and who are many and in good repute" (1). For his successes Isidore gives the honour to God (2), because he knows very well that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights" (3). And let us admire once again Isidore's humility: "I am not sinless" (4) he says, and "I am less not only than Moses, and Paul, but, I should say, I am less than nearly all men" (5). This phrase reminds us really of Paul, with whom, we can say, Isidore was akin in spirit and in virtue. Indeed, Isidore also was "serving the Lord with all humility of mind" (6).

Not without reason we have stopped at seven of Isidore's virtues. He lived a holy life; he had many virtues. But as the number seven symbolically means completeness, so the aforementioned seven virtues of Isidore could respectively and representatively signify the integrity of his character, the perfectness of his life. And if to this impression we add the profit we get from his letters, the great and various benefit which these letters always made to the Church, we understand why, and how, rightly the Church canonized him and venerates him so much (7). Isidore wrote to the Reader Theophilus that his brother who died "was really a palace of purity, a shelter of prudence, an acropolis of bravery, a metropolis of justice, a treasury of charity, an altar of gentleness and, in one word, he was the treasury of every virtue..." (8). All these virtues also apply to Isidore himself, and that is why his memory is everlasting. "Ἀρετῆς γὰρ ἐκτίσματο φύσιν, ἧς οὐ πέφυκεν ἀπισθεῖν τελευτῆς" (9).

-
1. IV 205, 1300A. of also V 349, 1537D "Ὅτι πρὸς τοὺς ἐπαῖνους ἐρυθρίην πέφυκα, μάλα ἀκριβῶς οἶδέ σου ἡ παίδευσις... Τί δῆποτε τοίνυν ἐπαῖνους συνθεῖς πολλῶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ὑπερβαίνοντα ἀξίαν ἀπέστειλας;"
 2. III 253, 933A- III 312, 977D- IV 112, 1184B
 3. James I, 17
 4. III 285, 960C. of also V 398, 1564D-65A where he confesses a vice of his own.
 5. III 366, 1020A
 6. Acts 20, 19
 7. It is characteristic that St Isidore is venerated in the GOC, RCC and CC on the same day (4 February) and with special rite.
 8. II 151, 605A
 9. V 186, 1437D

2. The reputation, standing and influence of St. Isidore

Isidore writing to the presbyter Zeno to whom he sent his old cloak and from whom he accepted a new coat, is complaining lest Zeno would preserve Isidore's hair raiment as a valuable memento. "Εἰ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον μέλλεις, ὡς τὰ τιμὴν ἁγίων, τηρεῖν, ἐμὲ μὲν εἰς ἀπόγνωσιν ὀθήσεις, ἐλεγχὼν ἑμαυτοῦ τὴν συνέδωκεν ἔχοντα.." (1). Independently of Isidore's complaint, this information according to which someone was collecting and preserving Isidore's old cloths ὡς τὰ τιμὴν ἁγίων is important. It shows nothing less but that Isidore still living was beheld as a saint. Compare here the incident according to which someone had recourse to Isidore and when saw him "πρηνὲς σπουδαίως ἐκ' ἐδόφους ἐγένετο" (4). It also signifies how much people were respecting Isidore.

It was precisely because of his sanctity and the integrity of his character, that Isidore was feeling free to write to eminent personalities of his age, to improve their behaviour, to protest against their policy or to correct their faults. Among the most eminent figures of the age was Cyrill of Alexandria. He was eminent and he was powerful; he also was a great thinker and theologian. But Isidore did not hesitate to improve his behaviour and thoughts. Photius preserved in his 'Bibliotheca' the testimony of the tritheist Stephen Gobarus, according to which "Isidore was blaming Theophilus and Cyrill the prelates of Alexandria because of their adherence of Chrysostom, whom he was praising and admiring" (2). Indeed we find among Isidore's letters some eight (3) sent to Cyril. In these letters Isidore writes frankly, with courage, as a saint: "Many people from those who gathered at Ephesus ridicule you ὡς οἰκείαν ἀμυνόμενον ἔχοντες ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁρθοδόξως ζητοῦντες. ————— They say he is Theophilus' nephew and imitates his behaviour. For as Theophilus plotted the known rage against John the beloved by God, so you, they say, wish to be proud of the same thing" (4). Isidore teaches Cyril that "sympathy does not see clearly, but antipathy

1. I 216, 320A

2. Cod. 232 MG 103, II 04C. of also Niceph. Kallistus' (E.H. XIV 53 MG 146, 1252B) testimony: "Αντικρυς δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χρυσόστομου πνέων, πολλά τε Ἀρκαδίου καὶ Κυρίλλου καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκείνῳ θεοφίλου καθάπτεται, διελέγχων τὴν κατὰ τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῶν σκευωρίαν"

3. These letters are I 310, 323, 324, 370, II 127, III 306, V 79, and 268. Three other letters (I 25, 394, 497) were sent to a different person, called also Cyril. cf. Bouvy, loc.cit. p. 145 and P.A. Schmid, loc.cit. p. 94.

4. I 310, 361C

does not see at all"(1). A strong answer to Cyril's inconstancy is found in Isidore's I 324 letter. "Ναὺς τοὺς ἐπιδόας"(2), writes to him again, whereas in other cases he suggests to Cyril something which ought to be done by him. Besides, it is characteristic that even on one theological subject - the two Natures of Christ - Isidore teaches Cyril(3). And let it be noted that despite these reproofs, Cyril calls Isidore 'Father'(4); so great was his estimation of that humble but saintly monk.

We must add here the fact that many bishops were asking Isidore to solve their difficulties concerning Biblical or other problems, that is, the fact that Isidore was a sort of teacher to those bishops. Thus, Hermogenes of Rincorura asked to learn the meaning of Ps 29, 10(5) and of Ez. 21, 3(6) and Isidore tried to elucidate these verses. And in another case, when Hermogenes was complaining about the bishop Eusebius' behaviour, Isidore wrote to him: "Learn that the Eye which sees everything will not tolerate for long such behaviour..."(7). In many other instances also Isidore solved difficult questions for many bishops(8) or other learned men(9).

-
- I. A very rich use of this important letter has been made by many Scholars. In translating the phrase "προσπάθεια μὲν οὐκ ὀφθαλμοῖς, συνπάθεια δὲ ὁλός οὐκ ὀφεί" there are some slight differences. Thus, M. L. abbe Fleury (E.H. III XLVI V p. 382) translates the word προσπάθεια into prejudice. L. Duchesne (Early History of the Christian Church, III 256), translates it into favour. We prefer the word 'sympathy' for προσπάθεια. See also Liddel-Scott: Greek-English Lexikon, where προσπάθεια is translated by 'passionate attachment', 'sympathy', 'strong passionate desire'. Kidd and Quaston (loc. cit. III 184) also prefer 'sympathy'.
 2. I 370, 392C
 3. I 323, 360B
 4. I 370, 392C. This fact, together with the εὐνοίας of II 127, 565B indicates that Cyril replied to Isidore.
 5. II 139, 584AB
 6. II 208, 649A. cf III 130
 7. II 199, 644C
 8. e.g. To A. pollónius Isidore explains Exod. 23, 3 in II 269, 697D. Is. 6, 10 in II 270, 697D-701A. Abramius (I 308, 361A) is taught about askesis. Evoptius (II 215) learns the meaning of Deut. 22, 25-27. To Heraclides (III 10, 733BC) Isidore elucidates the meaning of Exod. 28, 23. To Lambetius (III 131) Eccl. 7, 7. Synesius (I 241, 329C) is taught that "the Son is consubstantial with the Father". For bishop Gregory (I 125, 265BD) Isidore interprets Exod. 4, 24f. According to Tillemont (loc. cit. p. 110), this Gregory was that of Nyssa; Balanos (loc. cit. p. 30 note 4) thinks that such an identity is not excluded chronologically. Bouvy (loc. cit. p. 151-2) says that Tillemont was wrong in this point. P. A. Schmid (loc. cit. p. 2) is undecided. As a matter of fact it is uncertain whether this Gregory is Gregory of Nyssa, but we

Among Isidore's letters there are two, sent to the King Theodosius⁽¹⁾. This king must be Theodosius ~~II~~^{III}, the son of Arcadius (312-449). The fact itself that Isidore writes to the Emperor, shows not only his courage, but also his authority. Moreover in these two letters there is one reproof and one suggestion. Thus Isidore writes: "Join power with gentleness and spend the money with proper distribution. For a king is not saved because of his great strength, neither does he who spares the plentitude of riches avoid the impiety of idolatry"⁽²⁾. The other letter deals with the presence of the Emperor at the Council at Ephesus and says that if the Emperor could have time to go in person to Ephesus, that would be an unblemished act. And certainly he could help the Council and the Church by stopping his men of the Court from dogmatizing, because it was dangerous. "Beware, he writes, lest they cause troubles to the State, falling through their perfidy on the Rock of the Church; because She, as God who established Her told, has been fastened and even the gates of hell do not prevail against Her"⁽³⁾.

Rufinus, the powerful Praefor, also had got two letters⁽⁴⁾ from Isidore, concerning the governor of Pelusium. In the first letter Isidore writes to him to dismiss Cerynius from his office because of his bad policy and conduct at Pelusium and closes his letter as follows: "Either dismiss him from his office or learn that you will with him be judged and punished by God"⁽⁵⁾. And to Cerynius himself Isidore addresses two letters blaming him and also exhorting him to live a better life and to rule with justice.

To more than thirty bishops from Eusebius of Pelusium to Cyril of Alexandria, to strong political leaders from Cerynius to the Emperor Theodosius and to many learned people of the age Isidore wrote solving their questions, correcting their faults, blaming their bad behaviour or praising their good. What else does it mean other than that Isidore was a famous person, a recognized authority, an unblemished character? "Priests, bishops, monks, provincial officials, great men of the Court, all were rebuked with the most complete freedom: the Emperor him-

cannot exlude such a coincidence, since Gregory of Nyssa died in 394 and the content of the letter signifies that Isidore was still rather young.

5. V 349

1. N. Kallistus, loc. cit. MG I 46, 1252B, says that Isidore δ. ἡλεγχε even Arcadius, but no extant letter of Isidore's confirms it.
2. I 35, 204C
3. I 311, 361D-364A. Fleury's (loc. cit. p. 383) translation of this letter is more or less insufficient and unsuccessful.
4. I 178, 489
5. I 178, 300A

self, the pious Theodosius II, did not escape the strictures of the saint of Egypt⁽¹⁾. "Ὁ τῶν Πηλουσιωτῶν κατακρησῆς, Ἰσιδωρος"⁽²⁾ was a light on the candlestick and this light shone before men and "gave light unto all that were in the house"⁽³⁾. And this house was not only Pelusium; it was the whole Church, the whole Empire. "Non modo apud Pelusiotas atque pagorum et vicinitatum habitatores, sed in tota Augustamnica et Aegypto, ne dicam in universo imperio magnam aestimationem venerationemque collegit"⁽⁴⁾. Isidore was speaking or writing frankly, impartially, freely. And his voice was heard carefully, beneficently, gratefully. Because this voice was a "voice of authority, voice of a man of God"⁽⁵⁾.

And what about the results of Isidore's influence upon so many people? Unfortunately we have not so much concrete information, but we are more than certain that the results were not despicable. Thus Isidore himself in one case says that he "had persuaded many people to embrace virtue"⁽⁶⁾, and that they were in good repute. Again, writing to the bishop Apollonius, he informs us about another of his deeds: "By admonition and exhortation, having before hand the help of the divine Grace, we have brought back a friend, who loving at first the heavenly philosophy later on neglected his calling. And now, celebrating the event, we sing the triumphal song"⁽⁷⁾. Do we think that the spiritual edification of so great a number of people was not a noteworthy result? There were of course some wicked men at Pelusium, such as the bishop Eusebius, the presbyters Zosimus, Martinianus and Maron, the prefects Gigantius and Cerynius and others. But how can we say that Isidore did not influence even them? The fact that they did not become worse than they were before, the fact that they reckoned the voice of Isidore, signifies that Isidore influenced even them⁽⁸⁾. We are obliged to mention here the benefit

1. L. Duchesne, loc. cit. p. 206

2. Anast. Sinaita: Guide, chap. 4 MG 89, 156D

3. Matt. 5, 15-16

4. Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 160

5. Duchesne, loc. cit. p. 205

6. IV 205, 1300A

7. III 273, 952B. cf III 394, 1033A: Καὶ ἄλλον ἄνδρα μισοπόνηρον ἀνέστη-

8. cf Duchesne, loc. cit. 332: "The bishop of Pelusium (Eusebius) ἁγ. had been ejected for his attachment to Dioscorus".

which Cyril got from Isidore. And if someone does not agree that Isidore corrected Cyril even in one theological question - we personally think that Isidore's voice acted on (1) Cyril's definite formulation of the doctrine of two Natures of Christ - we will agree that Isidore influenced Cyril's character, since moreover Cyril was respecting Isidore by calling him Father. A great injury took place against the venerable John of Antioch. For the restoration of that straggling of the truth and of justice, Isidore strove with bravery and we can say with certainty that Isidore's contribution for the reestablishment of Chrysostom's name and memory, was effective (2). Isidore's influence in general concerning the ecclesiastical and political constitution was remarkable. Because "cet homme sage, à la rare fortune d' assagir tous ceux qui l' approchant" (3). Because, as the wise Photius said "Isidore πάντων ἐστὶ χρηματίζων ἀξιόχρεος with regard to words and to the sacerdotal and ascetical life and behaviour" (4).

3. Tributes to St. Isidore

a) Ancient (6th-14th cent.)

We have seen that the humble monk of Pelusium, the venerable Isidore, was adorned with rare gifts and many Christian virtues and also that because of his excellent character and saintly life, his reputation, standing and influence were so remarkable. Now it is time to cite some tributes dedicated to Isidore, which will also show from another aspect Isidore's splendour. Firstly, the ancient voices.

1. cf Anastasius Sinaita, loc. cit. MG 89, 1450: "Μὴ καὶ Ἰσιδώρου τὸν Πηλουσιώτην ἀπέστατο, περὶ δύο φύσεων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιστεύλαντα ὃν καὶ πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἀνγορεύει, ἐπὶ ὁσὶν ἄλλοις" W. Kallistos, loc. cit. MG 146, 1152A: "Καὶ μάλιστα Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου, καὶ μὲν ἐλέγχετο, καὶ δὲ καὶ παραίνεσαι χρημένου διορθώσεως ἀξιοῦται. θεῖα τι καὶ μυστικωτέρῃ ἀποκαλύψει Fessler (Institutiones Patrologiae, Oeniponte 1860, vol. II p. 616): "quin S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus quem ad restituendam S. Joannis Chrysostomi memoriam Isidorus potissimum induxit, ipsum velut patrem coluit et paterne ab eo suscepit monita, quibus ad munus Episcopale probe gerendum rectamque fidem strenue defendendam instrueretur".
2. cf Baring-Gould (Lives of the saints, London 1878, p. 84): but by the influence of St Isidore, who earnestly strove to bring councils of peace before Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria was induced to withdraw his objections"
3. Batiffol P.: Anciennes Littératures Chrétiennes: La Littérature Grecque, Paris 1897 p. 314
4. Letters, book II, let. 44 MG 102, 861D

Severus of Antioch, writing a letter to Zacharias of Pelusium on the subject of the holiness of the Church and wishing to strengthen his opinion by referring to Fathers, cites two important -according to him- pieces of evidence from the Fathers: that of Gregory the Theologian (or. XLXIII 15) and that of Isidore of Pelusium (II 246, 684D-685C). This means that Severus considered Isidore an important theologian, whose voice was a voice of authority. He says: "I will cite for you a passage from a certain presbyter (Isidore, I mean, a native of your city of Pelusium, who was wise in learning and in piety) which is sufficient for this present purpose"⁽¹⁾. This evidence is very important both for its antiquity-it was written during Severus' episcopacy between 513-18- and for the fact that it comes from Severus whom some people use to denigrate Isidore. Another passage from Severus attributes to Isidore such virtues and praises which no other orthodox writer attributed. Here it is: "Salutatio venerabilis presbyteri Isidori, altaris Christi, vasis ministerii ecclesiarum, thesauri Scripturarum, patris verborum, gazophylacii virtutem, templi pacis"⁽²⁾.

Facundus, the learned bishop of Hermiane who composed his work 'Pro defensione Trium Capitulorum' at about 550, mentions three letters from Isidore⁽³⁾, and says that Isidore was "vir sanctissimus et magnae in Ecclesia Christi gloriae... qui etiam pro vitae ac sapientiae suae meritis, ut pater ab ipso Cyrillo et honoratus est et vocatus"⁽⁴⁾. The description of 'Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenaei'⁽⁵⁾, attributes to Isidore adjectives such as "sanctissimus et beatissimus doctor Ecclesiae".

Evagrius Scholasticus praises Isidore as follows: "In that reign Isidore, whose glory for his deeds was large and who was famous for his works and words, was also flourishing. He had so much weakened his flesh by pains and strengthened his soul by divine words and contemplation, as to live on earth an angelic life and to be always a living pillar of unique life and of contemplation to God"⁽⁶⁾. It is a splendid eulogy and it is repeated by N. Kallistus⁽⁷⁾, with the addition "the divine Isidore".

Anastasius Sinaita⁽⁸⁾ states that Isidore adorned the Church at Pelusium. The wise and great Photius⁽⁹⁾ says that Isidore was very famous among the monks; he calls him *ἐκλαβρότατος*⁽¹⁰⁾ that is

-
1. Letters, I 208, 9 in E.W. Brooks: The sixth book of the letters of Severus, Oxford 1903, vol. II part II p. 251
 2. CSCO ser. 4 vol VI p. 182
 3. I 370, 310, 324
 4. ML 67, 573A
 5. Chapter VI, MG 84, 587B. This chapter has been reedited by R. Aigrain and the description has also been transferred
 6. loc. cit. MG 86, 246I-4. The last phrase of this eulogy is many times repeated by many commentators of Isidore.
 7. loc. cit. MG. 146, 1252
 8. loc. cit. MG 89, 156D
 9. loc. cit. ed. Berclini 1824, 406H p. 247.-
 10. MG 103, 1104C

'most reverent' and speaks of him as one of the saints. He classifies him among Basil the Great and Gregory, and names him "ποικίλην μοῦσαν, ὅς ὥσπερ λόγων, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἱερατικῆς καὶ ἀσκητικῆς πολιτείας πανῶν ἐστὶ χρηματίζειν ἀξιόχρεως" (II).

Suidas⁽¹⁾ names Isidore "most learned, philosopher and rhetor. The author of the 'menologium Graecorum'⁽²⁾ says that Isidore became wise, loved God more than the world and left parents, riches and glory; that he illuminated the whole world by his letters and that he died having lived well. Finally, N. Kallistus says that because of his virtue and his words, Isidore was in good repute and his letters signify his zeal⁽³⁾ which he had for the Church and for those who were injured.

These voices are not many, but are enough to certify that Isidore in an age not so remote from his death, was given the praise, the eulogy and the veneration of an excellent character, of a saint, characterized as θεοφύρος⁽⁴⁾ and μέγας⁽⁵⁾.

b) Modern (18th cent. onwards)

Let us now cite some witnesses later than the above mentioned which will prove that even today Isidore is highly praised.

"St Isidore of Pelusium, writes Fleury⁽⁶⁾, is one of the most famous monks of his time". Ceillier⁽⁷⁾ says that Isidore was always considered as an extremely saintly man, whose name was glorious in the Church of Christ". P. B. Glueck⁽⁸⁾ says that Isidore of Pelusium is a "great glory" among the Church Fathers of the fifth century and it is about his life, writings and doctrine that catholics and non catholics write. J. Alzog⁽⁹⁾ asserts that Isidore at the Council at Ephesus (431) was "eine einflussreiche person, that is a very important person. W. Moeller⁽¹⁰⁾ writes

I. Lexicon, ed. L. Custerus, Cambridge 1705, II p. 150

2. 4th February, MG II 7, 293D-296B

3. loc. cit. MG I 46, 1249-52

4. Amartolos G.: Chronicon 202, 13 MG II 0, 732B. He quotes the letters I 152 and V 168

5. ibid. 203, 4 MG II 0, 736B

6. loc. cit. p. 328

7. loc. cit. p. 603-4

8. Summa doctrinae moralis, Wirceburgi 1848, prooemium p. III

9. Grundriss der Patrologie, Freiburg 1866 p. 348

10. RED vol II (1883) p. 1123

11. Letters, book II, let 44, MG I 02, 861D

that Isidore's letters "represent him as one of the noblest religious characters of the age, in intimate connection with all the most prominent men of his time". Batiffol⁽¹⁾, insists that Isidore influenced very much the theological affairs of his time, because he had the rare success to make wise all who approached him. W. Smith⁽²⁾ writes that Isidore "was not a person to do things by halves... He became a thorough monk in all that pertained to ascetic self-devotion" and copies the opinion of Evagrius, which we have already mentioned. Fabricius⁽³⁾ thinks that "among the most excellent ornaments of the Church and the more useful writers, Isidore of Pelusium is justly estimated". Isidore, as having "mentem fecundam, ingenium excultum, prospectum elevatum, animi sensus acutos affectusque pios" is praised by L. Bober⁽⁴⁾ and for his eloquence and erudition⁽⁵⁾ as well. Edm. L. A. Bouvy, who twice⁽⁶⁾ dealt with Isidore, highly praises him. He says that Isidore "homo fuit vere pius et sanctus magister morum gravis ac vehemens, nemini tamen severior quam sibi, summus in Ecclesiae Christianae, sapientiae princeps, atque in epistolico genere mirae cujusdam brevitatis et elegantiae praeclarum exemplar"⁽⁷⁾. Isidore was a representative of the better Greek Monasticism, writes C. E. Luthardt⁽⁸⁾. Isidore was "one of the noblest, most gifted and liberal representatives of Monasticism of his own and of all times" declares Kurtz⁽⁹⁾. W. Bright⁽¹⁰⁾ calls Isidore 'venerable' and C. H. Turner⁽¹¹⁾ says that he "was one of the most interesting figures in a generation which produced many interesting men; and that it is strange that more attention has not been devoted to him in recent times. His correspondence remarkable from many points of view, is unique in the patristic period". S. Cheetham⁽¹²⁾ sees Isidore as a combatant and says that Isidore stands out as one who in an age of fierce controversy never became a mere participant, and instead of other commendation, he copies Evagrius' hymn which we have cited. R. Aigrain⁽¹³⁾ writes that "within the distance

-
1. *loc. cit.* p. 314
 2. DCB vol. III p. 316
 3. Quoted in L. Bober: *De arte hermeneutica S. Isidori Pelusiotae*, Cracoviae 1878 p. 53
 4. *ibid.* p. 109
 5. *ibid.* p. 110-111
 6. S. Isidori Pelusiotae libri tres, Neumasi 1884 and Jean Chrysostome et Isidore de Peluse, in EO vol. I (1897-8)
 7. Libri tres, p. 161
 8. History of Christian Ethics, transl. by W. Hastie, Edinburgh 1839, p. 173
 9. Church History, transl. by MacPherson, London 1894, vol. I p. 285-6
 10. The Age of the Fathers, London 1903, vol. II p. 244
 11. The letters of St Isidore of Pelusium, in JThS, vol. VI p. 70
 12. A History of the Christian Church, London 1905 p. 235
 13. Quarante-neuf Lettres de S. Isidore de Péluse, Paris 1911, p. 17

of fifteen centuries Isidore's work has not perhaps lost its efficacy". G. Krueger⁽¹⁾ is of the opinion that "His letters show him to have been a highly esteemed spiritual counsellor thoroughly aglow with holy earnestness; a very shepherd of souls, and a teacher versed in Scripture. Isidore was an example of Greek Monasticism in its noblest form". Tixeront⁽²⁾ imitating Photius, classifies Isidore among the best epistolographers of the Greek Church and notices that "all his letters bring the impression of a prolific spirit, of a friend of peace". L. Duchesne asserts that St Isidore and St Nile the Sinaites "were counsellors, spiritual directors, for the whole empire of the East" and that their voices were "voices of authority, voices of men of God" and especially he names Isidore "the saint of Egypt"⁽³⁾. Balanos⁽⁴⁾ says that "Isidore can really be considered as one of the noblest, wisest and most liberal representatives of the monastic life of his age and of all ages, the main representative of the monastic spirit in its noblest expression". G. Krueger⁽⁵⁾ characterizes Isidore as "lovable and sincerely Christian ascetic". Isidore was "a spirit extremely cultivated" testifies F. Cayré⁽⁶⁾. B. Altaner, as O. Bardenhewer⁽⁷⁾ and Tixeront⁽⁸⁾ before him, following Photius, says that Isidore "was a master of the polished ~~had~~ epistolary style"⁽⁹⁾. J. Quastep⁽¹⁰⁾ accepts the testimony of Severus of Antioch that Isidore was "famous for his piety and his knowledge of Holy Scripture" and of Photius who "lists Isidore among the ancient Christian masters of epistolography with Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus and calls him a model of priestly and ascetical life, of style and phraseology". We close this paragraph with a passage, which more or less places Isidore in his right position. "Certainly Isidore did not possess the theological depth of a St Augustine, the rich Biblical knowledge of a St Hieronymus and the dogmatic acuteness of a St Cyril of Alexandria, all of whom were his

-
1. NSHE vol VI p.46
 2. Précis de Patrologie, Paris 1918, p.220-I
 3. loc.cit. vol.III p.205-6
 4. loc.cit.p.33-4. cf Ph. Baphides, Ecclesiastical History (in Greek) Constantinople 1884, vol.I p.362
 5. A Decade of research in early Christian literature, in HThR vol.26(1933) p.249
 6. Patrologie et Histoire de la Theologie, Paris 1953, vol.I p.571
 7. loc.cit. p.379
 8. loc.cit.p.220-I
 9. loc.cit. p.308. And so does H. Gregoire: Les Sauteralles de S. Jean Baptiste, in Byz vol V (1929) p.III
 10. loc.cit. III, p.181

contemporaries. But as a true admirer and imitator of St John the Baptist, he is 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness' (Lk 3, 4) he who reminds others of their duties and a creator of the customs of the contemporary East" (1).

c) Hymnology of the GOC

Since St Isidore of Pelusium is a saint venerated with a special celebration in the GOC, there is a special rite dedicated to him. This special rite consists of hymns divided into two categories: those of the Vesper and those of the Matin, before the holy Liturgy. Inasmuch as St Isidore's feast-day coincides almost with the great feast of Candlemas (2 February), some hymns are dedicated to this event. Thus, in the Vesper we have 8 hymns dedicated to the feast of Candlemas and only 3 to St Isidore. In the Matin, we have 15 (including the 8 εσπερινά) hymns for Candlemas and 24 for Isidore. To sum up, we have 23 hymns for Candlemas and 27 for St Isidore. The fact that St Isidore has not any special ἀπολυτίκιον but the same as many other hermits, is due most probably to the feast of Candlemas. The most of these hymns for Isidore belong to the Κανών composed by the Hymnographer Theophanes. The acrostic of this Κανών is Εὐ τῶν Μοναστῶν τὸ κλέος μέλλει ἦναι. We can divide the eulogy of Theophanes who seemingly had some knowledge of St Isidore's life and teaching and of the whole hymnology, into the following paragraphs:

i) Isidore is praised as a true monk. "You have blown out the fire of passions by the pain of asceticism and having gone up to the height of dispassionateness, o divine Isidore, you now are with great exultation present at Christ's throne" (2). The third hymn of the third ode of the Κανών says that Isidore followed Christ with joy bearing his cross by a strong asceticism, and so as much as it was possible, he became similar to Christ as to purity of life (3).

ii) Isidore is praised as a great teacher and theologian, as a vessel of wisdom. Thus, Isidore "appeared as the pen of the Holy Spirit" (4), because of the beauty of his words and by the flood of grace and by his rain of words he waters all those who 'savour the things that be of God' "for he has put his mouth as a crater to the Spring of wisdom from above" (5) and hence he

1. F.A. Schmid, loc.cit. p. I

2. Ἐξακοστειλάριον

3. Isidore's temperance and sobriety, as par excellence monastic virtues are highly praised. See Kanon, ode 3, hymn 2; ode 5, hymn 1; ode 6, hymns 1 and 2; ode 7, hymn 2; ode 8 hymn 1

4. Kanon, ode 4, hymn 3

5. Vesper, Στιχηρά of the Saint, hymn 2: "Τῇ πλημμύρᾳ τῆς χάριτος καὶ τοῖς ὄμβροις τῶν λόγων σου, καταρδεύεις ἅπαντας τοὺς θεόφρονες. τῆς ἀνωτάτω σοφίας γὰρ κρατῆρι τὸ στόμα σου ἐπιθείς ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς, βαφιλῶς σὺ ἐξήντησας καὶ διέδωκας πανταχοῦ τὰς ἀκτῖνας τῶν δογμῶν

spread everywhere the rays of the doctrines, by writing, teaching and admonishing. In the first hymn of the Vesper and in many other hymns as well, Isidore is called πάνσοφος and in the third hymn of the Vesper he is praised as a "vessel of wisdom and of teaching inspired by God". He is characterized as "Bible of knowledge of teaching" (1), as "ocean of wisdom" (2), as a "pillar lighted up" (3), as "pure theologian" (4) whom "the Lord put in the heaven of Faith as a sun" (5) and who "following the teaching of the Fathers taught us to worship τρισὶ Προσώποις Μονάδα φύσεως ἀκτιστον, ἀναρχον enlightening all believers" (6).

iii) Isidore is also praised as the "chosen vessel" to help many people for their salvation, "τοῖς πιστοῖς ὁμαλίζων τὴν διάβασιν of the Egypt of passions and luxury" (7). "He who, being good, wishes all men to be saved, showed you, o very learned, as a guide and leader to those who are mistaken, in order that many of them might return to the way of salvation" (8).

iv) Isidore combined θεωρίαν and πράξιν and the Hymnographer praises this excellent combination: "You were going up to God, by theory and works, τῆς θεωρίας ἐπίβασιν τὴν πράξιν πηξάμενος" (9). And Isidore obtained it because he loved the highest of what a man could love" (10) and "the word of Grace shone in his soul as a ray of light" (11) and thus "he became the light of the world" (12).

What else have we to add to this excellent encomium? Nothing, but two more lines, which we find in the special rite of his veneration:

Τὸν πηλὸν ἐκδύς καὶ χαρὰς τυχὼν ζένης (13)
χαίροις παμμάκαρ, θεόφρον, ἦ σ' ὁ δὼρ εἰ (14).

των, ἐπιστέλλων καὶ διδάσκων καὶ νοουθετῶν ἀξιόγαστε"

1. Κάθισμα of the Saint
2. Kanon, ode 4, hymn 2.
3. ibid. ode 5, hymn 2
4. ibid. ode 3, hymn 1
5. ibid. ode 7, hymn 1
6. ibid. ode 9, hymn 2
7. ibid. ode 6, hymn 2
8. ibid. ode 5, hymn 3: " Ὁ θέλων πάντας ὡς ἀγαθός, πάνσοφε σωθῆναι ὁδηγὸν τοῖς πλανημένοις σὲ εἰδείξε, πολλοὺς ἐπιστρέφειν πρὸς σωτηρίας οδόν"
9. Vesper, Στιχηρά of the Saint. cf Kanon, ode 1, hymn 2
10. ibid. : "
11. Kanon, ode 9, hymn 1
12. ibid. ode 7, hymn 2
13. A line from St Isidore's Synaxarium
14. Κοντάκιον of the Saint

Chapter II

ST ISIDORE'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND ENVIRONMENT

A) THE BACKGROUND

I. General situation

From the edict of Milan (313) a new era started for the Church. Christianity at first was placed on an equality with Paganism. But even during the decade 313-323 when Licinius and Constantine were reigning together, the Christian Church had actually more privileges. A series of religious enactments of this period, displays Constantine's preference for Christianity and Eusebius⁽¹⁾ is ready to inform us that Constantine built great Churches, furnished them with copies of the Scriptures and permitted Clerics and Laymen to assemble for their dedication. When Constantine became sole Emperor (323), Christianity took the first rank. As Moses emancipated Jews from the tyranny of Pharaoh, thus Constantine gave to the Church the much desired freedom from persecutions. He became a second Moses.

H. Lietzmann⁽²⁾ says that "Constantine's christian convictions may be regarded as highly questionable, and correspondingly of little value". This is almost true especially with regard to his conduct on the Arian controversy. But, "nevertheless, it is indubitable that his policy was to set a positive value on the Church and to weave it into the organism of the Roman Empire as a dominant element and a political bond"⁽³⁾. Constantine was thinking that God had destined him for high things and it is just for this reason that Church policy was for him an inseparable part of State policy.

After Constantine's death (337) and during the reign of his third son Constantius (351-61), an attempt for the reestablishment of Arianism appeared (351-6). This attempt was more clear in the East under Valens (364-78)⁽⁴⁾.

With Julian the Apostate (361-3) a new danger appeared. When a child in the interior of Cappadocia Julian, being instructed in the Christian Religion, learning Biblical texts by heart and joining the lower Clergy as a 'Reader', was promising that when he would be called to the royal Court, he would continue the good relations between the State and the Church. But when he was initiated into the magic mysteries and

1. E.H. X 2,3 MG 20,845B-846B; De Vita Const. II 42 MG 20,1017C-1020B; IV 36 MG 20,1184C-1185B

2. From Constantine to Julian, transl. by B.L. Woolf, London 1950 p. 82

3. Ibid.

4. B.J. Kidd: A History of the Church to A.D. 461, vol. II Oxford 1922, p. 227

became a hypocrite by playing the part of a true Christian and especially when he decided to fight for the throne, things changed. "Christianity appeared to him as the enemy that had to be overcome" (1). He tried to do it and to restore Paganism. But, thanks to God, his attempt was shortlived (361-3).

Jovian (363-4), the successor of Julian, although not pure in life, was a Christian. He took measures for the peace of the Church. Valentinian I (364-375) was by conviction a Christian and an Orthodox (2).

In 392 the worship of the gods was declared high treason. By the end of Theodosius I (395), the Church in the heathen Empire had become the Church of the Christian Empire (3). And as early as 428, heathenism was looked on in the East as defunct (4). "The fourth century happens to be the culmination of a two hundred years' crescendo, the resultant of a long and growing movement that could not cease abruptly" (5).

2. Doctrinal controversies and consequent developments

After the persecutions, a great internal danger disturbed the Church: the heresies. Being free from external pressures, the Church struggled to keep the purity of Her Faith. It is the development and determination of ecclesiastical doctrine that lend to this epoch its distinctive character (6).

The beginnings of Arianism happen evidently in the years 318-23, but the fault of Achillas (311-12) by grace of which Arius was restored to the deaconate and put in charge of the oldest parish Church in Alexandria and the fact that the teaching of Lucian of Samosata (d. 312) was the basis on which Arius built his teaching, certify that Arianism started earlier. Lucian taught a subordinationist theology, Arius began to teach clearly that the Son of God and the Holy Ghost as well are simply creatures, for only the Father is true God. He was calling

1. H. Lietzmann, loc. cit. p. 263

2. Socrates, E.H. IV I MG 67, 464A-465B; Sozomenos, E.H. VI 6 MG 67, 1308A-1309B

3. Kidd, loc. cit. p. 3

4. O. Bardenhewer, loc. cit. p. 234

5. J. M. Campbell: The Greek Fathers, Norwood Mass. 1929 p. 48

6. Bardenhewer, loc. cit. p. 235

Christ ἀντίστα which ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν , i.e. there was a time when he was not and that οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ κτίσθαι. ἔσχε καὶ αὐτότε..."(1). —————> Arius' teaching which caused so much trouble to the Church(2) throughout the greater part of the fourth century, was condemned at the first Ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 325, where the orthodox teaching that the Son of God is Θεός ἀληθινός ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ and Υἱός τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ was defined. We owe the purity of the Christological doctrine in that time mainly to St Athanasius the Great, who was the pillar of the Church and the main defender of Orthodoxy. After the condemnation of Arianism at Nicaea and during the fourth century, Arians (325-56) and Semi-Arians (357-61), struggled to restore it, but these efforts were of little avail. Besides, the Church had at her disposal an already defined Christological doctrine. By the second Ecumenical Council (381), Arianism was no longer a threat.

S a b e l l i a n i s m which was but Judaism in disguise(3) teaching not an essential but an economic Trinity(4), had only a few adherents. Besides Sabellius, Marcellus of Ancyra was the more important figure of this heresy.

The struggle of the Church against Arianism obliged some adherents of the latter to reject the ἀνθρωπότης of the extreme Arians and to accept the theory of ὁμοότης and ὁμοουσιότης. These people are known as Semi-Arians. A development of Semi-Arianism which took shape at the beginning of the second half of the fourth century, was m a c e d o n i a n i s m. Macedonius, a bishop of Constantinople (352-62) who was the main representative of this heresy, was teaching that the Holy Spirit was a creature like angels, differing only in degree(5), and therefore the Holy Spirit is subordinated to the Father and to the Son. The second Ecumenical Council in 381 at Constantinople, condemned Macedonius and defined the true orthodox teaching that the Holy Spirit is οὐκ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον. Other leaders of Macedonianism besides Macedonius, were Eustathius of Sebastia, Eleusius of Cyzikys and Sophronius of Pempelopolis. The orthodox representatives against Macedonianism were St Athanasius and Didymus the Blind in Alexandria and the three Cappadocians.

1. St Athanasius: Against Arians I 5 MG 26 21A

2. The extent and intensity of the battle of the Church against Arianism makes us surprised and frightened even today. "Sixteen centuries of theological security, which the golden age gave the future, dull even the Orthodox of our day against the details of that struggle" (J.M. Campbell, loc.cit. p. 49)

3. St. Basil the Great, let. 189, 2 MG 32, 685D

4. ibid, let. 210, 5 MG 32, 776C and Kidd loc.cit. II p. 254

5. St Athanasius, let. to Serapio I, I MG 26, 532A

Apollinarianism owes its name to Apollinaris of Laodicea. This very learned and versatile ecclesiastical writer "seemed at first on our side" says St Basil⁽¹⁾. Apollinaris was an anti-Arian at the beginning, but his teaching became heresy and schism by his consecrating Vitalis to be bishop of Antioch in 376⁽²⁾. Apollinaris teaching was referring to the two Natures of Christ. If Christ was also a perfect man, then he could sin, said Apollinaris. "Οπου γάρ τέλει-ος άνθρωπος, ἐνεί καὶ ἀμαρτία⁽³⁾". The Son of God assumed a living flesh, an animated body, but it was the divinity itself that took the place of the human νοῦς or of the human πνεύμα.⁽⁴⁾ In other words, Apollinaris refused the human Nature of Christ. St Athanasius and the three Cappadocians struggled against this heresy which was officially condemned at the second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in 381.

Nestorianism was contemporaneous with Isidore (428-444). He died before the explosion of the Monophysite heresy (444-553).

In the West we have in the fourth century the heresy of Donatism, owing its name to Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae in Numidia (313). No works are current under his name⁽⁵⁾. But Donatus the Great, bishop of Carthage (315-55) who was a learned and eloquent man, but whose pride of spirit and of office were intolerable, wrote many books supporting this heresy. Parmenianus also followed it. The teaching of Donatus and subsequently of Donatism is that the Church is holy and no unholy person could be Her member. Also, that the efficacy of the sacraments depends on the subjective disposition of the priests. Against these theories, Optatus of Mileve and St Augustine wrote.

Priscillianism. About 370 a certain Marcus, a native of Memphis in Egypt accompanied by two followers brought into Spain a strange compound of Gnostic speculations. They converted Priskillian, who became the chief of the sect. Priscillianism is characterized by gnostic dualistic speculations reminiscent of Manichaeism and by a system of mythological and astrological conceptions. When in 380 Priscillian and his followers were excommunicated, he became bishop of

1. Let. 265, 2 MG 32, 985B: "...ὅς τοσοῦτο πλέον ἐλύπησεν ἡμᾶς, ὅσῳ ἐδοξεν εἶναι ἐξ ἡμῶν τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς"

2. Theodoret, E.H. V 4 MG 82, 1204A

3. St Athanasius, Against Apollinaris I, 2 MG 26, 1096B

4. Bardenhewer, loc.cit. p.242

5. Ibid. p.426

Abile in Lusitania. In 385 Priscillian and several of his adherents were beheaded.

3. Monasticism

Monasticism in Egypt had been established long before Ildore. During the persecution under Decius (249-261), many Christians in order to escape the persecutors in the cities, fled to the desert for a time. Some of them remained there as ascetics throughout their life. Paul of Thebes (d. 340), spent the greater part of his life in the eastern desert. "By 270 there were many ascotes living as hermits or solitaires" (1). Among them we find the true founder of Egyptian monasticism i.e. St Antony, the 'patriarch of monks' and his disciple Ammonas. In 320 at Tabennisia, Pachomius established a monastery which was later followed by ten special houses, of which two were dedicated to women. Here we have the foundation of Coenobitism.

But monasticism was in full flow over Christendom, shortly after St Athanasius' days. We possess some information about Egyptian monks from an account of St Theodora, the disciple and successor of St Pachomius written by Symonius in 390 at the request of the patriarch Theophilus. Orsinius, the second successor of Pachomius, Macarius the Great who for sixty years lived in the desert of Scete, Macarius the Younger of Alexandria who lived as a hermit in the Nitrian desert and Evagrius Ponticus, not only were Egyptian monks in that time, but they wrote several works, especially homilies and letters, for the guidance and edification of other monks or devout people.

Besides these monks we know some others, who visited the Egyptian monastic scetis in that time. Thus in 371 a noble Roman lady, Melania by name, went with Rufinus to Jerusalem and Egypt on pilgrimage. This visit of Melania to the Scetis made a great impression on the monks who gave her all the proper information concerning monasticism. Rufinus spent about eight years (371-8) in Egypt. St Jerome who was a great admirer of the monastic life, was in Jerusalem in 386 and from there on his way back, he went to Egypt, spent a month with Didymus the Blind and visited Scetis. He has left various scattered remarks about his visit in several of his letters. Paula who was of noble birth and of great wealth and a friend of St Jerome, visited Nitria in about 385. Palladius of Helenopolis in Bithynia who became a monk in his twentieth year

-
1. De Lacy O' Leary, loc.cit. p. 25
 2. ibid. p.28

visited Alexandria and the Nitrian Valley. To him we owe the most important source for the older monasticism 'Asceticon' 'Istotopid' in which there are descriptions of the various monasteries and hermits he had visited. John Cassian visited Egypt twice and lived for ten years among the Egyptian monks. During his second visit he collected the proper material for the composition of his two important ascetical works.

4. Patristic Literature

The period from the Council of Nicaea (325) to the Council of Chalcedon (451) which includes the first four great Ecumenical Councils, is the golden age of patristic literature. It is especially in the fourth century that the greatest Fathers of the East lived and struggled to strengthen the Church newly released from external persecutions. "The middle decades of the fourth century saw a generation grow up to whom it was to be given to unfold the full flower of Christian literature" (1). The special conditions or the factors which caused the patristic literature to be very quickly developed and improved in that period, are:

i) The fact that the Church which suffered so many tribulations during the first three centuries from the persecutions, was now free. This fact gave the opportunity to the Church to see her internal needs and to deal with them.

ii) The doctrinal controversies which took place in the fourth century have left us a rich production of patristic literature. The heresies of Arianism, Sabellianism, Macedonianism and Apollinarianism in the East and of Donatism and Priscillianism in the West, which were the biggest and most dangerous Church problems of that period, obliged the orthodox Fathers to give the right answer and solution. Thus many dogmatic and polemical treatises appeared, in order to define the trinitarian and christological doctrines.

iii) But the official representatives of the Church, i.e. the Clergy, were not responsible only for keeping the purity of the Faith or for excommunicating the heretics, but also for edifying the true sons of God. The order "feed my sheep" was not applied only to the Apostle Peter, but to all the Apostles and subsequently to all their successors, i.e. bishops and other clergymen who would have the privilege to be *κλῆρον Χριστοῦ* (2). Thus, when the Church became free from external pressure, the bishops and other clergymen tried to edify the congregations. A large number of homilies and sermons preserved for us, thanks in many instances, to the tireless stenographers, were delivered in that period. Many treatises or little books or letters of a moral and instructive nature appeared

1. H. Lietzmann, loc. cit. p. 245

2. I 136, 272C

then.

iv) The growing of monasticism also contributed to the growing of patristic literature in that time. Monks needing instruction or able to give instruction to other monks; eminent representatives of monasticism especially of the Egyptian one being charged to guide many people outside Monasteries, produced a great deal of homilies, treatises and letters.

v) The need for recording all important religious events produced the Church histories and Chronicles. Biographies of important monks or other personalities were also written.

vi) The systematic interpretation of the Scriptures has been improved in that period and produced many very useful volumes. Here we must mention the two well known and famous Schools: The catechetical school of Alexandria and the exegetical school of Antioch. These schools and to some extent the Syrian school of Edessa in Mesopotamia, caused a great production of patristic literature especially in interpreting the Scriptures.

When Isidore of Pelusium started his career as an eminent ecclesiastical figure (c. 390), many historical and ecclesiastical things were already arranged. The Empire was Christian. New doctrines had been developed and defined. Monasticism was in full flow over Christendom. The Fathers before him had marked the period as the peak period of patristic literature. All these facts are the historical background to Isidore and the important inheritance he had received; and, since he started to live in that era and was to continue it, this background signifies also the importance of his position.

B) THE ENVIRONMENT

We have seen in the previous paragraph the historical background to Isidore. These historical realities did not stop when Isidore came on the stage of public action. They were simply continuing as the route of a river; and Isidore came into this route.

The emperor Theodosius was in his last years. His sons, Honorius (395-423) in the West and Arcadius (395-408) in the East, were not to mark a very important rule. Ambrose was full of power and action at Milan. Augustine was still (395) presbyter and Chrysostom was struggling at Antioch. Paganism was dying. Heresies did not disappear and Pelagianism and Nestorianism especially were to disturb the Church in the first half of the fifth century.

This is a general glance at the whole Empire. But Isidore lived in Egypt. He had relations mainly with Pelusium and Alexandria which apart from his family were his environment. Hence we have to make some remarks only about this environment, in the hope that they will help us to understand him better; besides it is necessary.

I. St Isidore and Alexandria

The environment in which Isidore lived is mainly Pelusium. But it is also true that he had many relations with Alexandria. Not only because he studied there, but also because Pelusium was under the jurisdiction of this Patriarchate, because the heads of the See in that time made many efforts to depose Chrysostom whom Isidore was highly admiring and because of some differences in expressing the orthodox view of the doctrines with which the Ecumenical Councils at Ephesus (431) and at Chalcedon (451) dealt.

Isidore's life began when Athanasius the Great was occupying the throne of Alexandria (328-73) and expired in the episcopacy of Cyril (412-44). Thus Isidore knew five Patriarchs of Alexandria: Athanasius, Peter II (373-80), Timothy (380-85), Theophilus (385-412) and Cyril. But Isidore's maturity and activity cover the years from 390 to 432. So we may say that he had relations especially with Theophilus and Cyril.

- Theophilus was an ambitious and revengeful person who did not hesitate to do anything in order to obtain his purpose⁽¹⁾. According to the testimony of the tritheist Stephen Gobarus, Isidore ἐμύκρυν Theophilus ἔνεκα τῆς πρὸς τὸν Χρυσόστομον ἀπεχθασίας⁽²⁾. Isidore was calling Theophilus λιθρανῆ, χουκολάτριον and σκαίδον⁽³⁾ and as a matter of fact Isidore had the right to call him so. N. Kallistus also testifies that Isidore "ἀντι-κρουσ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χρυσόστομου πύθεν, πολλὰ τε Ἀρκαδίου καὶ Κυρίλλου καὶ τοῦ Θεοφίλου Θεοδοίου καθάπτεται, διελέγχων τὴν κατὰ τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτοῦ σκευερσίαν"⁽⁴⁾.

We understand better the adjective λιθρανῆς attributed by Isidore to Theophilus if we bear in mind the episode between Theophilus and Isidore the 'Hospitaliter' preserved in Palladius of Hellenopolis Διάλογος, where we read: "A phara-

1. cf L. Duchesne, loc.cit. III p.39-40 and 52

2. Quoted in Photius Bibliotheca 232 MG 103, 11040

3. I 152, 285A

4. loc.cit. MG 146, 1252B

whole passion for stone (λίθωνες) has occupied Theophilus for buildings, of which the Church has no need"(1). The homonymy of Isidore the Hospitaliter and of Isidore of Pelusium was the cause of a misunderstanding according to which Isidore of Pelusium gave grounds for Theophilus to begin the quarrel with Chrysostom(2), which is not true(3).

Theophilus was worthy of deposition and Arcadius himself suggested it to Chrysostom who did not accept it. But, alas!, at the same time (June 403), Theophilus with his friends and other enemies of Chrysostom, having the support of the empress, decided the deposition of Chrysostom at the house of Euphrasia(4). Isidore was energetically stigmatizing the proceedings of Theophilus and, according to Duchesne it is really "surprising that though adopting a style of this sort Isidore had not had to suffer from the revengeful Patriarch"(5). If this is correct, it signifies Isidore's sanctity and reputation, but it is rather certain that Isidore has been expelled from Alexandria by Theophilus.

Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus, did not inherit only the apostolic See of Alexandria (412), but also his uncle's violence, bigotry, passionateness and policy. Theophilus's frenzy deposed Chrysostom when alive; Cyril's obstinacy was denying Chrysostom even dead. Cyril who was present at the synod of the Oak (403) continued his obstinacy in refusing to restore at least the memory of Chrysostom till 417-18(6). The phrase "ἀποχρεῖτω τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ καταλόγου ὁ μὴ λειτουργῶς" occurs in

Cyril's letter to Atticus of Constantinople, written in 416, and signifies his passionateness and antipathy against Chrysostom.

Isidore wrote eight letters to Cyril(7). From these letters we learn that whereas Cyril was respecting Isidore calling him 'Father'(8) and although Isidore was calling Cyril πάντων ἀπостоῦ(9), the former did not hesitate to blame the latter for his behaviour. The points about which they were differing were to begin with Chrysostom and his memory.

1. MG 47, 22

2. MG II4, II57

3. I 152, 285A: "Ἡ γελῶν Αἴγυπτος... τὸν λιθοραγῆ καὶ χρυσολό-
τριν προβαλλομένη θεόφιλον, τέσσαρσι συνεργοῖς, ἢ μᾶλλον συναπο-
στάταις ὀχυρωθέντα, τὸν θεοφιλῆ καὶ θεολόγον κατεπολέμησεν ἀν-
θρώπον, τὴν περὶ τὸν ἐμὸν ὁμῶν υμῶν ἐπέχθειαν
καὶ δυσμένειαν, ὁ ρ μ η τ ῆ ρ ι ο ν τῆς οἰκείας εὐρηκῆτα σκαλ-
δότης".

4. B. J. Kidd, loc. cit. II p. 441

5. L. Duchesne, loc. cit. III p. 206

6. N. Kallistus (loc. cit. MG I46, II49-52) testifies it, but it is not out of question. Cyril perhaps never replaced Chrysostom's name in the Diptychs.

7. V. Supra, p. 15 note 3

8. I 370, 392C

9. II 127, 565A. cf 571AB

Stephen Gobarnus' and M. Kallistus' remarks with regard to Isidore's disposition against Theophilus, are directed also against Cyril. Isidore wrote to Cyril about his not too clear teaching concerning the two Natures of Christ and anticipated in a certain way the formula of the Council of Chalcedon (451) by writing to Cyril: "ὁ ἀληθινός καὶ ἐκ πάντων θεός, ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἀληθής, οὐτε ὃ ἦν τραχὺς, καὶ ὃ οὐκ ἦν προσλαβόν, ἐκ φύσεως δυοῖν ὃ εἰς ὑπάρχων ὕψος, ἀναρχος καὶ ἀπέραντος, κρδσφατος καὶ ἀίδιος" (1).

Cyril owes his reputation and recognition as a saint to his struggle against Nestorianism. It is said that what Athanasius was against Arianism, so against Nestorianism was Cyril. But even on this question, Cyril's conduct was not perfect. He was against Nestorius rather than against Nestorianism. Even in this case Cyril was a genuine nephew of his uncle who could not bear the fact that the New Rome was more respectable than Alexandria. Both tried to supplant Constantinople.

It is not enough for someone to express the truth; he must express it in a way, which is recommended by God. If now we consider Isidore's severe tone in writing to Cyril to stop the quarrels (2), we understand that, evidently, Cyril was not expressing the truth perfectly. And that is why Isidore wrote to him a letter which became famous: "Sympathy does not see clearly, but antipathy does not see at all. If then you wish to avoid both these faults, pass not violent sentences, but examine matters with justice... For many people from those who gathered at Ephesus ridicule you as οἱ καὶ αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐμὲν οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ ἱεροῦ ἱεροῦ ὁμοδοξίας ἱεροῦνα. They say, he is Theophilus'

nephew and imitates his behaviour. For as Theophilus plotted the known rage against John the beloved by God, so you, they say wish to be proud of the same thing, although there is much difference between the persons accused" (3).

After the condemnation of Nestorius, Cyril being pressed by the Emperor and wishing not to lose his power and influence, began to be more moderate with his opponents and accepted a symbol composed by Theodoret (453) Isidore wrote again to Cyril, frankly accusing him and exhorting: "You must be al-

1. I 323, 269B. With regard to two Natures of Christ, see below, part II chapter VI paragr. 2 c v

2. I 370, 392C

3. I 310, 361C. cf Fleury (loc.cit. III LXVI V p. 382), Duchesne (loc.cit. III p. 256) and J. Quasten (loc.cit. III p. 184). J.M. Schroeckh (Christliche Kirchengeschichte, Leipzig 1793 vol. XVII p. 294) says that Isidore was a friend of Cyril.

This opinion is difficult accept.

ways constant and not betray the heavenly things nor appear as opposed to yourself. For if you compare these which you wrote now with those which you wrote before, you will be either guilty of flattery or a servant of neglect, being defeated by vain glory and having not imitated the struggles of the great and saintly combatants who preferred to suffer living their life in exile than to accept a heretical teaching or even to hear it" (1).

Among the letters of Isidore addressed to Cyril there are two⁽²⁾ which deal with the ecclesiastical situation at Pelusium and constitute a sort of protest and a reference to the superior ecclesiastical Authority. He writes in the first: "It depends on your wisdom and authority, o best of all men, to restore by the strength of purity and concern the Church at Pelusium who is sleeping through the vices of her chiefs" (3). Further along in the same letter Isidore speaks of the vices of the presbyter Martinianus and the bishop Eusebius and obliges Cyril to intervene by punishing properly him who *καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀσκήσεως πάρεσθρα σφραγίσας τοῦ κἀλλοῦς αὐτῆς*⁽⁴⁾ *ἀφαιρῶντος ἐλυμήνα-*⁽⁵⁾ *το* (5) and by blaming the bishop⁽⁶⁾. In the other of these two letters, Isidore says that the avarice of those who deal with

the financial matters of the Church at Pelusium is insatiable and that he would do well if he would stop the avarice of those who administrate the ecclesiastical money⁽⁷⁾. These letters along with the others in which Isidore criticizes Theophilus' and Cyril's conduct show the relations which there were existing between Isidore and Alexandria. These relations fluctuate from dependence to criticism, from recognition to blame. They also show Isidore's position in that particular point. This position is high and excellent.

Isidore was not interested only in the affairs of his monastery, in monasticism the favorite subject to him or in the ecclesiastical situation at Pelusium, but he was interested also in the general and important problems of the Church. The Patriarchate of Alexandria under the jurisdiction of which he was, and the

1. I 324, 369C

2. II 127 and V 79. Bouvy (loc. cit. p. 145) adds V 268 as dealing with the situation at Pelusium, but it is doubtful. This letter deals with priesthood and its bad representatives, but it does not say where these priests were. Perhaps at Pelusium; perhaps elsewhere.

3. II 127, 565A

4. i.e. of the Church of Pelusium

5. II 127, 568C

6. ibid. 572C

7. V 79, 1373B

Patriarchs of this great See also were his concern. Ecclesiastically Isidore was subject to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, but the Patriarchs of Alexandria were for Isidore objects "for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (1).

2. St Isidore and Pelusium

The geographical situation of Pelusium will occupy us later. Here we try to describe the ecclesiastical, political and social situation of Pelusium and to give a short account of the people residing in that city in Isidore's time.

a) Ecclesiastical situation

Pelusium had its own bishopric and bishop. The bishop and the Church at Pelusium were under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Alexandria as were the other bishops of the Augustamnica prima. Among the addressees of the letters of Isidore there are thirty bishops (2). We know very little (3) of these personalities, except Cyril of Alexandria, Hermogenes of Rhinocolura, Gregory of Nyssa (?) (4) and Synesius of Cyrene. But it is evident that the most of these bishops were bishops of Egyptian towns especially in Augustamnica Prima, round Pelusium. There were several (5) bishops in this province, of whom one was the bishop of Pelusium, a kind of Metropolitan (6).

When Isidore was in his maturity, being full of action, there was on the episcopal throne of Pelusium a bishop called Ammonius. This bishop was a native of Pelusium, and, according to Isidore, *ὅτις ἐπίσκοπος* (7) is really bishop like, famous (8), full of divine wisdom (9), all wise (10), really mellifluous in both his speech and his voice, possessing a subduing attraction (11). The episcopacy of Ammonius made Pelusium not only happy

-
1. 2 Tim. 3, 16
 2. Abraham, Alphios, Aypius, Aphthonius, Apollonius, Arabianus, Asolepius, Cyril, Elaphius, Evoptius (of Ptolemais?), Gregory, Heraclius, Heraclides, Hermogenes, Isidore, Lambertius, Leontius, Macarius, Maron, Martyrius, Moses, Palladius, Serapio, Strategius, Synesius, Theodosius, Theon, Theopemptos, and Tribonianus.
 2. cf ASS parag. 15 p. 477
 4. Tillemont (loc. cit. p. 110) says 'yes'. Rouvy (loc. cit. p. 151-2) says 'no'. Balanos (loc. cit. p. 30 note 4) says 'perhaps'. Although not sure, we do not exclude the coincidence. V. ch. I p. 16-7 note 8
 5. Le Quien: Oriens Christianus, Parisiis 1740, vol. II pp. 531-54. cf also Mansi IV 1160, 1165
 6. Even today the Metropolitan of Pelusium (Port-Said) is the first after the Patriarch in the Patriarchate of Alexandria

but even a model of ecclesiastical things. "The city was proud of the patronage of its bishop Ammonius who was really bishop like, and, being full of divine and human good things it was deemed happy"⁽¹⁾. Ammonius gathered round him a college of good clergy helping him for the prosperity of the city and of the shire. "When Ammonius was bishop at Pelusium, everyone was following him and celebrating in being in his suite, as bees surround the queen of the swarm on the fresh flowers of gardens"⁽²⁾. We do not know for how long Ammonius ruled Pelusium; perhaps not for many years and certainly not for as many years as his successor Eusebius who was bishop of Pelusium for more than fifty years⁽³⁾. According to Evagrius⁽⁴⁾ Ammonius was alive when Chrysostom was being exiled. Thus we may assume that Ammonius lived till about 406⁽⁵⁾. Isidore himself⁽⁶⁾ states that Ammonius' successor was Eusebius.

Being the opposite of virtuous Ammonius, Eusebius was, according to Isidore, a horrible man. With regard to his body, he was of small stature, his face was lewd and his language barbarous⁽⁷⁾. But he was not responsible for these vices, says Isidore; he was responsible for his very bad character⁽⁸⁾. For he was semi-barbarous in his conduct, loquacious, ferocious in his anger, an opponent of virtue, an ally of malice⁽⁹⁾; he was banishing the important people and gathering those who were wicked⁽¹⁰⁾. He was completely avaricious⁽¹¹⁾, usurping, even the money destined for poor men⁽¹²⁾. He was a simoniac⁽¹³⁾. He had every vice and

(notes of the page 37)

7. III 178, 869A, III 245, 924A

8. II 127, 568A, III 178, 869A-III 245, 924A

9. II 127, 568A

10. *ibid.* 568B

11. III 245, 924B

1. III 245, 924A

2. *ibid.* 924B

3. Since he ordained Timothy Aeluros (454-77). See Evagrius, E.H. II 8, MG 86, 2521B: "Ετι Προτερίων περιούριος τε καὶ τῆς ἱερατείας εὐσεβέστερος"

4. *ibid.*

5. Le Quien, *loc. cit.* p. 533. - Balanos, *loc. cit.* p. 143 and 158 note 4

6. II 127, 568B

7. V 140, 1408B

8. *ibid.*

9. *ibid.*

10. *ibid.* and II 50

11. I 215- II 60, 221- V 196

12. II 21

13. I 26, 30, II 3, 151, V 470, 531

no virtues⁽¹⁾, so that Isidore could call him dishonest⁽²⁾, wicked⁽³⁾, uncharitable⁽⁴⁾, notorious⁽⁵⁾, and impious⁽⁶⁾. He was not a normal man, but *κακὸν καὶ ἕνρον καὶ ἀνθρωπομορφον ἐνόνον*, i.e. a wicked, strange and anthropomorphic beast⁽⁷⁾. O Lord, how good and tolerant thou art in leaving such a person for fifty years to represent thee! Duchesne⁽⁸⁾ says that Eusebius of Pelusium "had been ejected for his attachment to Dioscorus" but then Isidore who fought against this wicked person was dead.

"If Eusebius loved virtue, says Isidore, he would not prefer people other than the virtuous. But inasmuch as he has malice as a friend and partner, he has relations with persons like him"⁽⁹⁾. Indeed, according to the information we get from Isidore's letters, Eusebius took care to gather round him persons equally as wicked as himself.

Of the presbyters of Pelusium, Zosimus was the worst. He was a thorn in Isidore's flesh if we bear in mind that Isidore wrote to him more than one hundred letters⁽¹⁰⁾ blaming him and that many of his letters addressed to other persons dealt with Zosimus and his conduct. Other persons also wrote to Isidore complaining and protesting against Zosimus. For Zosimus got the Priesthood by simony⁽¹¹⁾, was completely avareicious⁽¹²⁾, gluttonous⁽¹³⁾, luxurious⁽¹⁴⁾, lascivious⁽¹⁵⁾ and lewd⁽¹⁶⁾, arrogant⁽¹⁷⁾, indiscreet⁽¹⁸⁾, fool-hardy⁽¹⁹⁾, cruel⁽²⁰⁾.

1. II 50, III 272

2. I 39

3. I 177

4. I 492

5. III 82, 197

6. II 122, 199

7. III 245

8. loc.cit. III p.332

9. III 29, 749B

10. There exist about 80 letters addressed to the presbyter Zosimus, and another 40 letters simply to Zosimus. It is rather sure that the most of the forty letters were sent to the same Zosimus.

11. I III, II 3, V 393

12. II 44, II 3, III 173, V 210, 512

13. I 465, V 496

14. I 140, IV 2-4

15. II 205, III 143, 218, 401, V 231, 346 etc

16. III 224, V 59, 437

17. III 113, 360

18. I 120

19. II 94, 224, III 70, V 510

wretched⁽¹⁾, a wild beast with a human face⁽²⁾, an anthropomorphic devil⁽³⁾, and therefore, he was a stain on the Church⁽⁴⁾. As his patron, so was Zosimus lacking in every virtue and accomplishment whereas he was full of every vice⁽⁵⁾.

Similar to Zosimus was Maron, another presbyter at Pelusium. He was avaricious⁽⁶⁾, gluttonous⁽⁷⁾, ungrateful⁽⁸⁾, and got the priesthood by simony⁽⁹⁾. As Zosimus he also was a stain on the Sanctuary⁽¹⁰⁾. Martinianus, another bad presbyter at Pelusium, was also attached to Eusebius. Martinianus was a lewd man, avaricious and simoniac but seemingly able, since he had subdued even his bishop, ἐς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπισκοπὴν ὑπερῶν ἀνδράποδον⁽¹¹⁾. Although a slave⁽¹²⁾, Martinianus wanted to be bishop. When Isidore heard it, he wrote an extensive letter⁽¹³⁾ to Cyril of Alexandria, who evidently had threatened Martinianus⁽¹⁴⁾, in order to frustrate Martinianus' ordination. Martinianus did not become a bishop; but it was a great thing that he was allowed to remain as a presbyter.

There were other bad clergymen at Pelusium. The deacon Chaeremon, ὁ δονδὺν εἶναι δεικνύων⁽¹⁵⁾, was crafty⁽¹⁶⁾, and merciless⁽¹⁷⁾, whom the bishop Ammonius had deposed "for four great crimes"⁽¹⁸⁾, but whom Eusebius restored again. The subdeacon⁽¹⁹⁾ Palladius, later deacon⁽²⁰⁾, was very keen to be bishop. He was good at the beginning but later on he went astray⁽²¹⁾. His attempt, however, to be bishop, gave Isidore ground for writing to him two important letters⁽²²⁾ on the Pauline phrase "if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work"⁽²³⁾. These letters must be a spiritual

-
1. V 437
 2. I 134
 3. II 94
 4. V 213
 5. II 108, III 242
 6. I 379, II 265, III 167
 7. I 69
 8. III 105
 9. I 145
 10. II 16
 11. II 127, 558D
 12. 1b1d. 565D-69A
 13. II 127
 14. 1b1d. 572B
 15. III 258

16. III 353
17. V 150-1
18. III 64, 178
19. I 373, III 144
20. There are about 30 letters addressed to the deacon Palladius
21. IV 219, I313A- V 93, I380D- V 550, I633C
22. III 216 and IV 219
23. I Tim. 3, 1

mirror for examining the candidates for episcopacy. Balances⁽¹⁾ says that this Palladius perhaps became a bishop. Isidore's letters addressed to the bishop Palladius⁽²⁾ hardly certify this assertion. The archdeacons Lucius⁽³⁾ and Pappophilus⁽⁴⁾, the deacons Eustathius⁽⁵⁾, Hierax⁽⁶⁾, and Serenus⁽⁷⁾ were also surrounding the bishop Eusebius and completing a horrible picture of the Church at Pelusium.

This is the bad side of the picture of the Clergy at Pelusium. But, undoubtedly there were also good clergymen at Pelusium and the shire and Isidore forbids us to consider all people as bad. "Do not think that everyone is like those (the above mentioned clergymen) but there are some people who preserved the apostolic character, whom no one accused of sins"⁽⁸⁾. Besides Ammonius, the predecessor of Eusebius, for whom we have cited enough information, there were excellent presbyters, like Theodosius⁽⁹⁾, Aphrodisius⁽¹⁰⁾ and Hierax⁽¹¹⁾, fine deacons like Eutonius⁽¹²⁾ and saintly readers like Timothy⁽¹³⁾, who "was really a palace of purity, a shelter of prudence, an acropolis of bravery, a metropolis of justice, a treasury of charity, an altar of gentleness, and, in one word, he was the treasury of every virtue..."⁽¹⁴⁾. From the Clergy of the shire, Isidore praises highly the bishop Hermogenes of Rhinocolura⁽¹⁵⁾ and the bishops Lambetius⁽¹⁶⁾ and Theodosius⁽¹⁷⁾. All the clergymen, higher and lower, who got letters from Isidore, number 150. The most of them, perhaps two thirds, were residing in Pelusium and its area. There is no doubt that many other clergymen, not mentioned by Isidore, were living at that time at Pelusium.

Concerning Monasticism at Pelusium, we have the following information. Isidore addressed five letters to groups of monks. Thus he writes: To the Monastery of (or before) Pelusium⁽¹⁸⁾ on hospitality and accuses the monks who neglected it; To

1. loc. cit. p. 151
2. I 321, II 284, III 140

3. I 29, 200CD

4. I 157, 288C

5. III 369

6. V 184, 1433C

7. III 217

8. III 117, 744BC

9. III 349

10. V 28

11. II 125, 564D- III 223, 905AB

12. III 87, 247, V 564

13. II 151, 155

14. II 151, 605Af

15. II 21, 150, 199, III 132, V 378, 449, 466

16. II 211, 221, III 48, 114, 240

17. II 131, III 245, V 494

18. I 150

Πηλουσιώταις εἰς τὸ Κοινὸν βίον⁽¹⁾ on repentance; to ἐν Πηλουσίῳ
 Μοναχοῖς⁽²⁾ (πρὸς τῇ πόλει)⁽³⁾ exhorting the monks to live
 as their calling obliges them; To Younger Monks⁽⁴⁾ on the
 right fasting⁽⁵⁾ and to the Monastery in Tabennisia⁽⁶⁾ on
 humility. Are all these monasteries different? We think
 that the first three letters are addressed to the same mo-
 nastery. The fourth signifies a different smaller monastery
 near Pelusium and the fifth is clearly addressed to the mo-
 nastery in Tabennisia in the Thebaid. Isidore also addresses
 two letters to nuns. One⁽⁷⁾ to Alexandrian nuns called 'San-
 dalariae' on vigilance, and another to nuns who frequently
 visited the city⁽⁸⁾ to avoid τὸν θορύβον τὸν πόλεμον. It is
 evident that these nuneries were different and that the se-
 cond one⁽⁹⁾ near Pelusium. Thus near Pelusium there were two⁽⁹⁾
 monasteries and one nunnery. Besides, there were some anchori-
 tes, as the presbyter Paul⁽¹⁰⁾ and hermits, as John⁽¹¹⁾ and
 Theodosius⁽¹²⁾.

How many monks there were, we do not know. What we know
 is that about 40 individual monks⁽¹³⁾ had got letters from
 Isidore. Undoubtedly there were many more⁽¹⁴⁾. Among them are

Ⓞ was

1. I 154
2. I 220
3. The MSS Vat. 649 and Altemp. have this addition
4. I 474
5. Probably the νεοπαγῆς monk Theognostus (I 101) belonged
 to that Monastery
6. I 93
7. I 87
8. I 367
9. We mean that for these two or at most three monasteries
 we have information from the letters of Isidore. Probably
 there were more monasteries as the number of the archi-
 mandrites mentioned could signify. Compare I 275 addressed
 according to vat. 649 and Altemp. MSS, to τοῖς πρὸς τῇ πόλει
 μοναστηρίοις (344b)
10. V 131
11. I 75-6
12. V 389
13. Alphios, Aphrodisius, Archontius, Athanasius (Abbot), Boethos
 (is it a proper name or does it mean 'assistant' - βοηθός?),
 Cassian, Caton, Cyrus, Dorotheus, Dosithus (Abbot), Elisaeos,
 Elias, Helion, Heron, John (hermit), Lampetius, Luke (Abbot),
 Marathionius, Mark, Nilamon, Nilus, Orion, Pachom, Paul (Abbot)
 Paul (anchorite), Paul (the monk. One or many?), Partinus,
 Pellagius, Peter (Abbot), Philip, Phrontinos, Quintinianus,
 Strategius, Thalassius, Theodosius (anchorite), Theodosius (another
 monk), Theognostus, Thomas, Theopompus, Zeno.
14. I 49, 298. Depending on V 174, 1429A we are perhaps justified
 in saying that there were carnal brothers living as monks
 together or not, at the same time.

five or six archimandrites. The title at that time meant only abbot. These are Athanasius⁽¹⁾, Dositheus⁽²⁾, Luke⁽³⁾, Paul⁽⁴⁾ and Peter⁽⁵⁾. The letter I 117 addressed to the abbot Athanasius does not deal with monks or monkish problems. This could perhaps signify that this Athanasius was not in charge as an abbot. Perhaps he was retired.

The quality of monks round Pelusium at that time, was like that of the Clergy. There were some good monks, as for example Orion who was "simple in his speech, simpler in his thought and simplest in his life"⁽⁶⁾, or Strategius⁽⁷⁾, but they were rather exceptional. The case was that many monks, like Ambrose⁽⁸⁾, Lampetius⁽⁹⁾, Mark⁽¹⁰⁾, Pelagius⁽¹¹⁾, Philip⁽¹²⁾ and some nuns⁽¹³⁾ were living in luxury, gluttony, idleness and disorder.

The whole picture of the ecclesiastical situation at Pelusium is now complete.

b) Political and social situation

"By the end of the fourth century, middle Egypt became a separate province, named Arcadia, in honour of Theodosius' son and successor, and the provinces of Aegyptus, Augustamnica and the Thebaid were each divided into two"⁽¹⁴⁾. Pelusium belonged to Provincia Augustamnicae Prima and was its capital. The whole province was governed in the sixth century "by a duke possessing civil and military authority, subject only to the distant authorities at Constantinople"⁽¹⁵⁾. In Isidore's time, however, Pelusium was the residential town of the prefect who was ruling the whole district around it.

With regard to the rulers of Pelusium in Isidore's time we know that when Rufinus was at the helm of the Byzantine Empire⁽¹⁶⁾, the ruler of the province Augustamnica, was the

-
1. I 117
 2. I 392
 3. I 298. The addressee of I 318 is perhaps a different person
 4. I 49
 5. I 258
 6. III 45, 761C
 7. III 98. Besides this, one dozen letters were sent to him
 8. I 392
 9. I 13
 10. I 173
 11. I 314
 12. I 41
 13. I 367
 14. E. R. Hardy: Christian Egypt, Church and People, N. York 1952, p. 84
 15. *ibid.* p. 140-1
 16. I 489, 448D: "Ἦμεῖς δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν γινώσκοντες πρὸς ὃ βούλεσθε ἔχετε"

Cappadocian Gigantius. As they were thought before Isidore, so also in his time were Cappadocians always considered to be very bad men⁽¹⁾. Isidore says that "for the most part this race is cunning. It does not like peace, it is fed by quarrels, and it has one spring for that which is bitter and for that which is sweet"⁽²⁾. The "all-wicked and most hateful"⁽³⁾ Gigantius was a genuine Cappadocian. After the expiration of the period of his service and while he went to Constantinople for renewing it, people from Pelusium and Isidore himself tried to frustrate his re-appointment⁽⁴⁾. But unfortunately Gigantius obtained his purpose, in being re-appointed prefect of Pelusium. A letter addressed simply to Gigantius⁽⁵⁾ had undoubtedly as addressee a Gigantius different from the ruler. But Isidore in many of his letters⁽⁶⁾ deals with the prefect Gigantius and his bad conduct and policy.

Other bad authorities at Pelusium, according to Isidore, were Aspiarius⁽⁷⁾, Cerynius⁽⁸⁾ who most probably was duke of Augustamnica together or under or shortly after Gigantius⁽⁹⁾ and Diophrantius⁽¹⁰⁾.

There were also at Pelusium good authorities, whom Isidore mentions and praises. Thus he praises the Corrector, Ammonius⁽¹¹⁾, the Count Hermianus⁽¹²⁾, the most illustrious Hierax⁽¹³⁾, the excellent, Simplicius⁽¹⁴⁾, most probably duke of Pelusium, Tarsius⁽¹⁵⁾, Taurus⁽¹⁶⁾ and others. From the rest of the officers

I..of the epigramm of Demodocus (6th cent.B.C.) cited by Rittershusius in MG 78, 347 note 56

Καππαδόκων φαῦλοι μὲν αἶψά, ζῶντες δὲ τυχόντες
φαιλότεροι· κέρδους δ' εἰνεῖται φαυλότατοι·

Ἦν δ' ἀρα δὶς καὶ τρίς δρᾶζονται ἀκῆνης
δὴ τότε γίνονται φαυλεπιφαυλότατοι.

.....
Καππαδόκην παύ' ἐχίθονα κακὴ δακεν· ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ
καίθανε, γευσσάμενη αἵματος ἰοβόλου.

of also the proverb:

Καππαδόκες, Κρήτες, Κήλικες, τρία μάκκα μάκιστα

2. I 281, 348AB

3. ibid.

4. I 483-7 and 489

5. I 259

6. I 281, 430 (= IV 197),
483-7, 489-90

7. I 275, 344B-345A

8. I 178, 297D: "Ὅπως Κυρήνιος τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπελάβετο. I 174-7, 240, 493

9. ibid.

10. I 31

11. I 165, 395, II 120, V 212, 418-20

12. III 375, I 317. There are also other 43 letters addressed to him

13. III 344

14. I 225-6: "Ἦκει ὁ θαυμαστός Σιμπλίκιος τῆς ἡνείας τῆς ἀρχῆς μετα-
χειρίζων" I 226, 324B

15. I 160, 289C

16. III 365, IO17C

at the district of Pelusium in that time not mentioned so far, we mention here: The count Aetius⁽¹⁾, the tribune Ammonius⁽²⁾, the excellent Chrysis⁽³⁾, the president Conon⁽⁴⁾, Diogenes the Chief⁽⁵⁾, Dionysius the Corrector⁽⁶⁾, Gelasius the Duke⁽⁷⁾, Isidore the prefect⁽⁸⁾, Leontius the chief⁽⁹⁾, Nemesis the praetor⁽¹⁰⁾, Peter the corrector⁽¹¹⁾, Philoxenus the chief⁽¹²⁾, Serapion the Corrector⁽¹³⁾, Serenus the Tribune⁽¹⁴⁾ and Strategius the Duke⁽¹⁵⁾. All prefects, tribunes and other officials mentioned by Isidore are fifty in number.

With regard to the number of the population of Pelusium we are not very sure, but there are some certain points which permit us to assess it. Thus we know, mainly from Isidore's letters, that: 1) Pelusium was the capital of Augustamnica Prima; 2) The prefect was residing in it; 3) It had its own bishop; 4) There was there a βουλευτήσιον, i.e. a Senate⁽¹⁶⁾; 5) Isidore wrote letters to: 154 clergymen⁽¹⁷⁾, 40 monks, 5 monasteries and nuneries, 50 tribunes, prefects and other officials, 10 politicians⁽¹⁸⁾, 4 grammar teachers, 30 σχολαστικοί, i.e. literati of the age, 5 doctors, 2 sophists, 1 philosopher and 1 poet. It is true that many of the clergymen, political leaders and other important men who got letters from Isidore were not residing in Pelurium, but even if the half of the total number—which seems undoubtedly true—were residents of Pelusium, the fact is characteristic. We must also add that, 6) there was a floating population there, because there were merchants⁽¹⁹⁾, soldiers⁽²⁰⁾

1. III 141, 328

2. III 308

3. II 78

4. I 148

5. III 389

6. III 9

7. I 99

8. I 299, 485

9. III 229

10. I 47, IV 81

11. III 145

12. II 286

13. II 15

14. V 563-4

15. I 133

16. I 226

17. i.e. 30 bishops; 55 presbyters; 2 archdeacons; 49 deacons; 4 subdeacons; 14 readers; Total 154.

18. Aidesius, Alypius, Archontius, Cassius, Dorotheus, Elias, Heron, Hēpatius, Gessius, Peter

19. I 155, 299, 300, V 212

20. I 40, 462, 326-7, II 190-I, 203, III 32

and many peasants who were going to Pelusium to arrange their affairs; 7) The fact that in 451 the emperor Marcian (450-457) ordered that the wheat destined for Constantinople should be transferred by the Nile through Pelusium, since Alexandria, being displeased because of the exile of Dioscorus, rebelled against the Government(1); 8) Finally, according to Strabo(2), the city of Pelusium "τὸν κύκλον ἔχει τοῦ τεύχους σταδίων εἰκοσιν". A στάδιον is 202 yards; therefore the circumference of the city wall of Pelusium was 4040 yards. But Isidore lived three hundred years after Strabo's description, when, unquestionably, the city of Pelusium had been enlarged. This external size of the city indicates the number of its inhabitants. All these facts permit us to state that the population of Pelusium was not more than fifty thousand. L. Bouvy(3) assumes that Pelusium had approximately eighty thousand people. This seems unlikely. Still there is nothing which could oblige us to refute the statement that Pelusium was the largest city in the Augustamnica Prima.

The religious variety of the people residing at Pelusium, was as the variety of every town of the Christian empire in that time. The majority of the people were Christians(4). After Christians, pagans were of good number, as many letters of Isidore(5) inform us. There was also a Jewish community(6).

Education at Pelusium seems to have been good, for we are rather sure that most of the educated people with whom Isidore had correspondence were residing in Pelusium. Isidore writes to two Sophists: Asclepios(7) and Arpocras(8). These sophists were kinds of rhetoricians and teachers of rhetoric to the public(9), or better speaking, they were the tutors of the city, at least for Pelusium, as we understand from the letter V 458, where Isidore announcing the death of the excellent sophist Arpocras, asks the sophist Asclepius to suggest someone else for this reason, because "παίδευτοῦ χρήζει ἡ πόλις. Most of the thirty σχολαστικοί, i.e. teachers or literati who got letters(10) from Isidore were inhabitants of the capital rather

-
1. Theophanes' Chronicle, quoted in Diamantopoulos 1926/99-100 note 2
 2. Geographica, ed. G. Krammer, Berlin 1852, vol. III lib. XVII chap. I parag. 21 p. 371-2
 3. loc. cit. p. 77
 4. cf Diamantopoulos, 1926/101
 5. e.g. II 46, 146, III 135, 154, IV 31, 55, V 117, 164, 173, 186 etc
 6. IV 28, 31, V 458
 7. I 18, 141, 431, II 63, 90, 143, III 19, IV 225, V 119
 8. Many letters. See MG 78, 1704
 9. Diamantopoulos, 1926/295
 10. Alypius (perhaps Alypius), Alypius, Ammonius, Antiochus, Antony, Casius, Cyrus, Didymus, Dionysius, Dorotheus, Epimachus, Eudasmon, Harpocras, Heron, Ischyrlon, Isidore, John, Menas, Nemesianus,

than of the district. The same is also valid for the four⁽¹⁾ grammar teachers, for the poet Alexander⁽²⁾, the pagan philosopher Maximus⁽³⁾ and the five doctors⁽⁴⁾.

Among the extant letters there exists one addressed to the students of the presbyter Bonthos⁽⁵⁾. Does it mean that he had a school and therefore students or does it simply mean that some people were hearing of a presbyter called Bonthos who privately and occasionally was expressing his ideas? The phrase "ὁ φίλου Ἀβοντος εὐγενῆ βλαστήματα" signifies that the presbyter Bonthos who was a friend of Isidore's, was gathering round him some young people for the purpose of edification and that these pupils were worthy pupils of their spiritual leader.

The letter III 86 signifies that there was a library at Pelusium, perhaps in one of the monasteries or perhaps in the city. The word στοιχεισμός must be replaced⁽⁶⁾ by στοιχεισμός which means classification or arrangement. Then the word βιβλιοφύλας does not mean postman, but a man who keeps and possesses a catalogue of books; it means librarian. And a library in that time at Pelusium, means many things.

Public discussions on religious subjects were probably being held⁽⁷⁾. The fact that among the Christians there were living many Pagans and Jews, recognisable yet remnants of an old 'glory', was a permanent cause for discussions and disputes. There are several letters of Isidore's written against Jews or gentiles, as it was then a widespread custom of all Fathers to speak and to write against them.

Such is, in brief, the picture that rises up before us from Isidore's letters, which helps us to understand that Pelusium was at that time quite an important city where Isidore could find everything and where he had a field for doing everything for Christ's glory.

Nilamon, Nilus, Peter, Proaeresius, Ἐχολαστικὸς (unpersonally), Strategius, Theodore, Theodosius, Theon, Timothy, Theologius.

1. Agathodaemon, Hermias, Nilus, Ophelius

2. V 331

3. I 96

4. Domastius, Dorotheus, Hierax, Nilamon, Oribasius

5. III 28

6. There is no such word in Greek

7. III 253, 932D

3. St Isidore's family

Of the family of Isidore we know very little, almost nothing. The only source which speaks of it is the *Menologium Graecorum*, where we read "οὗτος ὁ ἅγιος...⁽¹⁾ εὐγενὴν καὶ εὐσεβὴν γονέων, συγγενεῖς δὲ ἔχων Θεόφιλον καὶ Κύριλλον τοὺς τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπους..."⁽¹⁾. Many Scholars speaking of Isidore avoid the

pitfalls by citing nothing of Isidore's family; a few others simply copied or translated this information of *Menologium*.

There is nothing forbidding us to accept the first part of this information. On the contrary, Isidore's good education and piety, his relations with so many eminent personalities of the age and the fact that he was feeling free to express his opinions even against patriarchs or the emperor, permit us to say that he was really of a noble family, financially independent, and of pious parents⁽²⁾. M. Smith has recently published⁽³⁾ a 'Life' of Isidore, which the monks of Μονή Athos were using for their edification. There is written in this 'Life' that Isidore "εὐσεβοῦς ρίζης, εὐσεβέστερος κλάδος ἐβλάστησεν· ἐκ πρώτης γὰρ ἡλικίας εὐθὺς, τὴν ἀρετὴν ἄκρως ἠσπάσατο"⁽⁴⁾.

There is no reason to deny this information. Everyone can easily accept it as true.

The second part of the information of the *Menologium*, seems to be rather untrue, although someone could bring the fact that Isidore strictly criticizing and frankly blaming Theophilus and Cyril, remained almost unpunished⁽⁵⁾, to support the opposite opinion⁽⁶⁾.

With regard to Isidore's family, no further detail is, unfortunately, available.

1. 4th February, MG II 7, 293D

2. Niemeyer (*De Isidori Pelusiotaе vita, scriptis et doctrina*, Halle 1825, reprinted in MG 78, pp. 15-102) p. 15, without any important reason rejects the whole information of the *Menologium*, by saying that it is not proved. Bouvy (loc. cit. p. 46-7), Balanos (loc. cit. p. 13), Duchesne and Diamantopoulos (1926/II 0) accept the first part of it.

3. An unpublished life of St Isidore of Pelusium, in E pp. 429-438

4. *ibid.* p. 435

5. The 'Life' (p. 437) asserts that Theophilus expelled Isidore from the Clergy of Alexandria.

6. O' Leary (loc. cit. p. 160-1) supports it.

Chapter III

EXAMINATION OF DATES AND PLACES

I. Dates

The dates of many Fathers, like those of many ancient historical personalities are not very well known and so Scholars frequently face many difficulties, in some cases insuperable, in fixing them. Almost the same is also valid with regard to the dates of Isidore's life. No source tells exactly when Isidore was born or died. But there is evidence telling us roughly when he lived and worked, by the help of which we can approximately confirm his dates.

The first very rich source which provides us with valuable hints on chronological indications of Isidore and his life is the collection of his extant letters. Thus, 1) Isidore writes to the praetor Rufinus whose position near Theodosius was important and powerful from 390 until 395 when he died. The content of these letters shows that when Isidore wrote them, he was a mature parson. He was easily 35 or 40 years old. A man of 25, as Kihn⁽¹⁾ thinks, could not write such letters to such person on such matters. Bardenhewer⁽²⁾ remarked that these letters are ~~also~~ those of a man of position and that he must therefore have been born before 360. 2) The able⁽³⁾ eunuch of the Palace Antiochus to whom Isidore sent a letter⁽⁴⁾ is another certain point. Antiochus skilfully ruled the State when Theodosius II was still very young (408-14). 3) Synesius of Cyrene died in 414. He got a letter⁽⁵⁾ from Isidore of which a certain echo is found in the fifth letter of the former. This letter of Synesius' was written between 410-14. 4) There are two letters addressed to the king Theodosius. Diamantopoulos⁽⁶⁾ thinks that the first of these two letters⁽⁷⁾ was sent to Theodosius I who died at the beginning of 395, and the other⁽⁸⁾ to Theodosius

-
1. Kirchenlexicon, VI p. 964-5 .The letters to Rufinus are I 178 and I 489
 2. Geschichte der Altkirchliche Literature, Freiburgh 1924, vol. IV p. 101
 3. I 36, 204D: "Ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς μόνον διάκονος τυγχάνεις τῆς βασιλείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγεις αὐτὴν καὶ θῶς βούλει, σκεῦσον ἀναρρῶσαι τὸ δίκαιον"
 4. I 36
 5. I 418
 6. loc.cit. 1926/108
 7. I 35
 8. I 331

us II. Most probably both letters were sent to the son of Arcadius, Theodosius II (412-449). The content of the second letter refers to the Ecumenical Council at Ephesus (431). 5) The letter I 310 to Cyril of Alexandria, was written during or rather after the Synod of Ephesus. 6) Cyril calls Isidore 'Father' (1). Apart from Cyril's respect for Isidore, this information could also signify that Isidore must have been about 20 years older than Cyril (2).

External pieces of evidence approximately designating the dates of Isidore, are: 1) Severus of Antioch; "Fuit temporibus sancti Cyrilli episcopi Alexandriae..." (3). 2) Evagrius (4) who says "in that reign Isidore also was flourishing". This reign must be that of Theodosius II. 3) Anastasius Sinaita (5) who testifies that "Isidore who decorated the Church of Pelusium sends letters and teaches the all-wise Cyril, as a father his son". 4) Photius (6) who places Isidore as contemporary with Theophilus, Chrysostom and Cyril. 5) George Amartolos (7), who says that Isidore was flourishing when Valens (364-378) was reigning. 6) The anonymous author of the 'Life' of St Isidore (8), who states that St Athanasius forced Isidore to become a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria; that Isidore had been expelled from the Clergy of Alexandria by Theophilus (9); and that when dying Isidore was approximately one hundred years old (10). And 7) N. Kallistus (11), who states that Isidore was dealing with Arcadius, Cyril and his uncle Theophilus, proving their weaving of plots against St John Chrysostom and concludes that from this event we understand that Isidore lived in their time.

These internal and external pieces of evidence can certify that: 1) Between the years 390 to 433 Isidore was full of action. 2) About 390-395, Isidore was a man of position, easily 35-40 years old. 3) In 373 when St Athanasius died, Isidore could be almost 25. And 4) Isidore was living after 431.

-
1. I 370, 392C
 2. of Fleury (loc.cit. III KKVI p. 415), Bouvy (loc.cit. p. 4) and M. Smith ('Life' in E p. 434)
 3. CSCO ser. 4 vol VI p. 182
 4. loc.cit. MG 86, 246I-4
 5. loc.cit. MG 89, 156D
 6. Bibliotheka MG 103, 1104C
 7. Chronicon 194, 3 MG 110, 680C
 8. E 436
 9. ibid. p. 437
 10. ibid. p. 438
 11. loc.cit. MG 146, 1252B

Then when was Isidore born? L. Bober⁽¹⁾ thinks that it is impossible to fix the date of Isidore's birth. Kihn⁽²⁾ and L. Bayer⁽³⁾ place Isidore's birth in 370; W. Moeller⁽⁴⁾, not after 370; G. Krueger⁽⁵⁾, most probably before 370; Balanos⁽⁶⁾ and A. Anwander⁽⁷⁾ about 360; J. Fessler⁽⁸⁾ and Souvy⁽⁹⁾, about 350; M. Smith⁽¹⁰⁾ and Diamantopoulos⁽¹¹⁾ are undecided in this point. Our opinion is that Isidore was born at about A.D. 350, rather before than after. His maturity and activity, as his letters richly illustrate, cover the years 390-433. From the years 390-5 to his death he lived as a presbyter and monk at Pelusium.

With regard to Isidore's death, Christ⁽¹²⁾ places it in 460; W. F. Hook⁽¹³⁾ thinks that Isidore died in the middle of the fifth century; the same is supported by Schroegkh⁽¹⁴⁾, C. E. Luthardt⁽¹⁵⁾, Kurtz⁽¹⁶⁾, Batiffol⁽¹⁷⁾, Baphides⁽¹⁸⁾ and O' Leary⁽¹⁹⁾. Tillemont⁽²⁰⁾, Ceillier⁽²¹⁾ and G. Marasa⁽²²⁾ place Isidore's death in 448-9; Cross⁽²³⁾ says that although Isidore's writings show his opposition to Eutyches, Isidore seems to have died before the latter's condemnation at Chalcedon, i.e. before 451; Kihn⁽²⁴⁾ and Kidd⁽²⁵⁾ place Isidore's death in 440; B. F. Westcott⁽²⁶⁾, G. Krueger⁽²⁷⁾, L. Bayer⁽²⁸⁾, Balanos⁽²⁹⁾ and Bareill⁽³⁰⁾, about 440; P. A. Schmid⁽³¹⁾, following

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. loc. cit. p. 3 | 21. Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques, Paris 1858-68, vol. XIII p. 603 |
| 2. Patrologie, II p. 230 | 22. Dizionario Ecclesiastico, by A. Mercati-A. Pelzer, Torino 1955, vol. II p. 480 |
| 3. loc. cit. p. I | 23. ODCS p. 705 |
| 4. RED II p. 1123. cf RETHK IX p. 444 | 24. Patrologie II p. 231 |
| 5. NSHE VI p. 46 | 25. loc. cit. III p. 264 |
| 6. loc. cit. p. II and Patrology (in Greek) p. 387 | 26. A general survey of the history of the Canon of the NT, London 1896 p. 456 |
| 7. LTK p. 625 | 27. NSHE VI p. 46 |
| 8. loc. cit. II 614 | 28. loc. cit. p. I |
| 9. loc. cit. p. 46 | 29. loc. cit. p. 33-and Patrology p. 388 |
| 10. E. p. 434 | 30. DTC VIII p. 84 and 87 |
| 11. 1926/109 | 31. Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium, Par. II, p. 23 |
| 12. History of Greek Literature, Greek transl. 1905 II, p. 840 | |
| 13. Ecclesiastical Bibliography, London 1850, vol. VI p. 266 | |
| 14. loc. cit. and Balanos p. 33 | |
| 15. loc. cit. p. 173 | |
| 16. loc. cit. p. 235-6 | |
| 17. loc. cit. p. 314 | |
| 18. loc. cit. I p. 362 | |
| 19. loc. cit. p. 160-I | |
| 20. loc. cit. p. 116 | |

Bardenheuer⁽¹⁾, between 435-40; M. Smith⁽²⁾, after 435; Bouvy⁽³⁾, Anwander⁽⁴⁾, Altaner⁽⁵⁾, Bihlmeyer⁽⁶⁾ and Quasten⁽⁷⁾, about 435; Philaret⁽⁸⁾, probably in 436; J. Fessler⁽⁹⁾, after 434 and W. Moeller⁽¹⁰⁾, not before 431. Our opinion is that Isidore died shortly after 435, because the fact that there are not extant letters after 433 or 434 does not necessarily mean that Isidore died immediately. Most probably he passed his last years quietly, with more prayer and contemplation in his monastery. Still he died before 440, because it was impossible for Isidore to keep silent for a long time if he was alive. Some letters of Isidore's⁽¹¹⁾ are not against the teaching of Eutyches, but against some similar conceptions which appeared in Alexandria before the Eutychian quarrel (448)⁽¹²⁾. Isidore died c. 437.

2. P l a c e s

The birth place of Isidore is generally accepted to be Alexandria. This opinion is based only on the information given by Photius⁽¹³⁾, according to which Isidore Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει. It has generally been thought that this information came directly from Ephraem of Antioch (527-45) and has been accepted by a large number of Scholars. Thus Tillemont⁽¹⁴⁾, Coillier⁽¹⁵⁾, Schroeckh⁽¹⁶⁾, Niemeyer⁽¹⁷⁾, Glueck⁽¹⁸⁾, Bollandists⁽¹⁹⁾, Fessler⁽²⁰⁾, L. Boper⁽²¹⁾, W. Moeller⁽²²⁾, Alzog⁽²³⁾, Bouvy⁽²⁴⁾, Schaff⁽²⁵⁾, Batiffol⁽²⁶⁾, Philaret⁽²⁷⁾, G. Krueger⁽²⁸⁾, Aigrain⁽²⁹⁾, Bayer⁽³⁰⁾, Schenk⁽³¹⁾, Tixeront⁽³²⁾, Balanos⁽³³⁾, Anwander⁽³⁴⁾, O' Leary⁽³⁵⁾ and Quasten⁽³⁶⁾, all accept that Isidore was born at Alexandria.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Geschichte..p.101 | 19. ASS 4th Feb., vol. I p.474 |
| 2. MThR vol.40 p. 207 | 20. loc.cit. II 614 |
| 3. loc.cit. p.161 | 21. loc.cit. p.3 |
| 4. loc.cit. p.625 | 22. RED II 1123 and RETHK vol. IX p.444 |
| 5. loc.cit. p.308 | 23. loc.cit. p.348 |
| 6. Kirchengeschichte, Paderborn 1951 vol. I p.408 | 24. loc.cit. p.46-7 |
| 7. loc.cit. III p.180 | 25. History of the Christian Church, Edinburgh 1884, vol. II p. 941 |
| 8. loc.cit. p. 103 | 26. loc.cit. p.314 |
| 9. loc.cit. II p.617 | 27. loc.cit. p. 98 |
| 10. RED II p.1123 | 28. NSHE VI 46 |
| 11. I 102, 323, 405, 419, 496 | 29. loc.cit. p.13-4 |
| 12. cf Balanos, loc.cit. p.31-2 | 30. loc.cit. p.4 |
| 13. Bibliotheca, ed. Berlin 1824, 406H p.247 and MG 103, 963 | 31. PWK IX 2069 |
| 14. loc.cit. p.97-8 | 32. loc.cit. p.220-I |
| 15. loc.cit. XIII p.600 | 33. loc.cit. p.13 |
| 16. loc.cit. XVII p.321 | 34. loc.cit. vol.V p.625 |
| 17. loc.cit. p.15-6 | 35. loc.cit. p.160-I |
| 18. loc.cit. p.1 | 36. loc.cit. III 180 |

The whole passage from Photius, relating to Isidore, is as follows: "Εν τούτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ ἐν μονάζουσι περι-
βλέπτου, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς δὲ τὸ γένος οὗτος ἦν καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν αἰδέ-
σιμος, διαφόρους ἐξ ἐπιστολῶν διαφόρων χρήσεις ἐπιφέρει, αἱ κατὰ πᾶν-
τα συμβαίνουσι ταῖς κατὰ τῶν αἱρετικῶν ὥς οὐκ εὐσεβεῖσι συκοφαντου-
μέναις". Two important remarks are appropriate to this passage
with regard to the birth place of Isidore. The first is that
the phrase 'Ἀλεξανδρεὺς δὲ τὸ γένος οὗτος ἦν', being a parenthe-
sis, does not belong to Ephraem, but to Photius. The verb ἐπιφέρει
strengthens this opinion. In other words, the evidence that Isi-
dore was from Alexandria belongs to the ninth century and not
to the sixth⁽¹⁾. The second remark is that even this phrase
does not clearly mean that Alexandria was the birth place of
Isidore. Photius does not say that Isidore was born at Alexan-
dria, but that 'Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τὸ γένος οὗτος ἦν, — which is
different. The word γένος is related to living beings⁽²⁾ and
never to places. The word γένος might mean καταγωγή, γενεά, οἰκο-
γένεια, ἀπόγονοι, τέκνα, συγγενεῖς, φυλή, φύλον, ἢ ἡλικία, i.e.
origin, generation, family, descendants, children, relatives, sex
or age respectively, but it never means γέννησις, i.e. birth.
Moreover, it never means birth place⁽³⁾. Therefore we can say
that the phrase 'Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τὸ γένος ἦν' means that Isidore's
family had its origin in Alexandria, but it does not necessa-
rily mean that Isidore himself was born at Alexandria. Most
probably his parents were from Alexandria.

These two remarks make Photius' note too weak, and therefore,
the opinions of the Scholars who adopted this note, doubtful.
No other source speaks of the birth place of Isidore to be
Alexandria. Bardenhewer⁽⁴⁾, Duchesne⁽⁵⁾ and Kidd⁽⁶⁾ depending
evidently on Facundus⁽⁷⁾ evidence call Isidore simply 'Egypti-
an'. This is true, but it is not accurate. Ch. Hase⁽⁸⁾ says that
Isidore was a resident of Alexandria. Still there is not even
one extant letter of Isidore's which could support the opinion
that Isidore was born at Alexandria, whereas the letter IV 207
rather signifies that Isidore considered Alexandria as a fo-
reign city⁽⁹⁾.

-
1. cf Diamantopoulos 1926/107
 2. This word is also used in grammar and logic, but this use
is irrelevant to our question
 3. cf S. Byzantios, loc.cit. p. 247 and H. Liddell-Scott, loc.cit.
I 524
 4. Patrology, p. 379
 5. loc.cit. III p. 205
 6. loc.cit. III p. 186
 7. loc.cit. ML 67, 573A
 8. A History of the Christian Church, transl. by Ch. Blumenthal-
C. Wing, N. York 1856 p. 132
 9. IV 207, 1301A: 'Εν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ πρὸς Αἰγύπτῳ...
cf Diamantopoulos 1926/107

Refusing the conception that Isidore was born at Alexandria, we state that Isidore's birth place was undoubtedly Pelusium. The reasons which justify this opinion are external and internal too.

The oldest and most important source which speaks of Isidore's birth place is Severus of Antioch and it is curious that, to the best of our knowledge, no one so far used this information. Severus, writing during his episcopacy (513-18) to Zacharias of Pelusium on the holiness of the Church and having previously cited the opinion of St Gregory of Nazianzus(I), refers after that to Isidore by saying: "But not to extend the discussion to a great length, I leave the rest on one side, but will cite for you a passage from a certain presbyter (Isidore I mean, a native of your city of Pelusium, who was wise in learning and in piety) which is sufficient for this present purpose"⁽²⁾. And immediately Severus cites Isidore's letter II 246⁽³⁾. This information "dating practically from Isidore's lifetime"⁽⁴⁾, declares that Isidore was born at Pelusium, for the word 'native' of a city does not mean inhabitant of it, but it means someone who was born in it.

We find the same information in the Menologium Graecorum: "Οὗτος ὁ ἅγιος (Ἰσίδωρος) Αἰγύπτιος, ἐγένετο ἀπὸ πόλεως Πηλουσίου λεγομένης"⁽⁵⁾. The verb γίνομαι with reference to persons, means 'to be born'. Thus the Menologium also testifies that Isidore was born at Pelusium.

Finally a new 'Unpublished Life', edited by M. Smith⁽⁶⁾ asserts the same thing: "Ὁ θεὸς οὗτος Ἰσίδωρος, ὁ βίῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ χρηματίσας θαυμάσιος καὶ ἡλίου κατ' ἀμφοτέρα λάμπας φαιδρότερον. κ(α)τ' ἰδέα μὲν τὸ Πηλοῦσιον εἰς ἡλικίας δὲ τοῦτο περιφανὲς τῶν κατ' Αἰγύπτου"⁽⁷⁾.

These three very clear and old pieces of evidence are being strengthened by some internal ones, i.e. by information from the letters of Isidore. Thus: a) There is no one letter which could exclude the possibility of Pelusium, to being his birth place. The letter I 275 brought by Balanos⁽⁸⁾ for the support of the opposite opinion, does not prove that Isidore was not from Pelusium by reason that in this letter he blames

-
1. Or. XXXIII 15
 2. E.W. Brooks: The sixth book of the letters of Severus, Oxford 1903, vol. II part II, letter I 208, 9 p. 251
 3. MG 78, 684D-685C
 4. Quasten, loc.cit. vol.III p.181
 5. MG II 7, 293D
 6. E pp.429-38
 7. ibid. p.435
 8. loc.cit. p.12 note 2

the inhabitants of Pelusium. Because, if it were true, then, "neither would Epimenides be from Crete, nor Aristophanes or Cratinus or Eupolis or Demosthenes from Athens, nor would Isidore himself not only not be from Alexandria but he would not even be from Egypt, since he so strictly characterizes Egypt in the letter I 419"⁽¹⁾. Apart from that, the heading "Τοῖς περὶ τὴν πόλιν" could only signify that Isidore at that time was not in the city, or, if, according to the Vat. 649 and Altemp. MSS we correct the title to "τοῖς περὶ τὴν πόλιν μοναστηρίοις" —→, this heading could indicate that Isidore sent this letter either from the city or from another monastery or hermitage. Some other letters⁽²⁾, simply indicate that Isidore was not in the city of Pelusium at that time. He was, most probably in his monastery. b) The letters I 489⁽³⁾, I 484⁽⁴⁾, I 174⁽⁵⁾ and III 270 could indicate that Isidore considered Pelusium as his own city. c) The greater part of the two thousand extant letters were sent to the inhabitants of Pelusium. d) of the other letters sent to other people, many deal with problems of Pelusium⁽⁶⁾. This fact also signifies that Isidore cared about Pelusium and its problems, because this city was his own city.

Summing up we could say that Isidore was born at Pelusium and that is why he has been called Πηλουσιώτης. We must then understand that when Anastasius Sinaita⁽⁷⁾, Suidas⁽⁸⁾, the anonymous author of a life of Isidore⁽⁹⁾, N. Kallistus⁽¹⁰⁾ and others call Isidore Πηλουσιώτην, they perhaps mean a native and not simply an inhabitant or a monk of Pelusium.

Here we must dedicate some words to Pelusium. We have already written in the previous chapter about the ecclesiastical, political and social situation at Pelusium and the people residing there in Isidore's time. Now some remarks from a geographical and historical point of view are necessary.

Josephus mentions Pelusium four times in his 'Antiquities'⁽¹¹⁾ speaking of its siege by Sennacherib, and another three times in his 'Against Apion'⁽¹²⁾, refuting Cheremon's information by

1. Diamantopoulos 1926/105 note I

2. I 37, II 101, 127, 176, 226, III 245, V 456

3. 448D: "Ἡ μ ε ς τ ο μ ἑ ν ἄρχοντι Καππαδόκη χρησάμενοι..."

4. "Ο φθορεὺς τῶν πολιτῶν ἡμῶν Καππαδόκης..."

The word πολίτης means either citizen or fellow citizen. In this case and the subsequent one it rather means fellow citizen

5. 296C: "Χάρτην ἡμῖν οἱ π ο λ ῖ τ α ἰ πεποιμένοι"

6. e.g. I 35, 36, 176, 311, 486, 489, II 101, 127, III 245, V 2, 79

7. loc.cit. MG 89, 145C

8. loc.cit. II 150

9. Quoted in Niemeyer loc.cit. p.23 note j and in Bouvy, loc.cit. p.56 note 2

10. E.H. 28 MG 146, II 52A and 53 MG 146, 1249D

11. Book X I, 4 Engl. transl. by Whiston, Edinburgh 1865, p.213

12. Book I par. 32, 3 ibid. p.620-1

that of Manetho. These references indicate how old Pelusium was.

Strabo gives a short and accurate account of the area of Pelusium: "Μεταξύ δὲ τοῦ Τανιτικοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πηλουσιακοῦ, λίμναι καὶ ἔλη μεγάλα καὶ συνεχὴ κώμας πολλὰς ἔχοντα· καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ Πηλουσίον κύκλῳ περικείμενα ἔχει ἔλη, αἱ τινες βάραθρα καλοῦσι καὶ τέλματα· ὠκίσται δ' ἀπὸ θαλάττης ἐν κλείουσιν ἢ εἰκοσι σπύλοις, τὸν δὲ κύκλον ἔχει τοῦ τείχους σταδίους εἰκοσιν· ὠνόμασται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πηλοῦ καὶ τῶν τελεμάτων" (1). Strabo mentions Pelusium another three times. From this description we learn the following: a) The whole area and Pelusium itself was surrounded by lakes and large bogs. b) There were there many small towns or villages. c) The city of Pelusium was built more than twenty στάδια i.e. 4040 yards away from the sea. d) Pelusium had a wall of which the circumference was 4040 yards. And e) Pelusium got its name from mud and marshes (3).

The first item of Strabo's information certifies that there were no mountains there and that Pelusium was surrounded by plains where there were lakes and large bogs. Dimantopoulos (4) and M. Smith (5) insist that Pelusium is really surrounded by plains. But the Menologium (6) testifies that Isidore "κατέλαβε τὸ ὄρος τὸ πλησίον κείμενον τοῦ Πηλουσίου". M. Kallistus by saying "... Ἰσίδωρος ὁ τοῦ Πηλουσίου ὄρου κατηγησάμενος" (7), agrees with the Menologium, that there was a mountain there. Also some texts of the 'Life' say that Isidore retired to monastic contemplation in the hill country of Pelusium (8). Of the scholars, Heumann (9), Niemeyer (10), Bonvy (11), Alzog (12), Schenk (13), Leclercq (14), Balanos (15), Cross (16) and Quasten (17) are of the opinion that there was there a mountain or at least a hill on which the monastery of Pelusium was built and where Isidore lived as a monk. There is not any internal evidence which could sufficiently prove that the

1. loc. cit. III p. 371-8

2. ibid., par. 24

3. Diamantopoulos (1926/100) thinks that the word Pelusium has an Egyptian root: 'Phul'. M. Smith (loc. cit. p. 432 note 3) reports that "the modern arabic name for the place means mud"

4. ibid. and 449

5. loc. cit.

6. MG II 7, 293D-296B

7. loc. cit. MG I 46, I 249D

8. E 432

9. loc. cit. p. 5

10. loc. cit. p. 18

11. loc. cit. p. 58-9

12. loc. cit. p. 384

13. PWK IX p. 2068-9

14. CE VIII p. 185

15. loc. cit. p. 12-3

16. ODCC p. 705

17. loc. cit. iii p. 480

area around Pelusium was hill-country. The phrases "ὅτε τῷ ὁρῶν τῆς ὑψηλῆς πολιτείας προσέβαινες" (1) and "σῶζον σῶζε τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον ὁρῶς" (2), must be metaphorically understood; They signify monastic life. Neither could the phrase "κατέλαβέ τις τὴν ἐσχатиάν ἣν οἰκοῦμεν" (3) give any allusion that we might accept the fact that there was a mountain at Pelusium. Therefore it is most probable that the area round Pelusium being near the sea and having wide and continuous lakes and bogs consisted of salt-flats. The city of Pelusium alone was perhaps built on a low hill (4).

In defining more accurately the area of Pelusium, we borrow Hardy's description, according to which "as one came down from Syria, the first Egyptian town was Rhinocorura or Rhinocolura. Further along was the more important centre of Pelusium, which in a way, balanced Alexandria as the eastern gate way of the Country" (5). Let it be noted that Isidore in three cases (6) speaks of Egypt as if it were a different country. Pelusium, however belonged to Egypt, to lower Egypt to be exact, possessing the extreme eastern delta of the Nile. Nothing is today saved from the old Pelusium, except some ruins of a fortress, four thousand yards from the sea.

Isidore's activity mainly took place at Pelusium. He lived in Alexandria probably for 20 or 25 years, but he lived for more than eighty years. So he passed the greater part of his life at Pelusium. When in Pelusium from about 395 to about 435, Isidore was in his maturity and showed his splendid and amazing activity.

The place of Isidore's death cannot be other than at Pelusium. The 'Life' (7) testifies that Isidore became ill, since he as a man had to die and that he died at his monastery at

-
1. I 13, 188A
 2. I 213, 317B. Also see below, chapter V par. 4
 3. I 142, 277A
 4. cf Andreossy: *Mémoire sur le lac Menzaleh* p. 276-7, quoted in Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 75 note 3: "Peluse est située à l'extrémité orientale du lac Menzaleh, entre la mer et les dunes, au milieu d'une plaine rasée, nue et stérile... Le terrain est couvert dans presque toute son étendue d'une croûte saline". See also M. J. Le Père: *Description de l'Égypte*, p. 168, quoted in Bouvy, too.
 5. loc. cit. p. 20
 6. I 152, 285A- I 175, 441B- and IV 207, 1301A
 7. E p. 438

Pelusium and was given a magnificent funeral by the multitudes, which went to see him on his death bed and ask for his last admonitions and wishes. There is no information which could exclude that given by the 'Life'. The Menologium agrees with the 'Life'. Three letters⁽¹⁾ speaking of a serious illness of Isidore, refer to a different illness, since he recovered his health again⁽²⁾.

On the basis of these remarks with regard to when and where Isidore was born, lived, worked and died, and wishing to give a summary of the dates and places, we cite the following table:

350(probably before)	:Isidore's birth at Pelusium
350-370	:At Pelusium, when and where he learned the propaedeutic studies
370	:At Alexandria, for higher studies
370-3	:St Athanasius ordains Isidore at Alexandria
375-390	:Most probably at Alexandria, doing quiet sacerdotal work and devoting himself to the study of classical education and of the Bible
c.390-95	:Removal from Alexandria; settlement at Pelusium
c.390-95 to 400-5	:At Pelusium, working as a priest and Church Teacher
400 or 405-435	:Monk at Pelusium
c.437	:Isidore's death at his monastery, at Pelusium

1. I 224, 324A- III I54, 845B- and IV 49, II00A
2. III I54, 845B

Chapter IV

EDUCATION AND SCHOLARSHIP

A) EDUCATION

I. Studies

There is no doubt that Isidore studied when a youth. His remarkable erudition, the respect paid to him at his time and after causing him to be called "wise in learning"⁽¹⁾, the increased esteem for his wisdom especially in interpreting the Bible, indicate that Isidore dedicated himself to studies. There is no reason to deny this opinion.

But what did Isidore study? His letters tell us that he studied the classics and other ancient pagan writers. Indeed, the fact that in his letters Isidore quotes or shows by them that he knew more than thirty ancient writers from Homer to Philo, leaves no room for any doubt. Further on we shall cite some figures to illustrate it, but it is enough for the moment to state that Isidore studied diligently and knew the Classics and other pagan writers before him. Isidore's letters also show that he studied the Bible very carefully. The fact that his correspondence mainly deals with biblical questions and interpretations and the other fact that he became famous for his interpretations, so that many contemporary with him, bishops or other educated people sought his opinions on biblical questions, or other bishops, theologians etc after him had recourse to his answers, testify that he was a master of the Bible, and that, subsequently, he must have studied to obtain his special knowledge. The Menologium says characteristically that Isidore "εμαθεν ου μόνον τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἕξω, καὶ ἐγένετο σοφός"⁽²⁾. This passage proves that Isidore became wise having learned the ἕξω γράμματα, which means 'non-Christian letters', i.e. he learned the classical education. The phrase "τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς" means that Isidore learned the Bible and most probably the works of some Christian writers. In fact, Isidore's letters show that he read and used some works of Fathers, especially those of Clement of Alexandria, Basil the Great and of Chrysostom. More details concerning Isidore's ac-

1. Severus of Antioch, Letters, book VI, 1 208, 9

2. MG II 7, 293D-296B; The same can be found in the 'Life', 2 p. 436

quaintance with the works of Fathers are given below; it suffices here to state that Isidore actually read some works of some Fathers or Church writers.

In answering now the question what Isidore studied, we say with certainty that he diligently studied the Classics, pre-eminently the Scriptures and also read some works of Greek Fathers and Church writers before him.

Another question now is: When did Isidore study? Undoubtedly he received his early schooling in his native town, i.e. in Pelusium, when he was a child or adolescent; in other words from the year c. 357 to 370, when he was between seven and twenty or ten and twenty three years of age. About the year 370 Isidore must have gone to Alexandria for promoting his education. He must have spent there some years studying, having in the mean time been ordained as a priest. In other words, from his twentieth or twenty third to approximately his thirtieth year, Isidore was studying Classics, the Bible and Fathers. We do not mean that when in Alexandria he was all the time attending lectures at the Catechetical School or elsewhere. It is most probable that Isidore was studying alone for a period.

The question of where Isidore studied is another point which occupied some Scholars. Thus some say that Isidore went to Antioch before 398 to meet Chrysostom and to study near him⁽¹⁾. Others say that Isidore went to Constantinople when Chrysostom was Archbishop there, to study near him⁽²⁾. Both these theories are untrue. There is no internal indication, ~~him~~ ^{him}. Others say that Isidore went to Constantinople when Chrysostom was Archbishop there, to study near him⁽²⁾. Both which oblige us to accept that Isidore studied at Alexandria. These reasons may be: a) Alexandria itself, which at that time was a famous centre of letters. b) The fame and splendour of St Athanasius the Great. c) The brilliant erudition of Didymus the Blind, who at that time was the Headmaster of the Exegetical School of Alexandria, and his fame as a saintly person. d) The fact that Alexandria was Isidore's ecclesiastical area. e) The fact that Alexandria was not far from Pelusium and therefore the fact that he could go to Alexandria without difficulty. f) The fact that most probably Isidore had relatives at Alexandria. g) The relations of the interpretation and of ideas of Isi-

-
1. e.g. The Greeks Meletius of Athens, Th. Pharmakides, Oeconomos ex Oeconomon, quoted in Balanos, loc.cit. p.14 note 2
 2. e.g. the Russian Philaret, loc.cit. p.93

dore with those of the Neo-Alexandrian Exegetical School, represented at that time by St Athanasius and the three Cappadocians. h) The fact that Isidore was in Alexandria between 370-73 when he was ordained by St Athanasius. All these reasons together assert that Isidore, after his encyclical studies at Pelusium, went and studied at Alexandria.

2. Teachers

It is unimportant to know who were Isidore's teachers at Pelusium. Besides, our curiosity, cannot be satisfied, because nothing is certain with regard to it. The question of the later teachers of Isidore, that is of his teachers when he was receiving his academical education, appears more interesting. In defining who was the teacher of Isidore, Scholars have been divided into the following classes:

1. St John Chrysostom was the teacher of Isidore. George Amartolos⁽¹⁾, ninth century, expressed for the first time this opinion. In the fourteenth century, J. Kallistus⁽²⁾ repeated it. From later and contemporary Scholars, those who accepted this statement are: Aistus Senensis⁽³⁾, Barocius⁽⁴⁾, Natalis Alexander Caveus, Fabricius⁽⁵⁾, J. M. Schröckh⁽⁷⁾, Fessler⁽⁶⁾, Bollandists⁽⁸⁾, Meletius of Athens⁽¹⁰⁾, Pharmakides⁽¹¹⁾, Oeconomos⁽¹²⁾, Bober⁽¹³⁾, Kihn⁽¹⁴⁾, Schaff⁽¹⁵⁾, Philaret⁽¹⁶⁾, Tixeront⁽¹⁷⁾ and F. Cayré⁽¹⁸⁾. They think that Isidore either at Antioch or Constantinople became a pupil of Chrysostom, attending his brilliant homilies.

This theory is not true. There is no reason to take G. Amartolos' and Kallistus' statements literally⁽¹⁹⁾. Chrysostom did not

1. Chronicon, IV 202, 3 MG 110, 728B and IV 202, 17 MG 110, 733B:

"... Ἰσιδώρον τινα προσβύτερον... οὐ τὸν ἀσκητὴν καὶ Πηλουσιώτην, μαθητὴν γεγονότα ποτὲ τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, καθὼς οἰονταὶ τινες....."
"Ἐἶχε δὲ μαθητὰς (ὁ Χρυσόστομος)..... ἀσκητὰς δὲ Μάρκον καὶ Νεῖλον, καὶ Ἰσιδώρον τὸν Πηλουσιώτην".

2. E.H. XIV 30 MG 146, 1157A "Νεῖλος τε ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀσκητής, ὃς τε τοῦ Πηλουσίου Ἰσιδωρος καὶ ὁ πολυθρύλλητος ἀσκητής Μάρκος, Ἰωάννη τῷ πάνυ μαθητευθέντες"

3. MG 78, 115

4. quoted in Niemeyer, p. 15

5. quoted in Bouvy, p. 61-2

6. Institutiones Patrologicae, II p. 614

7. loc.cit. XVII p. 521

8. ASS loc.cit. p. 474

10. Quoted in Balanos, p. 14 note 2

11. ibid.

12. ibid.

13. loc.cit. p. 5, 6, 15 and 18

14. loc.cit. p. 964

15. loc.cit. II p. 941

16. loc.cit. pp. 97-9 and 103

17. loc.cit. p. 220-1

18. loc.cit. I p. 571

19. cf. Quasten, III 181

teach in any School at Antioch or at Constantinople. Chrysostom was not a teacher in the special meaning of the term. Chrysostom took officially the office of the preacher at the Cathedral of Antioch in 386, when he was ordained as a priest and became famous at least after the delivery of the homilies 'On the Statues' (387). This means that Isidore who was about 37 years old at that time, i.e. contemporary with Chrysostom, could not easily have been a pupil. Neither could he have been later at Constantinople. If Isidore were a pupil of Chrysostom, then he could not keep silent, after the disgraceful decision of the synod at the Oak (403), when Chrysostom was dethroned⁽¹⁾. Therefore Isidore did not see in person Chrysostom at all. Those letters of Isidore which deal with Chrysostom and his memory, were written after his death⁽²⁾. The letter V 33 does not refer to Chrysostom. Isidore does not mention Chrysostom as his teacher. There is not internal evidence supporting the idea that Isidore heard of Chrysostom. The relationship of many ideas of Isidore with those of Chrysostom does not necessarily mean that the former was a pupil of the latter, for, if so, we have to accept that Isidore also heard of Clement of Alexandria or of Demasthenes with whom Isidore has many relations. L. Bobor's⁽³⁾ argument that if we deny that Isidore was a pupil of Chrysostom we cannot compromise the fact that Isidore studied at the Exegetical School of Alexandria and followed the method of the Exegetical School of Antioch means nothing, because the Neo-Alexandrian School was much different from the ancient Catechetical School which was characterized by the well known allegory. The Neo-Alexandrian School, represented by St Athanasius the Great and the three Cappadocians can easily be compromised with Isidore's method of interpretation. Isidore does not follow only the grammatico-historical method; he also delights in allegory. It is true that Isidore availed himself of the works of Chrysostom which spread very quickly⁽⁴⁾, but this does not mean that Isidore was a pupil of Chrysostom with the special meaning of the term μαθητής. "With the special⁽⁵⁾ of the term 'pupil', Isidore never was a pupil of Chrysostom, either at Antioch or at Constantinople"⁽⁴⁾. Isidore was an admirer of the Great and holy Father and an imitator of his splendid opinions and thoughts. That is all.

⑤ meaning

1. Bouvy: St Jean Chrysostom et St Isidore de Péluse, EO I (1897-8) p.198
2. cf. Balanos, loc.cit. p.16
3. IV 224
4. P.C.Baur, quoted in P.A.Schmid, loc.cit. p.89
5. loc.cit. p. 5

ii. The second class of Scholar is that which on the one hand denies that Isidore heard of Chrysostom, but on the other hand does not tell us who was the teacher of Isidore. This class is represented by Heumann⁽¹⁾, Niemeyer⁽²⁾, Balanos⁽³⁾, Bareille⁽⁴⁾, Diamantopoulou⁽⁵⁾ and Quasten⁽⁶⁾. To this class we can add Tillemont⁽⁷⁾ who is undecided.

iii. The third class of scholar is that, according to which not Chrysostom but someone else was the teacher of Isidore and that this 'someone else' was Didymus the Blind. It was Mingarelli⁽⁸⁾ who for the first time suggested this opinion. Bouvy⁽⁹⁾ repeated it, without supporting it sufficiently. L. Bayer⁽¹⁰⁾ followed Bouvy. G. Bardy⁽¹¹⁾ accepts a likely influence of Didymus on Isidore, without saying if this influence means that the former was a teacher of the latter. Schmid⁽¹²⁾ is undecided, or rather he is against the opinion. Balanos⁽¹³⁾ is clearly of this opinion: "We by no means accept Bouvy's opinion that in the letter V 33 Isidore is referring to Didymus the Blind, says Balanos, because the eye of a blind cannot be fearful and wise". Our opinion is that —→ Didymus could be Isidore's teacher, for the following reasons: a-h) The eight reasons we have cited to prove that Alexandria was the place where Isidore got his academical education⁽¹⁴⁾. i) The fact that apart from St Athanasius, Didymus the Blind was at Alexandria the most learned and important figure whom St. Athanasius placed Head of the Exegetical School of that city⁽¹⁵⁾, position which Didymus occupied for more than half a century. j) The letter V 33 could refer to Didymus the Blind and not to Chrysostom as Shott⁽¹⁶⁾ remarked. The words ἀνὸρ ἄνθρωπος apply to Didymus

⊙ against

1. loc.cit. p. 7-8
2. loc.cit. p.16
3. loc.cit. p.13
4. DTC VIII p.85
5. loc.cit. 1926/III. He seems to suggest with timidity Ammonius and Helladius the pagan grammarians
6. loc.cit. III p. 181
7. loc.cit. IV o. 110
8. De Didymo Commentarius, MG 39, 156-8
9. loc.cit. p.54-5
10. loc.cit. p. 4
11. quoted in Schmid loc.cit. p. 88
12. ibid.
13. loc.cit. p.16 note 2
14. V supra, o.60-1
15. Rufinus, E.H. II, 42 ML 21, 5940
16. MG 78, 1348A

whose fame as an ascetic and saintly person had been established at that time⁽¹⁾. The words οὗ τὸ ὄμμα διδάσκοντος φοβερόν ἐτύγχανε καὶ σοφόν can also apply to Didymus who was blind. It is especially the eye and sight of a blind which are fearful and not of a person who can see. 'Didymus eye was wise' might be a metaphor which means that Didymus himself was wise, which was true and a cause for people to admire him who although blind from his fourth or fifth year, who did not ever learn to read, showed such a brilliant erudition. We cannot say that the phrase ἡ δὲ ὀφρὺς ὑπερβεβλημένη τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς διεσήμενε τὸν νοῦν τῶν διδασκμάτων cannot be referred to Didymus, because when a blind man speaks, his face makes as many grimaces as the face of a person who sees, and this depends rather on the character and not on the eyes. The phrase δεινόν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐνείκελς τῆς θείας σοφίας τὸν ἐρωτᾶ applies especially to Didymus. The only thing which does not suffice us completely is the words 'ἐν ἐτὶ ὅττι ποτε' which mean 'I have met some time' or 'I had discussion some time' and which do not mean 'I was a pupil of someone'. In another case⁽²⁾ the verb ἐνέτυχον means 'I have read' or 'I have learned'. Thus we are not far from the truth if we say that the phrase ἐνέτυχον ποτε ἀνδρὶ ἁγίῳ could mean 'I have met and heard some time a saintly man'. And if he once heard such a holy and wise man whose speech was so attractive and beneficial, could we exclude the possibility that he other times also listened to him? The word ποτε does not mean 'only one time', but it means 'some time' and we think that it does not exclude a repetition of the same thing in the future. After all these remarks it is understood that the whole letter can easily apply to Didymus the Blind. We give now the letter in translation: "I have met and heard some time a saintly man, whose eye when teaching was fearful and wise, because his speech was most attractive; and whose eyebrow which was exceeding the eyes was indicating the meaning of the ideas. And, to say in one word, he on the whole was propitiating, inspiring those who were seeing the love of the divine wisdom"⁽³⁾. The fact that in such a short letter Isidore four times⁽⁴⁾ draws our attention to the eyes of that person whom he heard, indicates that these eyes were not normal and natural as the eyes of all men, but it rather indicates that they had something peculiar which was attracting the attention

-
1. Palladius, L.H. 4. cf. also Sozomenes, E.H. 4, 25 (Antony to Didymus "...Χαῖρε δὲ ὅτι ἔχεις ὀφθαλμοῦς, οἷς καὶ ἄγγελοι βλέπουσι, δι' ὧν καὶ θεὸς θεωρεῖται καὶ τὸ Αὐτοῦ φῶς καταλαμβάνεται."
 2. IV 198, 1285C: ἐνέτυχον ποτε ἱστορίᾳ περσιῇ....
 3. V, 33, 1348B
 4. ὄμμα-ὀφρὺς-ὀφθαλμοῖς-ὀρεῖσιν

of those looking at them. And this 'peculiar thing' can easily be the blindness of the wise Didymus. Finally the fact that this letter comes after the letter V 32 which is addressed to the same addressee and where Isidore speaks of Chrysostom, does not oblige us to accept the fact that both letters deal with the same person, because Isidore ought then to say 'ἐντυχόντες τοῦ τοῦ τῷ τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀνδρὶ' or he ought at least to name again the "all-wise John". k) From Isidore's extant letters there are seven⁽¹⁾ which are addressed to Didymus. Is this Didymus identified with the Blind, and, if that is so, could these letters strengthen the opinion that Didymus was Isidore's teacher? Apart from the letter I 281 which deals with Cappadocians and Gigantius⁽²⁾, the others deal with biblical questions and none of them can exclude the possibility of being sent to Didymus the Blind. Especially the beginning of I 331 can easily be applied to Didymus: "Being wise and searching prudently, you cannot be ignorant of anything. For, having everything in your youth, you have rest at your old age..."⁽³⁾. We are rather justified in saying that the phrase "the heretic people and those who are opposite to the right doctrine are cast out of the kingdom"⁽⁴⁾ could be applied to Didymus who, following Origen, expressed some non-Orthodox conceptions for which he has been anathematized at the fifth Ecumenical Council (553) at Constantinople. G. Bardy⁽⁵⁾, as J. Mingarelli⁽⁶⁾ before him, agrees that these seven letters addressed to Didymus and the other three⁽⁷⁾ addressed to Didymus Scholasticus, are applied to Didymus the Blind. But it is rather sure that the last three letters were sent to a different person as the letter V 206, which speaks of natural sons of Didymus Scholasticus indicates⁽⁸⁾. Didymus the Blind was not married and therefore he had no physical children. The passage does not speak of spiritual children. 1) The relationship between the expressions, way of interpretation and ideas of Didymus the Blind and of Isidore, could also certify the kinship between the two persons. P.A. Schmid⁽⁹⁾ says that "it is uncertain whether and

-
1. I 199, 201, 204, 205, 281, 330 and 331
 2. Gigantius was Duke of Pelusium before 395, Didymus died c. 398
 3. 373A. cf Mingarelli (MG 39, 157B): Haec vero omnia Didymo nostro *m i r i f i c e c o n v e n i u n t*
 4. I 205, 313B
 5. quoted in P.A. Schmid, loc.cit. p. 88
 6. Mingarelli says on IV 206, 1456C: Quae mirum in modum convenient auctori nostro" MG 39, 157BC
 7. IV 152, V 206, 207
 8. 1456C: Ἐν ὅσῳ τοῦ εἰς τὴν αἰὶν καὶ τὴν πρόνοίαν αὐτοῦ κατέστης αἰ τ ῖ ο ς , οὕτω καὶ τοῦ εἰς εἶναι καταστάλης"
 9. loc.cit. p. 88

how much Isidore was influenced by Didymus the Blind...I cannot show any influence of Didymus on Isidore's Christology". He also states that the study of A. Guenther does not elucidate the question, and cites G. Hardy who on the contrary thinks that Didymus' influence upon Isidore is most likely: "With respect to Isidore of Pelusium, the question is less easy to solve, and the influence of Didymus the Blind on him will be more probable" (1). Our opinion is that Didymus influenced Isidore and that there is a good relationship of ideas, expressions and ways of interpreting the Bible, between these two writers (2).

In summing up all we have said on the question who was the teacher of Isidore, we say that Chrysostom must be excluded as Isidore's teacher in the special meaning of the term. The teacher of Isidore when getting his academical education was Didymus the Blind at Alexandria, between the years 370-380. For how long Isidore was attending Didymus' lectures and how frequently we do not know. It is also most probable that Isidore was studying by himself.

B) SCHOLARSHIP

Isidore's erudition is spread over three fields: Bible, Classics and Fathers. We examine his erudition and skilfulness in dealing with the Bible in the second part of this Thesis. Here we try to give a picture of the other two points.

I. St Isidore and ancient pagan writings

a) St Isidore's attitude towards Paganism and pagan writings in general

"Έλληνες and Έλληνισμός in Isidore generally mean pagans and Paganism, except in one case (3), where interpreting Rom. 2, 10 he says that Paul did not mean in this case idolaters but pious people, as e.g. were Melchisedech, Job and Cornelius. With regard to Paganism Isidore many times expressed his opinion which fluctuated from disdain to attack.

Isidore disdained Paganism, because "it was a cunning custom" (4) "consisting of false fables" (5) which ought to be replaced by the Gospel which established a new life. He attacked Paganism because "it was calling the springs of shameful things 'gods'" (6) and because it wanted to deceive people by fraud (7).

1. ibid.

2. V infra, same chapter, par. 2 p. 71-2

3. IV 61, 1120B

4. II 46, 488A

5. I 270, 344A

6. I 96, 249A

7. IV 207, 1300C-1301B

With reference to pagan writings Isidore had not a much better opinion. For, "the philosophy of Greeks was lacking of the truth although it was insisting that it was searching for it. Rhetoric cares only for rhetorical ability and elegance. The art of grammar is proud of teaching the skill of words. If now all these are adorned with the truth, then they will be desirable to prudent men. But if they are opposite to the truth, then they are worthy of disgrace"⁽¹⁾. The writings of the pagan authors are "full of falsehood and worthy of laughter, for everything the say has a passion as its cause or purpose"⁽²⁾. These writings are characterized by a pride of words and an attempt to create fables⁽³⁾. Poetry frequently desires a fable and therefore it has falsehood as material⁽⁴⁾. Thus, being "a learning of loquacity", pagan writings are unworthy of instruction for a Christian who disdained earthly things and has been commanded to love nothing of them⁽⁵⁾. Apart from that, pagan writers not only disagreed but they attacked one another⁽⁶⁾ and although they wrote many books, they did not say important things⁽⁷⁾. "What will the benefit of using the Attic dialect be, when those which were said are hidden in obscurity and need other sayings which would elucidate them?"⁽⁸⁾. Isidore says that "it is better to learn the truth from an illiterate man than to learn the falsehood from a sophist"⁽⁹⁾. It was the general spirit of Christians of that era which was tending to deny everything which could be characterized as heathenish. Many⁽¹⁰⁾ Fathers wrote against Greeks; Isidore imitated them.

But if these conceptions are true, why did Isidore read and study pagan writings? Why did he use the writings and their examples? It is evident that he used them only as a means, never as an end. Isidore himself answered these questions in a letter addressed to the Reader Timothy: "Having as a honeybee collected as much from the outside education as it is useful to our philosophy-for if we must tell the truth they studied and obtained many things because of virtue-leave the rest aside, especially when you see them fighting each other"⁽¹¹⁾. This was a

-
1. III 65, 773B
 2. I 63, 224B
 3. I 369, 392B and IV 6, 1053C
 4. II 228, 665B
 5. I 227, 324C
 6. IV 55
 7. V 28
 8. IV 91, 1152A
 9. IV 67, 1124C
 10. Eusebius of Caesarea: Praeparatio (the first three books) MG 21; Basil the Great, ep. 233; Gregory of Nazianzus: ep. 235; Chrysostom: MG 47, 319-386; Epiphanius: Panarion, MG 41-2
 11. II 3, 457C

new tendency. Origen⁽¹⁾ already advised Gregory Thaumaturgos to avail himself of Greek philosophy. Basil the Great⁽²⁾ and Gregory of Nyssa⁽³⁾ in a way followed Origen. Clement of Alexandria⁽⁴⁾ and Gregory of Nazianzus⁽⁵⁾ attacked those Christians who being *ουατοί* and *ἀναλόγιστοι*⁽⁶⁾ were denying the reading of Classics. Isidore in the aforementioned letter and in III 393 expressed similar conceptions. Many ancient important figures, as e.g. Diogenes, Alexander, Aristides, Phocion, Epaminondas, Demosthenes, Socrates, Pythagoras and others "were the favourable examples and models to Isidore, from the time before the Christian era"⁽⁷⁾.

Isidore disdained pagan writings as a whole; but he availed himself of these writings when it was suitable. He read many, but he kept only what was useful "to our philosophy"; like a honeybee. And even if Isidore used the pagan writings because they could give some benefit, he availed himself of the *οὐδωτός* rather than of the *εὐωτός*. A beautiful letter addressed to the monk Peter, elucidates Isidore's position towards the pagan writers: "The words of the divine Wisdom (i. e. Holy Scripture) are simple, but the meaning is extremely lofty; the phrases of the outside wisdom are splendid, but if they are transformed into action, they are worthless. But if someone could grasp the meaning of the former and the external form of phrases of the latter, then he could be considered as the wisest of men. Because it is possible for eloquence to be a means to the supermundane wisdom if the former were to the latter as the body to the soul or as the flute to the flautist, if it did not create by itself any new doctrine but simply interpret the heavenly thoughts of the divine Wisdom"⁽⁸⁾.

b) St Isidore's use of ancient pagan writings

It is true that in many cases Isidore disdained and attacked the ancient pagan writings as being full of falsehood and serving the "gunning custom", i. e. Paganism. But he, nevertheless,

1. ep. I MG. II, 88-92

2. Exhortation to Youths.. MG 31, 563-90

3. De instituto Christiano, excerpt in MG 46, 287-306

4. Strom. I, I, 8

5. Hom. 45, II MG 36, 508f

6. *ibid.*

7. L. Bayer, loc. cit. p. 9. cf N. Capo: De Isidori Pelusiotaе epistolarum locis ad antiquitatem pertinentibus, Bess IK p. 342

8. V 281, I500D

had many times recourse to them as his letters illustrate. More precisely speaking, Isidore's letters give testimony that he used directly or not some thirty two ancient writers, some of them richly and systematically and others only incidentally. Three hundred and twenty seven letters of Isidore remind us of 259 passages from ancient writings and authors. This means that in every six or seven of his letters one testifies to his knowledge and use of these writings. But this does not mean that all these letters have a direct and accurate quotation from an ancient writer. The word for word quotations are but few. Only some times there are direct quotations. In most cases there are altered and cut quotations or only two or three characteristic words. And in some cases there is only a similar idea which is expressed or there is the entirely opposite idea which reminds us of the respective idea of an ancient writer. We must note here that in some cases Isidore had a second-hand knowledge of some ancient writers⁽¹⁾, through other writings of Fathers. But all these allusions which are scattered in Isidore's letters justify us in saying that he knew and used the respective ancient writers and indicate very clearly how vast his classical erudition was.

The ancient writer whom Isidore perfectly knew and quoted is Demosthenes⁽²⁾, the rhetor par excellence⁽³⁾, τὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος κρείττατον⁽⁴⁾. One hundred of Isidore's letters include a phrase or opinion from Demosthenes, or his name. Undoubtedly Isidore read Demosthenes' works and perhaps had a copy of them⁽⁵⁾. After Demosthenes, Plato comes second. His name, phrases or ideas, are found in seventy letters of Isidore. For Isidore, Plato was "the chief of the outside philosophers"⁽⁶⁾, he who was the most educated of all and who knew Socrates better than any other⁽⁷⁾. Demosthenes was for Isidore the first rhetor, Plato was for him the first philosopher; and that is why Isidore called Plato κολοφών⁽⁸⁾ and 'treasure of the Greeks'⁽⁹⁾. Undoubtedly Isidore read Plato's entire works. From the other writers, Isidore fre-

-
1. e.g. Lucian, Libanius and Plotinus. cf L. Bayer, loc.cit. p.98
 2. L. Bober (loc.cit. p.7-8) is wrong when saying that Isidore borrowed from Plato, Homer, Aristotle, Seneca and Demosthenes. Demosthenes must be first in the rank.
 3. V 465
 4. III 81
 5. cf L.J. Sicking: Isidorus van Pelusium, in De Katholiek, vol. 130 (1906) p.113-4, where a comparison of Isidore's V 126 and of Demosthenes (III 2,3) is made. This comparison indicates a dependence on Demosthenes's works
 6. V 72 and IV 28
 7. V 202, I 453D
 8. II 146, 593B
 9. V 387, 477

quently uses Philo⁽¹⁾, Homer⁽²⁾ who was the chief of poets⁽³⁾, and Isocrates⁽⁴⁾ who was peculiarly sympathetic to Isidore.

In more detail, the picture of use of ancient writings by Isidore as his letters illustrate, is as follows⁽⁵⁾:

A) P R O S E

1. R h e t o r s

a) D e m o s t h e n e s (6)

1. First Olynthiac	I4	In Isidore's	II 28, 476A
2. " "	20	"	II 146, 592A
3. " "	23	"	II 297, 725A
4. " "	16	"	IV 70, 1129A
5. " "	26	"	V 280, 1500C
6. " "	6	"	V 508, 1617D
7. Second	23	"	II 164, 617A-III 385, 1028C-V 60, 1361D and V 424, 1577A
8. " "	13	"	IV 18, 1065D-68A
9. " "	12	"	IV 85, 1145C; cf II 298 V 13 and V 265
10. " "	33	"	V 99, 1384B
11. Third	2 and 3	"	III 49, 764C-V 126, 139
12. " "	17	"	III 219, 904A
13. " "	9	"	V 120, 1396A
14. " "	11f	"	V 131, 1400C and 1401A
15. " "	22	"	V 498, 1616A
16. " "	19	"	V 501, 1616C-D-II 146, 601B and II 197, 641D- 644A

1. in 17 letters

2. in 17 letters

3. V 162

4. in 16 letters

5. Mainly three studies helped us very much in composing the following lists, to wit: 1) N. Capo: *De Sancti Isidori Pelusiotaes epistularum locis ad antiquitatem pertinentibus*, in Bess. VI (1901-2), series II, I 342-363; 2) L. Bayer: *Isidors von Pelusium Klassische Bildung*, in *Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur und Kirche*, by A. Ehrhard-J. P. Kirshh, Paderborn 1915, vol. 13, zweites Heft; 3) L. Fruechtel: *Isidoros von Pelusion als Benuezer des Clemens Alexandrinus und anderer Quellen*, in PhW vol. 58 pp. 61-4, and: *Neue Quellennachweise zu Isidoros von Pelusion*, *ibid.* pp. 764-68. Bayer's work is so far the most complete and perfect study on the subject. The footnotes under the letters in Migne are also useful. Bouvy's (*loc. cit.* p. 47-8) cita-

17. First Philippic	0	In Isidore's	II 105
18. " "	6	"	IV 18
19. " "	2	"	V 177
20. " "	37	"	V 369
21. Second	12	"	II 60
22. " "	27	"	II 174; cf. III 251 and V 186, 1437B
23. " "	11	"	V 342, 1535B
24. Third	27	"	II 127, 667D
25. " "	76	"	III 95, 604C
26. " "	36	"	III 259, 939B
27. " "	55	"	III 394, 1033A; cf V 37
28. " "	67	"	V 426; cf III 52
29. " "	5	"	V 521; cf. II 215
30. Fourth	2-3	"	II 180
31. " "	54	"	III 394; cf V 424
32. " "	7	"	V 17, 1536A
33. On Freedom	12	"	II 146, 600A
34. " "	15	"	II 240
35. " "	21	"	V 175
36. About Halonesos	26	"	III 367
37. " "	I	"	V 274
38. Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Χερ/σου	24	"	II 127, 586D; cf III 227
39. " "	49	"	II 171
40. " "	23	"	II 165
41. " "	46	"	V 51
42. " "	73	"	V 290
43. Πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν	18	"	V 498
44. Περὶ τοῦ Συμποριῶν	24	"	III 259, 939A; cf V 336
(cf III Philip. 5)			
45. " "	23	"	V 49 and II 187, 609C
46. " "	I	"	V 53 and II 231
47. Περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου	262	"	II 22; cf. II 146, 221, V 52, 85
48. " "	152	"	II 59
49. " "	122	"	II 83; cf II 54
50. " "	65	"	II 108

are very limited and inadequate.

6. There are 70 passages from 17 works of Demosthenes in 100 letters of Isidore.

51. Περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου	4	In Isidore's	II 146
52. " "	129	"	II 163; cf II 278 and V 340
53. " "	3	"	II 246, 685C
54. " "	159	"	III 152, 843C; cf II 121, 127, III 258, V 147
55. " "	262	"	III 216, 699B
56. " "	18	"	III 259, 937C
57. " "	323	"	IV 218
58. " "	38	"	V 99 and III 30
59. " "	158	"	V 195
60. " "	258	"	V 388; cf II 4
61. Περὶ Παρακρεσβ.	276	"	II 92; cf IV 184
62. " "	136	"	II 216
63. " "	195	"	III 81
64. To Leptines	102	"	II 216
65. " "	143	"	II 227
66. " "	74	"	V 465
67. Against Timocr.	104	"	III 260
68. " "	6	"	V 22
69. " "	7	"	V 151
70. " Aristog.	28	"	III 360

b) I s o c r a t e s (I)

71. To Demonikus	8C	"	II 128, 573A
72. " "	3B	"	II 146, 592B and V 186, 1441A
73. " "	27D	"	III 84, 792A
74. " "	5D (2)	"	IV 155, 1240C
75. " "	2B (3)	"	IV 162, 1248C
76. " "	5E	"	V 13 and 40
77. " "	5A	"	V 340, 1535C
78. " "	4C and 3B	"	V 528, 1625B
79. Παναγυρικὸς (adaptation)		"	IV 67
80. Apophthegmata	B4	"	V 35, 1348CD
81. Sixth letter	418B	"	V 114, 1392B
82. ?		"	II 209, 649B
83. ?		"	V 23, 383

1. Thirteen allusions in 16 letters of Isidore
2. Fruechtel (loc.cit.p.62) thinks that this quotation of Isidore's is similar to Isocrates' only accidentally, whereas it is almost the same with the 'Lemma φιλοσίμωνος' in John of Damascus II 13, 147
3. N.Capp (loc.cit.p.346) refers to 'To Demonikus' 1A

c) Aischines(1)

84. Against Ctesiphon	(2) 52	In Isidore's	IV 205, 1297B
85. "	170(3)	"	V 20, 1326C
86. "	224	"	V 287, 1504B

11. Historians

a) Thucydides(4)

87. III 39, 4	"	II 296; of IV 78
88. IV 59, 3(5)	"	III 224
89. I 137, and 138, 3	"	IV 205
90. III 37, 3	"	V 196, 1439B and V 477, 1603B
91. II 63, I	"	V 546
92. III 39, 4	"	V 59

b) Xenophon(6)

93. Memorabilia	I 6, 10	"	II 19 and 23
94. "	I 3, 9 and I 8, 1	"	III 66
95. "	I 1, II-14	"	V 202, 1453C
96. Cyropaedia	V I, 16	"	III 62 and 66, 775C
97. "	V I, 24	"	III 72
(cf Oeconom. 21, 12)			

c) Herodotus(7)

98. VII 50, 3 (Sob.Flor. 7,33)	"	III 397, 1036A
--------------------------------	---	----------------

1. Three indirect passages in three letters. Isidore perhaps read the homily against Ctesiphon; cf Bayer loc.cit.p.19
2. Cape(loc.cit. p.353) observed that we are not very sure whether Isidore got this phrase from Aischines, because it occurs also in Demosthenes. But the words ἐκ Αἰσχίνου "con declare that Isidore had in mind Aischines.
3. The similarity of these two passages is very limited, despite Bayer's (loc.cit.p.19) opinion
4. Six passages in eight of Isidore's letters. Seemingly Isidore did not read Thucydides very well
5. The epigram is completely preserved only in Thucydides, so we can say that Isidore got it from him.
6. Five quotations in seven of Isidore's letters. It is probable that Isidore read Xenophon
7. Bayer(loc.cit. p.36) accepts that Isidore did not read Hero-

iii. Philosophers

a) Plato(I)

99. Politeia	II 364AD	In Isidore's II 12	
100. "	VIII 550C, 555A		
	VII 415ff and		
	III 416	"	II 146, 593B
101. "	I 332Aff	"	II 159
102. "	VIII 562B	"	III 24
103. "	I 331AB	"	III 172
104. "	II 375B	"	III 291
105. "	II 358A	"	IV 5, 1053B
106. "	VIII 516E	"	V 11
107. "	IA 579B	"	V 27, 176-7, 196, 221
108. "	VIII 533D	"	V 52
109. "	VIII 563E	"	V 73
110. "	II 361A	"	V 149
111. "	VI 491E	"	V 477, 1603C
112. Phaedon	II 13f	"	I 96 and 379
113. "	66C	"	II 146, 593C
114. "	107C	"	II 204
115. "	69D	"	II 279
116. "	106E	"	III 248
117. "	107C	"	IV 22, 1072B
118. "	IIIA and II 4A	"	IV 47
119. "	65A and 66BC	"	IV 125, 1204A
120. "	66C	"	V 386
121. ?		"	V 202, 1456A (2)
122. Timaeos	37A	"	IV I
123. "	28C	"	IV 58; cf III 34, 775A
124. "	41CD(not accurate)	"	IV 125, 1201C
125. "	69C	"	V 64
126. "	37D-38C and 39ff	"	V 266
127. Protagoras	343B	"	I 99 and II 38
128. "	324B	"	II 53, 497B
129. "	339 and 340D	"	II 56

dot, since he did not use him. But the fact that Isidore did not use Herodot, does not necessarily mean that the former did not read the latter. Apart from that, Isidore uses in one case Herodot, as Fruschtel(p.63) points out, cf IV 198

1. 59 citations from 17 works of Plato in 70 letters of Isidore

2. Isidore himself attributes this phrase to Plato, but Capo(loc. cit. p.347) and Bayer (loc.cit.p.50) insist that nowhere in Plato we can find such a phrase.

I30.	Gorgias	473A, 509C	In Isidore's	II 257
I31.	"	476(2)	"	III 26
I32.	"	469C, 474B	"	III 390 and 100
I33.	"	492	"	V 99
	(cf Politeia	IV 430E)	"	V 387
I34.	Alkibiades	I 109DE	"	
I35.	"	II 140 (cf Poli-	"	III 99, 805D
	tela I 348D)		"	III 154, 848D
I36.	"	II 141CE	"	III 171
I37.	"	II 143A	"	III 70
I38.	Apologia	29D	"	III 241
I39.	"	21D	"	IV 30
I40.	"	17C	"	II 107
I41.	Cratylus	413C	"	IV 114, 1185B and
I42.	435C	435C	"	IV 127
I43.	"	400C	"	IV 163, 1252A
I44.	Axiarchos	365E	"	III 133, 833A
I45.	Laws	V 728BC	"	III 36; cf V 225, 164
I46.	"	III 701C	"	III 113
I47.	"	II 606A	"	IV 4, 1051C
I48.	"	IX 873D	"	V 287
I49.	Phaedros	236D	"	II 148(2)
I50.	"	229E	"	IV 162
I51.	"	248A	"	V 125
I52.	Theaitetos	176C	"	II 162
I53.	"	176B	"	V 11; cf V 95
I54.	Philebos	22C (33C)	"	IV 5, 1053A
I55.	Symposion	389A	"	V 202
I56.	Symposion	173A	"	I 3
I57.	Sophistes	229ff	"	IV 21, 1069C

b) Aristotle (b)

I58.	Nic. Ethics	IX 8, 1168B and	"	III 145
		VIII 7, 1157B, 36	"	
I59.	"	II 6ff, 1107B, 3 and	"	III 321
		1107B, 9	"	
I60.	"	VII 12, 1160B, 2 and	"	IV 143
		III 194	"	

1. cf Politeia X 615; According to Fruechtel (loc. cit., p. 63-4) this phrase belongs to Sophocles, fr. 877M: "Εἰ δὲ αὖτε εὐρακας, δεινὸν καὶ καθεῖν αὖ δέει"

2. L. Bayer is not very sure for the similarities of I49-I57. Fruechtel testifies for the items I49 and I52

3. Eight passages in eight of Isidore's letters. Isidore probably knew only the Nicomachean Ethics

I61. Nic. Ethics	III 3, III2A, 18ff	In Isidore's	IV 205, 1297A
I62. "	V 10	"	V 7
I63. "	I 7, 1028A, 32	"	V 108
I64. Eth. End.	II 11, 1228A, 2. 17	"	III 102
I65. Categ.	I	"	III 92

c) Epikuros (1)

I66. (mentioned)	"	I 450, IV 94
------------------	---	--------------

d) Diogenes Cynecus (2)

I67. VI 2, 54	"	III 66
---------------	---	--------

e) Democritus (3)

I68. Diels Fragm. 51	"	I 437
I69. " " 34	"	I 259
I70. " " 145	"	III 232; of III 259

iv. Others

a) Hippocrates

I71. ed. Kuehn I 7	"	II 16, 79
I72. ? (Isidore knew it probably through Plutarch)	"	V 528

b) Arion Didymus

I73. Diels 458 fr. 21	"	II 43, 485A
I74. " 462	"	II 72
I75. " 451	"	IV 125, III3A

1. Most probably Isidore did not read Epikuros
2. Bayer (loc.cit.p.65) attributes this phrase to Diogenes Cynecus. Capo (loc.cit.p.354) thinks that Isidore is referring to Diogenes Laertius, although he refers to both. Capo also attributes to Diogenes Laertius I 4, 2 and II 5, 4 the letters V 6 and V 331 respectively (loc.cit.p.355-6)
3. The first and second citations from Democritus, were known to Isidore most probably through Clement of Alexandria. Isidore had only a second-hand knowledge of the philosophers before Socrates. cf L.Bayer, loc.cit. p.46

c) A e t i o s

176.	Diels	339f	In Isidore's	II 273
177.	"	357, 548, 432, 341, 343	"	IV 58, III 2AB and III 3A
178.	"	358	"	IV 192
179.	"	392, 387, 310	"	V 125

d) P r o v e r b s

180.	Isidore	I 18: Κατὰ πετρῶν σκαίρειν καὶ καθ' ὕδατων γράφειν
181.	"	II 28, 127, 145: Μὴ κακῶ τὸ κακὸν ἰδῆσθαι
183.	"	II 94: Λιθίστα σμήχειν, καλινυδρίαν ἄδειν
183.	"	III 320: Μηδὲν ἀγαν, μέτρον ἀριστον, γυνῶσι σαυτὸν
184.	"	V 92: Ἀνερρίψθαι γὰρ κύβος
185.	"	V 242: Ἀ μὴ δεῖ ποιεῖν, μηδὲ ὑπονοεῖ ποιεῖν

v. P o s t - C l a s s i c s

a) L u c i a n

186.	ed. Jacobitz	II 3f	"	I 27
187.	?		"	IV 56, II 050

b) P l u t a r c h

188.	Mor.	183f	"	II 62 and V 383
189.	?(1)		"	II 42; cf. II 146 592C
190.	Apophthegm. Antig.	II 183D(2)	"	IV 175, 1265D

c) G a l e n

191.	Περὶ Ἰκποκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος ἀρεσκόντων		"	
	VII 7 vol. V, 643 ed. Kuechn		"	IV 125, II 970

d) P l o t i n u s

192.	Enn. I	I, p. I, 23f	"	III 131
------	--------	--------------	---	---------

1. cf. N. Capo, loc. cit. p. 358

2. According to Capo, ibid. p. 357, the letters II 74 and III 54 remind us also of Plutarch

e) L i b a u i u s

193. Mentioned and cited In Isidore's II 42

vi. Jewish and Hellenistic Literature

a) J o s e p h u s

194. Antiquities	VIII 7, 3	"	II 66
195. "	XVIII 63,	"	III 19
196. "	XVIII 126	"	IV 96, 11600
197. "	XVIII 63	"	IV 205
198. De Bel. Jud.	VII 360ff	"	III 257, 926B

b) P h i l o

199. Qu. in Gen.	I 23	"	III 243
200. " "	III 48	"	IV 6
201. " "	IV 99	"	III 288; cf III 179
202. " Exod.	II 110A	"	III 362
203. De Vita Mos.	I 31 (174)	"	III 160
204. " "	I 25 (141)	"	IV 87
205. " "	II 5 (27)	"	V 169
206. " "	II 99	"	II 143
207. " "	I 37ff	"	III 19 and 91, 7880
208. De Somn.	II 21 (147)	"	III 104
209. " "	II 24 (164)	"	II 109
210. De spec. leg.	III 13 (76)	"	II 215
211. De Jos.	2 (5)	"	III 356
212. De mut. nom.	3 (17)	"	IV 155
213. De an.	I 100	"	V 302

B) P O E T R Y

1. E p i c

a) H o m e r

214. Ilias	AV 348, AXII 60	"	II 21, 4710, V 231
215. "	II 489	"	II 231
216. "	AVII 5	"	III 31, 749B
217. "	AVII 265	"	III 70
218. "	AVI 856 or AXIII 103	"	IV 125, 12000
219. "	AXII 729 (cf Odys. VIII 167)	"	V 3
220. "	AA 341 (cf Odys. VII 41)	"	V 29

221. Ilias	IA	225-306 (Odysseus)		
	V	434-606 (Phoenix)		
	V	684-643 (Aias)	In Isidoro's	V 444
223. Odyssea	IV	418 (cf. XIII 289)	"	II 89, 583A
223. "	AI	315-17	"	II 228
224. "	XIII	347	"	IV 30
225. "	I	29-44 (cf. II. XVI 433)	"	IV 203, 1293B
226. "	XIV	58 (208)	"	V 407
227. "	XVIII	130	"	V 162, 1419A
228. "	V	69	"	V 413
229. "	XV	400	"	V 546

b) H o s i o d u s

230. Erga	296	"	II	50
231. "	352	"	III	294, 969B
232. "	737	"	IV	47

c) O r p h i c a

233. Fragg.	I I	"	II	211
-------------	-----	---	----	-----

ii. L y r i c a l

a) P i n d a r

234. Pyth.	VIII	95	"	II 166
235. "	IV	273	"	IV 217
236. Nom.	VII	74	"	III 322
237. Olymp.	VI	9ff	"	V 546

iii. T r a g i c

a) E u r i p i d e s

338. Medea	I 418	"	III	160
339. Phoin. Nauck.	623 fr. 812	"	III	235
340. "	" fr. 1024	"	IV	35, 1085D
241. "	" fr. 1036	"	V	196, 275
242. Alc.	626f	"	IV	125, 1200D
243. ?		"	III	287, 964C
244. ?		"	IV	96
245. Phoenis.	S 46	"	IV	58, III 136

b) S o p h o c l e s

246. Elektra	945	In Isidore's	V	546
247. Fragm.	209	"	IV	129, 1209A
248. ?		"	III	26
249. ?		"	III	52

c) C h a i r e m o u

250. Mentioned	"	V	244
----------------	---	---	-----

d) C h o i r e l o s

251. Mentioned	"	II	284, V 236
----------------	---	----	------------

iv. C o m i c a l

a) E u p o l i s

252. Mentioned	"	IV	205, 1297B
----------------	---	----	------------

b) A r i s t o p h a n e s

253. Mentioned	"	III	98, 805B
254. "	"	V	331

c) M e n a n d e r

255. ed. Meineke	IV 209 fr. I 7	"	V	444
256. Floril.	37, 19	"	V	213
257. Athen.	13.559E	"	V	264
258. ?		"	II	297
259. ?		"	IV	35, 1086D

Apart from the afore cited lists, Isidore mentions in his letters some other ancient wise men or important writers, namely: Socrates⁽¹⁾, Pythagoras⁽²⁾, Lysias⁽³⁾, Isaios⁽⁴⁾, Chrysip-

-
1. I II, II 279, III 66, 154, IV 55, 205, V 164, 166, 202
 2. IV 125, V 558
 3. IV 91
 4. IV 91

pus(1), Cicero(2), Livius(3) and Diodorus(4)

From the letters of Isidore we understand that he used the ancient pagan writings only as a means and never as a purpose. He had recourse to pagan writings in order to strengthen his opinion, only when those to whom he was writing were pagans or delighted in pagan writings.

The amount of the citations of Isidore from pagan writings is quite considerable, and one could perhaps say that Isidore was not an important writer, since he was many times borrowing from others. This is not true⁽⁵⁾, because the word for word passages from the Classics and other ancient writers are very few. The greater part of references consists of altered and transformed passages or opinions. This means that Isidore read and digested the writings and then he produced a new product which unquestionably belongs to him. Apart from that, Isidore's excellence does not depend on his erudition, but it depends on his excellent personality and high moral conceptions and ecclesiastical efforts⁽⁶⁾. These lists, however, show the extent of his classical erudition and perhaps indicate who from the ancient writers were read at Isidore's time. They signify also that Isidore did not know any other language than Greek.

Finally, Isidore's theoretical attitude against the pagan writings and his actual use and borrowings from them, show the new tendency of Christians to avail themselves of what was condemned during the previous Christian centuries. If we say that Isidore contributed by his letters to the reconciliation of Christians with the ancient spirit, we tell the truth.

2. His knowledge of Church Fathers and writers

There is no doubt that Isidore, living in an era when many works of Fathers and Church Writers had already appeared and having studied in Alexandria which was an important centre of letters, had a good acquaintance with the writings of some Fathers

-
1. V 558
 2. V 340, 465
 3. V 504
 4. V 219, according to Fruchtel, loc.cit. p.64 and 767
 5. Not only Isidore, but other Fathers as well who were acquainted with the Classics, used their writings. The writings of Clement of Alexandria, to cite only one example, remind us of 325 ancient pagan writers, Classics and others. There are more than 600 quotations from those writers in the works of Clement, as Otto Staehlin(GCS:Clement Alexandrinus, vol. IV p.30-59) points out.
 6. cf L. Bayer, loc.cit. p. 102

before him. The demonstration of the parallel opinions or expressions of Isidore with other Fathers and Church writers, would be an interesting and useful study, especially since no one so far dedicated himself to such a work. The footnotes of Possin and Rittershaus under the letters of Isidore in Migne's edition could be useful enough if they were accurate. Unfortunately they are indefinite and not clear. But even so, they could give some help in making the first step. And although no one pointed out the parallels of Isidore and of other Fathers, still some Scholars incidentally reported some similarities of Isidore's opinions and expressions with other Fathers. We gathered as many suggestions as we could and we added our own. May the lists which follow be a poor contribution to the whole subject.

O. Staehlin in his edition of the works of Clement of Alexandria⁽¹⁾ pointed out eighteen parallel passages of Clement and Isidore. Fruechtel⁽²⁾ found another nineteen borrowings of Isidore from Clement. Later on⁽³⁾ Fruechtel added five new similarities between these two Fathers. We add here ten new ones.

Isidore was ordained by St Athanasius about whom, writing to Cyril of Alexandria and letting him know his opinion about the two Natures of Christ, he declares: "You could not deny this opinion, possessing on the matter many consents of our holy Father Athanasius the Great, a man who exceedingly searched the divine mysteries"⁽⁴⁾. This incidental passage says that Isidore was considering St Athanasius as a holy, great and wise Father, who was par excellence the authority of dogmatic formulations. P. A. Schmid thinks that "we cannot prove somewhere a direct dependence of Isidore from Athanasius, although we find similar opinions against the confusion of the Natures of Christ in, for instance, the epistle to Epictet⁽⁵⁾ and in I 102 and 496"⁽⁶⁾, but there are similarities between the two Fathers. Schmid himself pointed out one; Rittershausius⁽⁷⁾ remarked a rather direct borrowing of Isidore from St Athanasius. Henri Gregoire⁽⁸⁾ reminds us of another similarity. This is: Athanasius' *Fragmenta exegetica* MG 27, 3 col. 1565 and Isidore's I 132. On the whole Isidore follows the Nicene

1. CCS, vol. IV p. 64

2. loc. cit. pp. 61-4

3. ibid. p. 767-8

4. I 323, 369B

5. MG 26, 1049-1070

6. loc. cit. p. 86

7. MG 78, III 5-6 note 92

8. Les Sauterelles de S. Jean-Baptiste, in Byz vol. V p. 115ff

Christological formulation⁽¹⁾ which means that he follows St Athanasius. If there are not any relations of teaching between the two Fathers, it happens for two reasons: Because St Athanasius dealt ----- especially with dogmatic teaching and St Isidore mainly with moral teaching and because there are unknown similarities between the two, but no one so far systematically tried to find them⁽²⁾.

St Basil the Great was for Isidore "the Father who regulated the customs by a rule of philosophy, having been inspired by God"⁽³⁾. He was a Cappadocian but entirely from Gigantius and his colleagues. He belonged to the *ἐκτετακτοὶ καὶ κατὰ κράτος* who, together with the two Gregories "enlightened the ends of the earth by the light of their lives and admonition"⁽⁴⁾. We may then expect that, when possible, Isidore availed himself of St Basil's works and thoughts. The list which follows points out many parallel opinions, ways of expression between the two and borrowings of Isidore from Basil.

A casual examination has shown that there is some kinship of ideas between St Gregory of Nazianzus and Isidore. We are sure that the relations are greater, but no one searched the works of these two Fathers for the purpose of marking the parallel ideas.

Tillemont⁽⁵⁾ assumes that the letter I 126 was sent to St Gregory of Nyssa (d. 393) and it seems to be probable, although we cannot ascertain it. The first two lines, however, could support Tillemont's opinion. These lines say that Isidore had got a letter from the bishop Gregory who was asking him on Gen. IV 24ff; that Isidore was ashamed because the letter was extensive or it was sent far from the place where Isidore was and that he did not anticipate himself being proud because Gregory was asking his opinion. If it is true that this letter was sent to Gregory of Nyssa, it already signifies a certain relation between Isidore and Gregory. We could also point out some similarities of opinion: e.g. Isidore's I 241 and Gregory's Contra Eunomium MG 45, 433; and Isidore's II 143 (III 27, 149) and Gregory's MG 45, 17-20 and 644. There are undoubtedly some more relations.

About the relations of Isidore with Chrysostom we have said enough. Isidore admired the great Father and fought for restoring his memory, but the former was not a pupil of the latter. There remains to point out the kinship of ideas between the two Fathers although it is quite a difficult task. No one gave us a list of

from

1. IV 99, II 64B-II 65A

2. cf Severus of Antioch, CSCO ser. IV vol. VI p. 185

3. I 61, 224A

4. I 158, 289A

5. loc. cit. p. 110

all the similarities of opinion and expression of Chrysostom and Isidore, although all agree that they are many. Neither have we composed a full list of the parallel extracts of these two Fathers, but, having gathered all the suggestions found in some studies and added our own suggestions, we give a list which, although fuller than the suggestions of other Scholars and indicative of how much Isidore availed himself of Chrysostom's works, is merely a simple contribution.

Isidore's relations with Cyril of Alexandria have already been described⁽¹⁾. We may add here that we cannot insist that Isidore availed himself of the teaching of Cyril, either because Isidore's letters give ground for the opposite opinion, or because when Cyril was on the stage as the most important Figure, Isidore had already formulated his teaching, proceeding Cyril.

One or two similarities between St Ignatius, Justin the Martyr and Isidore have been pointed out in Migne's edition of Isidore's letters⁽²⁾. Some parallel opinions of Isidore with some Latin Fathers⁽³⁾ happened accidentally. It is most probable that Isidore did not know Latin.

From other Church writers, there are marked similarities between Isidore and Origen⁽⁴⁾, although the former wrote against the latter⁽⁵⁾, between Isidore and Theodoret⁽⁶⁾ and especially between Isidore and Didymus the Blind⁽⁷⁾.

Before we cite the lists, we must stress that all these similarities do not prove that Isidore depended on the works of other Fathers. They simply indicate that his opinion coincided with that of other Fathers or that he in some cases availed himself of some of their works. If we except only a few direct quotations, the other similarities signify that Isidore read and digested other works and produced an entirely new output. What we have said with regard to the similarities with ancient pagan writings is also valid here. Apart from that Isidore was not the only Father who used works of other Fathers.

1. V supra pp. 34-7

2. I 476, IV 183, 145, 165

3. Especially with Cyprian, Tertulian, Augustine and Hieronymus

4. Isidore: II 3, 457C - Origen: To Gregory the Wonderworker I, 1f;

" : III 92, 796C - " : In Jeremias 20, 1

5. IV 163, 1248D-1253A

6. Isidore: IV 205, 1297B - Theodoret's ep. 73 MG 83, 1241C

" : V 184, 1433C - " Graecorum affectionum Curatio I MG 83, 783f

7. See below, 'Lists'

Many other availed themselves of, e.g. Clement of Alexandria⁽¹⁾. As happens today, so at that time an exchange of views, opinions and expressions was taking place. Karl Krumbacher⁽²⁾ points out that all later Orthodox writers were depending on the writings of the earlier Orthodox writers. This dependence shows the insistence of all Orthodox to the Tradition. Besides, no one produces something entirely new. Everyone's theory is based on something which was done before him.

And now the lists:

a) Clement of Alexandria and Isidore⁽³⁾

1.	Protreptikos	I	.Staehlin	I	6, 13	In Isidore's	I	259
N 2.	"	IV	"	K	48, 18-9	"	I	353, 3840
N 3.	"	VI	"	I	52, 15-6 and	"	V	184, 14330
	(cf. Strom. I 20)	"	"	I	63, 25	"	I	92
4.	"	X	"	I	68, 10	"	II	151, 605D
5.	"	X	"	I	78, 23	"	V	142
6.	"	XII	"	I	84, 35	"	I	435
7. Paedagogos	I, 2	"	"	I	92, 3-8	"	I	457
8.	"	I, 2	"	I	93, 15-9	"	I	438, 424B
9.	"	I, 5	"	I	98, 9; 15 and	"	I	442
				I	99, 14	"	I	451, 4290
10.	"	I, 6	"	I	109, 19 and	"	I	453
				I	110, 3	"	II	53, 4960
11.	"	I, 7	"	I	122, 16 and	"		
				I	114, 9	"		
12.	"	I, 7	"	I	123, 26 and	"		
				I	124, 1	"		
13.	"	I, 8	"	I	129, 22 (cf	"		
	"	III, 11	"	I	283, 16)	"		

1. e.g. With Clement's Strom I 5, 28 (cf. I I, 18) and Protr. I 6, 18 the following agree: Origen (To Greg. Thaum. I II), Basil the Great (MG 31, 563ff and 568-9C), Gregory of Naz. (MG 37, 1592ff), Isidore (II 3, 457C) etc. O. Staehlin in his edition of the works of Clement of Alexandria (IV 59-66) declares that more than 600 quotations from the writings of 46 Fathers and other Church writers have similarities with Clement's writings. For example, Hippolytus' writings show 39 similarities with Clement's works (p. 62-3); John of Damascus' writings show 141 similarities with Clement's (p. 63-4); The works of Maximus the Confessor show 31 similarities and Theodoret's writings show 135 similarities (p. 65-6). Clement himself quotes or refers to 38 Church writers before him. Among them are some heretics. For example there are 21 similarities between him and Hermas (p. 28) 24 similarities between him and Barnabas and 52 similarities between him and Clement of Rome.

2. History of Byzantine Literature, Greek transl. by G. Soteriades

14.	Paedagogos	I, 8	Stachlin	I 136, 23-5	In Isidore's	I 444
15.	"	I, 9	"	I 136, 26	"	I 346, 380D
16.	"	I, 9	"	I 138, 2-4	"	I 381
17.	"	I, 9	"	I 141, 19-23	"	I 382
18.	"	I, 10	"	I 146, 4	"	V 286
19.	"	II, 1	"	I 154, 24	"	I 384, 400B
20.	"	II, 1	"	I 160, 9-12	"	I 336
21.	"	II, 1	"	I 160, 24f	"	I 361
22.	"	II, 1	"	I 162, 14f	"	I 384
23.	"	II, 2	"	I 167, 16-20 and 168, 15-18	"	I 385
24.	"	II, 4	"	I 181, 15 and 182, 1	"	I 456
25.	"	II, 4	"	I 182, 20 and 183, 1	"	I 364, 457
26.	"	II, 6	"	I 107, 31	"	I 245, 332B
27.	"	II, 10	"	I 210, 19-24	"	I 461
28.	"	II, 10	"	I 220, 5	"	V 200
N 29.	"	II, 10	"	I 224, 12-9	"	I 132, 269C
30.	"	III, 2	"	I 239, 28	"	cf I 5, 184A V 17
N 31.	"	III, 3	"	I 248, 34-5 and II 209, 1	"	I 464, 437B
32.	Strom III 4	III, 7	"	I 259, 19-24	"	I 466
33.	"	III, 10	"	I 265, 17-19	"	I 470
34.	"	III, 11	"	I 272, 7f	"	III 131
35.	"	III, 11	"	I 283, 28	"	I 469, 440B
36.	"	III, 12	"	I 286, 32 and 287, 1	"	I 471, 440C
N 37.	"	III, 12	"	I 287, 26-9 and 289, 15-18	"	II 188, 637A
N 38.	Stromata	I, 5		MG 8, 720C	"	I 227, 324C
N 39.	"	I, 5		MG 8, 728A	"	I 96, 248D-9A
N 40.	"	I, 10	"	II 31, 1-5	"	III 403, 1037D- 1040A

Athens 1897 vol. I p.279f
 3. The list shows 51 similarities. From these, 18 have been pointed out by Otto Stachlin (loc.cit. p.64) and 23 by E. Fruechtel (loc.cit. pp.61-4 and 767-8). We added 10 new ones, marked by N

41.	Stromata	I, 17	Stashlin	II 55, I	In Isidore's	III 119
N 42.	"	II, 1		MG 8, 933A	"	III 42, 760B
43.	"	II, 11	"	II 138, 19 and	"	
		VIII, 3	"	III 82, 13	"	II 97
44.	"	II, 16	"	II 152, 17	"	I 343, 380B
45.	"	II, 18	"	II 155, 13	"	II 23, 472D-473A
N 46.	"	III, 9	"	II 225, 16-9	"	III 252, 932B
47.	"	V, 6	"	II 353, 24	"	II 158
48.	"	VI, 11	"	II 478, 14	"	II 100 cf. II 273, 704A
49.	"	VII, 3	"	III 14, 25	"	IV 178
50.	"	VII, 15	"	III 74, 13	"	IV 76
51.	"	VII, 16	"	III 67, 28 and	"	
		VIII, 1	"	III 81, 25	"	II 66, V430

b) Basil the Great and Isidore (1)

52.	In Hexaemeron	I, 2	Garnier	I 32C (cf		
		in Ps 32, 3	"	I 191C)	In Isidore's	III 154, 845CD
53.	"	II, 2	"	I 17B	"	II 254, 689C
54.	"	II, 8	"	I 29B	"	II 158, 613AB
55.	"	V, 7	"	I 66BC	"	III 84, 789D
56.	"	VI, 1	"	I 70	"	IV 141, 1221B
						IV 204, 1292B
						V 28, 1341CD
57.	"	VIII, 6	"	I 107E-108	"	I 141, 276C-277A
58.	"	VIII, 7	"	I 108B	"	II 119, 560C
59.	"	VIII, 8	"	I 111D	"	I 403, 408B
60.	"	IX, 2	"	I 114D	"	V 162, 1417D
61.	"	IX, 6	"	I 124C	"	III 112, 817BD
62.	In Psalmum	I, 6	"	I 135A, 136B	"	IV 8, 1056C
63.	"	VII, 5	"	I 145CD	"	I 472, 440D
64.	"	VII, 7	"	I 148D	"	IV 210, 1304D-1305A
						III 131, 832AB
						III 320, 984AB
65.	"	XXVIII, 1	"	I 162D	"	IV 24, 1073B and 1076A

1. The list shows 49 similarities suggested for the first time here, except one or two for which we found a reference elsewhere. Let it be noted that we examined for this purpose only 25 sermons of St Basil's, i.e. the first volume of his works. This means that a thorough examination will enlarge the number of the parallels between these two Fathers.

66.	In Psalmum	XXVIII, 3	Garnier	I 166A	Isidore's	II 246, 685A
67.	"	XXVIII, 3	"	I 167D and		
	"	XXXII, 3	"	I 191B	"	V 28, 1344D- 1345A
68.	"	XXXII, 2	"	I 189EB	"	I 364, 389A
69.	"	XXXII, 5	"	I 194C	"	IV 113, 1184C
70.	"	XXXII, 5	"	I 195BC	"	I 157, 220A I 293, 353C
71.	"	XXXII, 6	"	I 196E	"	IV 127, 1205A III 217, 901B
72.	"	XXXII, 8	"	I 199A	"	IV 47, 1097C V 368, 1548C
73.	"	XXXIII, 1	"	I 206D	"	I 9, 185A
74.	"	XXXIII, 2	"	I 206D	"	I 397, 405A III 22, 745D
75.	"	XXXIII, 3	"	I 208A	"	V 184, 1433C
76.	"	XXXIII, 6	"	I 213D	"	I 403, 408B
77.	"	XLIV, 2	"	I 229D	"	II 186, 636C
78.	"	XLIV, 4	"	I 231AB	"	III 130, 829CD
79.	"	XLIV, 4	"	I 231C and 232D	"	IV 28, 1080d- 1081A IV 67, 1124C
80.	"	XLIV, 6	"	I 235E	"	III 388, 1029AB
81.	"	XLIV, 9	"	I 238A	"	IV 5, 1053AB
82.	"	XLIV, 12	"	I 242D	"	V 186, 1437C
83.	"	XLV, 1	"	I 243C and		
	"	XLV, 8	"	I 250DE	"	III 232, 913A
84.	"	XLVIII, 4	"	I 258BC	"	II 157, 612B IV 166, 1257AB
85.	"	XLVIII, 6	"	I 260A	"	I 126, 268A
86.	"	XLVIII, 8	"	I 263B	"	II 136, 577B
87.	"	XLIX, 4	"	I 273B	"	I 66, 225D
88.	"	LXI, 5	"	I 282C	"	IV 149, 1233C
89.	"	CLIV, 5	"	I 289D	"	III 252, 932B
90.	Adversus Eunom.	I, 15	"	I 320AB	"	III 224, 893C III 232, 913C
91.	"	I, 17	"	I 324CD	"	I 422, 417AB III 342, 1001B
92.	"	I, 20	"	I 327D	"	III 18, 744CD III 53, 796B III 355, 1012CD
93.	"	I, 25	"	I 333C-34	"	III 334, 992BC
94.	"	II, 12	"	I 349AB and		
	"	II, 17	"	I 357C	"	I 241, 329C
95.	"	II, 15	"	I 354DE	"	IV 142, 1224A
96.	"	II, 21	"	I 364B	"	I 353, 384C
97.	"	II, 23	"	I 367CD	"	I 67, 228A
98.	"	II, 23	"	I 368A	"	IV 142, 1224A
99.	"	III, 2	"	I 388E and		
	"	III, 5	"	I 393A	"	I 109, 256C
100.	"	III, 7	"	I 394B	"	V 28, 1344D-5A

c) Gregory of Nazianzus and Isidore (1)

I01. Or. II Apolog.	IO	MG 35,422A	In Isidore's	V 275,1496D
I02.	54	MG 35,464AB	"	III 216,897BC
I03.	82	MG 35,488C	"	IV 36,1088C
I04. De Dogm. et Con-				
stit. episc.	IV	MG 35,1072A	"	III 112,817AB
I05. De Pace	II,16	MG 35,1148C	"	IV 36,1088C
I06.	III,2	MG 35,1152B	"	IV 10,1057AB
I07.	III,8	MG 35,1160CD	"	III 112,817AB
I08. Theologica	I,3	MG 36,130D	"	III 39,757C
I09.	I,10	MG 36,248C	"	IV 55,1105AC
I10.	II,4	MG 36,29C and		
	II,17	MG 36,48C	"	II 93,637C
I11.	II,6	MG 36,32C-33A	"	V 28,1344D-45A
I12.	III,8	MG 36,84C	"	III 214,893C
				III 232,913C
				I 476,441C
				IV 183,1273D
I13.	IV,4	MG 36,108AB	"	I 18,192B-93B
I14.	IV,11	MG 36,116C-7B	"	III 335,993D-7A
I15.	IV,17	MG 36,125B	"	I 453,432B
I16.	V,10	MG 36,144A and		
	V,19	MG 36,153B	"	I 109,256BC
I17.		MG 36,168C	"	II 143,588D-89A
I18. In Sancta Lumina	I3	MG 36,349A	"	I 323,369B

d) John Chrysostom and Isidore (2)

I19. Ad Theod. Lapsus	I,3	Montf. I,6B(3)	"	I 51,213BC
I20.	I,11	" I,14DE	"	IV 135,1216C-7A
I21.	II,2	" I,44D	"	IV, III, 1177A
I22. De Compactione	I,3	" I,154B	"	IV, 123, 1197A
I23.	I,6	" I,161E	"	IV, 181, 1273B

1. The list shows 18 parallel opinions of which 16 are suggested here for the first time. We believe that the similarities between these two Fathers are more.
2. The list shows 58 similarities. Of these more than 25 are suggested by us. We have found the remaining in other studies and especially in Balanos' monograph. References are cited according to the edition of Montfaucon or of Migne. The borrowings of Isidore from Chrysostom or the similarities of ideas between the two are much more than this list shows.
3. cf De Statuis VII 3 Montf. II 102D

124. De Virginitate		Montf. I, 334BC	Isidore's I 413, 412C
125. "		" I, 336CD	" III 351, 1008D IV 115, 1189A
126. De Sacerdotio	III, 5	Montf. I, 468C-9E	" III 216, 896A II 200, 645A
127. "	III, 5	" I, 469EA	" II 52, 496B
128. "	III, 8	" I, 477D	" II 209, 649B
129. "	III, 16	" I, 483E	" II 264, 696C
130. "	IV, 2	" I, 496DE	" II 121, 561A
131. "	V, 4	" I, 510D	" III 96, 805A
132. "	VI, 6	" I, 520CD	" II 284, 713B
133. "	VI, 11	" I, 526CD	" III 15, 741CD
134. In Kalendas	3-4	" I, 859A-60E	" II 147, 601C-4A
135. De Statuis	I, 4	" II, 8B	" V 413, 1572D
136. "	IV, 5	" II, 65C	" II 175, 628A and I 126, 268A
137. "	V, 2	" II, 73B	" V 179, 1432B
138. "	XV, 4	" II, 185E	" II 278, 709C and V 185, 1436A-7A
139. "	XVI, 4	" II, 195EA	" I 57, 220AB
140. "	XIX, 4	" II, 232E	" II 150, 604C
141. "	XX, 6	" II, 244A	" IV 185, 1277A
142. De Poenitentia	VI, 1	" II, 374E	" V 186, 1444B
143. De Fato et Prov.	5	MG 50, 768	" III 191, 877B
144. " "	6	MG 50, 772	" IV 112, 1180A
145. In Pecc. Fratr.	2	MG 51, 355-6	" III 172, 864C
146. In Genes.	LXVI, 2	" IV, 730BC	" II 24, 773A
147. In Matth.	I, 1	" VII, 2B-3C	" III 106, 812AD
148. "	IV, 8	" VII, 70A-71A	" II 135, 577BC
149. "	IV, 8	" VII, 72BC	" III 208, 889CD-92A
150. "	V, 3	" VII, 89CA	" I 18, 192B-3A
151. "	VII, 3	" VII, 126A	" I 378, 396C
152. "	X, 4	" VII, 166EB-7C	" I 5, 184A
153. "	L, 3	" VII, 582B	" II 246, 685A
154. "	LV, 4	" VII, 630AB	" III 166, 860AB
155. "	LXXXIV, 4	" VII, 906C	" III 104, 809A
156. "	LXXXVI, 3	" VII, 920AC and	"
ad Rom XII, 8		" IX, 610CD	" V 17, 1333C and V 65, 1364D-65A
157. In Joannem	IV, 2	" VIII, 33B-34A	" III 112, 817BC
158. "	VIII, 2	MG 59, 67-8 and	"
ad Eph. XXII, 3		MG 62, 159	" IV 10, 1057B
159. "	XXII, 3	" VIII, 150BC	" III 192, 877D and V 528, 1625BC
160. "	XXXII, 3	" VIII, 216B	" I 27, 200B
161. "	XXXVIII, 4	" VIII, 255D	" III 335, 996D
162. "	LXXV, 4	" VIII, 507D-8A	" III 334, 992BC

I63. Ad Roman.	IV, 1	Montf.	IX, 495A	Isidore's	V 453, 1589B
I64. "	IV, 2	"	IX, 497D	"	III 242, 921AB
					IV 99, 1164C-65A
I65. "	XI, 5-6	"	IX, 592BD	"	II 146, 593C-96A
I66. "	XII, 8	"	IX, 611AB	"	V 17, 1336A
I67. "	XII, 9	"	IX, 612DE	"	II 243, 684B
I68. "	XXIII, 1	"	IX, 752C-53A	"	II 216, 657D-60B
I69. Ad i Cor.	XVIII, 1		MG 61, 146	"	IV 129, 1208B
I70. "	XVIII, 1		MG 61, 145-6	"	IV 129, 1209BC
I71. "	XXXII, 1	"	X, 333E	"	IV 103, 1169CD
I72. Ad ii Cor.	XV, 3	"	X, 644EA	"	V, 98, 1381D-4A
I73. Ad Ephes.	XXI, 4		MG 62, 155-6	"	IV 13, 1061B
I74. Ad Philip.	II, 5		MG 62, 196	"	V 450, 1588C
I75. Ad i Tim.	V, 1		MG 62, 527	"	II 11, 465B
I76. Ad Hebraeos	XXX, 1		MG 63, 210	"	IV 192, 1280C
				"	IV 119, 1193C

c) Didymus the Blind and Isidore(I)

I77. De Trinitate	I, 16	MG 39, 332D	"	IV 183, 1273D
I78. "	I, 18	MG 39, 356A	"	I 67, 228A
I79. Expos. in Ps	4, 5	MG 39, 1168A	"	II 189, 640AB of II 239 and III 338
I80. "	28, 3, 7	MG 39, 1312A	"	I 5, 184A
I81. "	49, 16	MG 39, 1393A	"	III 232AB and IV 126, 1204B
I82. "	76, 2-4	MG 39, 1473C	"	III 129, 829B
I83. "	93, 20	MG 39, 1504CD	"	I 81, 240A
I83. "	112, 5	MG 39, 1548A	"	IV 151, 1236CD
I84. "	150, 3-5	MG 39, 1613C-16B	"	I 364, 388D-9A
I85. Adver. Eunom.	IV, 1	Garnier I, 397B	"	IV 183, 1276A
I85. "	IV, 1	" I, 397C	"	III 166, 860B
I86. "	IV, 1	" I, 397E-8	"	III 31, 752A
I87. "	IV, 2	" I, 407D	"	I 460, 436B
I88. "	IV, 3	" I, 410CD	"	III 334, 9928C
I89. "	IV, 3	" I, 411A	"	I 117, 261A
I90. "	IV, 3	" I, 414D	"	III 31, 749D
I91. "	IV, 3	" I, 419D	"	I 137, 273A
I92. "	V	" I, 420B-21B	"	I 109, 256BC
I93. "	V, 2	" I, 445D	"	III 214, 893C of III 232, 913C
I94. "	V, 2	" I, 445E	"	I 476, 441C of IV 183, 1273D

I. The list shows 24 similarities, although the examination of Didymus' works is inadequate. All these similarities are sug-

195.	Adver. Eunom.	V, 4	Garnier	I, 448C-9D	Isidore's	II	I 43, 585B-588D
196.	"	"	"	I, 448E	"	II	I 43, 585D
197.	"	"	"	I, 449E-50A	"	III	I 41, 837BC
198.	"	"	"	I, 423BD	"	I	60, 22IC

gested for the first time. We believe that they are much more. The treatise 'Adversus Eunomium' is appended to St Basil's homonymous work, in the edition of J. Garnier, to which we are referring.

Chapter V

M A T U R I T Y

It is not our intention in this chapter to examine Isidore's activities when he was a mature man, for it was done in the other chapters, where we examined other questions too. Our purpose here is to define and to elucidate all Isidore's capacities or occupations during his maturity. In other words, we try here to define whether Isidore was a poet, a rhetor or religious teacher, if he was ordained priest and by whom; how and where he lived as a monk and if he became abbot. The answer to these questions is necessary and will complete Isidore's portrait.

I. P o e t

It was John Lang, who for the first time, suggested the opinion that Isidore was a poet, as John Chatard⁽¹⁾ informs us. J. Bily⁽²⁾ refuted Lang's opinion. It would be useful, however, to draw some more lines on the matter, than Niemeyer did.

The first misunderstanding which gave ground for the formation of the opinion that Isidore was a poet, depended on the statement of Eusebius. He says: "Ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς βασιλείας διέκρηκε καὶ ἰσθμωρὸς, οὐ κλέος εὐρύ κατὰ τὴν ποίησιν, ἔργῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ πρὸς πᾶσι διαβόητος"⁽³⁾. The same information was repeated later by N. Kallistus⁽⁴⁾.

The phrase κατὰ τὴν ποίησιν does not signify that Isidore was a poet and that his poetic art was glorious, but it simply means that his fame was great "κλέος εὐρύ"⁽⁵⁾, as poetry could say. This interpretation is strengthened by the next phrase ἔργῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ πρὸς πᾶσι διαβόητος, which means that he was famous to all people because of his works and words. In other words, wishing to describe how great was Isidore's fame, Eusebius used, a poetic expression which gave grounds for misunderstandings⁽⁶⁾.

1. MG 78, II 5

2. Quoted in Niemeyer, loc. cit. p. 34

3. E.H. I 15, MG 86, 246I-4

4. E.H. XIV 53 MG 146, I 252

5. The phrase is homeric; cf. III 98, 805B: "κλέος οὐρανόμηκες", which corresponds to that of Aristophanes.

6. cf. John Chatard, loc. cit., and Balanos, loc. cit. p. 36

Isidore's conceptions about poetry were not good. He says: "poetry delighting frequently in fables, has falsehood as its material; and making itself bold by an unlimited pleasure, it grows and flourishes by showing that which is fabulous and bombastic" (1). If Isidore, examining the poetic art of Homer whom he called "chief of poets" (2) is expressing his opinion about poetry by such words, could we expect that he dedicated himself to poetry, even for a short time? Isidore loved truth very much (3) as he declared, according to him, poetry frequently had its spring in falsehood. How could we reconcile these two opposite things. The answer could be either that Isidore did not love truth—God forbid!— or that he was not a poet—which is true.

Could Isidore's letters supply us with material appropriate for forming the opinion that he composed poems? Yes, they could; and yet, no, they could not. As a matter of fact there are some letters or extracts of some letters (4) which look like little poems. Thus someone could say, 'yes' there are examples of poems. But they are very few. Still, although these examples look like poems, they are not poems. They simply are good examples of elegant prose, where we see some rhyme endings. Such examples with rhyming endings are, according to E. Fehrle (5) one hundred and twenty five out of 2,000 letters. Of these 125 examples, 85 (i.e. 68%) were conforming to certain rules and 38 (i.e. 32%) were not. Most probably "Isidore knew very well the usual rhyme endings of phrases, but he did not follow them slavishly; he used them very frequently only in finely worked speech" (6). Thus we may say as result that Isidore's letters too do not prove that he was a poet; they only certify that he was a master of an elegant and poetic prose.

+ and,

2. Rhetor or religious Teacher?

According to the testimony of Suidas (7) Isidore was φιλόσοφος and ποιητής. If the word 'Philosopher' in Suidas' Lexikon means a man who knows how to think and to express his right thoughts, or an educated man who gives clever answers, or simply a man who lo-

1. II 228, 665B

2. V I62

3. II I46, 600BC

4. e.g. I 18, 193B; I 130, 269AB; I 161, 289D; I 335, 376B etc.

5. Saltzschlus und Rhythmus bei Isidoros von Pelusion, in BZ vol. 24 (1923-4) p. 316

6. ibid. p. 318

7. loc. cit. II I50

was wisdom, then Isidore was a philosopher. But what does the word *protop* mean? If it means an eloquent man or a good speaker, we could accept it. If it means that Isidore in his official capacity was some time rhetorician or a teacher of rhetoric, then we disagree.

Heumann, depending on Suidas and Euagrius, declared that "Isidore has been rhetor, that is teacher of eloquence"⁽¹⁾. To strengthen his opinion, Heumann brings the letter V 93, addressed to the deacon Palladius, where Isidore says: "You were among the College of pupils, considered as their chief..."⁽²⁾. Kihn⁽³⁾, Philaret⁽⁴⁾ and Tixeront⁽⁵⁾ also followed Suidas or Heumann. Diamantopoulos⁽⁶⁾ is of the same opinion and for strengthening his opinion he brings in the letter V 553 where Isidore says that he "prefers to educate the mind rather than the language of those who approach him"⁽⁷⁾. G. Redl in her special study "Isidore als sophist"⁽⁸⁾ analyzing the letter III 57 where Isidore speaks of the extent and lucidity of speech tries to prove that Isidore was a rhetor. The last supporter of this opinion is F. Cayré⁽⁹⁾.

Other scholars on the contrary expressed the opinion that Isidore was neither rhetorician nor teacher of rhetoric. Thus Niemeyer⁽¹⁰⁾ thought Heumann's conception a mere indefensible suggestion and opposed it. Bouvy⁽¹¹⁾ also opposing Heumann and denying the view that Isidore was a teacher of rhetoric said that if we accept that Isidore was a teacher of rhetoric and that his letters betray his pupils, then we had to accept that Cyril of Alexandria or the praetor Rufinus were Isidore's pupils! L. Bayer⁽¹²⁾ too, supported the opinion that Isidore was not a rhetor; and if his letters show a rhetorical style, it happens because it was the custom of the time to write letters in such a style. Compare for example the letters of St Basil the

1. loc.cit. p. 7

2. V 93, I380D

3. Kirchenlex. VI 965

4. loc.cit. III 104

5. loc.cit. p. 220-I

6. loc.cit. 1926/294-5

7. V 553, I636B

8. Gerda Redl: Isidore von Pelusion als Sophist, in ZKG vol. 47 (1928) pp. 325-32

9. loc.cit. I 571

10. loc.cit. p. 39

11. loc.cit. p. 14

12. loc.cit. p. 1

Great or St Gregory of Nazianzus. Finally Balanos⁽¹⁾ refused to accept the fact that Isidore was a rhetor.

We also think that Isidore in his official capacity was not a rhetorician nor moreover a teacher of rhetoric. The letter V 93 brought by Heumann and Diamantopoulos, speaks of pupils but it does not say who was the teacher. And it says clearly that the deacon Palladius was ardently seeking to catch the *d i v i n e w o r d s*⁽²⁾ which does not mean that he was attending a school of rhetoric, even if we accept that Isidore was his teacher which in itself is probable. The letter V 553 brought by Diamantopoulos, proves the opposite thing from what Diamantopoulos thought; it proves that Isidore was a teacher educating the minds or the souls of his pupils rather than their language, whereas a teacher of rhetoric cares for language and style only. We can accept Suidas statement if we agree that the word rhetor here means that Isidore was an eloquent and persuasive speaker, but no more. Isidore's occupation was not rhetorician and he did not teach rhetoric. He was not even a 'sophist' as e.g. was Arpocras. Rhetorical figures, of speech, rules of how to speak and use of rhetorical words⁽³⁾, signify his knowledge of the classical rhetors and not his occupation.

We are not far from the truth if we accept that Isidore, before he went to the desert to live as a monk, was at Pelusium a kind of religious Teacher, a catechizer, or a teacher or a preacher of the Church⁽⁴⁾. This seems most probable, because Isidore was wise in learning and famous for his piety and zeal for the Church. Almost all his letters prove that he was instructing. There are, however, some concrete hints which could support this opinion. Thus, writing to Therasius, he says: "You are indignant against us whom God placed *t e a c h e r s* of the same Church, because we are fighting against Arius..."⁽⁵⁾. In another of his letters Isidore writes: "We take pains *c a t e c h i z i n g* in such a way"⁽⁶⁾. The two aforementioned letters⁽⁷⁾ are also suitable here.⁽⁸⁾ If Isidore were a spi-

1. loc.cit. p. 24-5

2. I380D: "... σφοδρότερον τῶν ἄλλων μεταδιώκων τὴν τῶν *θεολογῶν* θήραν"

3. e.g. πρδληφς (IV I22, II96C) or κατασκευή (IV II7) etc.

4. cf Balanos, loc.cit. p.24

5. I 389, 401C

6. I 488, 448C

7. V 93 and 553

8. cf IV 205, I300A

ritual counsellor for many people even outside Pelusium why should we not accept that he was also for Pelusium? Hence his authority and esteem.

3. Priest

To the best of our knowledge, only Balanos denied that Isidore was a priest. He says: "The information according to which Isidore became a presbyter, seems to us unlikely" ⁽¹⁾. Balanos's reasons are: a) It would be impossible for a presbyter to blame his bishop and fellow presbyters as Isidore did, and his reproofs could with difficulty be tolerated. b) Isidore's letters do not show that he had any ecclesiastical office, whereas they show that he does not put himself in the Clergy. Balanos's information depended on the 'Synedicon', Facundus and Suidas, and his theory, being indefensible, falls by itself.

Undoubtedly Isidore became a priest. There are many pieces of evidence supporting this opinion. Thus the earliest information about Isidore of which the root reaches his lifetime, four times testifies that Isidore was a presbyter. This information is of Severus of Antioch ⁽²⁾. He reports that in a letter of an unknown ascetic ⁽³⁾, Isidore is saluted as follows: "Salutatio venerabilis p r e s b y t e r i Isidori, altaris Christi, vasis ministerii ecclesiarum, thesauri Scripturarum, patris verborum, gazophylacii virtutem, templi pacis" ⁽⁴⁾. As P.A. Schmid remarked "this is a unique contemporary testimony which we know about Isidore" ⁽⁵⁾. In a letter to Zacharias of Pelusium written during his episcopacy (513-18), Severus answers again the question whether Isidore was a presbyter. He writes: "But not to extend the discussion to a great length, I leave the rest on one side, but will cite for you a passage from a certain p r e s b y t e r (Isidore I mean, a native of your city of Pelusium, who was wise in learning, and in piety) which is sufficient for this present purpose" ⁽⁶⁾. After Severus, Facundus

-
1. loc.cit. p.28-9. There are several other Scholars who do not express their opinion on this particular point.
 2. CSCO ser. IV vol.VI p.182: "Presbyterum Pelusii" (3d line); "presbyter orthodoxus illius (i.e. of Pelusium) civitatis (6th line); "Presbyteri Isidori" (21st line); "Venerabilis presbyteri" (23d line).
 3. "Ex epistula alicuius religiosi, cuius nomen ignoratur"
 4. CSCO loc.cit. p.182
 5. loc.cit. p. 2
 6. The sixth book of letters, vol.II part II p.251

referring to Isidore calls him "...Isidorus p r e s b y t e r Aegiptius Pelusiota..."(1). The 'Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenaei'(2) attributes to Isidore the office of Presbyter. Photius(3) names Isidore "ἀγιόχρουν καὶ ἱερατικόν". Suidas(4) calls Isidore πρεσβύτερον which rather means presbyter and not only an old man. The 'Life'(5) says clearly that Isidore was ordained presbyter. The 'Vita Chrysostomi'(6) independent from the 'life' declares that Isidore became presbyter.

Of the Scholars Tillemont(7), Fleury(8), Ceillier(9), Niemeyer(10), Glueck(11), Boher(12), Alzog(13), Moeller(14), Philaret(15), Kihn(16), Kurz(17), Aigrain(18), Krueger(19), Sheik(20), Bardenhewer(21), Ba-reill(22), Diamantopoulos(23), Schmid(24), Cayré(25), M. Smith(26) and Quasten(27) accept the opinion that Isidore was a presbyter.

Isidore's letters do not exclude his being in priesthood as Balanos thinks. On the contrary they testify that Isidore had an ecclesiastical office at Pelusium. This office was not simply the office of a catechizer(28) or of a teacher of the Church(29), although the words 'teacher of the Church' could mean preacher which indicates that the possessor of that office was a clergyman; but it was the office of a priest. A letter of Isidore's, addressed to the bishop Synesius, elucidates the question. Isidore writes: "It is good in the presence of dangers to be prepared and serve God(30) and fight by Faith against the hostile phalanxes, but it is not good to expose ourselves through indolence to the enemies and opponents; because we have come to such a degree

-
1. loc.cit. ML 67, 573A
 2. MG 48, 583 and 587
 3. Letters, II 44, MG 102, 861D
 4. II 150
 5. E 436
 6. Quoted in Niemeyer, p. 24
 7. loc.cit. p. 101
 8. loc.cit. p. 328
 9. loc.cit. XIII p. 600-I
 10. loc.cit. p. 21-3
 11. loc.cit. p. I
 12. loc.cit. p. 8-9
 13. loc.cit. p. 348
 14. R&D II 1123 and RThK IX p. 444
 15. loc.cit. p. 99
 16. Patrol. II 230
 17. loc.cit. I 285
 18. loc.cit. 13-4

19. NSHE VI 46
20. PWK IX 2068
21. Geschichte..p. 100
22. DTC VII 85
23. 1926/450
24. loc.cit. pp. I, 6-7, 8
25. loc.cit. p. 571
26. E 434
27. III 181
28. I 488, 448C
29. I 389, 401C
30. Διακονεῖν and not διακονεῖσθαι

of lack of will ὡςτε μὴ δὲ καὶ ῥόγῃ ἐχέειν θεῶ
 ἵερα ἑαυτοῦ ἐν because the evil which surrounds us does not
 permit us to use the defensive ways⁽¹⁾. Because Phineas also
 used a javelin⁽²⁾ when God was excited⁽³⁾ by the acts of
 men. This letter tells us that Isidore held the office of a
 clergyman, but since he was occupied at that time fighting
 against the enemies of the Church, he had no time to worship
 God by the special task of offering the mass. Since there were
 many clergymen at Pelusium who could do this, Isidore dedi-
 cated himself to a more difficult task, for which there were
 not so many able men available.

The corollary to these remarks is that Isidore unquestion-
 ably entered the priesthood. And since no one refers to him
 as deacon and, since Joannes Grammaticus' note that Isidore
 was bishop⁽⁴⁾ is entirely wrong, Isidore's office was the
 office of a presbyter. He was ordained presbyter and served
 Pelusium as a presbyter for an unknown time. Most probably
 he was not attached to any special Church of Pelusium or at
 least he was not strictly attached only to one Church, but
 was a kind of preacher and spiritual leader who was visiting
 the Churches for preaching and counselling of Christians,
 either celebrating the liturgy or not. He acted in such a capa-
 city till he went to the desert and lived as a monk.

Another question arises now, By whom was Isidore ordained
 priest? Tillemont⁽⁵⁾ and Glueck⁽⁶⁾ supported that Isidore re-
 ceived the office of presbyter by Eusebius of Pelusium. This
 is unlikely. Isidore was priest long before Eusebius was bishop
 of Pelusium. The letters of Isidore addressed to Eusebius of
 Pelusium and those addressed to others where the former deals
 with the latter's conduct, exclude the fact that Isidore was
 ordained by Eusebius of Pelusium. Was then Isidore ordained by
 Ammonius, the predecessor of Eusebius? Bareill⁽⁷⁾ is of this
 opinion. As a matter of fact we cannot chronologically exclude
 such a possibility. The letters dealing with Ammonius, could
 support this opinion. But we have not even one piece of eviden-
 ce that Ammonius ordained Isidore. We cannot rely only upon the

1. The text has ἄφασθε τὴν ἀμυντηρίαν ἐργάζων. We have to under-
 stand it as meaning 'to use the defensive ways' against ene-
 mies. Most probably the phrase signifies that Isidore meant wor-
 ship which is a 'defensive way' against the enemies of the
 Church, whereas attack against them was at that time needed.

2. Numbers 25, 7

3. I 232, 325C

4. CSCO loc.cit. p. 183: "Isidori, episcopi Pelusii Aegypti...".
 cf Severus, ibid. p. 182: "His autem temporibus nullus apparet
 nomine Isidorus, qui fuerit episcopus Pelusii, non operam dedi-
 ut de hoc inquirerem"

5. loc.cit. p. 101

6. loc.cit. p. 1. "Presbyteri dignitatem Isidorus ab Eusebio, Pe-
 lusii episcopo, recepisse dicitur". 7. DTC VII 85

eulogistic writings of Isidore about Ammonius, for Isidore highly praised also Chrysostom⁽¹⁾, Hermogenes of Rhinocorura⁽²⁾ and the bishops Lambetius⁽³⁾ and Theodosius⁽⁴⁾.

Two rather old pieces of evidence, of the tenth and eleventh centuries, certify that Isidore has received the priesthood by St Athanasius the Great. The first is found in the 'Vita Chrysostomi' which according to Niemeyer⁽⁵⁾ was written after 950. The extract we need says: "Τούτῳ τοίνυν τῷ Θεοφίλῳ διαφορά τις συμβέβηκε πρὸς τε τὸν Πηλουσιώτην Ἰσιδώρον, ἄνδρα ὁσίον, καὶ ὃν ὁ Ἀθανάσιος τοῦ Μεγαλοῦ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἡξιωμένον τιμῆς"⁽⁶⁾. It says clearly that Isidore was ordained by St Athanasius the Great. It also says that διαφορά τις happened between Theophilus and Isidore. This last led Niemeyer⁽⁷⁾ and Bouvy⁽⁸⁾ to express the opinion that a different person called ~~also~~ Isidore gave grounds for the διαφορά and, therefore Isidore of Pelusium was not ordained by St Athanasius. But why do Niemeyer and Bouvy think that this διαφορά is the quarrel between Theophilus and Chrysostom or the supposed origenistic conceptions of Isidore of Pelusium? If this is true, then Isidore the Hospitaliter stands well instead of Isidore of Pelusium. But this διαφορά can best be the reproof of Theophilus by Isidore. It is true that in "the preserved letters Theophilus plays only a small part"⁽⁹⁾, but there was no need for him to hear more rebukes in order to behave as he behaved, since he was such as he was.

The other evidence is found in the 'Life'⁽¹⁰⁾. There is written there: "Πλὴν καὶ τὴν ἀμικτον ταύτην διαγωγὴν ἐλόμενος ὁ μακάριος, καὶ θεὸς (εὖ) μόνον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔχειν βουλόμενος μάρτυρα· δηλὸς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κἄσι γίνεται τοῖς κατ' Αἰγυπτίον· ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ τὸν ἀρχιερατικὸν θρόνον τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας⁽¹¹⁾ κοσμοῦντι· ὁ μέγας οὗτος ἦν ὁ Ἀθανάσιος, ὁ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως πρόμαχος καὶ τῶν κακοδόξων αἰρέσεων γενναῖος ἀντίπαλος. Ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοίνυν ὁ θεὸς Ἰσιδωρος τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἐκκλησίας ἐγκαταλείνεται, μόλις μὲν καὶ ἀκων, πεισθεὶς δ' οὖν ὁμῶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ"⁽¹²⁾.

1. I 152, 156, 310, II 42, IV 224, V 32

2. II 21, 150, 199, III 132, V 378, 448, 466

3. II 211, 221, III 48, II 4, 240

4. II 131, III 245, V 494

5. loc.cit. p. 24 note 1

6. ibid., note 1

7. ibid.

8. loc.cit. p. 56-7

9. M. Smith, 'Life' E 435

10. E 429-38

11. This means of Alexandria. cf. Eusebius, E.H. II 8 MG 86, 252IA:

Ἐπιτηρήσαντες δ' οὖν καιρὸν οἱ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας :252IB: τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας
ων...

12. E 436

As M. Smith observed, this 'Life' is independent from that of the 'Vita Chrysostomi' and "That independence strengthens the case for the elements about which the stories agree—that Isidore was ordained by Athanasius, forced out of the presbytery by Theophilus, and an extremely old man in the time of Cyril—elements which in themselves are not unlikely"⁽¹⁾. If we are correct in suggesting, that Isidore studied in Alexandria near Didymus the Blind⁽²⁾ and that he went there early in the seventies of the fourth century⁽³⁾ when St Athanasius was still alive, then the possibility of Isidore being ordained by Athanasius is not chronologically excluded. This possibility could be strengthened by the fact that Athanasius was for Isidore a holy, wise and great Father, an authority of dogmatic formulations⁽⁴⁾ and by Isidore's conduct in rebuking Cyril. Since no other source tells us by whom was Isidore ordained and since the other facts of Isidore's life do not exclude the possibility of being ordained by St Athanasius, we accept the information given by these two 'Lives' as correct. L. Bober⁽⁵⁾, having read only the 'Vita Chrysostomi' has already agreed that Isidore was ordained by St Athanasius. M. Smith⁽⁶⁾ also agrees. Isidore was ordained presbyter by St Athanasius the Great, between 370-373.

4. Monk and Abbot

Isidore is known as an eminent monk and there is no doubt that he became a monk. No one disputed it. But some questions need an answer. Why and when did Isidore start his monkish career and for how long was he a monk? What kind of monk was he? Was he a hermit living alone or a permanent resident of a monastery? And finally, was he simply a monk or did he rule over a monastery? What was his position among the monks? In this paragraph we try to answer these questions.

1. *ibid.* p. 434

2. *V. supra* pp. 60-I and 63-66

3. *V. supra* pp. 49-52

4. I 323, 369B

5. *loc. cit.* p. 8-9

6. E 434

In his study of Isidore Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁾ several times suggested quite strange opinions. One of these is that Isidore did not decide to be a monk "because of an interior spiritual evolution, but some need relating to life and a will to avoid the exasperation of the struggle which became unequal between himself and Gigantius, led him to a monastery"⁽²⁾. If this is true then how could we explain Isidore's attitude towards askesis, an attitude which tells us that he put askesis above all things and preferred it to everything? He says, for instance, that "askesis is the imitation and vase of every commandment of the Lord"⁽³⁾. The Menologium testifies that Isidore "having loved God more than the world, left his parents, riches and glory and became monk"⁽⁴⁾. The 'Life' rather signifies that he early took monastic vows, because "πρὸς τὸν μονήρη βίον ἀπέκλεινεν... καὶ τὸ νεκρωθῆναι κόσμῳ, Χριστῷ δὲ ζῆσαι, συμφέροντα αὐτῷ κρῖνας..."⁽⁵⁾. Isidore was disdaining the world and its troubles⁽⁶⁾, considering monasticism as the high philosophy⁽⁷⁾, as the way of life by which he could save his soul⁽⁸⁾. Thus Isidore became a monk being convinced that askesis was for him the highest and most correct way of life. He became a monk because of his inner inclination and not because of exterior necessities, although it is probable that even external conditions of his life played a small part.

When did Isidore start to live as a monk? The 'Life' states that he twice went to his monastery⁽⁹⁾. The first of these times, if the information is correct, must have happened at an early age. The Menologium⁽¹⁰⁾ rather signifies that he was rather young when he became monk, since, no occupation is mentioned after he got his education. N. Kallistus⁽¹¹⁾ testifies that Isidore "ἐξ ἑνὸς νέου" became a monk. Bardenhewer⁽¹²⁾ and Cross⁽¹³⁾ think that Isidore was for forty years an Abbot. Except for the opinion that Isidore was an Abbot, the other point of view seems to be correct. If Isidore died c. 437, then we should accept the opinion that he started as a monk earlier than c. 395. Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁴⁾ thinks that

1. 'Ισιδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης, Jerusalem, in NS 1925/26

2. *ibid.* 1926/303

3. I 278, 345C; cf I 129

4. *loc. cit.* MG II 7, 293D-96A

5. E 436

6. I 191, 266

7. I 402, 408AB; V 485, I 069AB

8. I 213

9. E. 436-7

10. *loc. cit.*

11. *Loc. cit.* MG I 46, I 249

12. *Geschichte...* IV 100

13. *OLCC* p. 705

14. 1926/303

Isidore's departure to the desert happened before 396. But in 395 Isidore was not so young; he was about 45 years old. Therefore we have to assume the information given by the 'Life' according to which Isidore went twice to the monastery, as probable. Consequently we have to accept that Isidore when very young went to the desert. That after living there for some time, he left the desert. (What would we say if it would be suggested that St Athanasius found him in the monastery and forced him to be ordained presbyter?) - Again, after he lived in the world shall we say twenty years, he again retired to solitude till he died. All these suppositions about when Isidore started his monastic career are simply suppositions likely in themselves, but they are not proved. What we can accept as true is that Isidore in an early stage⁽¹⁾ of his life, because of inner inclination, dedicated himself⁽²⁾ to askesis and lived as an ascetic for more than forty years⁽²⁾.

Pelusium is generally accepted as the place where Isidore spent his monastic life. A text of the 'Life' says that Isidore having left the life in the town went to the mountain of Nitria where he lived as a monk⁽³⁾. This text is wrong. Besides M. Smith informs us that other texts of the 'Life' say that Isidore retired to monastic contemplation in the hill-country of Pelusium⁽⁴⁾. The Menologium⁽⁵⁾ also states that Isidore dwelt in the mountain which was near Pelusium and there he lived as a monk. N. Kallistus⁽⁶⁾ reported the place as the Pelusiatic mountain. Of the later scholars, Alzog⁽⁷⁾ says that Isidore lived in a monastery found on a mountain near Pelusium and so do J. Fessler⁽⁸⁾, Bouvy⁽⁹⁾, Philaret⁽¹⁰⁾, Bardenheuer⁽¹¹⁾, Balanos⁽¹²⁾, Ba-reill⁽¹³⁾ and Leclercq⁽¹⁴⁾. Duchesne⁽¹⁵⁾ says that the monastery was in the outskirts of Pelurium. G. Krueger⁽¹⁶⁾, and Bihlme-

-
1. cf Philaret, loc.cit. p. 98
 2. cf here the evidence of G. Amartolos (Chronicon I 94, 3 MG II 0, 680C: "Κατ' αὐτὸν γὰρ τὸν καιρὸν (Valens' 364-378) οἱ τῶν Μοναχῶν πατέρες τῷ βίῳ καὶ τῇ ἀξίᾳ τῆς ἀρχαιότητος Μανῆλιος, καὶ Ἰσιδωρος... κατὰ τὴν Αἰγύπτου ἤ κ η α ζ ο ν". It is most probable that Amartolos speaks of Isidore of Pelusium.
 3. E 436
 4. ibid. p. 432
 5. loc.cit.
 6. loc.cit.
 7. loc.cit. p. 348
 8. loc.cit. II 614
 9. loc.cit. 58-9
 10. loc.cit. p. 98
 11. loc.cit. IV 100
 12. loc.cit. p. 28
 13. DTC VII 85
 14. CE VIII 185
 15. loc.cit. III 205
 16. NSHE VI 46

yer⁽¹⁾ place it near Pelusium. P. Schaaff⁽²⁾ places the monastery on the principal eastern mouth of the Nile and Diamantopoulos⁽³⁾ thinks that the place where Isidore lived as a monk was far from Pelusium, in the desert, near the frontiers of Egypt and Asia.

We cannot exactly define the place where Isidore lived as a monk, because, as we will see, he did not stay only in one place. What we can say is that the monastery or monasteries must generally be in the area of Pelusium as the 'Synodicon', the oldest information concerning the place testifies, - "circa Pelusium". It could be that his hermitage was more remote⁽⁴⁾. As there were already from the beginnings of the fourth century many monasteries throughout Egypt and especially at Rhinocorura⁽⁵⁾, it is equally probable that the place where Isidore lived his monastic life was between Pelusium and Rhinocorura or between Pelusium and Babylon. The second suggestion is more probable. We can also say that the area of Pelusium as we have already seen⁽⁶⁾, had no mountains. So we must metaphorically understand the phrase: "ἀλλὰ σὺ δὲ τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον, ὁ ρ ο ς"⁽⁷⁾ and "ὅτε τῷ ὁ ρ ε ι τῆς ὑψηλῆς πολιτείας προσέβαινες"⁽⁸⁾. They signify the monastic life⁽⁹⁾. And we are afraid that all those who thought that Isidore lived as a monk on a mountain near Pelusium (they are many) - misunderstood the word ὁ ρ ο ς. Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁰⁾ and M. Smith⁽¹¹⁾ are ready to support these last statements. It is especially Strabo⁽¹²⁾ who remains the everlasting guardian⁽¹⁰⁾ of the opinion that Pelusium was surrounded by plains where there were lakes and large bogs.

What kind of monk was Isidore? Was he living alone or together with others? Was he a resident of only one monastery? As it is known, long before Isidore three systems of monastic life were established: The type of hermits who lived away from other monks; a large collection of cells where many men lived together, but each his own life; this is the ἰδιόρρυθμον, i.e. peculiar system as it is called in Greek; and the cenobitic system. To which of these three systems is Isidore's monastic life applied?

1. loc.cit. p. 390

2. loc.cit. I 198

3. 1926/449

4. I 318 and 142: ἐσχατιὰ

5. Sozomen, E.H. VI 31 MG 87, 1388A-1389C

6. V supra, chap. III par. 2

7. I 213, 317B; cf Gen. 19, 17

8. I 13, 188A

9. cf also I 216, 341B: "...πρὸς ὃν φ ο ς, χειραγωγῶ ἀναβάσεως. Ἀρνησαί
σαυτὸν καὶ ἄρον τὸν σταυρὸν, καὶ φεύγε ὡς καγὼ"

See also I 258, 337B: "...κατὰ βραχὺ προσάβζειν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀνάβασιν".

10. 1926/100 and 449

11. E 432

12. Geographica XVII chap. I par. 21

External sources and later Scholars tell that Isidore lived in a monastery⁽¹⁾ which means that he preferred the cenobitic system. His letters could support this opinion. Thus in a beautiful letter which reminds us of Paul's epistle to Philemon, Isidore writes: "A certain youth reached the place where we live, who, having asked the man who guards the door claimed to come to me..."⁽²⁾. This passage could signify a monastery. The word *μόναστρον* which occurs in a letter⁽³⁾, could mean monastery⁽⁴⁾. Another letter⁽⁵⁾ could also signify that he was living together with others in a monastery. That is he was a cenobite.

But at the same time Isidore's letters supply us with material which could justify us in saying that he was also a hermit, or an anchorite. Thus the letters I 318 and especially I 402 where we read "ἐπὶ τὴν μετρίαν εἰδῆσιν ἡ κατὰ μὲν αὐτὸν προσέβηκεν ἀναχωρησὶς"⁽⁶⁾, could support the opinion that Isidore lived also alone, as an anchorite. Leontius of Byzantium⁽⁷⁾ calls Isidore a hermit⁽⁸⁾.

Despite that cenobite and hermit are words signifying two opposite conditions, we think that both apply to Isidore. He lived in a monastery when younger. He became hermit later on, as this stage is for those monks who are more advanced in the monastic contemplation. But even then, from time to time he was visiting his previous monastery or monasteries, which means that he was an anchorite. If the 'Life'⁽⁹⁾ is right that Isidore died in his monastery, information which is also given by the Menologium⁽¹⁰⁾, then we must assume that Isidore when old returned to his monastery where he lived until his death.

There remains to examine whether Isidore was a simple monk or an Abbot.

-
1. Tillemont (p.100), Ceillier (XIII 600) and Leclercq (Cf VIII 186) state even the name of the Monastery: Lychnos. But as we have seen there were several monasteries near Pelusium at Isidore's time.
 2. I 142, 277A
 3. I 52, 216A
 4. cf Tillemont, loc.cit. p.101 and Diamantopoulos 1926/450
 5. II 182, 633C: "καὶ ἀπολογουμένους μὲ δεξιόμεθα· τοῦτο δὲ μὴ ποιῶντας, τῆς ἑαυτῶν συνουσίας ἐξοστρακίσωμεν"
 6. 408A
 7. quoted in Balanos p.28
 8. There is no doubt that there were at Pelusium anchorites and hermits at Isidore's time. cf V 131; I 75; I 76 and V 389. But the phrase *περὶ ὡς καὶ γὰρ* (I 266, 341B) simply means that Isidore denied the world in order to live as a monk.
 9. E 438
 10. loc.cit.

It is generally accepted that Isidore was Abbot of the monastery near Pelusium. Thus, from the Scholars, Xistus Senensis(1), Tillement(2), Ceillier(3), Moeller(4), Schaff(5), Philaret(6), Kurz(7), Bright(8), Kihn(9), Cheetham(10), Krueger(11), Aigrain(12), Schenk(13), Balanos(14), Bardenhewer(15), Barelli(16), Duchesne(17), Leclercq(18), Anwander(19), Bihlmeyer(20), Hardy(21), Cross(22) and Altaner(23), accept the opinion that Isidore was an abbot(24). The older testimonies: N. Kallistus(25), 'Synodicon'(26), and the 'Apophthegmata Patrum'(27), refer to Isidore as an abbot. It is evident that all later Scholars followed Apophthegmata and Synodicon, where Isidore is called ἄββας for the first time.

But what does the term ἄββας mean? As it is known the word is of Aramaic origin and we find it in Greek only in the N. Testament(28) where it means πατήρ and is applied to God. In the patristic literature and especially in the monastic terminology ἄββας means equally 'old monk' or 'father' or 'abbot'(29). In the Apophthegmata themselves where six letters(30) of Isidore's are quoted, the term ἄββας signifies many offices. Thus we

-
- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. MG 78, II 5 | 21. loc.cit. p. 101 |
| 2. loc.cit. p. 100-I | 22. ODCC 705 |
| 3. loc.cit. XIII 600 | 23. Hat Isidoros..B2 42 (1943-9)p.97; Patrology p.308: "Probably as superior". |
| 4. RED II II23 and REThK IX 444 | 24. Niemeyer(loc.cit. p.22) informs us that also "Sirmondus, Lupus, Pagius, Basa- gius, Graveson, Heineius, Arnoldus, Saxius, Weismannus et Rosenmullerus, Isidorum monasterii sui praefectum fuisse arbitrantur" |
| 5. I 198 and II 94I "Isidore presided over a convent"(?) | 25. loc.cit. MG I46, I249D |
| 6. loc.cit. 99-100 | 26. MG 84, 583 and Mansi V 758 |
| 7. loc.cit. III 285-6 | 27. MG 65, 22ID |
| 8. loc.cit. II 244 | 28. Mk I4,36; Rom.8,15; Gal.4,6 |
| 9. Patrol. II 230 | 29. cf Liddell-Scott Lexicon vol. I p.4 |
| 10. loc.cit. 235 | 30. II 275;98;I3I;III 69;24; and the beginning of II II6, 557B |
| 11. NSHE VI 46 | |
| 12. loc.cit. I3-4 | |
| 13. PWK IX 2068-9 | |
| 14. loc.cit. p.27 | |
| 15. Geschichte..IV 100 | |
| 16. DTC VIII 85 | |
| 17. loc.cit. III 205 | |
| 18. CE VIII I85 | |
| 19. loc.cit. V 625 | |
| 20. loc.cit. p.408: "Abt(?)" | |

read: "Ἀπῆλθε ποτε ὁ ἀββᾶς Ἰσιδωρος⁽¹⁾ πρὸς τὸν ἀββᾶν θεόφιλον τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας"⁽²⁾, and "ἔλεγον περὶ τοῦ ἀββᾶ Σιλουανοῦ οὗ ὡς ᾔθελεν ἐξελεθεῖν εἰς Συρίαν, εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ Μάρκος· Πάτερ, οὐ θέλω ἐξελεθεῖν ἐνθεν, ἀλλ' οὐδέ σε ἀπὸ ἐξελεθεῖν, ἀββᾶ"⁽³⁾. In these two extracts we see that ἀββᾶς means presbyter, archbishop, abbot and father. In modern Greek ἀββᾶς means 'monk' or in general 'father of monks' rather than abbot. Then Schmid⁽⁴⁾ and Quasten⁽⁵⁾ are correct in saying that the phrase ὁ ἀββᾶς Ἰσιδωρος ο Πηλουσιώτης εἶπε of the Apophthegmata means 'father of the desert' or 'father of the monks'. Therefore the deacon Rusticus who in the Synodicon wrote: "Isidori presbyteri et abbatis monasterii circa Pelusium"⁽⁶⁾ was wrong with regard to the word ἀββᾶς. For, whereas the term in Greek does not mean only abbot, in Latin it means only abbot. Hence the misunderstanding by all subsequent Scholars.

It is also remarkable that old sources such as Severus of Antioch, Ephraem of Antioch, Facundus, Euagrius, Photius, Menologium, 'Life' keep silent about Isidore's supposed capacity as an abbot of a monastery. The later Scholars, Heumann⁽⁷⁾, Niemeyer⁽⁸⁾, Schmid⁽⁹⁾ and Quasten⁽¹⁰⁾ deny the fact that Isidore was an abbot. Diamantopoulos⁽¹¹⁾ says that he is ignorant of the matter.

Although it is true that Isidore did not rule over a monastery, that is although he was not an abbot, his letters, however, signify that he was more than abbot. He was an arbitrator between monks and others⁽¹²⁾, a person of authority⁽¹³⁾, a spiritual counsellor but also a severe inspector⁽¹⁴⁾ to whom many had recourse, asking for his advice, intervention, arbitration and guidance.

Isidore was not an abbot but his letters tell us that the abbots of the area⁽¹⁵⁾, the monasteries⁽¹⁶⁾, the Convents⁽¹⁷⁾ and other monks as well⁽¹⁸⁾ needed his instruction, guidance or inspection. Isidore was not an abbot of an actual monastery at Pelusium, but living an angelic life on earth⁽¹⁹⁾ and being an important ruler of monastic life⁽²⁰⁾, he was essentially the superior of all monasteries and monks round Pelusium.

1. Not Isidore of Pelusium, but a presbyter of Scetis

2. MG 65, 221B

3. *ibid.*, 296D

4. *loc.cit.* p.8

5. *loc.cit.* III 181

6. MG 84, 583 and Mansi V 758

7. *loc.cit.* p.4-5

8. *loc.cit.* p.22-3

9. *loc.cit.* p.7

10. III 180-I

11. 1926/450

12. e.g. I 142; 318; V 423; 425.

13. I 182, 633C

14. e.g. I 37; 150; 154; 174-5; 275

15. I 49; 117; 258; 298; 392; cf I 318

16. I 150; 154; 220; 474; He writes even to the monastery in Tabennisia (I 93)

17. I 87; 367

18. V. Supra chap. I section B par. 2

19. Euagrius E.H. I 15

20. Photius, letters II 44 MG 102, 861D

Chapter VI

ST ISIDORE'S WRITINGS

A) THE 'LOST' WRITINGS

I. W i t n e s s e s

Speaking of the 'lost' writings of Isidore, we do not really mean that we are sure that Isidore composed some concrete works which have been lost; some of these works exist whereas others were never written by Isidore at all. But we preferred to use the word 'lost' and to put it in inverted commas rather, than to write simply the works of Isidore differing from his letters, because we shall deal with the opinions and theories concerning these works which have been considered by some Scholars as lost. And before citing these works and the opinions concerning them, it is, we think, necessary, to cite the witnesses with regard to them.

External pieces of evidence that Isidore wrote also other works apart from letters, are a) Severus of Antioch: "Mixit illi Isidoro tres quoque assignari amplas orationes adversus gentiles et de eo, quod non sit fatum" (1). b) Suidas' assertion that "ἐπιτολὰς ἐρηγνυούσας τὴν θείαν Γραφὴν γέγραφε καὶ ἁλῶν τινῶν" (2) and c) N. Kallistus note who also declares in connection with Isidore "πὸ λαλῶν μὲν αὐτῷ ἐγράφη ὁφελείας ἀπάσης ἐμπελῶ, μάλιστα δ' ἐπιστολαί" (3).

Parallel to these testimonies are the opinions of several later Scholars who discussed the probability of Isidore's composition of works so far unknown and who tried to find them or to state that they were lost.

We have also some interior witnesses, that is some allusions in the extant letters of Isidore which show that, indeed, Isidore composed something more than merely letters. Thus, writing to the count Herminius, Isidore says to him that he wrote a λόγος to which he is referring. He writes: "Ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἑλληνας ἡμῖν γραφέντι λόγῳ" (4). Once more Isidore refers to the same λόγος, writing to the sophist Arpeccras (5). In another of his letters Isidore informs us that he sent to the count Herminius at his request a

1. CSCE loc.cit. p.182

2. Lexicon, II 150

3. E.H. XIV 53, MG I 46, 1252

4. II 137, 580B

5. II 228, 664D-665A

"Α ο γ ι δ ι ο υ περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰσαρμμένον" which he had composed and that "some people merely praised this work, whereas others judged it to be the best⁽¹⁾ of the other writings composed by other writers on the same subject"⁽²⁾. Thus there is no doubt that Isidore had written some works plus his letters⁽³⁾. But what exactly did he write? All which has been told so far with regard to the 'lost' works, may be put in the following lines:

2. 'De Nativitate Domini'

Niemeyer in his Commentatio⁽⁴⁾ reported that a work entitled "Isidorus Pelusiota de nativitate Domini" is attributed to Isidore of Pelusium and that he had never^{had} an opportunity to examine it. According to Fessler⁽⁵⁾ this work has the title: "B. Isidori e p i s c o p i, theologi vetustissimi, de nativitate Domini, etc, libri duo; Haganoae 1529 and has^t really written by Isidore of Seville, under the title 'Contra Judaeos'". We consider it sufficient to state that we have not any other information anywhere concerning this work and that it is rather sure that Isidore of Pelusium did not compose such a work.

+ βεβη

3. 'Concerning Faith'

Philaret of Tsernicov reported in his 'Historical teaching concerning Church Fathers'⁽⁶⁾, that a MS (No 101) of the 14th century existed in the library of St Sergius' Monastery in Moscow, containing in a slavonic translation, a work composed by Isidore 'Concerning Faith'⁽⁷⁾. Balanos⁽⁸⁾ and M. Smith⁽⁹⁾

1. cf here L. Bayer's opinion (p. 101), according to which this short treatise being merely a popular exposition is lacking entirely of philosophical depth: "Selbst seine Ausführungen in III 154 ueber schicksal und Vorsehung, eine Polemik gegen epikureische und stoische Weltauffassung, entbehrt jeglicher philosophischer Tiefe; es ist mehr eine populaer gehaltene Darlegung"

2. III 253, 932D-933A

3. cf IV 12, 1061A

4. MG 78 p. 35

5. loc.cit. II 624-5

6. Greek Translation, Jerusalem 1887 vol. III p. 104 note I

7. "Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου περὶ Πίστewς. Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θεόν ἀγέννητον, καὶ εἰς ἓνα Υἱόν γεννηθέντα, καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐκπορευόμενον κλπ."

8. loc.cit. p. 36

9. loc.cit. HThR 47 p. 210

repeated this information. So far, there is not any known Greek text of this work.

4. "Ὅσοι εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου συνεγράφαντο"

Isidore's great admiration for and estimation of Chrysostom gave ground for some people to think not only that Isidore was a pupil of Chrysostom, which is not true, but also that Isidore contributed to the work "Ὅσοι εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου συνεγράφαντο", which also is not true⁽¹⁾. Indeed Isidore has been asked by Symmachus or by the monk Simon to write something with regard to Chrysostom's tragedy, but he replied as follows: "Ἐρωτᾷς τὴν περὶ τὸν θεσπέσιον Ἰωάννην τραγωδίαν. Ἀλλὰ φράσαι ταύτην ἅ πο ρ ῶ, Νικᾷ γάρ τὸν νοῦν ἡ μέθη τοῦ πράγματος. Μικρὰ δὲ μάνθανε..."⁽²⁾. These μικρὰ being nothing else but just one or two thoughts, could never be considered as a contribution to the work "Ὅσοι εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου συνεγράφαντο". But of course, in a wider sense, Isidore contributed to the life of Chrysostom by some of his letters⁽³⁾.

5. "Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου Ἐρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις"

Hardt⁽⁴⁾ wrote in his catalogue of codices of the library of Bavaria that the MS gr. 270 had a collection entitled; "Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου ἐρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις". M. Smith⁽⁵⁾ also wrote that another MS in Zagora, No II5, possesses the same collection and that some of the passages from Isidore cited in Catenae are introduced with the words "From the Questions and answers". This collection of extracts having been collected by an anonymous writer, does not possess extracts only from Isidore, but also from Chrysostom, Basil, Olympiodorus, Nilus, Markus, Maximus and Theodosius⁽⁶⁾. Niemeyer's opinion that Isidore's contribution to this collection is too little and therefore Isidore did not write any work entitled "Ἐρωτήσεις καὶ Ἀποκρίσεις", seems to us most probable⁽⁷⁾.

1. cf Niemeyer loc.cit. p.34

3. I 152, 284D-285A

4. I 152; 156; 310; II 42; IV 224; V 32.

4. Quoted in Niemeyer loc.cit. p.34

5. HThR 47, 210

6. Niemeyer, loc.cit. p.35

7. cf J.Fessler, loc.cit. II 624

6. P o e m s

Another theory is that Isidore was also a poet who wrote poems which now are lost. This opinion is based on Evagrius notice: "Ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς βασιλείας διέπρεπε καὶ Ἰσιδωρος, οὗ κλέος, εὐρύ κατὰ τὴν π ο ῖ η σ ι ν, ἐργῶ τε καὶ λόγῳ περὶ πᾶσι διαβόητος" (1). Although we find in many letters of Isidore a poetic way of writing and some letters which could be considered as little poems, we think that Evagrius' word ποιησις does not mean in this case poetry. Therefore Isidore did not write poems as J. Lang (2) thinks.

7. ' T o C y r i l o f A l e x a n d r i a '

G. Cave (3) interpreting Evagrius' testimony: "Ἐγγράμματα δὲ πρὸς Κύριλλον τὸν ἀσκήτονον ἐξ ὧν μάλιστα δεῖνυνται τοῦ θεσπεσίου συνακμᾶσαι τοῖς χρόνοις" thought that Isidore wrote against Cyril a book which now is lost. This opinion is entirely unlikely as Du Pin (4), Ceillier (5), Fabricius (6), Heumann (7) and Niemeyer (8) have already observed. The only thing which is true is that Isidore wrote eight letters to Cyril the bishop (of Alexandria) (9) and another three letters sent simply to Cyril. Ceillier (10) is in doubt whether these letters were sent to Cyril the Patriarch of Alexandria or to a different Cyril. Most probably the last three letters were sent to a different Cyril.

8. The two extant Λόγοι

But a greater discussion has been made by Scholars concerning the two following works composed by Isidore which we shall now examine. These works are firstly the Λ ο γ ὸ δ ῆ ο ν περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τιμαρμένον and secondly the Λ ὀ γ ο ς πρὸς Ἑλληνας.

-
1. loc.cit. MG 86, 246I-4.N. Kallistus (loc.cit. XIV 53 MG I46, I252) repeated later the same words
 2. Quoted in Niemeyer, loc.cit. p.34; cf Balanos, loc.cit. p.36.V. Supra, chap.V par.I for more details
 3. Quoted in Niemeyer, loc.cit. p.34
 4. L.E. Du Pin: Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques, Paris 1691 vol.III part II p. 4
 5. loc.cit. XIII 604
 6. Quoted in Niemeyer, loc.cit, p.33
 7. loc.cit. p.9 note aa
 8. loc.cit. p.33-4
 9. cf Bareill DTC VII 88
 10. loc.cit. p.604

Fleury⁽¹⁾, reporting that Isidore composed several works, says that "we have remaining only letters". L. Bober⁽²⁾ also thinks that these two works have been lost by a lapse of time. The same is asserted by J. Fessler⁽³⁾, Baphides⁽⁴⁾, Kurz⁽⁵⁾ and Batiffol⁽⁶⁾. Philaret⁽⁷⁾ thinks that these works have been either lost or were never published. H. Leclercq too, says that "the only extant works of St Isidore are a considerable correspondence"⁽⁸⁾. Heumann-it was to be expected from him who tried to deny the authenticity even of the extant letters-says also that these works have been destroyed; and, in a quite paradoxical way he declares: "Indeed, we believe that the cause of destruction of these two books happened because the author of them was a cheap monk; we are not doubting that if these books had a greater value and if their writer was a Bishop, they would be preserved at a future age and at our own time"⁽⁹⁾. Finally, J. Alzog⁽¹⁰⁾ and W. Moeller⁽¹²⁾ referring only to the work 'against Greeks' think that it is lost. All who spoke about the destruction of these two λόγοι are wrong, as the next pages will prove. And before we examine each one of these we must dedicate some lines in proving that these two λόγοι are separate and different from one another.

Rittershusius⁽¹³⁾ in 1605 suggested for the first time that these two λόγοι coincide. After almost ninety years Dupin⁽¹⁴⁾ accepted the same opinion. Later on, Niemeyer⁽¹⁵⁾, Bouvy⁽¹⁶⁾, Kihn⁽¹⁷⁾, Bareill⁽¹⁸⁾, Bardenhewer⁽¹⁹⁾ and Anwander⁽²⁰⁾ agreed also that the letter III 154 is both the 'Λογίδιον περί τοῦ μή εἶναι εἰσαρμένον' and the 'Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας'. The difficulties in accepting this opinion are many and insuperable. Isidore himself⁽²¹⁾ states

-
1. loc.cit. p.328
 2. loc.cit. p.12: "Quae injuria temporum perierunt"
 3. loc.cit. II 624
 4. loc.cit. p.362
 5. loc.cit. I 286
 6. loc.cit. p. 314
 7. loc.cit. III 104 note I
 8. CE VIII 189
 9. loc.cit. p.9: "Interitus vero horum duorum librorum etiam hanc fuisse causam arbitramur, quod auctor fuit vilis monachus, non dubitantes, maiori imprelio futuros nostramque ad aetatem per-venturos eos fuisse, si scriptorem habuissent episcopum"
 10. loc.cit. p.348
 11. RETHK IX 447
 12. MG 78, 579-80 note 32
 13. DTC VIII 88
 14. loc.cit. p.8 note c
 15. loc.cit. p.31-2
 16. loc.cit. p.137
 17. Patrologie II 234
 18. Patrology, p.379-80 and Geschichte..IV 106
 19. LTK V 626
 20. II 137; 228; III 253
 - 21.

that: a) These λόγοι were dealing with different subjects; b) they had different titles; c) their addressees were different. Besides we must add that: d) The one is λόγος, the other λογίδιον (1); e) the one had been written and sent as a letter, the other had been composed as a λόγος (2); f) The fact that the content of the λογίδιον περί τοῦ μή εἶναι εἰσαρμένον is against Gentiles does not necessarily mean that it is the λόγος πρός Ἑλληνας as Niemeyer (5) wishes, because there are many letters of which the content is against Gentiles; g) The title 'Πρός Ἑλληνας' does not mean necessarily 'adversus Graecos' or 'contra Gentiles' as certain Scholars translated and thought; h) Finally we must note here that the compilation of the two titles into one 'Λόγος πρός Ἑλληνας περί τοῦ μή εἶναι εἰσαρμένον' suggested by Du Pin (4) and followed by Niemeyer (5) in order to compromise the two λόγοι in one and the same letter is clever but it is not correct being a product of artifice and of strong imagination. For these reasons and in spite of the irresolution of Tillemont (6) and Ceillier (7) who did not say to us if these λόγοι were one or two, we think that these λόγοι were separate and different in both cases no matter which of the two letters III 137 and III 253 to Herminius was written first. This opinion is not only ours; before us Fabricius (8), Cave (8), Heumann (9), Schroeckh (10), Glueck (11), Fessler (12), Solandists (13), Bober (14), Moeller (15), Smith-Wace (16), Schenk (17), Balanos (18), Altaner (19) and Quasten (20) accepted the same thing.

-
1. The characterization belongs to Isidore (II 137; III 253). cf also Heumann (loc. cit. p. 9) and B. Altaner (Hat Isidoros.... in BZ vol. 42 p. 96-7). Altaner (ibid) remarks that this distinction of the one as λογίδιον and of the other as λόγος could also signify that the latter was better than the former, even concerning the rhetorical style.
 2. B. Altaner, loc. cit. p. 100
 3. loc. cit. p. 31
 4. loc. cit.
 5. loc. cit. p. 32
 6. loc. cit. p. II 7
 7. loc. cit. p. 604
 8. Quoted in Altaner, loc. cit. p. 92
 9. loc. cit. p. 9
 10. loc. cit. XVII 522-3
 11. S. Isidori Pelusiotae summa doctrina moralis, Wirceburgi 1848, p. 3
 12. loc. cit. II 624
 13. ASS loc. cit. par. 21 p. 483
 14. loc. cit. p. 15
 15. RETHK IX 447
 16. DCB III 318
 17. PWK IX 2069
 18. loc. cit. p. 35-6 and Patrology p. 389 note 3
 19. loc. cit. p. 96 and 100
 20. loc. cit. III 184

a) The Λογίδιον περί τοῦ μή εἶναι εἰμαρμένον

The Λογίδιον περί τοῦ μή εἶναι εἰμαρμένον is undoubtedly preserved among the extant letters of Isidore, and is the letter III 154, MC 78, 845B-849C. With this opinion many Scholars agree⁽¹⁾. There are difficulties concerning this letter being accepted as the Λογίδιον περί τοῦ μή εἶναι εἰμαρμένον. The first is that this is characterized as a letter and is too brief in comparison with other λόγοι of other Fathers. The second difficulty is that this work is printed as having been sent to the sophist Arpocras, whereas Isidore himself⁽²⁾ says that he sent it to the count Herminus and that Arpocras had perhaps⁽³⁾ got the other work, i.e. the Λόγον πρός Ἑλληνας.

In solving these two difficulties we would mention the following: a) With regard to the first difficulty: since this λόγος could have easily been written for a certain man who asked for it and sent to a certain addressee, it ought to have the characteristics of a letter. And since to the whole discussions which were taking place in that time at Pelusium concerning fate⁽⁴⁾ this Λογίδιον of Isidore was a mere contribution, it could be expected to be short. Moreover since the style of Isidore's writings is characterized by a tremendous laconicism as to write a letter consisting of only a dozen words⁽⁵⁾, why should we not accept as a λογίδιον a letter consisting of almost one thousand⁽⁶⁾ words? The second difficulty might be explained by the fact that either the addressee of this letter

+ two

1. e.g. Bouvy, W. Moeller, Turner, Bardenhewer, Balanos etc. Altaner (Hat Isidoros..p.98) says: "Ep. III 154 ist ebenso wie Brief II 228 an dem Rheter Harpokras gerichtet". Quasten III 184.
2. III 253, 932D-933A
3. II 228, 664D-665A
4. III 253, 932D. We possess two other letters of Isidore's (III 135 and 191) directed to a certain Paul on the same subject. Most probably Paul asked Isidore's opinion on Fate and Isidore replied to him in brief in III 135. Seemingly Paul was anxious to learn more about it and asked Isidore again; then Isidore replied to Paul in III 191 which is longer and better than III 135.
5. e.g. II 154, 609A
6. It consists of 993 words, to be exact, and, including the title, 1003 words. This λογίδιον compared with the letter IV 163, 1248D-1253A which is also characterized by Isidore (1249C) as λογίδιον and which consists of 662 words, claims to be big. With regard to laconicism and extent of the letters of Isidore, see below, section B of this chapter, par. 2. We think it sufficient at the moment to remark that six letters (III 335; IV 96; IV 129; IV 163; IV 166 and V 28) are a little bit shorter than the letter III 154. Three other letters (III 96; 351 and IV 125) are

in Migne's edition is wrongly Arpocras or that probably Arpocras also got a copy of this work whereas the other identical copy sent to Herminius is lost. Let it be noted here that this second difficulty gave ground for some Scholars to identify the two λόγοι about which we are telling with this letter. This opinion is not true, for the reasons we have already cited.

To sum up: The Λογίδιον περί τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰμαρμένον, being independent and different from the Λόγον πρὸς Ἕλληνας is not lost, but it is preserved and is identified with the letter III 154 which is not part of the Λογίδιον but it is the whole Λογίδιον.

b) The ' Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας

Many Scholars said that this λόγος is lost⁽²⁾. Others said that it is identified with the letter III 154, which is not true⁽³⁾. Altaner, who is the only one so far who dealt systematically⁽⁴⁾ with this λόγος and the other concerning Fate as well and who compared and examined carefully every external and internal evidence, concluded also that this λόγος is lost. J. Quasten too⁽⁵⁾ accepted this opinion. We try here to find and to define this λόγος among Isidore's extant letters and we think that the result of this search is not unworthy.

First of all the meaning of the preposition πρὸς with accusative, might be 'to' or 'against' or it might signify a comparison. Thus the Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας may be 'to or against Greeks', or since the word 'Greeks' also meant Gentiles in ancient times, 'to or against Gentiles' or this Λόγος might signify a compari-

approximately equally extensive; and six letters (II 127; 146; III 216; IV 58; 205 and V 186) are longer than III 154. Evidently Altaner's opinion (Hat Isidoros... p. 100) according to which out of 2,000 letters only eleven letters have such an extent and from these II letters only 3 are essentially longer than III 154, is not perfectly correct.

2. V. Supra p. 112

3. V. Supra pp. 112-3

4. B. Altaner: Hat Isidoros von Pelusion einen Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας und einen Λογίδιον περί τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰμαρμένον verfasst? In BZ vol 42 (1942-9) pp. 91-100

5. loc. cit. III 184

of a certain thought between Isidore's opinion and that of Greeks. Inasmuch as there is not any separate extant work of Isidore under the title Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας could we try to find it among his letters? Of course we could, as we did concerning the Λογίδιον περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰμαρμένον. In making this effort, we say that four letters⁽¹⁾ of Isidore could be suitable for such an examination:

1) II 46: Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων. Someone who τὰ Ἑλλήνων ἐπρέσβευε said to the presbyter Athanasius "that the Gospel introduced a new and opposite to the ancient custom way of life"⁽²⁾. Opposing this objection Isidore writes to Athanasius refuting him who in connection with the Gospel πρεσβεύει τὰ Ἑλλήνων. Can this letter be the Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας? We think no. Because neither is this letter speaking of εὐημερία as Isidore states in II 137 nor of Μαντική as he declares in II 228. Although this letter bears the title Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων and speaks against a certain conception of someone who thinks as pagans do, this letter is not the Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας. Apart from that this letter is too short and there is no room for joining it with another letter.

ii) II 146: This letter is quite extensive, addressed to a pagan⁽³⁾ and is dealing with the phrase of Demosthenes "δεῖ δὴ χρημάτων". This letter which is characterized by Isidore himself as dealing "περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι χρημάτων"⁽⁴⁾, in spite of the word λόγος occurring in it⁽⁵⁾ could by no means be the Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας.

iii) IV 55: This letter deals with Πυθαγόρειοι, Ὀμηρίζοντες, Πλατωνίζοντες, Ἀριστοτελικοί, Στοιχοί, Ἐπικούρειοι, Λογικοί, Μεθοδικοί, Ἐμπειρικοί and Κυνικοί who did not agree with their opinions and who calumniated each other. Moreover, says Isidore, if I wish to tell also the differences between ρήτορες, ποιηταί and συγγραφεῖς "πολύς τε καὶ ἁλός γος καὶ χρόνος ἀναλωθήσεται"⁽⁶⁾. If we now reckon the phrase "τίς οὖν τολμήσει τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρεσβεύοντων εἰπεῖν..."⁽⁷⁾ and the fact that this letter was sent to Arpocras who probably

I. The short letter I 96, 248D-249A addressed to the Greek Philosopher Maximus, bearing the title Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων is not suitable. The same holds good with regard to the letter I 270, 341D-

344A

2. 448A

3. 592B: "Οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ Ἑλληνὰ τε ὄντα καὶ τὰ Ἑλλήνων πρεσβεύοντα, χρὴ ἐν τῶν σῶν σε χειρῶσασθαι"

4. II 149, 604B

5. 597C and D and 600D

6. II 105C

7. II 5D-II 08A

got a copy of the Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας (1), we should expect that this letter could be the Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας. But, it could not be, because it deals neither with εὐημερία nor with Μαντική but with φιλαρχία and αἰρέσεις.

iv) V 186: Thus the only extant letter which could claim to be the Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας is the letter V 186⁽²⁾. It is addressed to Ἑλλήνων Παισίν characterized by Isidore himself⁽³⁾ as παραί- νεσις and is consisting of 1284 words, i.e. comparing it with III 154 which is the Λ ο γ ὀ ῖ ο ν this letter is longer. The content of this letter in general is virtue in comparison with other goods and especially with wealth, and the problem of εὐ- μερία of bad and good men. Could this letter claim to be the Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας? We think it could. And here is why and how:

First, we have the title: Ἑλλήνων Παισίν

Second, we have sufficient extent: 1284 words.

Third, we have the content⁽⁴⁾ as Isidore himself stated in two of his letters, i.e. II 137 and 228. To fix this third argu- ment and to leave no room for any doubt, we bring the following:

Isidore in his II 137 letter where he states that he wrote a λόγον πρὸς Ἑλληνας, gives us a summary of the content of that Λόγος. He says: "Τὸ εὐ η μ ε ρ ε ῖ ν τὸν πονηρὸν καὶ τὸ ἐν τοῖς εἰς σκρον χαλεποῖς γίνεσθαι τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ τὸν εἰς λῆξιν ἡκόντων ἐπ- αίνων ἐμπλεῶ, δυστόπαστόν ἐστιν ἀληθῶς καὶ δυσέφικτον καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀν- θρωπότητος μέτρων ἐπέκειννάν τε καὶ πορρωτάτω. Θεοῖς γάρ κρίμασι παρα- χρεῖν ἀναγκαῖον. Καὶ εἴπερ βουλόμεθα φρονεῖν ὀρθῶς, μόνῳ τῷ ἀκηράτῳ καὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας τὴν γνῶσιν ἀνάφαντες, πρὸς τὰ ἐν χειρὶ βαδιοῦμεθα, α καὶ μὲν πρὸς ἡμῶν εὐρίσκεσθαι φιλεῖ. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ αὖτε δεῖν κατὰ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ἐπαμῦναι τῷ λ ο γ ῳ ἐπημύναμεν, ὥς γε ἡδυνήθημεν, ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἑλληνας ἡ μ ε ῖ ν γ ρ α φ ῆ ν τ ι λ ο γ ῳ, ὃ ἐντυχὼν εἴσῃ τὴν λύσιν τοῦ προβλήματος". In other words Isidore says that in his Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας he was dealing with the problem of εὐημερία of bad and good men, that is with the problem of Θεοδικία. And this subject is really examined in his letter V 186 to Ἑλλήνων Παισίν. We cite some extracts from this letter for proving our assertion: "... Ἀλλὰ πολλοί, φασί, παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν εὐ η μ ε ρ ο ῦ σ ι, καὶ ἀρετῆς χωρὶς πλουτοῦσιν. Ομολογῶ μὲν κατὰ τοῦτο ὅτι πῶς αὖ εἰκότως ἀποτρέφει τῆς ἀρετῆς οὐ συννοῶ. Εἰ μὲν γάρ εἶχε τις σαφῶς ἀποδείξει, νόμῳ φύσεως κεκωλυμένα ταῦτα ἀμφοτέρωθεν συνελθεῖν, ἀ ρ ε τ ῆ ν τε, φημί,

1. II 228, 664D

2. We are really surprised that Altaner who mentioned this let- ter twice (Hdt Isidoros...p. 99 note 1 and 100 note 4) did not deal with it in more detail, but he disdained it as ha- ving been sent impersonally.

3. I 444A

4. Altaner, loc.cit. p.99 thinks that no extant letter deals to- gether with Θεοδικία and Μαντική and concludes that this Λόγος is not extant: "Da in keinem der uns erhaltenen Briefe die zwei Probleme (Mantik und Theodizee) zusammen behandelt werden, ist mit dieser Feststellung zugleich bewiesen, dass der Λόγος πρὸς

καί εὐημερίαν, μάλιστα μὲν δ' οὕτως εὐλογον ἦν τὸν πλοῦτον πρό-
της ἀρετῆς ἐλθεῖν, τῇ ῥαθυμίᾳ δ' ἂν ἴσως τοῦτο σηπτομένη παρεῖχε συ-
γνώμην... (I)... Ἐπειδὴ γάρ τῶν ὄντως ἀγαθῶν, τῶν οὐρανίων φημί, ἑαυτοῦς
ἐστέρησαν, τὰ πρόσκαιρα αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται, καί ταύτη ἐκκόπτων αὐτῶν τὴν
ἀπολογίαν. Σκοπήσατε δὴ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἀρετῆς ἀποῦσης εὐημεροῦ-
σίν τινες, ἀλλὰ τινες ἂν ποτε ἦσαν ἐν τῷ εὐημεροῦν, τῆς ἀρε-
τῆς προσοῦσης. Καί μὴν εἴτις ἐθέλοι μετὰ ἀκριβείας ζητεῖν (εἰ γάρ
καί παράδοξον δοῖται τὸ λεχθησόμενον, ἀλλ' ὅμως λελέζεται) ἐκ τοῦ παντός
αἰδῶνος μετὰ τῶν εὐφρονούντων ἢ τῶν φαύλων εὐροί τὴν ἀληθεῖ εὐ-
ημερίαν γεγεννημένην· εὐημερίαν ἔγωγε ὀρίζομαι τὴν
αὐτάρκειαν· ὀλισθηρὸν γάρ εἰς ἀκολασίαν ἢ τῆς χορηγίας ἐτοιμότης... (2)...
...Εἰ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς τούναντιον δοκεῖ διὰ τὴν δοκοῦσαν καί οὐ τὴν
οὔσαν εὐπραγίαν περιεργάζεσθαι, θαυμαστόν οὐδέν. Οἷ τε γάρ
παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν πλουτοῦντες, αὐτῷ τούτῳ τῷ παρ' ἀξίαν γνωριμότεροι καθ-
ίστανται· οἱ δὲ εἰκότως εὐημεροῦντες, αὐτῷ τῷ εἰκότως εὐη-
μερεῖν οὐ παρέχουσί τινι θαυμάζειν. Τὸ γάρ παράδοξον, πλείω ποιεῖ τὸν
ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον. Διὰ τοῦτ' ἴσως ἐλάττους ὄντες οἱ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν εὐ-
φερόμενοι, τὴν τοῦ πλείονος εἶναι δοξαν ἀπηνέγκαντο. Θῶμεν τοῖνυν (χρῆ
γάρ καί ἀπὸ συγκρίσεως τὸ δέον σκοπεῖν) ἴσους αὐτοὺς εἶ-
ναι· καί συνεψάμεθα, πότερον ἀμεινόν μετ' ἀρετῆς ὁ πλοῦτος, ἢ καθ' ἑαυτόν.
Καί μὴν, ὁ μὲν τῆς εὐημερίας ἐπιλειπούσης τῷ κτήματι τῆς ἀ-
ρετῆς ἔχει θαρρεῖν· τὸν δὲ οἰχομένης τῆς εὐπραγίας ἀτιμὸν ἀνάγκη κεῖ-
σθαι. Ὑποθῶμεθα δὲ πᾶσαν ραθυμίας ὁδὸν ἐκκόπτοντες, καί κενώρισθαι
ταῦτα τῇ φύσει, καί τοῖς μὲν τὴν ἀρετὴν, τοῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῦτον μεμερισμέ-
ως περιγίνεσθαι καί μὴ μεταπίπτειν τὴν εὐημερίαν ὥσπερ τὴν
κροίσου. Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν εἰλετο μᾶλλον Σόλων εἶναι ἢ Κροῖσος; Τίς δὲ
οὐχὶ Πλάτων ἢ Διονύσιος; Τίς δὲ οὐ Σωκράτης μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀρχέλαος; Καί τί
δεῖ πολλοὺς φιλοσόφους καταλέγειν καί συγκρίνειν τυράννοις, ὧν καί ἡ
μνήμη ἂν ἐσβέσθῃ, εἰ μὴ διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων ἀρετὴν τε καί σοφίαν; διὸ καί
τούτους παρείς, ἐκί τὸν συμβουλευτικὸν τρόπον τὸν λόγον τρέφαι-
μι. Εἰ τοῖνυν ἀρετὴ μὲν κρείττων χρημάτων, ἢ δὲ εὐημερία ἢ ἀ-
ληθὲς τοῖς σπουδαίοις ἀκολουθεῖ, καί ἡ δοκοῦσα δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐπεται εἰ
καί διὰ τὸ εἰκότως εὐδοκιμεῖν οὐ παρέχουσι θαυμάζειν, τῶν φαύλων διὰ
τὸ παρ' ἀξίαν πλουτεῖν γνωριμωτέρων καθεστῶτων καί πλειόνων δοκοῦντων·
εἰ δὲ καί ἴσοι εἶεν τῷ ἀριθμῷ ἀμεινόν οἱ μετ' ἀρετῆς εὐ-
ημεροῦντες. Εἰ δὲ καί κενώριστο ταῦτα τῇ φύσει, τὴν ἀρετὴν
πρὸ τῆς εὐημερίας αἵρετέον, τί καταρραθυμοῦμεν τὸν τῆς ἀρε-
τῆς προδιδόντες στέφανον; (3) These extracts plead clearly that
the problem of θεοδικία is examined in the letter V 186.

In the other letter, where the important evidence that Isi-
dore wrote a λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας is found, we read: "Ὅτι ἡ Μα-
τικὴ ὑβλος ἦν παρ' Ἑλλήσι καὶ μάτην ἐθρυλλεῖτο, δέδεικται μὲν μοι
ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἕλληνας λόγῳ" (4). In other words Isidore states that in

1. I440BC
2. I440CD
3. I441A-C
4. II 228, 664D-665A

ἡ Ἕλληνας nicht überliefert ist und als verloren gelten
muss!"

his λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας he also dealt with Μαντική. And happily enough the letter V 186 deals also with Μαντική although not in as many words as in the case of εὐημερία. We think that, depending on the content of the letter V 186 we have the right to say that Isidore in this letter was thinking in such a way: Greeks have Μαντικὴν and they praise it highly. But their Μαντική is unable to appease their fear of the future; so they neglect virtue which could provide them with a good future, ἀγαπᾶσι τὰ παρόντα and gather wealth which serves vice in order to secure their future life; thus their Μαντική becomes ὕβλος, i.e. loquacity or nonsense, since it cannot help them in their future true prosperity which depends not on wealth but on virtue. On the contrary the ἐνδρετοὶ ἐξηγουῦνται καθάπερ προφηταὶ τὰ μέλ[†] to those who follow them seeing their virtue. Here now is Isidore's extract from the letter V 186: "...Πάντων τῶν ὄντων ἡ δοκοῦντων ἀγαθῶν μέγιστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστόν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ· καὶ ταυτὸν εἰσὶν οἱ ταύτῃ συμβιοῦντες πρὸς τοὺς ἀμοιροῦντας, ὅπερ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν πρὸς τὰ θηρία· ἀγγελοὶ δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους· βαδίζουσι γοῦν διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀγγέλοις ἐοικότες. Ὅσπερ γὰρ λαμπτήρες ἐν σκότῳ ἐξαίφνης ἀφθέντες ἐπιστρέφουσι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ὀψεις, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι τοὺς ἄλλους καὶ ἐκπλήττουσι καὶ φωτίζουσιν. Οἱ δὲ ἀφέντες τὰ οἴκετα ἔπονται πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν ἀγαλλόμενοι· καὶ γίνονται πρὸς ἐκεῖνους, ὃ δὴ πρὸς τοὺς ποιμένας τὰ πρόβατα, συγχωροῦντες ἀγεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅπῃ ἢ βέλτιον· οἱ δὲ παραλαβόντες πειθηνίους, ἐξήγουσιν αὐτοὺς καθάπερ προφηταὶ τὰ μέλλουσα. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀρετῆς ποιουμένων λόγον, παρ' οἷς ἡ παραυτίκα ἡδονὴ καὶ ῥαστώνη μεῖζον ἰσχύει τοῦ ποθ' ὕστερον συνοίσειν μέλλοντος." (1) οἱ διὰ μὲν ἀπληστίαν καὶ ἀδικίαν τὰ παρόντα ἀγαπᾶσι διὰ δὲ σκαιότητα τρόπων τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα οὐδέεν προορῶσι, τῶν ἐν χειρὸς μόνον φροντίζον· τιθεμένων φράζουσι· "τὸ παρόν εὖ τίθεται". Ἐκεῖνοι τὰ μέλλουσα σκοποῦντες προμηνύουσιν, καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκβάλλον κατὰ τοὺς λόγους στεφανοῦνται καὶ ἀνακηρύττονται." (2).

We do not think of course that this last extract speaks very clearly on Μαντική but we do really think that it is a good allusion on the subject of "Divination", that it is almost a proof that ἡ Μαντικὴ ὕβλος ἦν παρ' Ἕλλησι καὶ μάτην ἐθρυλλεῖτο, and that this extract being strengthened by the other factors already mentioned, could claim to be characterized as the one subject of the λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας.

The fact that the letter V 186 is preserved impersonally is not an obstacle⁽³⁾ for accepting it as the λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας, but on the contrary, it is one more reason obliging us to consider it as the λόγος.

† λοντα

1. cf Demosthenes' Philip II 27: "Οὕτως ἡ παραυτίκα ἡδονὴ καὶ ῥαστώνη μεῖζον ἰσχύει τοῦ ποθ' ὕστερον συνοίσειν μέλλοντος" and Isidore himself in II 174 and III 251

2. I437C-D

3. cf Altaner, loc.cit. p.100 note 4

On the question whether the letter V 186 is integral or part only of the *Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας*, we think that this letter is entire, but Isidore, having begun to write on the divination of Gentiles and having composed we may say the introduction to it, he was quickly led away by wishing to illustrate his opinion by examples; and having been occupied by virtue the most favourable subject to him went on to examine the problem of *θεοδικία*, and he forgot or thought it unnecessary, to come back and examine the question of divination.

In summing up our thoughts, we say almost with certainty, that the *Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας* written by Isidore is not really lost, but it is preserved and is the letter V 186 which possesses the proper title, the proper extent and the proper content.

B) THE EXTANT LETTERS

I. Number and authenticity of the letters

a) The number

Isidore's activity is illustrated in his letters and we may say that he became famous to the people after his age thanks⁽¹⁾ to his letters of which we possess a large collection. This statement signifies that the number of the letters was at some time larger. Indeed, we believe that Isidore really wrote more letters than those existing in Migne's collection. Interior pieces of evidence give ground for accepting this opinion.

External pieces of evidence concerning the number of the letters written by Isidore, are: a) The 'Synodicon'⁽²⁾ according to which two thousand letters of Isidore were preserved at the monastery of the Sleepless monks at Constantinople, divided into four codices of 500 letters each. b) Facundus⁽³⁾ who writes: "... quem duo millia epistolarum ad aedificationem Ecclesiae multi scripsis-

1. of L. Bayer, loc.cit. p.I

2. Chap. VI MG, 84, 587B: "...e x eius epistolis duobus millibus; qae sunt per quingentenas distributae in Acoemetensis monasteri codicibus vetustissimis quatuor, ubi etian per ordinem simplicium numerus continetur..."

3. loc.cit. ML 67, 573A

se moverunt...". c) Severus of Antioch who says that Isidore "permultas scripserit epistulas" and that nearly three thousand (tria fere milia) letters were preserved in books but of those the order and numbers were so confused that the same letters were given twice and thrice⁽¹⁾. These letters, however, were found in several codices⁽²⁾. d) Suidas⁽³⁾ who states the number of the letters as being three thousand. e) The heading of the MS Athos, Laura II77, XV century, which speaks of four thousand letters, although this MS contains only 101 letters⁽⁴⁾. f) The Menologium Graecorum⁽⁵⁾, according to which Isidore wrote ten thousand letters and g) M. Kallistus⁽⁶⁾, who agrees with the Menologium with regard to the number of the letters written by Isidore.

From two thousand to ten thousand the distance is tremendous. How could we fill this gap? L. Bober⁽⁷⁾ quotes Cardinal Belarminus' suggestion according to which a mistake took place: $\gamma = 10,000$ and $\iota = 3,000$; now, says Bellarmin, this is the error; instead of γ (gamma) which occurs in the Lexicon of Suidas, Kallistus accepted ι (iota). The idea is clever, but unfortunately it is simply a suggestion which cannot be indisputably fixed, although apart from Bober⁽⁸⁾, M. Smith⁽⁹⁾ and Altaner⁽¹⁰⁾ would be ready to abridge the number to three thousand.

Being unable according to our present knowledge to state the accurate number of the letters written by Isidore, we confine ourselves to discussing the number of the extant collection in the series of Migne, volume 78.

It is a common secret that Migne's edition contains in general many mistakes. This is more evident and in some cases unbearable with regard to the edition of Isidore's letters. Apart from other mistakes concerning the text, the orthography, the

1. GSCO loc.cit. p.182-3

2. ibid. p.184

3. loc.cit. p.150. Other editions of Suidas' have: "Γέγραφε ἐπιστολάς ἐρμηνευούσας τὴν θεῖαν Γραφήν Γ. καὶ ἑτέρας 2"

4. Spyridon-Eustratiades: Catalogue of the Greek MSS, HThS, vol. AII p.194: "Ἰσίδωρος, πρεσβύτερος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης, ἀνὴρ ἑλλογιμώτατος, φιλόσοφος τε καὶ ρήτωρ, ἐπιστολάς ἐρμηνευούσας τὴν θεῖαν Γραφήν χιλιάδας 8 καὶ ἄλλα τινά (ἔγραφε)".

5. loc.cit. MG II7, 296B: "Δέκα δὲ χιλιάδας γράφας ἐπιστολάς..."

6. loc.cit. MG I46, 1252: "Καὶ δὴ πολλὰ μὲν αὐτῷ ἐγράφη... μάλιστα δ' ἐπιστολαί... ὡσεὶ χιλιάδας δέκα".

7. loc.cit. p. 12: "Quod autem alteram quaestionem attinet, nempe numerum epistolarum, dekas hiliadum Nicephori ex erronee scripta littera graeca, numerum notante, exorta est, ut advertit Card. Bellarminus, cum littera Iota, puncto notata, pro (gamma) erronee fuerit accepta. Itaque posita hac explicatione numerus epistolarum S. Isidori coarctaretur ad tria millia".

8. ibid.

9. HThR 47 p.205-6

10. Patrology, p.308

punctuation etc. which are not examined now, we point out here the mistakes with regard to duplicates, and deficient numeration. These mistakes contributed to the formation of a false total number of the letters. Thus Migne's edition says that the extant letters of Isidore are: 500 in book one⁽¹⁾, 300 in book two, 413 in book three, 230 in book four and 569 in book five. In one word Migne gives the total number 2012 which is not true.

This number is not true for two certain reasons. Firstly the numeration jumps over the numbers 79 and 131 of the IV book of the letters⁽²⁾. Secondly, there are several letters printed twice. We must mention here that Scholars do not agree with regard to the number of duplicates. Thus Diamantopoulos⁽³⁾ finds 5 duplicates; Balanos⁽⁴⁾ finds 7; Bouvy⁽⁵⁾ finds 10; Capo⁽⁶⁾ and Turner⁽⁷⁾ find 12; Heumann⁽⁸⁾ finds 13; Niemeyer⁽⁹⁾ and Bareill⁽¹⁰⁾ find 15, and Baur⁽¹¹⁾ whom Altaner⁽¹²⁾ and Quasten⁽¹³⁾ seemingly follow, find 19 duplicates. Our opinion is that the duplicates number 13⁽¹⁴⁾. And if to this number we add the two missing numbers which have been jumped over in the fourth book of Migne's edition, we make the number 15. Taking this number away from the number 2012, we have as a result the number 1997. Thus the printed letters in Migne's edition are 1997⁽¹⁵⁾. If now we add to these letters the three unpublished letters given by N. Capo⁽¹⁶⁾, then we have exactly the number 2,000, that is we have the number of letters which have been preserved for us by the four codices of the monastery of the Sleepless Monks at Constantinople, since

-
1. Let it be noted here for history that H. Leclercq (CE loc.cit.) mistakenly numerates the letters, as 590, 380, 413, 230 and 569 respectively and gives the total number 2182!
 2. cf. Bouvy (loc.cit. p. 175); Capo (Isidori Pelusiotae epistolarum recensio ac numero quaestio, in SIF vol. 9 p. 462); Turner (loc. cit. p. 84); Balanos (loc.cit. p. 39) reports only for the letter IV 79. It is characteristic that as Lake (Further notes on the MSS of Isidore of Pelusium in JThS vol. VI (1905) p. 270) says these two missing numbers occur also in the Vatican and Ottonian MSS.
 3. 1925/744
 4. loc.cit. p. 40
 5. loc.cit. p. 172-5
 6. loc.cit. p. 262-3
 7. loc.cit. p. 84
 8. loc.cit. p. 12 note h
 9. loc.cit. p. 38-9
 10. DTC VII 88
 11. Duplicate in Mignes Patrologia Graeca in ThQ vol. 100 p. 252-4
 12. Patrol. p. 309
 13. loc.cit. III 182
 14. This does not mean that we agree with Heumann who also speaks of 13 duplicates for some of ours are different from his.
 15. loc.cit. III 182
 16. This does not mean that we agree with Heumann who also speaks of 13 duplicates, for some of ours are different from his.
 15. Niemeyer (loc.cit. p. 39) also states the number of the letters to be 1997, but his duplicates differ in some cases from ours.
 16. loc. cit. p. 465

this collection was, the first source of all later MSS, as C. Turner has proved⁽¹⁾.

The duplicates according to us are:

- | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1) I 4 = IV 195 | 6) II 116 = V 374 | 8) IV 56 = V 239 |
| 2) I 29 = IV 188 | 7) II 285 = IV 180 | 9) IV 122 = V 139 |
| 3) I 249 = IV 156 | | 10) IV 124 = V 187 |
| 4) I 430 = IV 197 | | 11) IV 147 = V 91 |
| 5) I 456 = IV 229 | | 12) IV 190 = V 138 |
| | | 13) IV 199 = V 43 |

It is most probable that the letters I 271 and 272 had their origin I 303, but the same is not valid with regard to the letters IV 206 and 207. It is also probable that the letter V 285 derived from V 484 or vice versa. The letters II 1 and II 39 are entirely different; hence Heumann who identifies them is wrong. The letters II 162 and V 116 are similar but they are not identical as Heumann and Niemeyer thought. Similar are also the letters II 193 and V 129, but they are not identical as Fessler⁽²⁾ thought. The letters V 24 and V 567 are not similar but entirely different. Heumann, Niemeyer, and Diamantopoulos identify the letters III 205 and V 221. We disagree. They are similar, but they are not the same at least as they appear in Migne's edition. Heumann and Niemeyer are also wrong in identifying the letters V 324 and I 233. The similarities in many letters of Isidore are easily explained by the fact that he had to write to more than one person on the same subject or to write twice or thrice to the same person on the same subject. But it is not wise to identify all these letters which are similar in their content. Summing up: Isidore wrote more than two thousand letters but we cannot define accurately their number. On the other hand, the letters printed in Migne are 1987 in number and if to this number we add the three 'un-edited' letters of Capo, we have two thousand letters, i.e. exactly the same number as Synodicon and Facundus reported. Hoping that among the extant and unexamined or among the yet undiscovered MSS containing letters of Isidore, are letters still unpublished, we expect a future lucky Scholar will have the privilege of announcing a new discovery.

-
1. loc.cit. p.71; K.Lake(loc.cit.270) proves in an excellent way that the letters contained in some of great importance MSS, are also 2000 in number. Altaner(Hat Isidoros p.97) speaks of the number of the extant letters as approximately 2,000.
 2. loc.cit. II 617

b) The Authenticity

Severus of Antioch for the first time (c. 519) denied the authenticity of some letters⁽¹⁾. He quotes another five letters of Isidore's⁽²⁾. Severus' reasons were doctrinal, for he wanted to attack John Grammaticus who used these letters. But Severus is wrong here since ancient sources disagree with him. Indeed, John Grammaticus, the Codex of the Sleepless Monks, Ephraem of Antioch, Leontius of Byzantium, Facundus of Hermiane, Evagrius Scholasticus and Anastasius Sinaita confirmed these letters as being genuine. Apart from this the number of these letters is almost insignificant compared with the total number of the remaining letters which even Severus considered as authentic, since he did not express the contrary opinion.

Thirteen centuries after Isidore's death and despite the old sources of evidence which are sufficient and tell us clearly that Isidore composed letters and that these letters are excellent, Heumann attacked the authenticity of Isidore's letters. Heumann's theory expressed in his dissertation is that Isidore's letters were not true letters, but were simply rhetorical 'progymnasmata', i.e. exercises⁽³⁾, composed for his pupils because Isidore was (according to him) a teacher of rhetoric, and that these letters were never sent to the persons for whom they were composed. To strengthen his opinion, Heumann brings the following arguments: a) Isidore wrote to people already dead, as e.g. to Oribasius or Peter the Apostle⁽⁴⁾ (!); b) Isidore's letters being lacking in any form of address at the beginning (χαίρειν) and in the greetings at the end (εὐχαριστοῦμεν) have not the epistolary form⁽⁵⁾. c) Isidore wrote to the same persons and on the same subject more than once. d) Many letters of Isidore are similar, and e) the content of many letters is so very strict and condemnatory that it would be impossible for these letters to be addressed to such persons without the incurring unpleasant consequences for Isidore.

Niemeyer⁽⁶⁾ and Bouvy⁽⁷⁾ answered these arguments, or better speaking, they entirely refuted them. Balanos⁽⁸⁾ and Diamanto-

1. I. 102; 310; 323; 370; 405

2. I 303; 311; II 157; 228; III 253

3. loc. cit. p. 16-7

4. ibid. 17-8

5. ibid. 18-20

6. loc. cit. p. 39-47; cf also Bober (loc. cit. p. 13)

7. loc. cit. 10-37

8. loc. cit. p. 40-45

poulos⁽¹⁾ simply repeated what Niemeyer and Bouvy said. Indeed, Heumann's arguments are so weak and fantastic that there is no need to answer them one by one. One answer ~~for~~ all these arguments would suffice: If Isidore were a teacher of rhetoric, as Heumann believes, giving his pupils examples in how to write and speak, then, he would never compose the 99% of his letters⁽²⁾.

Another theory against the authenticity of some letters of Isidore, is that of Niemeyer⁽³⁾, according to which these letters were not written by Isidore as they are preserved for us because of additions or separations into two or three parts made by copyists or other monks. Altaner⁽⁴⁾ also speaks of the letters III 135 and I 91 saying that they were one letter at the beginning and that this letter was divided into two⁽⁵⁾. This theory is partly true, but it is true not only for the works of Isidore. This is equally true for many works of many ancient writers and Fathers. Can we dispute the authenticity of all these works by the fact that some slight additions and unimportant interpolations interfered? No. The authenticity of a work does not depend on some slight additions, but on the work as a whole. And from this point of view Isidore's letters are entirely genuine and complete.

M. Smith⁽⁶⁾ expressed the opinion that the letters of Isidore are genuine "but they must certainly have been open letters, or they would not have survived". We do not accept this opinion. Was it possible for Isidore of whom Photius said that "he was a multifarious Muse of our court and an important authority on words"⁽⁷⁾ to leave his letters open? Let us accept that one or two of Isidore's letters remained open; is it wise to think that two thousand letters have been open?

After all these remarks we think that Isidore's letters are on the whole genuine. Isidore wrote them as letters and sent them to concrete addressees who were alive. The lack of *χαίρειν* and *εὖ ποῶς* is also lacking in many other Fathers and means nothing. Apart from that, the *προσφώνησις* at the beginning is not

1. 1925/746-8

2. Niemeyer and Bouvy answered Heumann in detail. We do not think it necessary to repeat the same things. with regard only to the 5th item we supplement it by saying that Isidore suffered very much because of his courage and accusations. cf I 389, 401BC; II 122, 561D; V 131, 1401B; V 223, 1468AB and 'Life' in E p. 437

3. loc. cit. p. 47

4. Nat Isidoros... p. 100

5. We venture to think that Altaner is wrong here. Both letters are complete and the one is not part of the other. Most probably Paul asked Isidore about Fate. Isidore replied to him in brief in III 135. Seemingly Paul wanted a more extensive answer on the subject and Isidore wrote to him again the letter III 191. As is evident from III 253, 932D discussions on Fate were

actually lacking⁽¹⁾. The similarity of some letters happened because different persons asked Isidore about the same subject or because the same persons asked him about the same theme twice or thrice. External old sources of evidence and internal strong reasons oblige us to accept the fact that Isidore composed letters and that these letters are, all things considered, genuine and complete.

taking place. These discussions led Isidore to write the Λογίδιον περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰμαρμένῃ (III 154). cf. III 191, 877B: Καὶ πολλὰ ἔχον εἰπεῖν, ν ν ν ἰ παραλείφω

6. HThR 47, 207-8

7. Letters II 44 MG 102, 861D

- I
ω σοφεί, II 213-III 135-174-186-IV 36-43-101-V 167-202-318-369-412
ω θαυμάσιε, I 147-III 142-158-226-245-317-349-V 106-271-277-451
ω μακάριε, III 154(848A)-159-IV 209-222-V 20-78-215-321
ω ἑλλογιμώτατε, III 163-263-IV 16-221-V 317
ω βέλτεστε, III 192-222-309-407-IV 44-68-135-V 4-43-65-87-193-213
218-227-259-260-271-314-356-397-434-441-463-493-529
ω φίλος, III 133-IV 205-V 236-399-525-544-551 of Chrysostom, in
Theodorum Lapsum, Montf. I 20, 24D
ω πραδύτατε, III 156
ω ἀριστε, III 255, V 435
ω σοφώτατε, III 18-330-340-403-IV 173
ω δεινώτατε, IV 205(1297D)-195
ω προσφιλέστατε, V 112
ω ἀγαθέ, V 221-323
ω τῶν, V 269
ω σοφιστά, V 348
ω φιλολογώτατε, I 181
ω ἐμπρονέστατε, I 354
ω φιλότης, I 456
ω ἱερὰ κεφαλῇ, III 130-245-267. cf Chrysostom: ὁ φίλη κεφαλῇ in The-
dorum Lapsum, Montf. I 11, 13A, and ὁ θεῖα κεφαλῇ in De
Comparatione, hom. I Montf. I, 150. Theodoret: ὁ θεῖα
κεφαλῇ, in let. 12 MG II 85A. Gregory Theol. in Laudem
Athanassii XXXVII MG 35, II 28B: φίλη καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλῇ
ω φιλοσοφίας ἀγαλμα, II 173
ω τῶν θεῶν ἀνδρεστε, I 51
ω τί σε καλέσας ἀξίως προσείπω; II 166
ω τί σε καλέσας ἀξίως προσονομάσω; III 73-275
ω σοφίας αὐτοφυές ἀγαλμα, III 313-V 518
ω τί σε καλέσας τῆς σῆς ἀναληψίας καθάφομαι; IV 2
ω ρητόρων ἀριστε, V 465
ω ἀγνείας ἀνάκτορον, III 240-387
ω μισοπονηρίας ἱερὸν τέμενος, III 178-247
ω καθαρότητος τέμενος, III 344

2. Characteristics of the letters

C.H. Turner⁽¹⁾ said that Isidore's correspondence "remarkable from many points of view is unique in the patristic period for the large number of his letters which have been preserved". It is completely true that Isidore's correspondence is unique in the patristic period but why is this so? Is it so only because of the large number of his letters which have been preserved? Certainly not only for this reason; but mainly because they deal with important subjects in a unique way and for the special characteristics and merits of these letters. We dedicate here some words to the characteristics of the letters. These characteristics may be put into the following sections;

a) External Form

By these two words we mean nothing else but the extent of the letters. Are they short or extensive? They are mostly short. Some of them are extremely short and look like epigramms. To illustrate this, let us take a few examples: Thus, a letter addressed to 'Young Monks'⁽²⁾ consists of only thirteen words. In this letter Isidore touches three subjects⁽³⁾. The letter II 9,964D on virtue consists of fifteen words. 14 words are enough for Isidore to write on a similar subject⁽⁴⁾. The letter II 154,609A addressed to Ophelia who was an educated man deals with lucidity in speech. This letter consists of only 12 words of which 4 are articles! In 14 words Isidore admonishes a notorious soldier to avoid pride⁽⁵⁾. The letters III 21,745C and III 200,884B con-

 ω πάντα μικρά πρὸς σέ φθέγγασθαι, III 223
 ω φίλου λέοντος εὐγενῆ βλαστήματα, III 288
 ω μετριοφροσύνης αὐτοῦζεστον ἀγαλμα, III 48
 ω τῆς Ἐκκλησίας θέλημα περίβλεπτον, III 408
 ω ἀρχιεὶς ἐπιστήμης ἀριβέστατον βασανιστήριον, III 74
 ω πρὸς μὲν τὰς ἐνδόξους πράξεις ἀχρησώτατε, πρὸς δὲ τὰς αἰσχίστας
 πρακτικώτατε, III 116
 ω πρᾶτατον τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις ὄμμα εἰ καὶ τοῖς ἀδικοῦσιν ἔστι φο-
 βερῶτατον, V 419

These προσφωνήσεις by the way, show Isidore's peculiarity in his writings.

1. JThS vol. VI p. 70

2. I 474, 441B

3. "Εἰ νομῆμας ἀσχεῖτε, νηστεύοντες μὴ τυφοῦσθε· εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτῳ αὐ-
 χεῖτε, μᾶλλον κρεωφαγεῖτε"

4. II 45, 488A

5. II 191, 640C

sist also of 14 words, and the letters III, 168, 860D - V 123, 1396D and V 434, 1581A, of 13 words. A beautiful letter on the consequences of sin⁽¹⁾ consists of ten words and five articles. Let us cite it wholly for it would be the last example in illustrating Isidore's laconic style:

"Ὅσοι αἱ ἔχεις τῇ τῆς μητρὸς θανάτῳ, οὕτω καὶ αἱ ἀμαρτίαι τῇ τῶν τιμωμένων μαρτυροῦνται ὀλέθρῳ".

The above mentioned examples are only a dozen in number. If necessary, we could bring some hundreds of examples for illustration. But we hope no one disagrees with the statement that Isidore wrote in an extremely laconic form.

The question now is: Why was Isidore writing in such a laconic style? The answer can be obtained from his own letters, because this question was put to Isidore himself. Isidore writes to the teacher Ophelio: "Speech is not wonderful when it is extensive and not at the right time; but it is wonderful when it is short, expresses many thoughts and when, despite its shortness, it omits nothing. And when this speech is delivered at the right time, it seems more vivid"⁽²⁾. It is not a characteristic of a man to say more than what is necessary, says Isidore. And it would be a characteristic of a woman to write more than what is necessary. "Then, either speaking or writing, let us keep the symmetry"⁽³⁾. In another of his letters Isidore speaks of briefness and lucidity and finishes with the following words: "If we have to declare something, the speech must be brief; if we must prove what we say, then the speech must be extended, but we must avoid every redundancy and tautology"⁽⁴⁾. If to these conceptions we add the fact that Isidore had to write to many persons and that he perhaps found difficulties in obtaining the material appropriate for writing, then we understand better Isidore's laconicism⁽⁵⁾.

But it is also true that some letters are quite extensive. There are many letters consisting of some hundreds of words. Thus, more precisely speaking, and omitting other letters, we report that the letter III 154, consists of 993 words and similar to it are the letters III 95- III 351 and IV 125. A little bit shorter than III 154, are the letters III 335; IV 96; 129; 163; 166 and V 28. More extensive than the letter III 154, are the following:

1. III 261, 944B

2. V 121, 1396B

3. V 360, 1544A

4. III 57, 768D-769A

5. Gregory of Nazianzus (MG37, 105) says that three are the main merits of epistolography: shortness, lucidity and elegance. We have seen that Isidore can be proud of the shortness. We shall see further along that his letters are also characterized for the other two merits.

II 127;145;III 216;IV 58;205 and V 186. This last letter consists of 1284 words. The most extensive of all Isidore's letters is that addressed to Kassius Scholasticus, which covers five and a half columns in Migne and consists of 1950 words.

Why does Isidore who very much loves and follows laconicism extend some letters? He does it because there were special circumstances. The letters III 154 and V 186 were composed as λόγοι. In the others Isidore had to prove something to illustrate it by examples, necessary for the case. He was of the opinion that when we have to prove what we say, the material must be extended, avoiding, however, all redundancy and tautology⁽¹⁾. Thus he is not against his laconicism. He follows his rule which is: Laconicism, when we declare something; the proper extension when we prove it; in all cases the avoidance of what is unnecessary and of tautology.

b) Language and style

The letters of Isidore show, as we have already seen⁽²⁾ a very rich acquaintance with the works of classical writers. He studied them and with regard to the language and style, he followed them. He imitates their mode of expression and uses in many cases the same words. Above all Demosthenes was the writer whom Isidore respected and followed. Isidore's language is the language of the Fathers, showing the signs of the Attic Dialect very clearly. There are scarcely any irregularities with regard to his language. Diamantopoulos⁽³⁾ thinks that the language of Isidore is inferior to Chrysostom's, the three Cappadocians, Cyril's and Synesius'. On the contrary, we assess Isidore's language as being rather superior to Synesius' and perhaps Cyril's, equal with Chrysostom's and on the same level as Basil the Great's and Gregory of Nazianzus' as the wise and excellent critic Photius already remarked: "It suffices you to have the sweet Basil, Gregory who is above all writers the craftsman of beauty and Isidore who is the multifarious Muse of our Court and who could be an important authority on speech"⁽⁴⁾. Altaner⁽⁵⁾ calling Isidore "master of polished epistolary style", agrees with Photius, and so does Cayrée⁽⁶⁾.

Isidore is a prose writer, but his prose is poetic. So clear is this in Isidore's letters, that it gave ground for the forms-

-
1. III 57, 769A
 2. V. Supra pp. 66ff
 3. 1926/II3
 4. Letters II 44 MG 102, 861D
 5. Patrology p. 308
 6. loc.cit. p. 571

tion of the opinion that Isidore was also a poet. He was not, but he was undoubtedly a master of poetic prose. E. Fehrle⁽¹⁾ states that out of 2,000 letters of Isidore he found 125 examples of rhyming endings of phrases. Of these examples, 85 (68%) were conforming to certain rules⁽²⁾ and 38 (32%) were not. One or two examples from Isidore's letters illustrate it:

Οὐκ οἶδε πόρος ἀγρυπνεῖν, (8 syls)
 Οὐκ οἶδε τύφος ἡρεμεῖν. (8 syls)
 Ἐργηδόρσεως δεῖται καὶ κραδότητος ἀσκησις. (15 syls)
 Εἰ οὖν ταύτης ἀντιποιῇ, ἐκεῖνα κατάργησον. (15 syls)
 Εἰ δέ γαστρός οὐ κρατεῖς, (7 syls)
 τί καὶ τὸν τόπον καταργεῖς (8 syls)
 καὶ τοὺς ἀθλοῦντας ἐννευρεῖς; (3) (8 syls)

It looks like a poem; does it not? Similar to it is the following one, consisting of two stanzas:

Τὸν βουλευθέντα εὐεργετῆσαι (10 syls)
 μὴ δυνηθέντα δὲ βοηθῆσαι, (10 syls)
 μὴ ἐκ τῆς ἐμβάσεως μέμφου (9 syls)
 ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς προθέσεως τίμα. (9 syls)
 "Ὅτι καὶ τῇ φύσει κενίνηται (10 syls)
 ἃ ἔχρην διαπραξασθαι (8 syls)
 εἰ καὶ τῇ δυνάμει ἐνάρκησε (10 syls)
 μὴ ἰσχύσας ἐργάσασθαι (4). (8 syls)

Isidore's writings with regard to the mode of expression and style, are characterized by a lovely elegance and unaffected grace⁽⁵⁾. He uses the figure of speech, climax. e.g.

"Ὅσπερ γάρ ἐν τοῖς πταίσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἔστι κακόν, τὸ δὲ κάκιον, τὸ δὲ κάκιστον (κακόν μὲν γάρ ἡ κλοπή, κάκιον δὲ ἡ πορνεία, κάκιστον δὲ ἡ μοιχεία). οὕτως καὶ τοῖς κατορθώμασι, τὸ μὲν καλόν, τὸ δὲ κάλλιον, τὸ δὲ κάλλιστον· καλόν μὲν γάρ ὁ γάμος, κάλλιον δὲ ἡ ἐγγράτεια, κάλλιστον δὲ ἡ παρθενία"⁽⁶⁾. Also:

Κακόν μέν τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν, κάκιον δὲ τὸ καὶ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἀναισθήτως εἶναι· τὸ δὲ καὶ τὴν προαίρεσιν διεφθάρθαι, καὶ μηδὲ τὴν κρίσιν τῶν πραγμάτων εἶναι ὀρθήν, κάκιστόν τις εἰκότως ὀριεῖται.⁽⁷⁾

The use of figurative language gives to the writings a peculiar grace:

-
1. Zatzschluss und Rhythmus bei Isidoros von Pelusion, BZ 24 p. 314
 2. cf P.A. Schmid, loc.cit. pp.45-50
 3. I 130, 269A
 4. I 335, 376B
 5. cf Tillemont loc.cit. p. 117-8; E. Du Pin loc.cit. p.9; Heumann loc.cit. p.28; Ceillier loc.cit. p.638-9; Fessler loc.cit. II p.625; Philaret loc.cit. III 112; Batiffol loc.cit. p.314 etc.
 6. IV 115, 1189A
 7. V 159, 1417A

Εὖ γε πεποιήμας, καί τοι τῶν τῆς ἀρωστίας λειψάνων ἔτι
ἡμᾶς κατασφενδονώντων, τὴν λῦραν ἀραχνισσάν μεταχειρίσασθαι
ἀναγκάσας καὶ μέλος ἄσαι, εἰ καὶ μὴ γεγονὸς καὶ ἐξάκουστον,
ἀλλ' ἀμυδρόν καὶ ἡσύχιον. Οὐκοῦν, ὁκνῶν σαυτοῦ τὰς ἀκοάς, καὶ
θῆγε τὸν νοῦν πρὸς εὐαισθησίαν. Ἡρέμα γὰρ ἄδοντες, οὐ ράδιον
ἀκοῦσαι. Πόθεν οὖν ἄρα, πόθεν ἀρξομαι τοῦ μέλους; (1) Or:

Ἐπ' ἐκείνου μὲν γάρ, ὥσπερ αἱ περὶ τὴν βασιλίδα τοῦ
σμήνου ἐν εὐδρόσοις λειμώνων ἀνθεσι περιεζάνουσι μέλισ-
σαι, οὕτω πάντες αὐτὸν περιεῖπον καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν ἐχόρευον.
Οὕτως γὰρ ἦν καὶ τὴν ὁμιλίαν καὶ τὴν φωνὴν μελισταγῆς,
καὶ χειρωτικὸν ἐκέκτητο θέλητρον. (2)

Isidore makes very frequent use of antithesis. e.g.:

Ἡ μὲν Αἴγυπτία τοῦ νέου ἦρα, ὁ δὲ νέος τῆς σωφροσύνης.
Διὸ καὶ ἡ μὲν θηρῶσα αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐπέτυχε τῆς θήρας, καί τοι
πάντα τὰ λίνα τῆς θήρας ἀναπετάσασα. Ὁ δὲ ἐπέτυχε τῆς θή-
ρας, πάντων τῶν δικτύων ἐκείνης ὑπερνεχθεὶς. Τῇ μὲν γὰρ
ἐχθρὸς, τῇ δὲ ὁ Νομοθέτης, τῆς σωφροσύνης συνηγωνίζετο. (3)

Isidore also uses alliteration. e.g.:

Ἦ ὁρῶν μὴ ἔρα, ἢ ἔρῳ μὴ ὄρα (η-ρ) (4)
Πολλοῖς πολλὰντι πρὸς κακοῦ γέγονε τό ἐν πολλοῖς ἐπιτυχεῖν.
Πλοῦτος μὲν γὰρ πολλοὺς ἐβλάψε... (π-λ) (5).

Isidore's letters are also characterized by the liveliness of
the style. The questions which succeed one another, stimulate a
continuous interest. e.g.:

Τί φῆς ὃ Δημόσθενες; Οὐδέν ἐστι τῶν δεόντων ἄνευ χρημάτων
γενέσθαι; Οὐ σωφροσύνην ἐπιδαίξασθαι, οὐκ ἀνδρίαν, οὐ δικαιο-
σύνην, οὐ φρόνησιν, οὐ φιλοσοφίαν, οὐκ ἀγαθότητα; Ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ
πρέποντα καὶ δέοντα ἂν τις κυρίως καλέσσειε. Ναί, φησί. Τί οὖν
ἐστὶν ὅπερ ἔφης; Τῶν ὀφειλόντων γενέσθαι εἶπον, ἐν πολέμῳ. Τί
οὖν τοῦτο, φαίης ἂν πρὸς αὐτὸν, οὐκ ἔταξας σαφῶς ἐν τῇ σαυτοῦ
λόγῳ; Ἡ οὐκ οἶδας τῇ τῶν πολλῶν ῥηθυμίᾳ, ὅτι ἂ βούλονται
ταῦτα καὶ κυροῦσι; (6)

Or:

Πῶς ὑπερβολῆς σωφρονισθεῖεν, οἳ γε καὶ τοὺς ψωφρονοῦντας
γελοῖσι; Πῶς δὲ ἐλεγχόμενοι παύσονται, οἳ γε τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας
διασύρουσι; Πῶς δὲ τοὺς θεῖους χρημοὺς αἰδεσθεῖεν, οἳ γε καὶ
μύθους αὐτοὺς νομίζουσι; Πῶς δὲ κρίσιν φοβηθεῖεν, οἳ γε μηδέ
εἶναι ταύτην διὰ τῶν ἔργων κηρύσσουσι; Πῶς δὲ τῷ Χριστῷ πεί-
σονται, οἳ γε Ἐπίκουρον δι' ὧν δρᾷσιν ἀνακηρύσσουσιν; (7)

This liveliness of the style becomes some times almost unbea-
rable when he is attacking those who are worthy of blame. e.g.:

1. III 154, 845B

2. III 245, 924B. For a translation of this passage, see p. 38

3. IV 77, 1137A

4. V 173, 1428B

5. III 154, 848D. of I III, 257A: "Ελαβες ἱερωσύνην ἀνιέρως ἀνίερε,
χρήμασι κλέφας πράγμα οὐράνιον (ρ).

6. II 146, 601AB

7. II 153, 608BC

Μὴ ὕβριζε τὴν θέλαν λειτουργίαν.
 Μὴ ἀτρίμαζε τὴν τῶν καρπῶν εὐλογίαν.
 Μὴ τῷ κέρῳ τὴν πόσιν πλεονέκτει.
 Μὴ τῇ ἀμετρίᾳ τὴν συμμετρίαν κακοποιεῖ.
 Μὴ τὰς φρένας πρόπινε πίνων. (1)

Also:

Ἡράκλειον ζευγος, ὡς ἔμαθον, συνήφας ἀγρίῳ σὺν,
 καὶ λέοντι θρασεῖ τὴν τῶν πτωχῶν ἐπέτρεφας οἰκονομίαν.
 Καὶ εἰ μὲν χρήμασι προέδωκας τῇ θαυμαστῇ ζυνωρίδι τὰ
 πράγματα, τοῦτο καὶ Ἰούδας ἐπόησε, τὸν Κύριον πεπρακώς
 τῶν πραγμάτων. Εἰ δέ καὶ λήμματος καθαρὸν τὸ ἁμάρτημα,
 αἰσχυνθήτωσαν οἱ ἀνομοῦντες διακενῆς. (2)

We can also find in Isidore's letters a form of humour:

Ὁ φίλος ὁ σὸς ἦλθε μὲν οὐ μαθησόμενος, ὡς ἔλεγεν,
 ἀλλ' ἐπιδειξάμενος καὶ διδάξων καὶ τὸ φρόνημα τῶν δο-
 κούντων τι εἰδέναι σβέσων. Ἀπῆλθε δὲ παθὼν, ὃ δρᾶσαι
 προσεδόκησεν. (3)

Or:

Ἐν μόνον καλὸν ἔχειν μοι δοκεῖ ὁ πλοῦτος, ὅτι τοῖς μέ-
 λιστα φιλοῦσιν αὐτόν, μινδύνους ἐξαισίους ἀποτίκτει. (4)
 refusing the praise from Eulogius, Isidore says:

Or,

Ὁ Εὐλόγιε, ὡς σφόδρα εἰ εὐλόγιος, ἐπαίρων ἐμέ
 καὶ τοὺς κατ' ἐμέ προσηρημένους. (5)

All these characteristics which run throughout Isidore's let-
 ters, give his language and style an excellent standing among
 those of other Fathers and confirm that he was a skilful crafts-
 man in the literary art. It has been written about him that "the
 style is natural, unaffected, and yet not without refinement. The
 correspondence is characterized by an imperturbable equability
 of temperament" (6). This is entirely true.

c) T h e C o n t e n t

Isidore's letters entirely differ from those we write every
 day when we say that we have received a letter and inform our
 addressee that everything goes well with us, or when we ask for
 something, or when we send our congratulations or condolences.

1. I 313, 364BC

2. I 425, 417CD

3. V 262, 1489B

4. V 447, 1582D

5. IV 31, 1084C

6. Leclercq CE VIII 186; cf Batiffol loc.cit. p.314

Isidore's letters are but excellent short treatises on many important subjects and have a special purpose and express ardently his will: to teach, to correct, to edify. Facundus already remarked that Isidore composed "duo millia epistolarum ad aedificationem Ecclesiae" (1) and N. Kallistus stated that Isidore by these letters "σύνταξ ἥθος καὶ βούλη" (2). As a matter of fact we do not need any external evidence to understand that Isidore wrote his letters "to the edifying of the Church" (3); the letters themselves show it clearly.

Another thing which we must note is that the letters deal always with important themes and express high thoughts. There is no need to illustrate this by examples, because all letters serve as good examples.

Finally, the content of the letters is characterized by a remarkable lucidity, because Isidore was thinking that "those who cover the truth by a literary art, seem worse than those who did not understand it" (4). He tried to tell the truth simply and lucidly (5), advised others to do so (6), and praised Chrysostom "who exceeded everyone in lucidity" (7). There exists an important letter dealing with the merits of speech which enables us to understand Isidore's style of writing and expression in general. The letter has as follows: "The merits of speech are truth, brevity, lucidity and σύναπτα i.e. to speak at the right time; the vices of speech are falsehood, verbosity, obscurity and speaking not at the proper time. For, what is the profit from speech if it is true but is not brief and bothers the audience? Or, what is its profit, when it is brief, but it is not lucid? Or when it is lucid, but it is out of place? But if speech has all the merits, then it will be vivid, urgent and animated, winning the hearers by the truth, subduing them by the brevity, touching them by the lucidity, completing the whole profit by the fact that it is delivered at the proper time" (8). Isidore did not only tell us which are the merits of a good speech, but he followed them in a unique way which characterizes all his letters.

-
1. loc.cit. ML 67, 573A
 2. loc.cit. MG I46, I252
 3. I Cor. I4, I2
 4. III 2I5, 893C
 5. III 95, 800BC
 6. II I54, 609A
 7. II 42, 484D
 8. V I45, I4I2AB

3. MSS, Codices and editions of the letters

a) M S S a n d C o d i c e s

It is not our intention in this section to deal with the MSS and Codices of the letters of Isidore particularly with the special task of examining their origin, characteristics, relations, value or history. This job has already been done quite successfully by special studies, at least for the more important MSS and are mentioned later on. It is now time for a specialist to join all these studies and to give some concrete results and directions for a future edition of Isidore's letters, a work so necessary today⁽¹⁾. Since a complete list of all MSS containing letters of Isidore has not been given so far, our purpose here is to give this list, as full as possible, in order to show the extensive and diligent copying and reading of the letters of Isidore—it will tell us about his importance—and to help the future specialist to save some of his time in dealing with the MSS, although, as M. Smith⁽²⁾ says, "the descriptions of the MSS are not full enough to make possible an accurate account". M. Smith⁽³⁾ also states that, having reviewed some major catalogues of eastern collections, he found 88 MSS containing selections from Isidore and that a thorough search of the minor catalogues of collections in Greece, has raised this figure to 175. M. Smith does not give any list. From Catalogues of MSS and studies which were available to us, we cite here some 125 MSS, containing letters of Isidore.

We have arranged the order of the MSS and codices according to the number of letters they contain, which is also a certain criterion, although not so certain, for the worth of the MSS. We have made, however, an exception for the MSS Vat. 649 and 650, and Ottob. 341 and 383 which form two important pairs of MSS, for their special relations with B a I and the original MS and for their important value. We have also put together at the end of the list, all —except a few— MSS which are preserved in the National Library and in many Monasteries on Mount Athos in Greece. For further details with regard to all MSS, one must consult the Catalogues and studies cited below, to which we are referring. To save space in this section since we repeat the same quotations

-
1. cf. G. Krueger: A decade of research in early Christian literature (1921-1930) in HThR vol. 26 (1933) p. 249: "A critical edition of the letters is sorely needed". cf also P. A. Schmid, loc. cit. p. 4-5
 2. HThR vol 47 (1954) p. 210
 3. ibid. 208-9

many times, we shall cite these studies or Catalogues by the initials before them:

- B Edm.L.A.Bouvy:De Isidoro Pelusiota libri tres
- Ba D. Balanos:Isidore of Pelusium(in Greek)
- C N. Capo:De S.Isidori Pelusiotae epistularum recensio-
ne ac numero questio, SIF IX
- EA S.Eustratiades-Arcadios:Catalogue of the Greek MSS in
the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mount Athos
HThS XI
- Li Sp.Lambros:Catalogue of the Greek MSS of the Mount
Athos, vol. I
- Lii The same work, vol. II
- La K.Lake:Further notes on the MSS of Isidore of Pelusium
JThS vol. VI
- Lu V.Lundstroem:De Isidori Pelusiotae epistolis recensen-
dis praelusiones, Erasos II (1897)
- N H.A.Niemeyer:De Isidori Pelusiotae vita, scriptis et
doctrina, MG 78
- S M.Smith:The Manuscript tradition of Isidore of Pelusi-
um, HThR vol. 47
- SE Spyridon-Eustratiades:Catalogue of the Greek MSS in
HThS vol. XIII
- T C.H.Turner:The letters of St Isidore of Pelusium in
JThS vol. VI

List of the MSS and Codices

1. The first source of all later MSS, the oldest, the fullest and the most important collection of Isidore's letters, is that of the Monastery of the Acemetae at Constantinople, written as early as the fifth or sixth century, consisting of 2,000 letters divided into four parts of 500 letters each. No extant MS preserves the whole of this collection⁽¹⁾.
2. B a I, membran. ff 191(0, 2440, 18). The oldest and most important MS preserved in the Greek Monastery of Grotta Ferrata. Written in the year 985⁽²⁾, divided into two parts, containing 600 and 1,000 letters respectively. No use of this MS has been made so far⁽³⁾.
3. Paris, gr. 832 (Medic. Reg. 2357), written in the 13th century, consisting of 155 leaves, containing the first 1213 letters. The 'editio Princeps' was based on this MS where the 400 letters missing in the Grotta Ferrata MS are preserved⁽⁴⁾.

-
1. Faundus, loc. cit. ML 67, 573A; Synodicon.. MG 84, 587; N 53; B I 63; Lu 71 and 74; T 74; La 270
 2. N 55 says that this MS has been written in 986
 3. N 55; Lu 73; C 452-3 and 457; T 74-5
 4. N 58 by mistake gives this codex as MDCCCXXXII; B I 64-6; Lu 70; T 75.

4. Vatican 649, chart. (O, 322A0, 325), written in 1554 and containing 400 letters (MG 78:II 101-300;III 1-200). It consists of 218 pp. and bears the heading: Τοῦ κυρίου Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου ἐπιστολῶν βιβλίον β'. This MS with the subsequent one form a pair⁽¹⁾.
5. Vatican 650, chart. (O, 322A0, 225) written in 1552 and containing 999 letters⁽²⁾.
6. Cod. Ottobon. 341, chart. saec. XVI (O, 243A0, 165) consisting of 367 leaves and containing as the Vat. 649, 400 letters. This MS with the subsequent one form a pair⁽³⁾.
7. Cod. Ottobon. 383, chart. saec. XVI (O, 230A0, 150), consisting of 268 leaves and containing as Vat. 650, 1000 letters⁽⁴⁾.
8. Venetus Marcianus 126, chart. saec. XIV, contains 1148 letters⁽⁵⁾.
9. Munich gr. 49, saec. XVI, contains 1148 letters in two series of 659 and 489 letters each⁽⁶⁾.
10. Munich, gr. 50, saec. XVI, contains the same 1148 letters, in the same order⁽⁷⁾.
11. Vienna, cod. gr. 60401 (225), 13th or 14th cent. contains 1000 letters⁽⁸⁾.
12. Moscow, 28 10th cent., contains 896 letters⁽⁹⁾.
13. Athos, Laura 284, 10th cent., on fol. I-159, contains 837 letters⁽¹⁰⁾.
14. Patmos, 119, 13th cent., contains 586 letters⁽¹¹⁾.
15. " 706, 11th-12th cent., contains 510 letters⁽¹²⁾.
16. Vienna, cod. gr. suppl. CIV (hist. 68) saec. XV, contains (on foll. 281-316) 414 letters⁽¹³⁾.
17. Florence Laurent. plut. 86, 8, saec. XV, contains 411 letters⁽¹⁴⁾.
18. Patmos 118, 11th cent., contains 399 letters⁽¹⁵⁾.
19. Vat. P11 II, gr. 127, saec. XV except contains 360 letters (MG 78, I II-341 and II 201-231)⁽¹⁶⁾.
20. Paris, gr. 949, written in 1581, bears the title: Μέρος ἐκ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου, contains 229 letters⁽¹⁷⁾.

-
1. Lu 69-70 gives the number of letters contained in Vat. 649 (and Ottobon. 341) as 1000 (999) respectively; C 453; T 75
 2. C 454; T 75
 3. C 454; T 75
 4. C 454; T 75-6; N 55
 5. Xistus Senensis (MG 78, II 5); John Chatard (ibid. the number 1184 is probably misprint); N. 56; T 77
 6. N 53-4; Lu 71-2; T 77
 7. Lu 72; T 77
 8. N 57; T 76
 9. S 209
 10. BE 38. The first 15 letters are missing because the MS is headless. S 209 states the number of the letters 852, which is wrong.
 11. S 209
 12. ibid.
 13. N 58; Lu 73; T 76
 14. N 55-6; Lu 73; T 77-8
 15. S 209
 16. S 450; T 76.
 17. N 58 gives this codex by mistake as DCCCCXLIX; B 166-71 thinks that this codex belongs to 14th cent., but T 76 states that this codex was written in 1581

21. Upsala gr. 5, olim Escorialensis, saec. XI, contains on foll. 149r-188v 140 letters (109 from book I; 8 from book II and 23 from book III) (1).
22. Vat. gr. 742, saec. XIII-XIV, contains 127 letters (2).
23. Athos, Laura II 77, on foll. 96a-139, 15th cent., contains 101 letters (3).
24. Vienna gr. CCXCII (203), 'antiquus chartaceus', contains 93 letters, including, according to Lambecius, one unpublished letter (4).
25. Monacensis 55I, bomb. saec. XV, contains 63 letters (5).
26. Angelicus 13 (C.4.14), saec. XI, contains 50 letters (23 from book I; 15 from book II and 2 from book III) (6).
27. Athos, Vatopgdi 342, on foll. 33a-47, written in 1747, contains 49 letters (7).
28. Bodl. Laud. gr. 42, saec. XII, contains 38 letters on the Psalms (8).
29. Vat. gr. VII, saec. XV, contains 36 letters from book I (9).
30. Monacensis 490, chart. saec. XV, contains 27 letters (10).
31. Vat. Ottobon. gr. 90, saec. XVI, contains 27 letters (11).
32. Cryptensis, B.a. VII (cod. part. 7) membr. saec. XI, contains 14 letters (12).
33. Cod. DXXV S. Marci Venetis, contains 13 letters (13).
34. Paris, suppl. gr. 686, membr. saec. XII, contains 12 letters (14).
35. Vindebonensis 193, contains 12 letters (15).
36. Laurentianus plut. 60, 16 chart. saec. XVI, contains 10 letters (16).
37. Barberinus V 18, membr. saec. XI, contains 9 letters (17).
38. " VI 21, membr., saec. XI, contains 9 (different) letters (18).
39. Vat. 856, chart. saec. XIV, contains 9 letters (19).
40. " 952, chart. saec. XV, contains 9 (different) letters (20).

-
1. Stig Y Rudberg: Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 5, in *Eranos Upsaliae*, vol. 50 (1952) pp. 62 and 69-70. The Catalogue of I 706; Graux (quoted in Rudberg); Lu 70; and T 78 state that this MS contains 131 letters and so does N 59-60 who also cites the numbers of the letters. Another difference is that N; Lu; and T state that the letters are found on foll. 145-184
 2. C 450; T 78
 3. SE 194
 4. N 57-8; Lu 74; T 78
 5. Lu 74; C 451; T 78
 6. Lu 70
 7. EA
 8. C 451 says that this MS contains 37 letters; T 78
 9. C 450; T 78
 10. Lu 74; C 451; T 78
 11. C 450; T 78
 12. Lu 75; C 449 says that this MS contains 13 letters
 13. N 57
 14. Lu 74; C 451
 15. N 58 gives this codex as CCXIII; evidently it is a mistake; C 451
 16. Lu 74
 17. C 449
 18. *ibid.*
 19. C 450
 20. *ibid.*

41. Paris 967, chart. saec. XIV, contains 7 letters (1)
42. Codex Gudianus, contains 7 letters (2)
43. Barocianus 197, chart. saec. XIV, contains 6 letters (3)
44. Barberinus VI 5, chart. saec. XIV, contains 6 letters (4)
45. a codex in the Monastery of St. Germanus, contains 6 letters to Cyril (5)
46. Paris, 1872, bomb., saec. XIV-XV, contains 4 letters (6)
47. Borbonicus II. A. 29, membr. saec. XII, contains 4 letters (7)
48. Vat. 840, chart. saec. XV, contains 3 letters (8)
49. Angelic. 67, membran. saec. XI, contains 2 letters (9)
50. Barberinus VI I, membran. saec. XII, contains 2 letters (10)
51. Vat. - Ottob. 408, chart. saec. XVI, contains 2 letters (11)
52. Vatic. - Reg. 46, chart. saec. XVI, contains 2 letters (12)
53. Vat. 358, chart. saec. XVI, contains 2 letters (13)
54. Vat. 384, chart. saec. XVI, contains 2 letters (14)
55. Paris 186, membr. saec. XI, contains 2 letters (I II 4; II 212) (15)
56. " 201, " saec. XII, contains the same 2 letters (16)
57. " 206 " written in 1308, contains the same 2 letters (17)
58. " 701 " contains the same 2 letters (18)
59. " 702 " saec. X, contains the same 2 letters (19)
60. " 704 " saec. XII, contains the same 2 letters (20)
61. Barocianus 213, chart. saec. XVI, contains 2 letters (21)
62. Bodleianus Laud. 33 membr. saec. XI, contains 2 letters (22)
63. " Misc. 182, membr. saec. XI, contains 2 letters (23)
64. Upsalensis gr. 8, chart. saec. XV, contains 2 letters (24)
65. Laurentian. S. Marc. 687, membr. written in 943, contains 2 letters (25)
66. Monacensis 381, membr. saec. X contains II 212 (26)
67. " 277, saec. XV contains I letter (27)
68. Genuesis, (Congreg. della Miss. urb.) 10, saec. XV, contains I letter (28)
69. Parisinus 3026, saec. XVI, contains I letter (29)
70. " 3382, membr. saec. XI, contains I letter (30)

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. N 58; Lu 74 | 16. Lu 71; C 45I |
| 2. N 59 | 17. C 45I |
| 3. N 60; Lu 74 | 18. ibid. |
| 4. C 449 | 19. ibid. |
| 5. N 59 | 20. ibid. |
| 6. N 58 gives this codex
as MCCCCXXII; Lu 74 | 21. ibid. |
| 7. Lu 74 | 22. Lu 71; C 45I |
| 8. C 450 | 23. Lu 71; C 45I |
| 9. Lu 71 states that this MS
contains only the letter
II 212; C 449 | 24. Lu 74; C 45I |
| 10. C 449 | 25. Lu 71; C 45I |
| 11. C 450 | 26. Lu 71; C 45I |
| 12. ibid. | 27. N 54; Lu 75 |
| 13. ibid. | 28. Lu 75 |
| 14. ibid. | 29. N 59; Lu 75 |
| 15. C 45I | 30. C 45I |

71. Parisinus 4366, chart. written in 1586, contains I letter⁽¹⁾
72. Barocianus 56, saec. XIV, contains II 42⁽²⁾
73. " 213, saec. XVI, contains I letter⁽³⁾
74. Barberianus II 60, 15th-16th cent., contains II 42⁽⁴⁾
75. Ottobon 362, 16th cent., contains I 311⁽⁵⁾
76. Laurentian VIII 17, chart. 14th cent., contains I letter⁽⁶⁾
77. " VI 5, membr. 12th cent., contains I letter⁽⁷⁾
78. Codex XLIV Upsaliensis, contains I 390⁽⁸⁾
79. Paris, coislin. II 2, written in 1329, contains "epp. aliquot"⁽⁹⁾
80. " 949, chart. saec. XVI, contains "epistolae aliquot"⁽¹⁰⁾
81. Vat. gr. 712, 713, saec. XIV, contains letters πρὸς δὲ ἁγίους⁽¹¹⁾
82. Athens, Nat. Libr. 468(477), contains some letters⁽¹²⁾
83. " " " II 20, contains some letters⁽¹³⁾
84. " " " II 21, contains selections from Isidore⁽¹⁴⁾
85. Athos, Laura I 398, 14th cent., on fol. 234a: "From Isidore's"⁽¹⁵⁾
86. " " I 782, on foll. 54b-66, written in 1789: "From the letters of Isidore"⁽¹⁶⁾
87. " " 37, on fol. 19-20, saec. 4, contains "Isidore's, on the resurrection of the Lord"⁽¹⁷⁾
88. " " 359, on foll. 108b-109b, contains rather the same letter⁽¹⁸⁾
89. " " 222(beginning), 11th cent., contains "Isidore's on the soul"⁽¹⁹⁾
90. " " II 33, on fol. 283b, saec. XVII, contains I letter⁽²⁰⁾
91. " Iveron 4406(286) 16th cent. fol. 8a, contains 2 letters⁽²¹⁾
92. " " 4449(329) 16th cent., contains extracts from Isidore and from other Fathers, as well⁽²²⁾
93. " " 4616(496) saec. XVI-XVII: "Isidore's"⁽²³⁾
94. " " 4624(604) 18th cent., contains fragments from Isidore and from other Fathers⁽²⁴⁾
95. " " 4502(382), on fol. 202b, 15th cent., contains I let⁽²⁵⁾
96. " " 4508(388), on fol. 927-9, 16th cent. contains extracts from Isidore⁽²⁶⁾.

-
1. C 451
 2. Lu 75; C 451
 3. Lu 75
 4. Lu 75; C 449 states the age of this MS as cent. the 14th
 5. Lu 75; C 450
 6. C 450
 7. Ibid.
 8. N 60
 9. T 78
 10. Lu 74
 11. C 450; T 78

16. SE 318
17. Ibid. 5
18. Ibid. 50
19. Ibid. 27
20. Ibid. 185
21. Lii 71
22. Ibid. 86-7
23. Ibid. 157
24. Ibid. 184
25. Ibid. 110
26. Ibid. 136

12. Sakkellion quoted in Lu 75-6; T 78; The number of the letters is not stated. S 209 says that this MS consists of 51 folia
13. Lu 75-6
14. Ibid.
15. SE 240

97. Athos, Iveron 5431(1311)16th cent., contains some letters(1)
 98. " " 5457(1337)16th cent., contains "from Isidore's"(2)
 99. " " 5498(1378)15th cent., contains 1 letter(3)
 100. " " 4491(371), 13th-15th cent., contains some extracts from Isidore(4)
 101. " " 4330(210) on foll. 126a-129, 16th cent., contains letters to Cyril and Ophelio(5)
 102. " Dionysiou 232, contains some letters from Isidore(6)
 103. " " 3697(163)17th cent., contains "from Isidore's"(7)
 104. " " 3809(275), on fol. 519a, 17th cent., contains the letter on ITim. 3, 1(8)
 105. " " 3815(261), contains some letters(9)
 106. " " 3818(284)17th cent., contains some letters(10)
 107. " Panteleimonos 6018(511) on foll. 37a-45, XVII cent., contains "a list on the letters of Isidore"(11)
 108. " " 6288(781) on foll. 5b-17, 16th cent., contains some letters(12)
 109. " Xenophontos 748(46)18th cent., contains some letters(13)
 110. " " 790(88), contains comments on letters of Isidore by A. Paricos(14)
 111. " Dochiariou 2961(287)16th cent., contains 1 letter(15)
 112. " " 2938(264)18th cent., collection by D. Kerameus(16)
 113. " Vatopediou 135, on fol. 1a written in 1336, contains Isidore's on the Liturgy(17)
 114. " Koutloumousiou 3083(14), on foll. 499-492(18)
 115. " Gregorion 650(104), contains "from Isidore's"(19)
 116. " Stavroniketa 1018(153), on fol. 62a, 18th cent., contains interpretations of letters of... Isidore.(20)
 117. " " 1022, 18th cent., contains some letters(21)
 118. " Karakalon 1580(67), 14th-15th cent., contains apophthegmata from Isidore(22)
 119. " Pantokratoros 1052(23), 9th cent., headless and mutilated, contains extracts from Isidore(23)
 120. " St Anne 103(22), contains a small selection from Isidore(24)
 121. Marc. gr. 495, 14th cent.(25)
 122. Marc. gr. 525, 15th cent.(26)
 123. Barocianus 81, chart. 15th cent., contains "epist. aliquot"(27)
 124. Cod. in aliqua Bibl. Romana, contains some letters(28)
 125. Codex Wellensis, contains letters from Isidore's(29).

1. Li 263
 2. ibid. 272
 3. ibid. 278
 4. ibid. 99
 5. ibid. 61
 6. Li 379
 7. ibid. 350
 8. ibid. 398
 9. ibid. 400
 10. ibid.

11. Li 387
 12. ibid. 432
 13. Li 66
 14. ibid. 72
 15. ibid. 266
 16. ibid. 262
 17. EA 38
 18. Li 274
 19. Li 57
 20. Li 136

21. Li 95
 22. ibid. 16
 23. S 208 note 14; the number of letters is not stated
 24. ibid.
 25. C 451
 26. N 55
 27. N 60
 28. Li 89
 29. ibid.

b) Editions (I)

1. I 5 8 5, 'Editio Princeps' at Paris by J. Billy, containing 1213 letters in Greek and with a Latin version, divided into three books of 500, 300 and 413 letters respectively. The title of this edition is: 'Επιστολαί τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου. S. Isidori Pelusiotae epistolarum amplius mille ducentarum libri tres, nunc primum graece editi; quibus e regione accessit latina clarissimi viri Jacobi Billii Prunaei, S. Michaelis in Ermo quondam coenobiarchae interpretatio. - Parisiis apud Guillelmum chaudiere, via Jacobaea, sub insigni Temporis et Hominis Sylvestris'. This edition was based on the MS Paris gr. 832 (Medic. Reg. 2357) ⁽²⁾, and was reprinted in the second part of the 5th volume of the Library of the Fathers at Cologne in 1618 ⁽³⁾.
2. I 6 0 5, a revised and enlarged edition by C. Rittershusius at Heidelberg, containing 1443 letters (230 new) in Greek and in Latin, divided into four books. This edition which was based on the MSS Venetus Marcianus 126 and Munich gr. 49 or 50, bears the title: Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τῆς θείας Γραφῆς ἐπιστολῶν βιβλία τέσσαρα. S. Isidori Pelusiotae de interpretatione divinae Scripturae epistolarum libri quatuor. Quorum tres priores cum latina interpretatione Jac. Billii primum ante annos 14 Parisiis prodierunt. Jam vero sub prelum revocati MS cod. Bavarici ope plurimis in locis insigniter aucti, suppleti, correcti sunt; quartus nunc primum exit novus ex eodem codice Bavar., cui Venetus in Bibliotheca S. Marci respondet, descriptus et latinus factus a Cumrado Rittershusio, J. C. Ex officina Commeliniana 1605 ⁽⁴⁾.
3. I 6 2 3, at Antwerpiae, by Andrew Schott, under the title: Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου ἐπιστολαί ἀνέκδοτοι. S. Isidori Pelusiotae epistolae hactenus ineditae de locis sacrae Scripturae moribusque formandis, ex Vaticana pontificia bibliotheca nunc primum exute notisque et argumentis illustratae ab Andrea Shotta Soc. Jesu presbytero, in 8o. This edition consisting of 569 letters in Greek, was printed as the fifth book of Isidore's letters and was based most probably on the Vat. gr. 660 MS ⁽⁵⁾.

-
1. Apart from the aforementioned Scholars (Supra p. 135), Ceillier (loc. cit. p. 639-40), Glueck (loc. cit. p. 1-6), Bareill (DTC VIII 88-9) also dealt with the editions of Isidore's letters.
 2. N 35; B 176-7; Lu 69; T 78-9; Ba 38
 3. Ceillier, loc. cit. p. 639
 4. N 35-6; B 177-9; Lu 71; T 79; Ba 38 is wrong when saying that Rittershusius added to the previous edition a fourth book consisting of 489 letters from a Bavarian Codex.
 5. For this edition and for the following two, reference is given

4. I 6 2 4, at Rome by Andrew Shott, a latin translation of the former edition.
5. I 6 2 9, at Frankfurt, by Andrew Shott, a combination of the previous two editions, under the title: Sancti Isidori Pelusiotae presbyteri, epistolarum quas in Billii et Rittershusii editionibus desiderantur volumen reliquum, quas ex Vaticana summi pontificis bibliotheca nuper erutas nunc primum graece et latinae coniunxit... R.P. Andreas Shottus, S.J.
6. I 6 3 8, at Paris, by Morel, the first complete edition with '2012' letters, a combination of Rittershusius' and Shott's editions, full of mistakes, under the title: Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πηλουσιώτου ἐπιστολῶν βιβλία κέντε εἰς τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τῆς θ. Γραφῆς. Sancti Isidori Pelusiotae de interpretatione divinae Scripturae epistularum libri quinque; quorum tres priores ex interpretatione cl. v. Jac. Billii Prunaei, quartus autem a Cunrado Rittershusio, J. S., qui et notas uberiores et summas et indices prioribus libris adjecit, et quintus ab Andrea Shotto, S. J. presbytero, nunc primum in Gallia prodeunt; cum indicibus necessariis. - Parisiis, sumptibus Aegidii Morelli, via Jacobaea, ad insigne Fontis 1638 cum privilegio regis. (1)
7. I 6 7 0, at Rome, by Petrus Possinus, containing 2012 letters, with collations of six MSS, made on the margin of a copy of the 1638 edition by 'Franciscus Arcudius Calaber' bishop of Nusco. The six MSS were: Vat. 649 and 650; Ottobon. - Altemps 341 and 384; Codex Sfortianus; and codex Barberinus. The title of this edition is: Isidorianae collationes quibus S. Isidori Pelusiotae epistolae omnes hactenus editae cum multis antiquis optimae notae manuscriptis codicibus comparantur et inde circiter bis mille locis supplentur aut emendantur. - Ex bibliotheca Barberina (2).
8. I 7 4 5, at Venice, complete edition which "reproduces Possin's notes, but of the epistles themselves, it gives only a latin version" (3). The title of this edition is: S. Isidori Pelusiotae de interpretatione divinae Scripturae epistolarum editio prima Veneta latina auctior et emmentatior. Cui praeter notas Cunradi Rittershusii et Andr. Shotti adjiciuntur et notae aliae ex Isidorianis collationibus Petri Possini diligenter excerptae (4).

to N 36; B 179-182; Lu 72-3; T 79-80 and Ba 38 who states the number of letters in these editions as 559

1. N 36-7; B 182-3; T 80; Ba 38
2. N 37; B 183-5; T 80-1; Ba 38
3. T 82
4. N 37-8; B 186; T 82; Ba 38

9. I 8 6 0. J.P.Migne's edition, series Graeca, volume 78 .
10. In the sixth chapter of 'Synodicon adversus tragoe-
diam Irenei' ⁽¹⁾, thirteen letters of Isidore are prin-
ted. These letters are: I 25; I02; 3I0; 3II; 323; 324; 370;
404; 405; 4I9; IV I66; 2II; and V268, and have been re-
printed by Mansi ⁽²⁾ and by R.Aigrain ⁽³⁾. Aigrain re-
prints also other 36 ⁽⁴⁾ letters, all derived from
two MSS of the 'Synodicon Casinense' ⁽⁵⁾.

1. MG 84, 583-587

2. vol. V pp.758-762

3. Quarante-Neuf Lettres de Saint Isidore de Peluse, Paris 1911

4. III 223; 315; 329; 370; 317; 318; 405; and IV 174 marked as XI-
XVIII. V 21; 37; IV 100; V 126; 131; 160; 161; 201; 223; IV 56; V 240;
IV 108; V 224 marked as XX-XXXII. V 225 marked as XXXIV. IV
272; 276; 299; 300; 179; 46; V 500; 448; IV 126; V 481; 491; IV 217;
133; and 48 marked as XXXVI-XXXIX.

5. More about it see: Turner, loc.cit. pp.71-3; P.A.Schmid, loc.
cit. p.103f and especially R.Aigrain, loc.cit.

Part II

ST ISIDORE AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

C h a p t e r I

ST ISIDORE AND THE SCRIPTURES IN GENERAL

I. Preliminary note

In guiding the souls of his contemporaries to the true Christian life, Isidore had as his main means the Scriptures which he considered the highest authority and the perfect revealed truth. It was the interpretation of the Scriptures in general and of difficult passages in particular that established Isidore's excellent fame as one of the most important Figures of the age. Laymen, Monks, Clergymen of all degrees, well educated and in some cases people of the highest standing were constantly asking Isidore to solve their Biblical problems.

Isidore did not write any systematic commentary on any sacred book of Scripture. What he wrote concerning exegesis is hidden here and there and is simply an answer to a question or an admonition for the edifying of Christians in their particular needs. He not only learned the $\text{\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\omicron\upsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\eta\varsigma}$ (1), but through this knowledge he enlightened the Church of Pelusium⁽²⁾ in his time and countless number of Christians from his time onwards.

It is characteristic that "the most numerous group of the older mediaeval MSS"⁽³⁾ and three editions⁽⁴⁾ of Isidore's letters show him to be mainly an interpreter. After the Reformation many Scholars who dealt with Isidore, pointed out his excellence in Exegesis. It is, however, a pity, that today a few specialists know and avail themselves of Isidore's interpretations.

In this second part of our Thesis we try to give as complete a picture as possible of everything relating to the N.T., as Isidore used and interpreted it. In more detail, we examine Isidore's

-
1. Menologium Graecorum MG II 7, 293D-296B and 'Life' in E 436
 2. Anastasius Sinaita: Guide chap. I MG 89, 156D and Menologium, loc.cit.
 3. M. Smith, HThR 47, p. 209
 4. V. Supra p. 141-2: Editions, N° 2; 6; 8. of Suidas, loc.cit. II 150 N. Kallistus, loc.cit. MG 146, 1352 and MG 78, 178.

general position towards the Scriptures, the text of the N.T. he used, corrected or commented upon, and especially the rules, methods and types of his interpretation of the N.T. In addition we have a chapter assessing Isidore's capacity in criticism and interpretation and, to conclude, we have a chapter entitled 'Isidore's doctrinal teaching' which derives mostly from his interpretations.

It remains here to add that two special monographs on Isidore's Exegesis have already appeared: a) L. Bober: *De Arte hermeneutica, S. Isidori Pelusiota, Cracoviae 1878*, pp. 112, which Edm. Bouvy⁽¹⁾ did not assess as a noteworthy book. It is our opinion also that the first chapter of this monograph giving a historical account of Isidore's life, is not good. The other three chapters, however, dealing with Isidore's Exegesis are better than the first, although they do not cover sufficiently the whole subject. b) Jeasaph: *St Isidore of Pelusium as a Commentator of Holy Scripture (in Russian) in Bogoslovski Vrem. I (1915) pp. 535-561 and 728-834*. This we were not able to consult.

2. St Isidore's profound knowledge of the Holy Scriptures

By reading Isidore's letters one thing is easily understood; this is his deep knowledge of the Scriptures and his facility to use them. Moreover, the fact that Isidore never dealt especially with the Scriptures but only occasionally and in many cases without any preparation, obliges us to increase our esteem concerning this knowledge of him.

To illustrate Isidore's profundity with regard to the Scriptures it would be enough to cite only a few examples. Thus, interpreting John 21, 25 to Aphrodisia⁽²⁾, he quotes six references from the Scriptures (Dan. 3, 5; Exod. 3, 18; Ps. 106, 12; John 8, 37; 11 Cor. 7, 2; and John 1, 10) for the strengthening of his opinion. Again, he cites thirteen quotations from the Bible (Ps. 16, 8; Zach. 4, 10; Is. 40, 15; 18; Deut. 4, 15; 11 Cor. 11, 7; Gen. 1, 26; Gen. 3, 16; Ps. 8, 6-7; Ps. 36; Ps. 40, 2; Gen. 1, 27; and Matt. 5, 8) when

1. loc. cit. p. 203-4: "Librum ab omni fastu eruditionis remotissimum, ad res theologicas totum pertinere dicerem, nisi obiter et tanquam in transursu historicas quaestiones movisset. Opere enim in quatuor capita distributo, tria, et haec posteriora, artem Isidori hermeneuticam satis dilucide explanat"

2. II 99, 541B-44B

writing to a good friend of his, the namesake deacon Isidore⁽¹⁾. Finally, omitting other examples, Isidore when writing to a presbyter named Archivius⁽²⁾ and explaining Colos. 2, 19 refers also to Matt. 5, 22f; Mark 1, 41; Matt. 15, 28; Mk 4, 39; Matt. 21, 38; 1 Pet. 4, 1; Hebr. 10, 5; Phil. 2, 6; Rom. 8, 3; Ps. 39, 7; Zach. 4, 11; 1 Cor. 2, 8; John 1, 14; and Hebr. 1, 1, that is he cites fourteen quotations from the Bible in order to make his opinion clearer and all this takes place in a rather short letter.

In many cases the main text of Isidore's letters consists of Biblical quotations⁽³⁾ and even when he does not cite passages from the Scriptures he, by all means, writes according to their spirit. Isidore loved the Scriptures, considered everything of less importance⁽⁴⁾ and became a faithful, obedient and fruitful disciple of them; and that is why he so much delights in meditation of the Psalms, Prophets and especially the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles.

This profound knowledge of Isidore concerning Scripture enables us to understand that he was not merely a monk or an ordinary exegete but an important expert of Scripture and a skilful exponent of it.

3. The Holy Scriptures in General

Being convinced that the exposition of Isidore's opinions concerning the Scriptures in general would be useful and would help us to understand better his whole position towards the Scriptures, we try to cite the main points of his conceptions.

We have classified the material appropriate for this paragraph and we have put the proper headings. Since we do not think as necessary to comment much on these passages, there are only a few comments.

a) The H. Scriptures are called Διαθήκη and the reason

"The divine Scriptures call the 'treaty', συνθήκην that is the 'promise', ἐπαγγελίαν 'testament', διαθήκην because of its certainty and because it does not admit of transgression: δικά

1. III 95, 800B-804

2. IV 166, 1256B-1260A

N.B. 4. III 130; cf Bouvy, loc. cit. p. 47

3. e.g. II 175; I 416; II 143; III 335 etc.

τὸ πῶμα καὶ ἀναρῶμεν. For treaties are many times overturned whereas legal covenants are never⁽¹⁾.

b) Why have the Holy Scriptures been written?

Isidore says that God finding the thoughts of the ancient men pure and thinking them worthy of being taught without any mediator was speaking to them (e.g. to Noah, Abraham, Job) not by writings, but by Himself. But when the miserable Jews reached the depths of malice, then the writings and the teaching by them seemed to be necessary⁽²⁾. The same is valid for the N.T. also. For nothing written had been given to the divine Apostles, but only the grace of the Holy Spirit had been promised to them; for Christ said that the Holy Ghost "shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance"⁽³⁾. But as time was flying and since some people went astray concerning dogmas and others strayed concerning the right life, it seemed again necessary⁽⁴⁾ that the corrections of men would come by writings⁽⁵⁾.

In other words and in short, Isidore accepts that the Scriptures had been written because of the sins of men and for their help and correction; and this is true. Compare Is. 54, 13; Jer. 32, 39-40 and 11 Cor. 3, 3.

c) Metaphorical expressions for the H. Scriptures

i. The Scriptures are the rule of the truth⁽⁶⁾ and the truth which is contained in the Scriptures is without any pride⁽⁷⁾.

ii. To those who do not like the 'Good' the Scriptures seem to be simple and mere letters, but for those who are supermundane and φιλοθεάμονες⁽⁸⁾, the Scriptures are flourishing meadows which bloom with pure flowers from heavenly honey⁽⁹⁾.

iii. The divine Scriptures are a spiritual mirror where the story of good⁽¹⁰⁾ men and God's salutary laws are found. This

1. II 196, 641D

2. III 106, 812A; cf IV 53, II04BC

3. John I4, 26

4. cf Chrysostom in Matthew I a MG 57, 13

5. III 106, 812AD

6. IV II4, II85B

7. II 213, 656A

8. cf Basil the Great in Psalmum XLIV 6, Garnier I 235E: "Μακάριοι οὖν οἱ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ πολλοὺς φιλοθεάμονες..."

9. III 388, IO29AB

10. Isidore does not think that the Scriptures contain only the stories of good men, but also that God in the Scriptures did not keep silent about the lives of those who had transgressed (II 3, 457B)

mirror does not only show the ugliness, but, if we wish, it changes this ugliness to an inexpressible beauty⁽¹⁾.

1. The divine Scriptures are steps for the ascension to God.⁽²⁾

d) Authority of the Holy Scriptures

What Isidore says in his III 6 letter is certainly related to the Scriptures which are put by him in the highest rank as God's will. Thus Isidore says: "When God speaks or promises, all thoughts and probabilities of words must vanish. For all these compared with the office of him who speaks are nothing"⁽³⁾. It is easy to understand that Isidore in his letters gives the highest esteem to the Scriptures, because they are the word of God. Thus, interpreting Matt. 10, 28 he says among other things: "We have to consider that the Lord's determination is stronger than any other proof"⁽⁴⁾. Again, referring to Lk 7, 28 he says: "John was the greater prophet among those that are born of women, because the Lord said that"⁽⁵⁾. And Isidore concludes: "Therefore one must not object or contradict the Scriptures; but must promise in advance that he will do what he will hear. For, the fact that God is he who orders, banishes every contradiction and establishes every obedience"⁽⁶⁾. Isidore does not exclude syllogisms in elucidating the meaning of the Scriptures; but he is always ready to sum up his ideas and to strengthen them by the authority of the Bible, by words like these: "Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἀπὸ λογισμῶν εἰρησθε· ἐπιστρέψθε δ' ἡδὴ ἢ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ, φῆφος, ἐπισφραγίζουσα τὸ εἰρημένον καὶ λέγουσα....."⁽⁷⁾. For, as L. Bayer also remarks, Isidore's "Ziel ist immer die Wahrheit und das Leben nach der Wahrheit und dem Gesetz Christi. Daher kannte er nichts Höheres als die Heilige Schrift"⁽⁸⁾.

1. II 135, 577C

2. I 369, 392B

3. III 6, 732A

4. III 295, 969BC-972A

5. I 33, 204A. of also I 59, 221B: 'Ο Κύριος ἀπεφώνησε. I 109, 256C:

"We must obey Christ who is the accurate δογματιστής and who teaches accurately those truths which refer to his own essence". II 85, 529A: "Ἐὐλογεῖ γὰρ πᾶς λόγος μετὰ τὴν θεϊαν φῆφον.

6. II 249, 688A

7. IV 125, 1204A

8. loc.cit. p.102

c)Arrangment and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures

"The divine and pure Power, the Spring of wisdom, the Cause and the Beginning and the Root of prudence and of every virtue, having wished to plot the prediction of things to come with the more ancient writings, did, it wisely and with the highest of every reason and praise"(1). Although this passage does not tell us clearly about the inspiration of the Scriptures, it nevertheless shows Isidore's conception of God's direct inspection and arrangment of the Scriptures. Similar to this passage is the next one. "See the divine Wisdom which has been joined with poor words and examples. For, if G o d was taking care of His own dignity only and not of the profit of those who would hear, He would use heavenly and divine words and examples. But because He was legislating to men who are weak and who need human words (for in such a way they could easily understand what is superior of them) He joined the divine lessons with poor words, in order that even every woman and every child and the most illiterate of all men could gain something from them and from their hearing"(2). Compare also II 3, 457B in which Isidore exposes a similar idea. The new thought in this letter is that God in the Scriptures did not keep silent about the lives of those who had transgressed, so that one learning by all the examples might keep the good and avoid the wicked ones.

Apart from the above mentioned passages we must take into account the fact that Isidore attributes to the H. Scriptures such names as show that he believed their divine inspiration. Among these names are: 'Ιερὰ Γραφή(3), 'Ιερὰ Γραφαί(4), θεία Γραφή(5), θείαι Γραφαί(6), θεία Παύλαι(7), θείοι χρησμοί(8), θείοι καὶ οὐράνιοι χρησμοί(9), Δεσποτικοί Χρησμοί(10), θείαι Δέλτοι(11), θεία Λόγια(12) etc. Moreover there are in his letters some extracts which clearly declare that Isidore believed and taught the inspiration of the Scriptures. These extracts say that the d i v i n e S p i r i t spoke in the Psalms(13), that St John the Evangelist ὑπὸ αἵου

1. II 63, 505D
2. II 5, 461C
3. II 135, 577A
4. I 369, 392B; II 3, 457B; II 43, 485A; II 73, 616D; II 299, 725C; III 37, 757A; III 71, 780C; III 112, 817A; IV 17, 1064C
5. I 24, 197A; I 168, 293A; I 212, 316D; I 259, 337C; I 370, 392C; I 379, 396D; III 130, 829C; IV 67, 1124C
6. II 135, 577C; III 203, 885A; IV 114, 1185B and 1188C; IV 118, 1193A; IV 130, 1212C; IV 133, 1216A; V 257, 1485D
7. I 143, 280A
8. II 3, 457C; II 249, 688A; III 27, 748D
9. III 388, 1029A
10. IV 73, 1132C
11. III 95, 804B
12. IV 117, 1192B
13. I 416, 413B. cf. IV 182, 1273C: Τοῦ θεοῦ Πνεύματος ἐκάστῳ τὸ πρόσφορον ἀποδίδοντος.

ἡσυχαστοὶ ἐκινεῖτο (1) and that the Apostles, the uneducated and illiterate men, were educated by the inexpressible Wisdom and then they announced the divine message⁽²⁾. In another of his letters Isidore declares that "it was Christ, the King of heaven who taught through the Law and who preached through the Prophets"⁽³⁾. The word θεόκινευστος occurs in Isidore⁽⁴⁾ and means both those who understand what is written in the Scriptures and who are the "pure in mind"⁽⁵⁾ and those who understood the divine truths and exposed them in the Scriptures, i.e. the sacred authors. All these extracts along with Isidore's general attitude and position towards the Scriptures prove that he believed that Scripture was the word of God, that it has its origin in God, that God arranged everything in it, or the Holy Spirit inspired the Apostles and the Prophets to write what they wrote. L. Bober⁽⁶⁾, Bareill⁽⁷⁾ and others agree with this conception.

f) The simplicity and lucidity of the Holy Scriptures

In this paragraph we cite both what Isidore says concerning the simplicity and the lucidity of the Scriptures, since there are relations between them and since Isidore gives us ground for it. Thus he writes: "The divine and heavenly Oracles had been joined with lucidity, since they had been said and written for the profit of all mankind. For those who have other virtues related to words (these men are just a few) are not at all harmed by the lucidity of Scripture because they at once understand what Scripture says. On the contrary all others who deal with agriculture and other arts and with the other occupations of life avail themselves of the lucidity; and because of this lucidity they quickly and immediately learn what is right and what is beneficial"⁽⁸⁾.

By IV 67 Isidore replies to those who accuse the Scriptures for using humble and simple words and he tells why it happened so. He says: The Scriptures interpreted the truth by humble and simple words in order that wise men and children and women might learn... If the Scriptures ought to take care of something they ought to care for the multitudes. But since they took care of all, they brilliantly proved themselves divine and heavenly.

1. III 402, I037C

2. IV 30, I084A

3. IV 53, I104B. cf IV 203, I289AB: 'Ο θεός καί ἀκήρατος Κόυς...
οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἐρρίπτε τήν προφητείαν...

4. I 59, 220C

5. ibid. 221A

6. loc.cit. p.17

7. DTC VIII 89

8. IV 94, I152C

Therefore we do not find any fault in the Scriptures because they did not take care of their own glory, but they cared for the salvation of those who could hear⁽¹⁾.

In spite of the lucidity and plainness of the Scriptures, the 'world' did not understand many truths. Thus, in explaining John 21, 25, Isidore says: "The Apostles, as Peter the chief of their college in his acts explicitly declared, wrote what they understood. But the 'world' did not understand even these which have been written. For he who was avaricious did not understand the teaching of poverty. Neither the lewd man understood the teaching concerning chastity, nor the greedy man the teaching concerning righteousness, nor the cruel man the teaching concerning philanthropy, nor the irascible man the teaching concerning calmness... This world does not understand (οὐ χωρεῖ), not because of its area but because of its mode. Not for the multitude of the letters, but for the magnitude of the things" (2).

By reason of the simplicity of the Scriptures and of some mistakes which slipped into them, Greeks accuse them⁽³⁾. But, "the Greeks are wrong when they accuse the Scriptures because they used some foreign words and contain many mistakes concerning conjunctions etc. For, let the Greeks tell us: How did the Scriptures with their mistakes urge eloquence to accept their teaching? Let the wise men tell us, how did the Scriptures with their multitude of mistakes vanquish the error found in the Attic Dialect? How did not Plato, the chief of the outside Philosophers, conquer any tyrant whereas the Scriptures prevailed over the earth and the sea?" (4)

In other words Isidore says that the simplicity of the Scriptures is intentional and it serves their lucidity and both benefit every people. So the simplicity is not disadvantage, but a great accomplishment.

g) The reading of the Holy Scriptures

i. Exhortation: "Give yourself throughout all your life to the divine Oracles". (5)

ii. Presuppositions: "Go hunting for the sacred Scriptures' meanings which sharpen our prudence to more sharpness, having begun with pains and prayers" (6). And since the Scriptures are

1. IV 67, 1124C-25A. cf. V 281, 1500D: "Τῆς θεῆς σοφίας ἡ μὲν λέξις περὶ, ἡ ἐννοία δὲ οὐρανομήκης· τῆς δὲ ἐξωθεν λαμπρὰ μὲν ἡ φράσις χαμαιπετής δὲ ἡ πράξις "

2. II 99, 544AB

3. cf. I 21; 196; II 98; IV 28

4. IV 28, 1080D-81A

5. II 3, 457C and II 135, 577C

6. II 106, 548C

the highest authority, the word of God, one must promptly obey them." One must not dare to oppose or contradict the divine Sayings. But before hearing what he must do he must promise to do it" (1).

iii. Profits: a) "If you would wish to deal with the sacred Scriptures gratefully and prudently, you would urge yourself on not only the love of the divine philosophy but also the desire of doctrines from which the heaven-worthy life has its foundation" (2). b) "Think of the reading of the sacred Scriptures as supplying the salvation for it, furnishing good examples, strengthens and helps the good feelings and the virility of those who hear it" (3). c) A more general profit of the Scriptures exists because "the Scriptures give the proper food to everyone. Thus they promise good hope to those in danger, encourage those who do good works, provide comfort to those who suffer and threaten those who sin" (4). d) "Many other outside writers and philosophers have written many things which neither profit the obedient men nor harm the disobedient ones. But on the contrary the divine Scriptures give great benefit to those who obey and harm much those who disobey. Why is there this difference? Because the other writers wrote hunting for glory whereas the Scriptures care for the salvation of hearers" (5).

iv. Hearing: Similar to the reading of the Scriptures is the hearing of them, the neglect of which, says Isidore, is a machination of the Devil who does not wish us to see the treasure, in order that we may not gain the riches. The Devil says that the hearing of the divine meanings is nothing so that he will not see the act being committed after the hearing. Therefore, do not neglect the honeyed hearing of the divine Scriptures. (6)

4. Relations between the two Testaments

a) One Authority for both

Isidore making the event according to which God was speaking from inside the fire of the smoking mount Sinai (7) parallel with

1. II 249, 688A
2. IV 33, 1085A
3. II 73, 516D
4. II 299, 725D
5. IV 140, 1220C
6. IV 208, 1301C
7. Exod. 19, 19f

that of the descent of the Holy Spirit to the Apostles⁽¹⁾ says that it happened so " in order that one God in both Testaments would be known, although there is a great difference between these two events"⁽²⁾. We can find a clearer declaration in relation to the Authority for both Testaments in another of Isidore's letters. Thus he says: "As there is one creator of the moon which is good and of the sun which is better, thus of the Old and of the New Testament there is one Authority who legislated wisely and very wisely and properly to the times"⁽³⁾. Compare also IV 209, I304A where Isidore once again declares that for both Testaments there is one Authority, and I I47, 281B, where explaining Matt. 8, 11 he says: "The Lord is building up the stones of Grace on the foundation stone of the Law and putting patriarchs and the divine people together"⁽⁴⁾.

b) Agreements between both

Isidore teaches clearly the interior concord of both Testaments as a result of the fact that one Authority is for both Testaments: "The Son of God did not bring any new doctrine from what the Law and the Prophets brought, but he had put the end to these truths which had been aforesaid of him. And if you ingeniously interpret the Old Testament you will find in it all the teachings of the N. Testament. For the N.T. renders the truths of the doctrines in the era of Grace clear from the teachings of the Law to those who rely upon the Law and consider the evangelical way foreign to that of the Law. Thus you will see the interior accord of both Testaments"⁽⁵⁾. The superiority of the N.T. over the O.T. does not mean difference⁽⁶⁾. See also the fifth paragraph of this section and compare I I47, 281B. "This is why, writes Isidore, Christ ordered the leper to offer the gift that Moses commanded, that the concord of the two Testaments be proved"⁽⁷⁾.

c) The preparatory character of the O.T.

As many Fathers who dealt with this special point of doctrine accepted that the O.T. became a *παράγωγός τις Χριστού*, so Isidore

-
1. Acts 2, 11
 2. I 494, 452A
 3. II 133, 576C
 4. cf. I, 146
 5. I 107, 256A
 6. I 458, 433D
 7. I 146, 281A

preached the preparatory character of the O.T. "The lessons from the Law and from the Prophets, he says, are a p r e p a r a t i-
o n for the new and evangelical philosophy. For the O.T. legis-
lates to the body whereas the N.T. legislates to the soul. The
former directs acts and the latter directs thoughts. The former
tells truths appropriate for beginners whereas the latter tells
truths appropriate for the very philosophers"(1).

d) Differences in instruction given by both

Although there is one Authority for both Testaments and in
spite of the interior accord we find in both, there are also
some differences depending on the preparatory character of the
O.T., on the more perfect purpose of the N.T. and on the reci-
pients of it. Accordingly Isidore says: "The Law was separating
holiness from wickedness... Christ was giving his philanthropic
grace more perfectly than the judgment of the Law did. For
the Law was cutting off that which was bad, whereas Christ was
changing it"(2). In other words this is a difference concerning
the m e t h o d of instruction.

The second difference concerns the c o n t e n t of instru-
ction; and this is indicated in Isidore's letter to the Reader
Timothy: "The O.T. was using symbolic orders, whereas the N.T.
radiated with true things and doctrines"(3).

There is another difference concerning the e x t e n t of
instruction. The O.T. only corrects those who sin; the N.T. sti-
mulates the desire for virtue. "The Law correcting not those
who live rightly but preventing the passions of those who dis-
obey is a fine education of accuracy. But the Gospel, not by fear
but by encouraging the desire of those who love virtue is an
exhortation of philosophy"(4).

e) The superiority of the New Testament

On the superiority of the N.T. over the O.T., Isidore speaks
very clearly and he confines himself rather to two points: The
superiority of the N.T. over the O.T. concerning philanthropy
and love on the one hand, and concerning punishment on the other.
The superiority of the Gospel over the Law, he says, is great:

-
1. IV 134, 1216C
 2. IV 189, 1280A
 3. I 494, 452A
 4. II 288, 717C

"For the Law includes philanthropy only for those of the same race whereas the Gospel extends it also to those belonging to foreign tribes or nations. The Law commands us to love the friends whereas the Gospel orders us to love the enemies as well. The Law legislates as if it was applying to children, whereas the Gospel exposes divine doctrines as if it was applying to philosophers" (1) Both Testaments speak about certain truths, but they speak differently. "The meaning of love is found in the O.T. also. Christ added 'as I have loved you' and for that reason he called it a new commandment. For it is different for someone to love the neighbour as himself and to neglect his own things in order to rectify his neighbour's things" (2). Again, referring to Rom. 12, 20 he says: "The commandment 'if thine enemy hunger, fed him' is not so great and new, but it is a kind of malediction. For I consider that if someone fell in such great need as to need the necessities of life and if he has to take alms from his enemy, this misfortune exceeds every suffering and every punishment. The new commandment 'love your enemies' is greater.." (3).

The superiority of the Gospel is certain also with regard to punishments. "The Law, says Isidore, punishes the murderers but Christ punishes also those who are angry" (4). Compare also II 243, 684B where a similar idea is found. Also, referring to Hebr. 10, 29, Isidore teaches the same thing. "Grace menaced and punished more bitterly than the Law those who sinned and did not repent. And this is certified by what Paul said: He that despises Moses Law, dies, i.e. is stoned, without mercy, i.e. without pity, without the possibility to ask for remission, without forgiveness, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who insults Christ Who delivered and honoured him?" (5) Let us cite one more noteworthy extract of Isidore's related to this paragraph. He says: "There is one Authority for both Testaments, but the Law was forbidding only the bad actions because the Jews were disobedient, whereas the Gospel, legislating, as it were, to Philosophers, also prevents in advance the thoughts which look like bad springs from which bad actions spring. The Gospel not only punishes accurately the sins done, but it safely prevents them from being done" (6).

These superiorities-one hardly can call them differences-of the N.T. over the O.T., do not mean a kind of abolishment

-
1. III 53, 765D-768A
 2. III 410, 1044B
 3. IV II, 1057D-1060AB
 4. III 254, 933B
 5. IV 168, 1260C-1261A
 6. IV 209, 1304A

of the Law by overturning it, but they mean a completion of it by "Christ who included it in a higher philosophy. Because the commandment concerning the lust sight includes certainly the commandment concerning adultery. And the commandment concerning anger includes also the commandment concerning murder"(1)

After all these notes and with regard to the whole subject of this paragraph we can better understand why Isidore says: "It is right to found an idea by the O.T. and to crown it by the N.T."(2).

-
1. III 53,768A
 2. III 335,993A

Chapter I I

ST ISIDORE AND THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. Textual classification of St Isidore's New Testament passages

Would an attempt at textual classification of the N.T. passages of the writings of a Father benefit the criticism of the Biblical text? We are convinced that it would, since it is true that the quotations from the Fathers are an indirect evidence for the text of the N.T.⁽¹⁾, although in many cases they "are of crucial importance in fixing both the date and place of various types of text"⁽²⁾. The antiquity itself of the MSS of the works of a Father is not⁽³⁾ an undoubted and authentic criterion and therefore we cannot rely only upon it. Thus, although certain Scholars⁽⁴⁾ prefer mostly the period from 175 to 300 A.D. later witnesses are also regarded and examined with special care. Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome⁽⁵⁾, Basil the Great's *Ethica*⁽⁶⁾, the two Gregories and Epiphanius of Salamis⁽⁷⁾ and Chrysostom (fourth century), Augustine, contemporary with Isidore⁽⁸⁾ and even John of Damascus' 'parallela Sacra'⁽⁹⁾ (eighth century) give much help to the textual criticism.

Could Isidore's quotations profit the textual purge of the N.T.? The reasons which urge us to get an affirmative decision with regard to this, are: a) Isidore lived and wrote in the fourth and fifth centuries, i.e. his writings are not too ancient but also not too late. The fact that the MSS of his letters are of a later date does not matter too much since all MSS of the works of all Fathers are of a later age than they have been written. b) He cites more than three hundred quotations from the N.T., i.e. quite a good number⁽¹⁰⁾. c) The fact that he is quite

-
1. B.F. Westcott-F. Hort: *The N. Testament in the original Greek*, vol. I (the text), London 1909 p. 566
 2. F.G. Kenyon: *Recent developments in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible*, London 1933 p. 38; by the same author: *The text of the Greek Bible*, Duckworth 1937 p. 149-50; Gregory C.R.: *Canon and Text of the N. Testament*, Edinburgh 1907, p. 422 and 424-5.
 3. Zuntz: *The text of the epistles*, London 1953 p. 225
 4. Kenyon: *Handbook to the textual criticism of the N.T.*, London 1901 p. 221; Westcott-Hort, loc. cit. p. 576; Gregory, loc. cit. p. 430-2
 5. Kenyon: *Our Bible and the ancient MSS*, London 1958, p. 166; Gregory, loc. cit. p. 433
 6. Westcott-Hort, loc. cit. vol. II (introduction) London 1881 p. 87; Gregory, loc. cit. p. 434
 7. Gregory, loc. cit. p. 434
 8. *ibid.* 435
 9. Westcott-Hort I p. 577

well-known as an Exegete and Theologian as early as the sixth century⁽¹⁾. Hence, we may say that at least a number of Isidore's quotations might help the criticism of the N.T. text under the difficulties⁽²⁾ which are also valid for the quotations of the Fathers generally accepted as profitable for this purpose.

But which quotations from Isidore could help the Biblical criticism? Isidore in many cases, like other Fathers, quotes a N.T. passage from memory and in other cases he quotes only one or two words out of a verse. Therefore and because "longer quotations might well be copied direct from a Bible codex"⁽³⁾, we are obliged to limit the number of the quotations which could help us. But even after the limitation of the quotations to those which consist of at least one biblical verse and which are in the main text of the letters and not as their headings (they might belong to the copyists or might be wrong, as e.g. the heading of IV 12, 1060C), there are some basic difficulties. Several of these longer quotations agree in all texts of the representative groups (it is not important if there is a discord in some of the less important witnesses). Such quotations are:

Matt. 4, 6-7	John 1, 1	Rom. 8, 15-8	Colos. 2, 9
5, 38	10, 30	12, 18	2, 15
6, 11	18, 23	1Cor. 6, 18	Hebr. 2, 15 (ac-
13, 15	Acts 4, 20	9, 27	cording to Vat.
13, 31-2	26, 24-5	11Cor. 5, 13	650. See also 78, 1229
19, 7-8	Rom. 1, 22	Ephes. 4, 27	footnote 64).
22, 2-3	2, 10		

Thus our decision cannot rely upon these quotations. Again, there are quotations cited in more than one letters and whereas in one letter one text is used, in other letter a different text of the same verse is quoted. e.g. Matt. 6, 1 (in III 34 Isidore seems to follow the Alexandrian or Western type, whereas in III 142 he seems to follow the Byzantine or Caesarean one) and Matt. 7, 12 where in two cases (IV 53 and IV 54) he uses $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and once (IV 91) he uses $\alpha\upsilon$. So we cannot say with certainty in these cases what text Isidore was using. Also there are cases where Isidore's text disagrees with all other known texts. Apart from these rea-

10. Justin the Martyr for example whose writings are generally accepted as supplying valuable material for criticism, quotes less. See Kenyon: Handbook... p. 224

1. V. Supra pp. 6-9 and 19-21

2. Kenyon: Handbook... p. 206-8; Westcott-Hort vol. I p. 506

3. Kenyon: Our Bible... p. 166

sons we are not very sure whether Isidore's N.T. quotations extant in his printed letters are exactly as he at first wrote them. This is also valid for the quotations from all other Fathers and that is why "we cannot properly, that is to say, with definite and final certainty, apply their testimony to the criticism of the text until we have accurate scientific editions of them. Yet it is impossible to stand and wait until that great task is done. The New Testament must be furthered as well as the present circumstances admit" (1). Finally he scarcely ever names the book of the Scriptures from which he quotes and hence in some cases we are not very sure whether he was using this or that sacred book: e.g. Matt. 24, 45 and Lk 12, 42. In spite of these difficulties, using the critical apparatus of Al. Souter's *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Oxford 1956, along with the British and Foreign Bible Society's N. Testament, second edition with revised critical apparatus, London 1960, we give as a result the two following lists:

a) D o u b t f u l quotations

either because they are quoted from memory, or because they belong to a 'Neutral' text, or because witnesses for these texts are too complicated or because there are no witnesses at all.

Matt. 4, 4: Οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτι μόνῳ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντί ῥήματι ἐκκορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ.

(Most probably not Western)

Matt. 5, 16: Λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὥπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν Πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Matt. 5, 38-9: Ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὁφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ. Ἐάν τις σε ῥαπίσῃ εἰς τὴν δεξιάν σου αἰχλὸν, στρέφον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

(Most probably not Western)

Matt. 7, 6: Μὴ δώτε τὰ ἅγια τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ ρίψετε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν αὐτοὺς τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέντες ρήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.

Matt. 12, 32: Ὃς ἂν εἴποι λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

(Most probably not Byzantine)

- Matt. 15, 8-9: Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσί με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· μάτην δὲ σέβονται με.
- Matt. 25, 27: Ἔδει σε καταβαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς τραπεζίτας, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἀπῆτησα ἀν' αὐτό σὺν τόκῳ.
- Matt. 26, 53: Δοκεῖτε ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι παρακαλέσαι τὸν Πατέρα μου, καὶ δώσει μοι δώδεκα λεγεῶνας ἀγγέλων;
- Luke 6, 41: Τί βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκόν οὐ κατανοεῖς;
- Luke 10, 29: Ὁ δὲ θέλων ἑαυτὸν δικαιοῦσαι εἶπε· καὶ τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον;
(Most probably not Byzantine)
- Luke 12, 42: Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδόναι αὐτοῖς τὸ σιτομέτριον; (III 170, 861B: τὴν τροφήν ἐν καιρῷ)
(Most probably Byzantine)
- John 7, 25-6: Οὐ τοῦτον ἐζητοῦν οἱ θάρισαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι; Ἰδοὺ παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσι· μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἐγνώσαν, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;
(Not Byzantine)
- Rom. 11, 8: Δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὣτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.
- 1Cor. 2, 2: Οὐκ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι ἐν ὑμῖν, εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον.
(Most probably not Byzantine)
- 1Cor. 9, 5-6: Μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, ὥς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Κληρῶς; Ἡ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Εαρνάβας οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι;
(Most probably not Byzantine)
- 1Cor. 11, 7: Ἀνὴρ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ὀφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν, εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων· ἡ δὲ γυνὴ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστι.
(Most probably not Byzantine)
- 1Cor. 12, 27: Ὑμεῖς ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους.
(Not Western)
- 11Cor. 4, 7: Ἐχομεν τοίνυν τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσι, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν.

- 11Cor. 13, 7-8: Εὐχόμεθα δέ τῷ Θεῷ, μή ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς μηδέν κακόν, οὐχ' ἵνα ἡμεῖς δοκιμοὶ φανῶμεν, ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς τὸ καλὸν ποιεῖτε, ἡμεῖς δέ ὡς ἀδοκιμοὶ ὦμεν. Οὐ γάρ δυνάμεθα τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας.
(Not Byzantine)
- Gal. 1, 8: Ἐάν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.
(Most probably not Byzantine)
- Phil. 1, 29: Ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσατο ὁ Θεός, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτόν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν.
- Phil. 2, 3-7: Ἀλλήλους ἡγουμένοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν... Τοῦτο φρονεῖσθε (IV 22: φρονεῖσθω) ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἀρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτόν ἐκένωσε μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.
- 1Tim. 3, 1-6: Εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ. Δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, φιλόξενον, διδασκτικόν, ἀνεξίκακον, μή πάροινον, μή πλήκτην, ἀλλ' ἐπιεικῆ, ἁμαχόν, ἀφιλάργυρον, τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος (εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆται οὐκ οἶδε, πῶς Ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται;), μή νεόφυτον, ἵνα μή τυφωθείς εἰς κρεῖμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου.
(Most probably quoted from memory)
- 1Tim. 2, 24-5: Δούλον δέ Κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἥπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδασκτικόν, ἀνεξίκακον, ἐν πραότητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μήποτε δώῃ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός ἐπίγνωσιν εἰς σωτηρίαν.
- Hebr. 4, 7-9: Εἰ γάρ αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖνος κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν ὁ Δαβὶδ μετὰ πολλὰς γενεὰς περὶ καταπαύσεως διαλεγόμενος εἶπεν· σήμερον ἐάν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μή σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὥς ἐν τῷ παρακικρασμῷ. Οὐκοῦν, ἡ ἀληθινὴ ἀνάπαυσις τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
- Hebr. 9, 17: See below, 'Textual criticism'
- James 3, 6: Ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας. Ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν φλογίζουσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ σπιλοῦσα τὸν τροχόν τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γέννησης.

b) Quotations of which the classification is rather sure:

- Matt. 5, 20: Ἐάν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη, πλεον τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (IV 204-IV 216).
Οὐ δύνησθε ~~ἐλθεῖν~~ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (I 79)
(Rather Alexandrian) + εἰσελθεῖν
- Matt. 5, 28: Πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
(Rather Alexandrian)
- Matt. 5, 44: Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν· καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς· προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ διωκόντων.
(Equally Byzantine, Caesarean, Western)
- Matt. 6, 10: Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
(Equally Byzantine, Caesarean, Western)
- Matt. 6, 12: Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.
(Byzantine)
- Matt. 6, 13: Μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα.
(Byzantine and Caesarean)
- Matt. 6, 15: Ἐάν μὴ ἀφῇτε παραπτώματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδέ ὑμῖν ἀφήσει ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν.
(Byzantine and Caesarean)
- Matt. 10, 28: Μὴ φοβεθήτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι· φοβήθητε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέννῃ.
(Byzantine)
- Matt. 15, 24: Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.
(Equally Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean)
- Matt. 19, 11: Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται.
(Equally Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean)
- Matt. 23, 37-8: Ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε. Ἰδοὺ, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος.
(Equally Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean)

- Matt. 24, 16: Οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη.
(Rather Alexandrian)
- Matt. 24, 41: Ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐν (τῷ) μύλωνι· μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται.
(Rather Byzantine)
- Mark 9, 40: Ὁ μὴ ὢν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν.
(Alexandrian, Byzantine, Western)
- Luke 24, 39: Τὸ πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς με θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα.
(Byzantine)
- John 12, 32: Ἐπειδὴν ὑψωθῶ, πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἑμαυτόν.
(Byzantine)
- 1Cor. 9, 20-1: Ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος, ἵνα Ἰουδαίους κερδήσω· τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἀνομος, μὴ ὢν ἀνομος Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐννομος Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κερδήσω ἀνόμους.
(Alexandrian)
- 1Cor. II, 30-2: Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοι, καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί· εἰ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα· κρινόμενοι δέ, ὑπὸ Κυρίου παιδεύομεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κέσματι κατακριθῶμεν.
(Byzantine)
- Gal. 6, 2: Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἂν ἀναπληρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
(Alexandrian, Byzantine, Western)
- 1Tim. 5, 8: Εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰδίων, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖ, τὴν πίστιν ἥρνηται, καὶ ἐστὶν ἀπίστου χείρων.
(Byzantine)
- Hebr. 12, 16-7: Μὴ τις πόρνος ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἡσαΐ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ. Ἰσθε γάρ, ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομήσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὔρε, καί περ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.
(Byzantine)
- 11John 8: Βλέπετε μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἃ εἰργάσασθαι.
(Alexandrian)

If, after all these, one should expect to hear about what text Isidore was using, we should say that Isidore for half of his quotations was using manuscripts belonging to the family of the Byzantine text; for the third quarter of his quotations he was using manuscripts belonging to the family of the Alexandrian text and for the last quarter he was using manuscripts belonging either to the Caesarean family or to the Western one. Unfortunately this result is not out of question and it is a pity because we are unable to ascertain it more. But concerning the textual criticism of the N.T. we should say with certainty that at least half of the total number of Isidore's quotations could enrich the critical apparatus which so far scarcely refers to Isidore, and moreover Isidore's attempts for the correction of the text could give much help.

2. Textual criticism of the New Testament

Among Isidore's various comments and notes in relation to his quotations from the N.T., of outstanding importance are his attempts to correct and to restore the Biblical text. His attempts testify that he knew more writings of the Biblical text than one, that he was doubting some of them, and his self-confidence that he was able to correct the text. These corrections are also very interesting because of their antiquity and because they are more or less successive. It would be useful indeed, if everyone dealing with criticism and restoration of the Biblical text had these attempts in his mind. Below we cite and examine all these efforts referring to the textual criticism of the N.T. inasmuch they are important and not so many in number.

The first attempt of Isidore's corrections, is a short and simple one. He refers to Acts 23, 9 and says that many times a letter having been changed or omitted or added confuses the meaning of the saying, as it has happened in this case. The text now has: 'I if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him' "but it is wrong because thus the meaning of this verse is changed and becomes opposite to the apostolic sense. The text ought to be not 'I if (ei) a spirit' but 'for (ἐπεὶ) a spirit...' (1). The same is valid with Hebr. 7, 11 which is referred together with the above mentioned correction and to the same words. It

is not 'i f (εἰ) therefore perfection were by the Lăvitical priesthood...' but ' ἐπεὶ (since or inasmuch as) therefore perfection were...' (1).

In both cases Isidore's suggestion concerning the change of the word εἰ into ἐπεὶ does not occur in any known manuscript. And whereas it seems to be good in the first case although the εἰ stands well and makes sense, in the second instance Isidore's suggestion is rather wrong. The εἰ stands better and introduces a direct conditional interrogative sentence.

~~Because~~ for the same reason, i.e. of the change of a letter, Isidore suggests that Philip. 4,3 ought to be 'I intreat thee also ὁζυς γυνὴς and not γυνήος' "because the letter iota is being added or written but is not pronounced" (2). Neither is the suggestion successful, nor the explanation clear. What does "the letter iota is being added or written but is not pronounced" mean? Or what is the concrete profit of the change into γυνὴς of the word γυνήος? If we put γυνὴς then we must change the ὁζυς also, since the word γυνὴς is an adjective of feminine gender and the word γυνήος being the vocative case of singular number could not be feminine gender but must be masculine. If one should agree with the writing ὁζυρος γυνὴς he ought to be ready to reply to us 'who was the other spouse of the γυνὴς ὁζυρος. The word ὁζυρος might well signify a male person residing at that time at Philippi whom Paul considered as Co-operator and called ὁζυρον or might be a name like Εὐόβας and Εὐνύχης which could easily be of masculine gender. For all these reasons and because Isidore's suggestion does not occur in any known text, we judge it as unsuccessful and wrong.

Discussions concerning the true text of the Bible, are not a new discovery. Isidore also informs us that in his time, there were many people who were discussing on the Biblical text and suggesting different writings. Thus, in two of his letters (3), Isidore says that some people being unable to understand the true meaning of Rom. I, 32 were changing it into: 'οὐ μόνον οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτὰ ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες τοῖς πράττουσι'. But he says it is wrong, "even although they attempted to prove that to do something is bigger than to approve of it. But I say that the apostolic books were not wrong. And whereas I do not attack those who did not understand the meaning (for perhaps in this case they have been deceived but in other cases they excelled and understood something which I did not understand) I shall tell what I have understood and I shall leave the decision to others. Now I say that reasonably this has been said: 'οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποι-

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid. IIBIA
3. IV 60; V 159

οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς ἁμαρτωίοις' (not only they do the same but have pleasure in those who do them), because to praise those who sin is much worse and claims more punishment than merely to sin" (1).

The text suggested by Isidore in this case is that of the 'Textus Receptus' and one might say that we have no correction here. Yes, we have no correction, but we have a refusal of another proposed text which looks like that of Itala, of Sixtina, of Clement of Rome and of Epiphanius. And this is important, because Isidore defends the 'Textus Receptus', explains why this text is correct and leaves no room for a different writing. Isidore's success in this case is evident and sufficient.

An important correction of Isidore's is that referring to Colos. I, 15. Although the matter is only one word or more precisely speaking the place of the stress on that word, the suggestion is intelligent and the result very important (2). We shall follow Isidore.

The text is: "Ὁς (ὁ Χριστός) ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως i.e. 'who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature'. Isidore says: "If the word πρωτότοκος takes the accent on the second syllable from the beginning i.e. πρωτότοκος it means he who was born first; if this word takes the accent on the second syllable from the end i.e. πρωτοτόκος it means he who first gave birth. In Homer (3) for example she who brought forth firstly is called πρωτοτόκος. Then it is easy to understand or rather it is necessary to understand that the divine Paul used this word in such a meaning, not teaching that Christ had been created as the first of the creatures—do not say it since Paul calls Him 'the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person'—but that He firstly gave birth to them, i.e. He created the creatures. Thus we will have the word πρωτοτόκος stressed on the third syllable from the beginning and then it will mean πρωτοτόκος not πρωτογενής; πρωτοκτίστης not πρωτοκτιστος" (4).

There probably would be an objection inasmuch as the word πρωτότοκος signifies birth either giving or taking and since Bible does not use the word 'creation' but 'birth'. Isidore, anticipating this objection, replies as follows: "If in this case we

1. IV 60, III 7C; IV 159, I 417B

2. L. Bayer, loc. cit. p. 6 says that the method of grammatical definitions in Exegesis is, according to Isidore, its foundation. For such definitions see III 4; IO; 92; 187; 264; etc. cf also P. A. Schmid, loc. cit. p. 71

3. Ilias XVII 5: "Ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αὐτῷ βαλὺν ὥς τις περὶ πόρτακι μήτηρ πρωτοτόκος, κινυρή, οὐκ εἶδ' αὖτε τόκοιο". The note of scholiast on this verse is very useful: "Πρὸς τὸ ἐλθεῖν ἢ οὐκ εἶναι γὰρ δραστηρίον καὶ μὴ ὑποκίπτον τοῖς τρόποις τοῖς προκαροζύνουσιν. Τὸ δὲ προκαροζυνόμενον δηλοῖ τὴν πρότερον τεχθεῖσαν". Quoted in L. Bayer, loc. cit. p. 83

4. III 31, 749C-52A

have 'birth' instead of 'creation', do not wonder because we find the same in other cases, e.g. in Deut. 32, 18; Is. I, 2; Ps 81, 6. Inasmuch as when God gave birth He dispassionately gave birth and when He builds He creates dispassionately, divinely and easily, for this reason the Scriptures use these words, not in order to consider the 'birth' as 'creation' and the 'creation' as 'birth' but in order to show us God's facility and dispassionateness" (1).

The corollary now is clearer. But someone could say that all these are Isidore's opinions and nothing else and hence he could accept or not these opinions. But Isidore fixes more firmly his opinion by referring to the Scriptures and says: "If the Apostle said that all things had been created $\mu\epsilon\tau'\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ i.e. after him, then he who says that Christ is $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is correct. And if the Apostle said $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ i.e. in him, because the creation and administration of all things are found $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ i.e. in the creator, e.g. Acts 17, 28, then ours is an undoubted victory. That is, Christ is $\Pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\tau\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ " (2).

We also could bring forward Isidore's comments on Colos. I, 17 which are closely related with Christ as $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ but we think that all the above mentioned extracts are more than sufficient to prove that Christ is $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and not $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and to certify that Isidore's suggestion in this case is a very successful and intelligent one (3). Those who stressed the Biblical text needed in this case Isidore's mind to understand Paul's mind.

We are not far from the truth if we say that a noteworthy attempt for restoring the Biblical text is found in what Isidore says referring to 1 Tim 4, 3. The 'Textus Receptus' has: $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \gamma\alpha\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu,\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \beta\omicron\rho\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. Isidore writes: "Some people say that this verse is a 'lapsus calami' of Paul; for he, having put the $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \gamma\alpha\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ i.e. 'forbidding to marry' in continuation with $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \beta\omicron\rho\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ i.e. 'to abstain from meats' said the opposite from what he intended to say; for abstinence from meats is not forbidden. For he ought to say 'forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats'. Now

1. III 31, 752A

2. Ibid. 752B

3. Isidore uses the same method concerning Exod. 28, 23 in III 10, 733BC. We venture to think that Didymus the Blind's (Adversus Eunomium IV in Garnier's edition of St. Basil's works, vol. I p. 414C-415E) and Chrysostom's (Ad Colos. III 2-3 MG 318-20) interpretations of this so important word, are not so successful as is Isidore's interpretation.

I shall agree with those who have this opinion if there is another 'lapsus calami' of Paul; but there is none. But pay attention lest this mistake took place because of a change concerning a letter or a 'tittle'. The text might be: 'κωλυόντων γαρμὲν, ἀντέχασθαι βρωμάτων' i.e. forbidding to marry, being absorbed in meats, or, 'κωλυόντων γαρμὲν καὶ ἐχασθαι βρωμάτων' i.e. forbidding to marry and abstain from meats. But as the Church recognizes marriage as honourable, so she does not abominate meats; but, again, she does not command us to be absorbed but shows us the medium way for marriage and meats. For he who can avoid the delight of them, is best; he who enjoys them moderately, is not blamed; but he who slanders them is out of the sacred enclosure⁽¹⁾. As it is evident Isidore in this case is not very sure about what was the true text and he does not declare definitely his opinion. Neither had he a different concrete text other than the Received Text to suggest. Therefore he tries to solve the difficulty rather intellectually. Both Isidore's suggestions are not found in any known text; but his second suggestion seems to be quite good and successful⁽²⁾.

Finally we come to the last attempted correction of Isidore. It refers to Hebr. 9, 17. The text is: 'A testament is of force after men are dead ἐπεὶ μὴ ποτε ἰσχύει while the testator liveth'. Isidore says: "I have found in older manuscripts the words μὴ τότε instead of μὴ ποτε. The change of μὴ τότε to μὴ ποτε seemingly happened by addition of a 'tittle' or letter by some illiterate men. The text must be: 'Ἐπεὶ δὲ γὰρ μὴ τότε ἰσχύει ὅτε εἴ ὁ διαθήμενος, μὲν θάνατον βεβαίωσται.....'⁽³⁾. Migne's edition in this case is very bad. For the conclusion of the above mentioned line a rich footnote found in relation to it in Migne's edition helped us very much. We can say probably with certainty that what Isidore wrote could be that which we have cited in Greek. As to the essence of this suggestion we should say that first of all it appears as a removal from the Textus Receptus because of the words μὲν θάνατον βεβαίωσται which do not occur also in any known MS and because of the order of the words of this line. The suggestion itself is good, although the other of the Received Text is equally good. But again Isidore is not definitely content with his opinion and this is the reason why he says: "If there was written μὴ ποτε we must not stress the μὴ but the μὴ ποτε which means never⁽⁴⁾". Apart from the success of the suggestion which is not very important from the point of view of its accurateness, at least Migne's edition does not help us more, Isidore's testimony that he had found a different writing in old copies, is noteworthy.

In closing this chapter it is right and necessary to say that Isidore's suggestions and attempts for purging the Biblical text save Phil. 4, 3 which is unsuccessful lie between the simple and the fine and are however noteworthy.

-
1. IV II2, III7C-II80B
 2. cf. L. Bober, loc. cit. p. 106
 3. IV II3, II84C
 4. ibid. II85A

Chapter III

ST ISIDORE AND HIS USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. Passages interpreted by St Isidore

Although Isidore became famous for his exegesis and in spite of the fact that several MSS and editions of his letters show him to be mainly an interpreter, it is true that Isidore did not deal systematically with the interpretation of the Scriptures. But it is also true that Isidore left quite a good deal of N.T. passages interpreted which now we have to enumerate.

Balanes⁽¹⁾ enumerates and cites some 222 passages from the N.T. interpreted by Isidore. Dimanatopoulos⁽²⁾, seemingly following Balanes, reports 220 passages without citing them. We have found almost three hundred and fifty passages from the N.T. interpreted by Isidore. Why is there this difference? Most probably because of a different way of calculating and enumerating the passages or because of an incompletely accurate examination of Isidore's letters made by the aforementioned Scholars. L. Bober⁽³⁾ does not give us a complete list of all the N.T. passages interpreted by Isidore, neither does he state their number. He only cites and examines 64 passages from the N.T.

The passages both cited and interpreted are fewer in number. So if we count only these interpretations the number exceeds that of Balanes only by two or three dozen. But to these interpretations we must also add those for which we do not find the citation of the N.T. quotation in Isidore's letters. As Isidore is quite singular in his writings and his manner of interpretation, it is more than certain that he went directly to the interpretation without citing the N.T. passage for which he was asked. Then, why should we not count these interpretations because he does not cite the biblical passages, since our intention in this paragraph is to enumerate his interpreted passages and not the N.T. quotations which he cites?

Our enumeration includes both kinds of interpretation and we think this is more correct and accurate. The list below shows the N.T. passages, cited or not and the reference to Isi-

1. loc.cit. p.173-76

2. loc.cit. 1926 p. 616 note I

3. loc.cit. p.44ff

dore's letters where the interpretation of these passages is found.

The sum of this enumeration gives the number 346, that is 124 passages more than what Balanos gave us. For these 346 interpreted passages references are given to about 440 of Isidore's letters. For some passages in this enumeration we do not give references to Isidore's letters but to other passages on this list. This means that references to Isidore's letters are the same for both passages.

Isidore delights more in Matthew (110 passages) and in the Pauline epistles (137 quotations including the pastoral and the epistle to the Hebrews)⁽¹⁾. There are not passages interpreted or even cited from iThessalonians, Philemon, iiPeter, i and ii John and Revelation⁽²⁾. Therefore Du Pin⁽³⁾ is not accurate in saying "Il n'y a presque point de livre tant de l' Ancien que du Nouveau Testament, dont il n' explique plusieurs passages". From fifteen books of the O.T. and from six books of the N.T. Isidore does not interpret even one passage.

The explanation of the cited numbers corresponds as follows: e.g. 'Matt. I, 25 in I 18, 192B and in III 31, 752C' means: Matthew chap. I verse 25 is interpreted in Isidore's book I, letter 18, in the 78th volume of MG, column 192, section of the column B; and in the book III, letter 31, MG 78 column 752, section of the column C. The same way holds good throughout. Citing the references, we tried to note all Isidore's letters referring to a N.T. passage. From this point of view, L. Bober's references are in some cases inadequate. e.g. interpreting Matt. 5, 20 he refers only to the letter I 79 (loc. cit. p. 88); or Matt. 5, 28 only to III 254 (p. 88-90); or Matt. 7, 5 to I 143 (p. 89-90); or Lk 12, 46 to III 408 (p. 94); or Hebr. I, 3 to III 18 (p. 106).

The N.T. passages interpreted by Isidore but not cited by him are marked in the list with NC (Not Cited). They are 92 in number.

-
1. L. Bober, loc. cit. p. 25 is evidently wrong when saying: "E libris no_{vi} Foederis autor noster prae ceteris amat explanare epistulam b. Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos". Even in the Pauline epistles, Isidore delights more in i Corinthians.
 2. It is characteristic that many Fathers or Ecclesiastical Writers, among whom Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Photius, Theophylact of Bulgaria and others did not quote the Apocalypse as Scripture. See B. F. Westcott: A general survey of the history of the canon of the N.T., London 1896 p. 450-I and 458.
 3. loc. cit. III II p. II; of Xistus Senensis (MG 78, II 5): in quibus (i.e. letters) omnes divinas utriusque Testamenti Scripturas exposuit" (i.e. Isidore).

List of N.T. passages interpreted by St Isidore

MATTHEW:

NC	I, I-16	:	in	I 7, 184C
	1, 25	:	"	I 18, 192B; III 31, 752C
	2, 9	:	"	I 378, 396C
	3, 2	:	"	II 222, 661C
NC	3, 4	:	"	I 132, 296C: partly cited in I 74, 233B
NC	3, 7	:	"	I 105, 253B
NC	3, 10	:	"	I 64, 224C-225A
NC	3, 12	:	"	I 65, 225A-B
	3, 15	:	"	I 66, 225C
	3, 17	:	"	I 67, 228A
NC	4, 3	:	"	I 76, 236AB
	4, 4	:	"	III 341, 1001A
	4, 6-7	:	"	IV 164, 1253B
NC	5, 9	:	"	IV 169, 1261AB
NC	5, 10-I	:	"	IV 93, 1153C; II 54, 497C
	5, 16	:	"	III 142, 837D-840A; IV 159, 1244C
	5, 19	:	"	III 120, 824B; III 362, 1016C
	5, 20	:	"	IV 216, 1309BC; IV 204, 1292D; I 79, 237B
	5, 22	:	"	IV III, 1176D-77A
NC	5, 23-4	:	"	IV III, 1177A
NC	5, 26	:	"	I 80, 237C
	5, 28	:	"	II 278, 709BC; III 11, 733D-36A (of III 66, 773C-76A); III 254, 933A; IV 109, 1176A; IV 204, 1292C; V 65, 1364D-65A; III 12, 737A and 740C; IV 122, 1195C which is exactly the same with V 139
NC	5, 29-30	:	"	I 83, 240C
NC	5, 34	:	"	I 155, 288A; IV 204, 1292C
	5, 38-9	:	"	II 133, 576AB; IV 86, 1148B; I 98, 249B (of also II 133, 576C); II 169, 621A; III 126, 828B; III 126, 828C (and IV 175, 1265C); IV 209, 1304A
	5, 44	:	"	IV 204, 1292C; IV II, 1060B
	6, 1-3	:	"	IV 41, 1092C and 1093A; IV 227, 1321BC; I 84, 241A; III 142, 837D-40A; IV 159, 1244C; III 34, 756B; IV 159, 1245A
	6, 8	:	"	V 97, 1449C
	6, 9-13	:	"	II 281, 712BC; IV 24, 1073A and 1076AB
	6, 15	:	"	I 142, 277BC; IV 185, 1276D-77A
	6, 22	:	"	II 112, 652D-53A
	6, 23	:	"	II 112, 653B
	6, 24	:	"	I 332, 373C
	7, 6	:	"	IV 181, 1273AB; I 143, 280A; II 211, 652A; II 253, 689C
	7, 11	:	"	III 117, 821B

	7, 12	:	in IV 53, II04B; IV 54, II04C-II05A; IV 91, II52D;
			V 28, I344C
	7, 18	:	" IV 81, II44AB
	7, 24	:	" III I41, 837BC
NC	8, 4	:	" I I46, 281A
NC	8, 11	:	" I I47, 281B
	9, 15	:	" III 335, 993D
NC	9, 17	:	" I 293, 353C; I 57, 220AB
NC	9, 20	:	" III 129, 829B
NC	10, 5	:	" I 153, 285B
	10, 15	:	" V 220, I464BC (cf V 221, I465A and III 203, 885A)
	10, 16	:	" I 126, 268A; II I75, 625C-28A
	10, 19	:	" IV 218, I312B
	10, 28	:	" III 235, 916BD; III 296, 969BC; IV I46, I229C;
			IV I25, I204A
	10, 34	:	" III 246, 924D-25A
	10, 41	:	" IV I35, I216C-I7A
	10, 42	:	" IV II8, II93A
	11, 11	:	" I 68, 228BC
	11, 12	:	" IV I36, I217B
	12, 5	:	" I 72, 232C
	12, 28	:	" I 60, 221C
	12, 32	:	" I 59, 221AD; cf also I 60, 221BC
NC	12, 40	:	" I II4, 257D-60A
	13, 15	:	" II 270, 700BC
	13, 19	:	" III 107, 813A
	13, 23	:	" II I44, 589C
NC	13, 25	:	" I I94, 305D-308A
	13, 28-9	:	" I I95, 308B
	13, 31	:	" II I98, 644B; IV 76, II36BC
NC	13, 33	:	" I 201, 312B
NC	13, 45	:	" I I82, 301A
NC	13, 46	:	" I I82, 301B
	13, 48	:	" I 205, 313AB
	15, 8-9	:	" III I58, 853B
	15, 24	:	" I I21, 264A
	16, 13	:	" I 235, 328C
	16, 16	:	" I 236, 328CL
NC	16, 18	:	" I 238, 329AB
NC	16, 27	:	" III I66, 860AB
NC	17, 27	:	" I 206, 313B; I 48, 212B
NC	18, 3	:	" I 207, 313C
NC	18, 27-30	:	" III II7, 821A
	19, 7	:	" III 76, 784BC
	19, 8	:	" III 76, 784D
	19, 11	:	" IV I65, I253C-56A
	19, 12	:	" III I3, 741AB; IV 204, I292C

	20, 21-3	:	in	I 137, 273A; IV 204, 1292C
	21, 38	:	"	IV 166, 1257B
	22, 21	:	"	I 209, 316A
	22, 30	:	"	IV 146, 1229C
	23, 2-3	:	"	IV 18, 1068B
	23, 5	:	"	II 150, 604C
	23, 37-8	:	"	I 380, 397A
	24, 16	:	"	I 210, 316B
	24, 17	:	"	I 210, 316BC
	24, 18	:	"	I 210, 316C
	24, 19	:	"	I 210, 316CD
	24, 28	:	"	I 282, 349A
NC	24, 36	:	"	I 117, 261A
	24, 41	:	"	I 285, 349C; I 283, 349AB
NC	25, 11	:	"	I 286, 349-52A
NC	25, 14	:	"	III 398, 1036D
	25, 20	:	"	I 287, 352B
	25, 21-3	:	"	IV 106, 1172C-73A
	25, 27	:	"	IV 177, 1268B; V201, 1453A; III 398, 1036D
NC	25, 33	:	"	I 228, 352 BC
	26, 10	:	"	II 88, 532B
NC	26, 34	:	"	I 357, 385C
NC	26, 7C-4	:	"	I 356, 385B; I 358, 385C; I 359, 385D-88A
	26, 39	:	"	I 289, 352C
	26, 41	:	"	II 76, 517D-20A
	26, 46	:	"	IV 48, 1097D-II00A; cf also III 147, 840D-41A
	26, 53	:	"	III 334, 992C
	27, 24	:	"	IV 128, 1205B
NC	27, 51	:	"	I 252, 336A; I 253, 336B; I 254, 336BC
NC	28, 2	:	"	I 406, 409AB

MARK:

	4, 39	:	"	IV 166, 1256C
	6, 18	:	"	IV 96, 1157B-II61A
	9, 40	:	"	III 3, 729A
	10, 27	:	"	II 117, 557D
NC	11, 14	:	"	I 51, 213BC
NC	12, 42	:	"	IV 118, 1193B
NC	13, 32	:	"	see Matt. 24, 36

LUKE:

NC	I, 20	:	"	I 131, 269B; I 257, 337AB
	I, 43	:	"	I 363, 388CD
NC	2, 5	:	"	see Matt. 17, 27

	2, 23	:	in	I 23, I96D-97A
	5, 30	:	"	I I89, I277D-I280A
	6, I	:	"	III IIO, 8I6BC
	6, 22	:	"	see Matt. 5, II
	6, 3I	:	"	see Matt. 7, I2
	6, 4I	:	"	IV 25, IO76CD
	7, I9	:	"	I 34, 204B
NC	7, 28	:	"	I 33, 204A
	9, 29-30	:	"	I 239, 329B
	IO, 29	:	"	IV I23, II97A
	II, 20	:	"	I 60, 22IC
	I2, 35	:	"	I 34I, 377C; IV 2I5, I309A
	I2, 42	:	"	III I70, 86IB; IV I45, I228D
	I2, 46	:	"	III 2I6, 90IA; III 408, IO4IC
	I3, 2	:	"	IV 74, II33C
NC	I3, 6	:	"	I 3I2, 364B
	I5, 24	:	"	V I79, I432B
NC	I6, 20-I	:	"	IV I2I, II96AB
	I6, 25	:	"	IV II6, II89C; V 22I, I465A
NC	I6, 26	:	"	I I72, 296AB
NC	I8, IO-4	:	"	III 278, 956AB
NC	2I, I-4	:	"	IV I93, I28IC
	23, 4	:	"	IV I28, I205BC
NC	23, 28	:	"	IV I80, I272BC; of also II 285; II I66; IV 97, II6IC
NC	23, 39	:	"	I 285, 336C; of also I 286
NC	24, 46	:	"	IV 98, II64A

JOHN:

	I, I	:	"	IV I42, I224Af; of also III I4I
	I, IO	:	"	IV IO, IO57B
	I, I2	:	"	V 28, I334AB; V I97, I449C
	I, I4	:	"	I 473, 44IA
NC	2, I-4	:	"	I 393, 404B
	2, I6	:	"	I IO6, 253CD
	2, I9	:	"	IV 2I7, I3I2A; II 2I2, 653B
	4, 22	:	"	III 334, 992A
	5, I9	:	"	III 335, 993D-96A; of also I 353, 384BC
	5, 4I	:	"	I 374, 393D
NC	6, 48	:	"	I 360, 388A
	7, 26	:	"	II 270, 700C; also see Matt. I3, I5
	9, 2-3	:	"	II 272, 70ICD
	IO, 8	:	"	III II9, 82ICD
	IO, 29	:	"	III I22, 824D-25A
	IO, 30	:	"	I I38, 273BC
	II, 35	:	"	II I73, 624C-25A
	II, 48	:	"	III I28, 829A

NC 13, 27 : in III 364, 1017B
 13, 34 : " III 410, 1044B
 NC 13, 35 : " V 133, 1216B
 14, 14 : " see John 1, 12
 14, 27 : " III 246, 924CD; of also Matt. 10, 34
 14, 28 : " III 334, 992BCD
 14, 31 : " V 48, 1097D-II00A
 NC 15, 1 : " I 168, 293A
 15, 25 : " V 220, 1316B
 16, 33 : " II 24, 473A; V 316, 1520B; I 95, 248C
 NC 18, 10 : " I 291, 353A
 18, 23 : " IV 196, 1285A
 NC 19, 19 : " I 491, 499C
 19, 34 : " IV 101, 1168A
 20, 23 : " II 5, 461B; III 260, 940D; I 97, 249AB
 NC 21, 15-7 : " I 103, 253A
 21, 25 : " I 259, 337C; II 99, 541C and 544B

ACTS:

NC 2, 3 : " I 494, 252A; IV 66, 1224A
 4, 16 : " III 182, 873A
 4, 20 : " III 335, 993B
 NC 5, 5 : " I 181, 300C
 NC 8, 38 : " I 447, 428D-29A; I 448, 429AB; I 449, 429B;
 I 450, 429C
 9, 15 : " IV 80, 1141A; III 271, 952A
 12, 22-3 : " IV 50, 1100D-OIA
 NC 13, 11 : " I 354, 384D
 14, 22 : " V 366, 1545C
 17, 23 : " III 346, 1004B; IV 69, 1128AB
 19, 35 : " IV 206, 1300B
 23, 9 : " IV 112, 1181A
 28, 15 : " I 337, 376CD

ROMANS:

I, 16 : " IV 29, 1031B
 I, 22 : " II 213, 656A; III 350, 1005B
 I, 26, 28-29 : " IV 101, 1165D-68A; IV 59, 1117A
 I, 32 : " V 159, 1417B; IV 60, 1117C
 2, 6 : " II 160, 613L
 2, 10 : " IV 61, 1120B
 2, 21 : " II 208, 649A
 3, 25 : " IV 73, 1132C-33A; IV 100, 1165AB

	5,17	:	in	III 195,880D
	6,12	:	"	IV 52,1101C
	6,23	:	"	IV 52,1101C
	7,8	:	"	IV 62,1120BC
	8,8	:	"	I 477,441C-44A
	8,9	:	"	IV 127,1204D-1205A
	8,15-7	:	"	V 197,1449D-1452A
	8,18	:	"	V 72,1369A;IV 63,1120D-21A;III 207,889B
	8,28	:	"	IV 51,1101AB;cf also II 2,457A;V 13,1061B
NC	9,3	:	"	II 58,501C-504A
	11,8	:	"	IV 101,1165C-68A
	12,1	:	"	III 75,781C
	12,11	:	"	see Acts 2,3
	12,16	:	"	III 186,876A
	12,18	:	"	III 284,960B;III 36,1088C;IV 220,1313AD-16A
	12,20	:	"	IV 11,1057D-60AB
	13,1	:	"	II 216,657D-60AB
	13,3	:	"	IV 102,1169B
NC	13,7	:	"	IV 102,1169B;IV 16,1064C
NC	13,10	:	"	IV 15,1064B
NC	13,13	:	"	I 456,433B

1 CORINTHIANS:

NC	1,20	:	"	I 429,420B
	1,24	:	"	II 143,585D
	2,2	:	"	IV 150,1236B
NC	2,13-5	:	"	V 128,1397D-1400A;cf also Rom.8,9;V 41,1352B;
		:	"	IV 81,1144BC
	3,2	:	"	I 445,428B
	3,8	:	"	V 83,1376A
	3,17	:	"	III 92,797B
	3,18	:	"	IV 6,1053CD
	4,5	:	"	IV 94,1156C
NC	5,5	:	"	V 290,1505B
	6,7	:	"	IV 95,1157A
	6,10	:	"	IV 42,1093B
	6,18	:	"	IV 129,1208A-1212A
	7,4	:	"	IV 129,1212A
	7,5	:	"	IV 119,1193C
NC	7,21	:	"	IV 12,1060C-61A
	7,29	:	"	I 413,412C
NC	8,2(I)	:	"	IV 132,1213D
	9,5	:	"	III 176,868AB
	9,20	:	"	II 138,580CD

	9, 21	:	1a	II 138, 580D-81B; of Acts 17, 23
	9, 27	:	"	III 265, 945C; of III 11, 736C
	10, 12	:	"	IV 14, 1061C-1064A
	10, 27	:	"	IV 68, 1128A
	11, 1	:	"	IV 46, 1097B
	11, 7	:	"	III 95, 801BC
NC	11, 27	:	"	III 364, 1017A
	11, 30-I	:	"	V 221, 1464D
	11, 32	:	"	V 96, 1381C; of also V 221, 1464C; III 203, 885AB
	12, 27	:	"	IV 103, 1169CD
	13, 11	:	"	I 443, 425C
	13, 12	:	"	II 56, 500A
	14, 20	:	"	I 442, 425B
NC	15, 8	:	"	III 198, 881D
	15, 29	:	"	I 221, 321B
	15, 31	:	"	III 399, 1037AB
	15, 33	:	"	IV 34, 1085D-1088AB
	15, 41	:	"	III 351, 1009BC
NC	15, 44	:	"	III 77, 785AB
	15, 56	:	"	IV 52, 1101D-1104A

11 CORINTHIANS:

	4, 7	:	"	II 4, 460B
NC	4, 17	:	"	V 72, 1369A
	5, 13	:	"	III 266, 948A
NC	12, 9	:	"	I 428, 420AB; III 182, 872C
	13, 7	:	"	IV 7, 1056B
	13, 8	:	"	III 260, 941C

GALATIANS:

	1, 8	:	"	III 165, 857D-60A
NC	3, 13	:	"	I 95, 248C
NC	3, 28	:	"	I 306, 360C
	4, 4	:	"	III 176, 868C; of also 1Cor. 9, 5
NC	6, 6	:	"	III 403, 1037D-40A
	6, 2	:	"	III 410, 1044A

EPHESIANS:

	1, 22	:	"	III 195, 880D
	2, 15	:	"	III 53, 768A
	4, 8	:	"	I 400, 405D
	4, 26	:	"	II 189, 640A

	4, 27	:	in	II 189, 640B
	5, 14	:	"	V 179, 1432C
NC	6, 11	:	"	III 385, 1028BC

PHILIPPIANS:

	1, 29	:	"	IV 104, 1172AB
	2, 3	:	"	IV 22, 1072A
NC	2, 4	:	"	V 292, 1508B; III 410, 1044B
	2, 6	:	"	IV 22, 1072AB; cf also John 14, 28
	2, 7	:	"	I 139, 276A; cf also IV 22, 1072AB
	2, 15	:	"	III 4, 720B
	3, 19-20	:	"	III 186, 876A; cf also Rom. 12, 16
NC	4, 3	:	"	IV 112, 1181A

COLOSSIANS:

	1, 15	:	"	III 31, 749C-52A; II 143, 588A
	1, 16	:	"	III 31, 752B
	1, 17	:	"	III 31, 752C
	2, 9	:	"	IV 166, 1256B
	2, 15	:	"	IV 108, 1173C
	3, 9	:	"	II 161, 616A
NC	4, 6	:	"	IV 49, 1100B

11 THESSALONIANS:

NC	2, 17	:	"	see Matt. 5, 19 and James 2, 14
----	-------	---	---	---------------------------------

1 TIMOTHY:

	3, 1	:	"	IV 219, 1313AB
	3, 1-6	:	"	III 216, 896AD-97BC-900AC
	3, 16	:	"	II 192, 640C-41A
	4, 3	:	"	IV 112, 1177C-80B
	4, 13	:	"	IV 88, 1149B
	4, 14	:	"	I 410, 412A
	5, 8	:	"	II 124, 564B
	5, 23	:	"	I 385, 400BC

11 TIMOTHY:

	2, 5	:	"	IV 122, 1159C
	2, 13	:	"	III 335, 993C; cf also John 5, 19
	2, 22	:	"	IV 220, 1316; cf also Rom. 12, 18

	2, 25	:	in	II 270, 700C; of also Matt. 13, 15 and John 7, 26
	3, 7	:	"	IV 155, 1240C
NC	3, 16	:	"	II 299, 725C-28A
	4, 1	:	"	I 222, 321CD

TITUS:

	1, 6	:	"	III 158, 853B (of also Matt. 15, 8-9); IV 85, 1148A
--	------	---	---	---

HEBREWS:

NC	1, 3	:	"	III 58, 769B; III 355, 1012CD; III 18, 744CD
	2, 15	:	"	IV 146, 1229BC-1232AB
	4, 8-9	:	"	IV 147, 1232CD
NC	4, 13	:	"	IV 77, 1097C; I 94, 248AB
	6, 18	:	"	III 335, 993C; of also Acts 14, 20
	7, 11	:	"	IV 335, 1181A
	7, 19	:	"	I 68, 228C; of also II 11
NC	9, 4-5	:	"	IV 73, 1132AC
	9, 17	:	"	IV 113, 1184C-85A
	10, 1	:	"	I 444, 425D
	10, 29	:	"	IV 168, 1260C-61A
	10, 34	:	"	III 225, 908D
	12, 6	:	"	II 179, 632C
	12, 7	:	"	III 184, 837BC
	12, 16	:	"	I 320, 368B
	12, 17	:	"	IV 26, 1077AB
	13, 4	:	"	IV 192, 1280C-81B (The N.T. passage is cited in I 234, 328B)

JAMES:

NC	2, 10	:	"	III 401, 1037B
	2, 14	:	"	III 403, 1037D-40A
	2, 20	:	"	IV 226, 1321AB; V 162, 1420C
NC	2, 24	:	"	IV 65, 1121D
	3, 1	:	"	I 93, 248A
	3, 6	:	"	IV 10, 1057AC; II 158, 613AB
NC	4, 6	:	"	I 164, 292B

1 PETER:

	1, 13	:	"	see Lk 12, 35
	3, 7	:	"	see 1 Cor. 7, 5

3, 15 : in see Matt. 10, 19
4, 1 : " IV 166, 1257A
4, 17 : " II 208, 649B
5, 8 :: " II 175, 628B

11 JOHN: 8 : " II 300, 728B; V 144, 1409C

JUDE: 13 : " IV 58, 1109AB

2. Additional N.T. passages cited by St Isidore

Apart from the 346 N.T. passages interpreted by Isidore, there are scattered in his letters some 49 other N.T. passages. These last passages are cited by him for the purpose of elucidation of a biblical passage or of the strengthening of his ideas. As a matter of fact there are some more passages cited and not interpreted among Isidore's letters, but we collected only these 49 having omitted the others which are only in the headings of the letters or consist of only one or two words or are somewhat inaccurate having been cited from memory.

The purpose of listing these uninterpreted passages is on the one hand to show how many N.T. passages Isidore used altogether, and on the other hand to give an available list to those dealing with the N.T. critical apparatus for enriching their indices.

The total number of the N.T. passages cited by Isidore in his letters is 303. Of these some consist of three or four or more biblical verses. One third of them are very good for critical apparatus. In other words Isidore supplies us with abundant and remarkable material.

List of additional N.T. passages

MATTHEW:

3, 3 : in I 375, 396A
5, 7 : " II 88, 532A
7, 5 : " I 82, 240B
8, 20 : " I 17, 192A
8, 22 : " III 252, 932C
11, 3 : " III 257, 936A
12, 27 : " I 60, 221C

12, 35	:	in	III 117, 821B
12, 39	:	"	I 417, 416A
12, 41	:	"	I 154, 285B
19, 6	:	"	V 287, 1504A
21, 40-41	:	"	V 375, 1552A
22, 14	:	"	V 89, 1377C
23, 39	:	"	III 257, 936A
24, 2	:	"	see Mk 13, 2 and Lk 21, 6; IV 74, II33C
25, 40	:	"	II 88, 532A
25, 41	:	"	II 90, 533C

LUKE:

5, 12-3	:	"	III 335, 996C
24, 39	:	"	I 477, 441C

JOHN:

3, 5	:	"	II 52, 496A
5, 14	:	"	IV 14, 1064A
8, 37	:	"	II 99, 544B
12, 32	:	"	I 491, 449C
14, 26	:	"	III 106, 812B
19, 15	:	"	I 256, 337A
19, 23	:	"	I 74, 233B

ACTS:

8, 19	:	"	II 5, 461A
8, 20	:	"	III 394, 1033C
8, 30	:	"	I 61, 224A
20, 33-4	:	"	V 299, 1512B
26, 24	:	"	III 266, 948A
28, 4	:	"	II 179, 632B; V 270, 1493D

ROMANS:

3, 23	:	"	IV 65, II21C
8, 27	:	"	III 92, 796D
14, 6	:	"	II 138, 581A

1 CORINTHIANS:

2, 10	:	"	III 92, 796D
4, 4	:	"	II 279, 712A
7, 15	:	"	III 284, 960C

7, 23 : in III 351, 1005C
 10, 13 : " II 280, 712B
 15, 50 : " I 477, 441D

GALATIANS:

2, 20 : " III 11, 736C
 4, 26 : " III 109, 816B

EPHESIANS:

5, 3 : " V 241, 1477D
 5, 18 : " I 496, 452B

1 TIMOTHY: 1, 9 " II 288, 717C

HEBREWS:

10, 31 : " I 234, 328B
 12, 14 : " 5, 241, 1480A

1 PETER: 2, 22 " I 416, 413C

3. Various material appropriate for an 'Introduction' to the New Testament

From a certain point of view all the material we find in Isidore's letters could easily be ~~subsumed~~ ^{contained} under the general title 'Introduction to the Holy Scriptures'. But, more precisely speaking we can arrange and classify his material into many categories, especially since today the term 'Introduction' has a special meaning. In this paragraph we put all the material which, various in its nature, could be characterized as 'introductory' to the N.T.. We put all this material in the order of the books of the N.T., so that it may be more easily found.

Matt. 2, 9: Concerning the star of the birth of Jesus Christ Isidore does not say what kind of star that was, but only that "the star became evangelist of the divine birth, with the usual route of the stars but with a different and a newer one, showing

+ not

as a finger the changed way and the holy cave and the venerable crib which was bearing the Lord"⁽¹⁾. He says nothing about the type of the star, because he perhaps knew nothing about astronomy.

Matt. 3, 4: On the locusts and the wild honey of John the Prophet Isidore's opinion is wrong in the first case and correct in the second⁽²⁾. He says: "The locusts on which John the Prophet was feeding, were not animals but ends of botans or plants. And the wild honey was not any grass or herb, but mountain honey, made by wild bee, which was most bitter and hostile to every taste"⁽³⁾.

Matt. 23, 5: What were the 'phylacteries'? Isidore says: "The phylacteries were little books, δελτία ἢ μιστά, in which the Law was carried and the teachers of the Jews hung them as now women⁽⁴⁾ carry the little Gospels"⁽⁵⁾.

Mark 6, 18: Concerning Herod the Tetrarch. Why is he called 'tetrarch'? "I think this is the reason why Herod has been called tetrarch; not only because he was reigning in a quarter of the paternal kingdom, but also because the four general kinds of vice prevailed upon him"⁽⁶⁾, i.e. adultery, injustice, murder and inconsiderable oath. Isidore is correct when saying that Herod has been called tetrarch because he was reigning in a quarter of the paternal kingdom, but his second suggestion that Herod has been called tetrarch because the four general kinds of vice prevailed upon him, is not true although it is clever.

Lk 6, 1: On the second Sabbath after the first, see below, chapter IV paragraph 3 e.

Acts 8, 38: With regard to who Philip was he who baptized the Eunuch, Isidore has the true conception and certifies it by Biblical witnesses. He says: "Philip who baptized the Eunuch was not the Apostle Philip who belonged to the Twelve, but he who had been chosen one of the Seven for the purpose of helping the widows along with Stephen the chief martyr of the good victory"⁽⁷⁾. Biblical witnesses brought forward by Isidore, are: a) "The apostle Philip remained in Jerusalem with the other Apostles, Acts 8, 1"⁽⁸⁾. b) "While the Twelve Apostles remained in Jerusalem, the other Disciples were scattered here and there and among them was this Philip who (Acts 8, 40) was found at Azotus and came to Caesarea from which he was brought. For he having been troubled because of Stephen's grief and perhaps having been afraid lest he suffer

-
1. I 378, 396C. of Chrysostom: in Matthew VII MG 57, 77
 2. See below, chapter IV parag. 3 e.
 3. I 132, 269C; cf also I 5, 184A
 4. cf Chrysostom: De Statuis XIX 4 Montf. II 232E: "Women and small children instead of a great amulet hang from their necks Gospels and they carry them with them wherever they go".
 5. II 150, 604C
 6. IV 96, 1157BC
 7. I 447, 428D-29A
 8. I 448, 429AB

the same, he came back home" (1). c) Acts 8, 14 and 17: "If he who baptized was one of the Apostles, he had the authority of giving the Spirit. But he baptizes only as a Disciple, whereas the Apostles, to whom this authority has been given, sanction the grace" (2). Biblical witnesses and Isidore's syllogism are correct. He is right.

Acts 17, 22: An interesting display of why the Mars' hill has been called 'Απελος Μᾶρος' is found in Isidore's II 91, 536BC and II 92, 536C-537B.

Acts 17, 23: Concerning the 'altar to the unknown God'. Why was this altar named 'to the unknown God'? Isidore gives us two answers: a) "When the Persians undertook an expedition against Greece, the Athenians sent Phidipides as messenger to the Lacedaemonians asking for alliance; and when he was on the 'Virginal Mountain' he was met by the ghost of Pan who was accusing the Athenians because they neglected him and adored other gods, and Pan promised to help them. Now, when the Athenians vanquished they builded up an altar and put the inscription 'to the unknown God'" (3). b) "At one time a great plague struck Athens and the Athenians adoring the known gods had benefited nothing. After that they considered that probably there was some other God who sent them the plague and whom they left without any adoration. Therefore they builded up an altar and put the inscription 'to the unknown God' and after their sacrifice, they were healed" (4). In this case Isidore does not say what is the true story because of which the altar was named 'to the unknown god' but he only thinks it sufficient to report both stories and reasons by saying that "people say that there are two reasons why the altar has been inscribed to the unknown god". The reason is that both legends are probable and neither completely checked. However Isidore's knowledge in this case is remarkable. (5)

Acts 28, 15: Concerning 'Aoli forum and three taverns'. Isidore says that "these words signify some places" (6) before Rome. The one place had some picture seemingly of Apius which was called 'forum' of him like the pictures of kings till now are called 'fora'. The 'three taverns' signify places in the use of inns or bars as they are so called in Latin" (7). Isidore's

1. I 449, 429B

2. I 450, 429C

3. IV 69, II 28AB

4. *ibid.*

5. cf. N. Capo, loc. cit. SIF IX 361

6. Evidently the latin translation which puts 'formam' for τῶνους is wrong; they were τῶνοι, not τῶνοι.

7. I 337, 376CD

first opinion concerning the Apili forum seems to be quite strange. For under the word 'forum' we understand the roman market. Apart from the main Roman Forum four additional fora were founded in the imperial period: The forum Julium, Augustum, Transitorium and the forum Trajani. The Apili forum was probably a market at the apia road⁽¹⁾. His second explanation with regard to the three taverns is successful, since the latin word 'taberna' really means tavern or inn. Nevertheless Isidore's note that the verse "...they came to meet us as far as Apili forum and the three taverns" "has been said by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles" is important as one more voice in relation to the writer of the Acts. In another case⁽²⁾ referring to Acts 2, 41, Isidore says that "ὁ θεοσεβὴς Ἀλουῆς ἔγραψε"

Rom. 2, 10: The meaning of the word 'Greeks': We know that the word 'Greeks' in the N.T. means either the natives of Greece or the gentiles. But here Isidore says that Paul speaking of the era before Christ's incarnate presence "names here Greeks not gentiles but those who were pious, living according to the innate law and taking care of everything relating to piety without the Jewish hypocritical remonstrances. Such were Melchisedec, Job, Cornelius"⁽³⁾. Eccentric indeed seems to be this opinion of Isidore's. How could one say that Melchisedec or Job who are mentioned by Paul in his verse were not Jews but they were Greeks? Evidently Isidore must not be proud of his opinion although his explanation seems to be plausible.

Hebr. 4, 15: By interpreting this verse Isidore says that "the θυμὸν and καρτερησάμενα had been written ἐν μεταφορῇ i.e. metaphorically by the wise Paul of the victims which were being brought for sacrifice, for these animals are naked from every garment after the taking away of their skin"⁽⁴⁾. In other words this quotation mentions the bloody sacrifices before Christ, tells something about the form of them and especially asserts Paul as the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews.

Hebr. 12, 7: Finally Isidore says something concerning the way followed by Paul in instructing Christians: "The divine Paul, he says, thinking that demonstration is attempted better and more actively by a question, he does so, omitting very often the declaration of truths, τὸ ἀποφαίνεσθαι. Because he was saying to those who were in suffering and were grieving 'what son is he

1. of N. Capo, loc. cit. p. 359

2. I 500, 453C

3. IV 61, II20B

4. IV 47, IO97C

whom the father chasteneth not?' in order that the demonstration might be stronger through the question. So he did elsewhere: 'is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?' in order to show more clearly the wrong of the thing. For many people dare to object to the declarations, τὰς ἀνοψάσεις; but questions persuade and muzzle and occasion some gentleness to him who asks" (1).

It is not our intention here to deal with the problems involved in an introduction to the N.T., but just to expose what and how Isidore says in relation to it. Therefore we are obliged to cite here his opinion concerning the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews although none⁺ Orthodox Scholars refuses to recognize Paul as the writer of this epistle. Isidore indirectly, but very clearly accepts Paul as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Among the quotations from the epistle to the Hebrews which are cited or interpreted, are also Hebr. I, 3 (in III 58, 769B); 4, 6-9 (in IV 147, 1232C or V 91, 1377D which is exactly the same); 4, 13 (I 94, 248AB); 9, 17 (in IV 113, 1184C); 10, 28 (in IV 168, 12600D); 10, 34 (in III 225, 908C); 12, 7 (in III 184, 873C) and 12, 17 (in IV 26, 1077A) which are reported directly and so clearly that one could not dispute them, as Paul's sayings. This is another one voice which is added to the orthodox Tradition which unanimously recognizes and teaches Paul as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.

+ of the

Chapter IV

ST ISIDORE AND THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. Rules Given by St Isidore

a) Concerning the Interpreters

Who and what must an interpreter of the Scriptures be? What things has he to take care of? Isidore attributes the highest authority to the Scriptures and therefore he teaches that he who will deal with their interpretation must be qualified to do it. To elucidate this fitness of the interpreter, Isidore says: "He who deals with the brilliant task of attempting to interpret the meaning of the sacred Scriptures must have a *σπουδή τε καὶ τρυφή*, i.e. prudent and lucid tongue and an *εὐσεβὴς τε καὶ εὐαγὴς*, i.e. pious and pure thought" (1). In other words not everyone could interpret the Scriptures but only he who has certain relations with them and who is qualified for that task. But again, he who is qualified for that task, must know that it is not very easy to understand "immediately those things which are reached after very many pains and struggles. But he must go to the understanding of the meanings of the sacred Scriptures which sharpen our prudence to better sharpness, by starting with pains and prayers" (2). And, of course, the interpreter must examine the passages accurately in order to obtain the true interpretations. "For interpretations which are ignorant of the questions are blind and they blind" (3).

The task of the interpreter of the Scriptures is splendid but he must do this work successfully, for otherwise, if he misinterprets them, he is guilty of a great sin. "Those who dared to falsify or to misinterpret the divine Oracles committed a sin for which there is not any apology or excuse. For, their thought that they have understood something wiser has guided them and those who believed them to a great illiteracy. Because they having erred in many sayings of the sacred Words, attracted their hearers where they wished and having forced the will of the Legislator sinned against it inasmuch as they did not say those things which appear as good to him, but sanctioned their own will" (4). Concerning the sin of misinterpreters

1. III 292, 965D; cf I 24, 197A where Isidore prevents those who have unworthy hands to touch the unattainable 'mysteries'

2. II 106, 548C 3. III 136, 836A; cf I 24, 197A 4. V 308, 1516B

Isaiah (I, 22) 'thy wine mixed with water, he complains about this situation and says: "Many times I was astonished by those who misinterpret the divine Scriptures and who attempt to expose their own will rather than that of the divine Scriptures. For they dare to distort divine things by mixing the will of the Scriptures which is unadulterate and sincere and which can rejoice the soul, with the wicked and transient water of their own doctrines" (1).

In order that misinterpretations of the Scriptures might be avoided, Isidore gave occasionally, when an opportunity was given, some rules concerning it. But we think that Diamantopoulos (2) is wrong when thinking that "by the phrase 'according to the rules and peculiarities of the Sacred Scriptures' (3) signifies the rules and customs of the interpretation. For it is clear that the words *νόμοι* and *ἰδιόματα* in this case indicate the customs and the peculiarities of the Scriptures and by no means the rules of the interpretation. Nevertheless, Isidore gives elsewhere some rules which now we expose:

a) In his first rule concerning interpretation Isidore says that the interpreter "must follow the Scriptures and not precede them and he must not force the mind of the Scriptures in order to agree with his own thought. For there is great danger to the soul of those who dare to falsify and to misinterpret the Scriptures" (4).

b) Evidently Isidore had a bad experience of the meaning of the Scriptures being forced by other people (5) and that is why he writes that "if the interpreters can interpret the Scriptures unconstrainedly, let them do it promptly; but if they cannot do so, let them not force their meaning improperly" (6). This appeared more clearly in another of his letters where he declares: "Let us not force the prophecies neither let us make deceitful plays upon words in order to smooth down the prophetic verse

+ Isidore

-
1. III 125, 825D
 2. loc.cit. 1926/618
 3. IV 101, 1165C
 4. III 292, 965D
 5. cf. eg I 371, 393A, where the testimony that Marcio maliciously changes Mtt. 5, 17 into "I am not come to fulfil but to destroy the Law"; also IV 112 concerning 1Tim. 4, 3, where Isidore says that some people rather by unfitness, did not understand the true meaning of the Scriptures. cf also Basil the Great, in Hexaemeron II 2, Garnier I, 17: "Οἱ παραχαράτται τῆς ἀληθείας, οἱ οὐχὶ τῇ Γραφῇ τὸν ἑαυτὸν νοῦν ἀκολοθεῖν ἐκδιδάσκοντες, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον βούλημα ὁτὴν διάνοιαν τῶν Γραφῶν διαστρέφοντες.."
 6. II 63, 508A

but let us understand prudently both those which have been said h i s t o r i c a l l y and those which have been said *κατὰ θεωρίαν*, i.e. in a contemplative spiritual sense"⁽¹⁾. Isidore refers these words to the interpretation of the O.F. of which the 'prophetic' is according to Isidore the main characteristic, but the same is also valid for the interpretation of the N.T.

C) Neither is the interpretation of the Scriptures easy nor is it simple. There are some 'things hard to be understood which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction'⁽²⁾. Thus an interpreter "is obliged to interpret the Scriptures s c i e n t i f i c a l l y and to search their powers p r u d e n t l y and he is not allowed to touch the unattainable mysteries by unworthy hands"⁽³⁾.

d) Finally an interpreter must take care to prove⁽⁴⁾ the Biblical sayings and not only to declare dogmatically his opinions. "Those sayings which need much testing and investigation are not elucidated *ἀποδείκναι* i.e. by a certain decision, but they are elucidated *ἀποδείξαι* i.e. by demonstration. For a *κατασκευή* i.e. a positive way of thinking which tends to ascertain a truth, and a *κατάλογος* i.e. a well arranged paragraph, and an *ἀπόδειξις* i.e. a demonstration which is the logical result of some already known phrases, are needed in order that these sayings might be interpreted. For, if someone by simply declaring ideas thinks that he uses demonstration, he is out of the company of wise men"⁽⁵⁾. This is true, says Isidore elsewhere, because "we must not declare dogmatically our thought but we must prove"⁽⁶⁾ what we have to say by other witnesses.

These suggestions of Isidore, or better speaking his rules concerning the interpretation are not sufficient if we examine them as we should examine them in a manual of Hermeneutic. But bearing in mind Isidore's unsystematic exposition in this case also and joining the aforementioned rules with his practice of interpretation as we shall see further on, we are allowed to be content with these rules and to give the proper praise to their recommender⁽⁷⁾.

1. IV 203, 1289D-92A

2. ii Pet. 2, 16

3. I 24, 197A

4. As for example Isidore proves in IV 101 what he wishes to say concerning Rom. II, 8 by a chain of Biblical passages which ~~compose~~ ^{take} the place of arguments.

5. V 64, 1364A

6. II 66, 509B

7. Du Pin (loc.cit. p.II) finds these rules excellent.

2. Methods of Interpretation

a) Interpretation of the New Testament by reference to the Scriptures

Since according to Isidore the highest Authority is the Scriptures being the word of God, he was referring many times to them in order to strengthen his opinion and to prove better what he intended to say. But this is a method of interpretation, moreover since he in some cases⁽¹⁾ says that this or that is true because the Lord said it or the Bible said it or Paul said it and after that the question is finished. Hence we recognize as Isidore's first method of interpretation these cases in which the answer is attempted to be found in the Scriptures and we cite a certain number of them for illustration, starting from Matthew.

Referring to Matt. I, 25 'he knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son', Isidore says: "Let the blasphemous and ungrateful people learn that many times we find in the divine Scriptures the word *sec* i.e. 'till', in the meaning of 'ever'. For example Gen. 8, 12; Ps. 10, 19; Is. 46, 9"⁽²⁾. Interpreting Matt. 10, 34 'think not that I am come to send peace on earth', Isidore elucidates it, by another of Christ's sayings: "It is clear that Christ by this verse does not disavow each type of peace, but that which has been yoked together with vice; and its proof is that which He says in another case: 'My peace I give unto you' (John 14, 27). Because peace is really that which can be proud of righteousness and piety"⁽³⁾. In elucidating the word *μῆναι* which occurs in Is. 6, 10 but also in Matt. 13, 15, Isidore says: "In this case the *μῆναι* i.e. 'lest at any time' does not indicate abolition of hearing but it does indicate a hope of obedience"⁽⁴⁾ and immediately he goes on to prove his opinion by referring to John 7, 25-26; 1 Tim. 2, 24-5 and Sirach 13, 15. In replying to the question 'wilt thou then that we go and gather them up' (Matt. 13, 28) and in vindicating Christ's negative answer, Isidore writes: "Nay; why? Lest the wheat will root up with the tares, lest a sinner who tries for his rectification will be carried away, lest innocent children will be cut out with cunning parents"⁽⁵⁾. But Isi-

1. V. Supra, p. 147

2. I 18, 192B-93A

3. III 246, 924D-25A

4. II 270, 700BC

5. I 195, 308BC

Isidore does not stop here; he recommends us to compare the examples of Esau for Job's sake, of Matthew for Gospel's sake, of Peter for his tears which the Lord had foreseen and of Paul who has been left so that the ends of the world might not lose salvation. And, to finish with the examples received from the interpretations of Matthew, let us bring another example relating to Matt. 26, 53. Christ said: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?". Isidore declares categorically this thought by referring to the Scriptures: "There was no need for so many angels, since only one angel killed a hundred and eighty five thousand in the time of Ezechias (IV Kings 19, 35). But Christ said that in order to encourage his disciples and to expel their doubt" (1).

The examples from other Evangelists concerning Isidore's method of interpreting the Scriptures by the Scriptures are fewer in number. We should mention only two or three examples from John. Thus, in telling his opinion concerning the meaning of the title J.N.K.J. on the Cross, Isidore says: "The title which had been fixed by Pilate over (2) the Lord's head, was fulfilling the voice of the Lord: 'and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me' (John 22, 32)" (3). In his endeavour to elucidate the meaning of the words *verba*, *verba* and *verba* which occur in John 19, 34 and in Rom. 11, 8 and in order to justify his opinion, Isidore cites the following Biblical passages: Rom. 1, 26; and 28; Sirach 14, 1; 11 Cor. 7, 8; Song 4, 9; Ps. 29, 13 and Ps. 118, 27 (4). Again, concerning John 21, 25 'I suppose that even the world....written', Isidore says that "this phrase is an exaggeration as it happens in the O.T., viz: Dan. 3, 5; Exod. 3, 18; and Ps. 106, 26. In the O.T. the exaggeration is a real one; in the N.T. it is restrained" (5). A good example of interpretation of the N.T. by itself or by referring to the whole Scriptures is that relating to Philip who baptized the Eunuch. We cite all Isidore's exposition concerning it in another chapter (6) and here we confine ourselves to telling that he solves the problem by referring to Acts 8, 1; 8, 40; 8, 14; and 8, 17. (7)

From the Epistles we should bring the following examples: Rom. 8, 8 where Isidore elucidates the meaning of the word 'flesh'. "The word 'flesh' has two meanings in the divine Scriptures. The one is the natural according to which flesh means just flesh

-
1. III 334, 992C
 2. The text has 'before': *Прѣ*
 3. I 491, 449C
 4. IV 101, 1165C-69A
 5. II 99, 541C
 6. V. Supra p. 184-5
 7. I 447-50, 428D-29A

as in Lk 24, 39. As to the other meaning, flesh means carnal mind or carnally minded man, as in 1Cor. 15, 50. Now, he who wishes to educate his mind subdues the urges of the flesh and while he is in flesh he pleases God and he inherits the heavenly realm in flesh as if he was incorporeal" (1). Among other explanations concerning 1Cor. 6, 18 Isidore tries to prove that 'he that committed fornication sinneth against his own body' by referring to the Scriptures. "Inasmuch as those who are married become one body by law (Gen. 2, 24; 1Cor. 7, 14), reasonably a man who commits fornication sins against his wife, that is to say against his own body; and a woman who commits fornication sins against her body, i.e. against her husband who became her body" (2). With regard to 1Cor. 11, 7 'the woman is the glory of the man', Isidore says: "How did Paul call the woman 'glory of the man'? We shall tell that woman from the beginning was equal in dignity to man and she had the same power. But since she had fallen, she diminished and her power decreased and she became subject to man. He says: You did not keep the equality of privilege, then accept the diminuation. 'Thy desire, shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee (Gen. 1, 26)" (3). In order to elucidate 1Cor. 15, 33 'evil communications corrupt good manners' again Isidore takes his examples from the Scriptures. He says: "Its proof is the sons of the Psalmist Amnon the elder and Absalom the younger, who lived with debauchery and destroyed their lives miserably. So great a vice is the evil communication" (4). In interpreting 1Cor. 5, 16 Isidore once again has recourse to the Scriptures. He says: "Even if we, the believers from among the Jews, were proud of Christ's kinship before, now we are not proud of it, but we are proud of his relationship by familiarity (κατ'οικειότητα), which relationship is a fruit of virtue. And this is why Paul was saying 'be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ' (1Cor. 11, 1). That is to say, I am proud of the imitation rather than of the carnal kinship" (5). A good example is also that relating to Colos. 1, 15, which we already have cited (6).

Let us take now our last few examples. Isidore is interpreting Hebr. 4, 8-9. In this case also he elucidates the Biblical saying by the Scriptures. He says: "The divine Paul was not speaking about the rest of the Jews which happened in Palestine by the leadership of Jesus the son of Man. He was not speaking at all about this rest. But Paul looks at the future rest and this rest

-
1. I 477, 44IC-44A
 2. IV 129, 1209D-1212A
 3. III 95, 80IBC
 4. IV 34, 1085D-88AB
 5. IV 46, 1097B
 6. V. Supra p. 167-8

is the purpose of his speech. And the proof that this opinion is true, is Paul's saying: 'if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God'. In other words, if Jesus the son of Nun had given them rest, then David could not say after so long a time 'today if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts'. Therefore, he says, the true rest is preserved for the people of God, i.e. for those who lived honourably according to the Faith and this rest is not in Palestine, but having been prepared, it is preserved in the supermundane Jerusalem⁽¹⁾. Even in cases which are not exactly interpretations but just notes on this or that matter, Isidore tries to demonstrate by the Scriptures. Thus in speaking about Paul's way of speaking⁽²⁾, he strengthens his opinion from the Scriptures. Finally, to complete the illustration of Isidore's method of interpretation by the Scriptures themselves, we cite our last example referring to James 3, 6. 'The tongue setteth on fire the *ῥοχόν* of nature'. Isidore says: "The sacred Saying says that the time of our life is embarrassed by the tongue for time looks like a circle (*ῥοχοειδής*) which turns round itself. The Scriptures did not say that the *ῥοχός* sets on fire the tongue, but that the tongue sets on fire the *ῥοχόν* i.e. the time which is like a wheel. For the Scriptures accuse intencion and prevent audacity"⁽³⁾. And now Isidore comes to affirm his opinion by the Scriptures. "The guarantee that the Scriptures called time 'wheel' for its circular scheme and because it turns round itself is that which had been said by the Psalmist: 'Thou crownest the year of thy goodness' (Ps. 64, 12)"⁽⁴⁾.

We have cited so far about twenty examples to illustrate Isidore's method of interpretation of the N.T. by itself or by the whole Scriptures. There are also about ten examples more which we do not cite because the already cited examples are more than enough to prove that Isidore really interprets a certain number of N.T. passages by the Scriptures. Concerning this method we would say that the same holds good for the interpretation of the O.T., but this we have set aside.

Surveying this method of interpretation used by Isidore, we should say that where there is a possibility of using it, because

-
1. IV 47, 1232CD
 2. V. Supra, p. 186-7
 3. II 158, 613A
 4. *ibid.* 613B; cf St Basil the Great, in Hexaemeron II 8 Garnier I 29: "...Τοῦτο δὲ κυκλικόν ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα (τοῦ χρόνου), ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχεσθαι, καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸ καταλήγειν"
 5. e.g. Matt. 5, 38-9; 5, 44; 10, 19; Lk. 13, 2; 18, 10-4; 1 Cor. 7, 5; 1 Tim. 3, 7; Titus 1, 6. of Supra p. 127f

we cannot do it everywhere, this method is the best one, at least for theologians. Fathers do it widely. Indeed, how much better could some interpretations of the Scriptures be if the interpreters had a better knowledge of the Scriptures and if they tried to find the solution to a problem concerning interpretation in the Scriptures!

Although these interpretations are not excellent in all cases, one cannot say that they are unsuccessful. And although in one or two cases we should prefer a better explanation and we could find it elsewhere, nevertheless they agree more or less with the spirit of the Scriptures and this is more than enough. Besides we must stress the fact that this method of Isidore does not banish his own thought and leaves him sufficient freedom to move freely and to apply this method only when it is possible and profitable.

b) Interpretation of the New Testament by reference to exterior evidences

Isidore knew very well the ancient Greek literature and he owed this to his excellent education. In his letters he repeatedly refers to names such as Demosthenes, Plato, Isocrates, Homer, Pindar etc. and of course to their ideas. And in many cases he brings their evidences to strengthen his own opinion whereas in other cases he refutes them. Also he knew Philo and Josephus and many times he has had recourse to them for the same reason. And of course he had at his disposal works of some Fathers before him and in many cases he availed himself of their works, even if in most cases he does not say where he has borrowed from. Thus in a certain case he says indeterminately: "I write what I have heard from a wise man, but I shall write also my own thought in order that you might find that which is more true" (1).

In a previous chapter (2) we tried to examine and to designate his relations with and his borrowing from other Fathers before him. Here we cite some examples in which Isidore says clearly to which external witnesses he is referring and which might justify us in saying that this is another method of Isidore's interpretations.

In interpreting Matt. 13, 15 and elucidating the meaning of the word $\mu\eta\nu\omicron\rho\epsilon$, Isidore says: "It is $\mu\eta\nu\omicron\rho\epsilon$ for wise men, of whom Philo seems to be one, to put the word $\mu\eta\nu\omicron\rho\epsilon$ instead of $\iota\omega\omega\varsigma$ i.e. 'perhaps' or 'in lieu of' ($\epsilon\omega\theta'\omicron\tau\epsilon$)" (3). This ex-

+ that

1. III 152, 844A
2. V. Supra, pp. 81ff
3. II 270, 700C. Isidore names Philo four times (II 134; 270; III 19; 81), but it is true that the former many times borrowed from the latter, as Fruechtel (PhW 58, 764-66) has proved.

planation is combined with what the Scriptures say and thus the result is certain. A better example is found in what Isidore says concerning Mk 6, 18 'it is not lawful to thee...'. "Why is it not? Some say that he had profaned the law of Moses. For although his brother had a child, he got his brother's wife, which was not permissible. Some others- of whom Josephus⁽¹⁾ is one- say that he had got the woman although her husband was living and had a daughter. There was not any divorce, because, if there ~~was~~, then John could not call it a transgression, since it would be permissible by the law. Finally others say that Herod killed his brother lest he would get the power and after that he got his brother's wife. But if this is correct why did John not blame Herod for the murder? Moreover John would blame Herod since he should then be a fratricide. I think the first opinion is correct"⁽²⁾. In this case Isidore names only Josephus, but of course his evidence that others say this or that is useful. And the more important is that Isidore does not only refer to them but he refutes them since they do not agree with his own opinion. Finally, we cite one more example relating to Colos. I, 15 in which Isidore again has recourse to external evidence. He writes: "If the word πρωτοτοκος takes the accent on the second syllable from the beginning, πρωτότοκος, it means he who was born first; again, if this word takes the accent on the second syllable from the end, πρωτοτόκος, it means he who first gave birth. In Homer e.g. she who brought forth firstly is called πρωτοτόκος. Then it is easy to understand or rather it is necessary to understand that the divine Paul used this word in such a meaning..."⁽³⁾.

These examples are very few but they could show that Isidore had in mind some other suggestions and that he knew what other people were telling and that he tried to avail himself of them. Just this intention of Isidore justifies this section as his second method of interpretation; and if we take into account other examples from the O.T., this would be clearer⁽⁴⁾.

An interpreter of the Scriptures must be somehow broad-minded and he must get what good he can find even outside of the Church as St Basil should also say. So does Isidore in some cases, where it is possible and profitable, and he does it successfully, and we are content with him.

-
1. Isidore esteems Josephus and names him five times: III 19; II 66; III 81; 257; IV 96.
 2. IV 96, II 60B-61A
 3. III 31, 749C. V. Supra p. 167-8. Isidore names Homer in seven of his letters: II 31, 749B; II 89, 533A; III 70; IV 30; IV 206, 1295B; V 444 and V 546
 4. cf. III 84, 789D: Εἰ δὲ βουλευθείης καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν ὠφεληθῆναι...

3. Types of Interpretation

With regard to the interpretation of the Scriptures the term 'method' signifies many times also the types of interpretation. Thus Scholars speaking about the allegorical or literal interpretations are referring to them as methods of interpretation. But it is true that the method, that is to say the way of interpretation gives us this or that kind of interpretation. Thus there is a close relation between method and type concerning interpretation; but still they are different things and we must not confuse them.

Since the term 'types' is wider than 'methods' and since our intention here is to include as many types of Isidore's interpretations as possible, we have preferred the heading 'types' and along with the literal and allegorical interpretations we shall include a kind of combination of both these types, alternative and unsuccessful interpretations.

a) Literal Interpretations

The number of Isidore's literal interpretations of the N.T. is more than two hundred. Thus we can say that Isidore prefers rather the method of the School of Antioch concerning interpretation, without rejecting of course the allegorical interpretation as we shall see in the next paragraph. We cite here some characteristic and representative examples of Isidore's literal interpretations to illustrate his method and ability.

Matt. 5, 20: Isidore says that the real meaning of this verse is: a) "For Christians to acquire more righteousness than that which the Scribes and Pharisees ought to have. Because those having more righteousness than the condemned, are not worthy to enter into the kingdom of heaven. But those are worthy to enter into the kingdom of heaven who much more exceed those who were in good repute according to Law and showed heavenly life" (1).
b) "If you shall not exceed those who were in good repute, in the O.T.; Because I do not mean those who will be judged" (2).
c) "If you will not turn the appearance into work the kingdom of heaven will be closed for you. Because this kingdom is true and is opened to those who seek it truly" (3).

1. IV 216, 1309BC

2. IV 204, 1292D

3. I 79, 273B

Matt. 6, 22: The light of the body is the eye. Why? Isidore replies: "For the eye rules all the body, cheers up and adorns the face and it is a light for all members, this is the reason why it has been established on one royal place, has got the highest portion and is provost of the other sensations. Because as the sun is in the universe so is the eye in the body. And like the sun if it will be extinguished by word everything will be disordered, thus the eye, too, if it will be extinguished will also make the feet and hands and almost all the body useless" (1).

Referring to Matt. 10, 41 Isidore writes: "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward. This verse in short means the following: If someone does good for a certain gain or for honour, he will not share in the glory of the good. But he will be glorified with the good who honoured it for its own sake" (2). For many people honour prophets or righteous men either for human glory or vital profit. And if someone, seeing the good, would sincerely honour the saints, he would be glorified with them" (3).

Explaining how 'he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John', Matt. 11, 11 Isidore says: "He who is perfect in Law, as John was, is by all means lesser than he who has been baptized into Christ's death. Because the kingdom of heaven is for those interred with Christ who descended to vanquish death and for those risen with him, who gives victory against death. Inasmuch as John was greater than any other born of all women" (4) and has been beheaded before the realm of heaven was given, he became blameless as to the righteousness of the Law, but having died before the era of grace, he became the least of those who became perfect according to the spirit of the life in Christ" (5).

Concerning blasphemy against the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit, Isidore gives us a good literal interpretation: "'Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son, it shall be forgiven him' the Lord said (Matt. 12, 32). For, to those who do not see well with the eye of the mind, the ineffably united God with the cheapness of the apparent flesh is with difficulty conceived and is difficult to look at, since the hidden Godhead is not known" (6). And

I. II 112, 552D-55A

2. 'Εκείνος τῷ ἀγαθῷ συνδοξασθήσεται, ὁ αὐτὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν δι' αὐτό τοῦτο τιμήσας cf Chrysostom: ad Theodorum Lapsum
I II Montf. I, 14DE

3. IV 135, 1216C-17A

4. but not from those born of the Spirit... as other codex has

5. I 68, 223BC

6. I 59, 221D: 'Επειδὴ τοῖς λημῶσι τὸν τῆς διανοίας ὀφθαλμὸν δυσκατάληπτος καὶ δυσθεώρητος ὁ ἠνωμένος ἀρρήτως θεὸς τῇ εὐτελείᾳ τῆς φαινομένης σαρκός, ἀγνοουμένης τῆς κρυπτομένης θεότητος.

for this reason blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is inexcusable: inasmuch as His deeds being apparent prove those making the blasphemies foolish and ungrateful. Because whereas the passions were being cut out and demons expelled by the Godhead's power, the grumbling Jews calumniated that these miracles were made by Beelzebub. Now this blasphemy which is clearly against the divine essence is, the Lord said, inexcusable" (1).

Referring to Matt. 19, 7-8 and concerning divorce, Isidore interprets: "Why did Moses command to give a writing of divorcement? Not as it is necessary to put away those women who transgress the institution of marriage, but wishing to prevent a bigger and worse evil, he did not enact the lesser but he allowed it. He not only considered the manifest marriage better than the secret adultery if some woman would do it, but he considered it better for those women to be put away or to be slain. He separated those who could not be together. For, those who ate prophetic blood, would not spare hated women. So Moses preventing the bigger evil, allowed the lesser one rather than ordered it... Moses commanded it because of the hardness of your hearts, that is to say for your disobedience and malignity" (2). But from the beginning it was not so. Also Christ ordered those women who transgress against the institution of marriage to be put away. But when such a thing does not happen, He ordered the toleration of all other vices of women and rather he declared that it is necessary" (3).

"That which has been said on virginity 'all men cannot receive this saying save they to whom it is given', says Isidore, has been said not because this gift has been given κατὰ ἀποκλήρωσιν, i.e. by drawing lots, for, then, he would not put before hand a prize, but in order to show: a) that those who had stripped for a wondrous struggle need the divine help. b) then, that this counsel descends from heaven decreeing not as a law but using admonition. c) that this gift is given to those who are not intemperate, who call the heavenly alliance, who preserve this gem by fasting and vigilance and who do not throw themselves to the devil by reason of indolence. Because if this gift has been given by drawing lots, the prize is unnecessary. It has not given by grace, but it is given to those who want it. For no one gives anything to those who do not wish it" (4).

What does Christ signify by 'watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation'?" This verse does not say, writes Isidore, that if someone watches and prays he will not enter at all into temptation, since this life is a trial and many people, even the best (Prophets, Apostles) have entered into many and great temptations.

-
1. I 59, 22IAB.cf also I 60, 22IBC
 2. Αὐτὸ τὸ ἀποκλῆσθαι ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ ῥῶτον
 3. III 76, 784BD
 4. IV 165, 1253C-56A

Not to enter into temptation is, perhaps, impossible, whereas to be undefeated by it, is possible. Christ by saying this counsel, hinted: be not defeated by temptation"⁽¹⁾. In this case Isidore seems to be wrong since the word εἰσέρχομαι never means to be defeated. But a more careful examination justifies Isidore because the word εἰσέρχομαι may mean occupy"⁽²⁾. Thus we must agree that Isidore's interpretation here is intelligent and denotes his classical education.

'Who is my neighbour?' This is a good question; and the answer from Isidore is a good one. "The Saviour defined the meaning of neighbour not with regard to the works nor the authority but with regard to nature... For proximity is decided by nature, not by virtue; by essence not by dignity; by sympathy, not by place; by the manner of curing not by the proximity of place. Consider as neighbour he who is in need and go spontaneously to help him"⁽³⁾.

Concerning Lk 16, 25 Isidore says: "The Bible by saying not merely ἐλάβες, i.e. you received, but ἀπέλαβες i.e. you received as a right (for the former means grace and the latter means reward), explains and elucidates the whole meaning. Besides, not only those who reached the higher stage of virtue have a certain human fault (for only God is sinless), but also those who have descended to the depths of vice have some good"⁽⁴⁾. Hence, "if you, the rich man, have done any good, you have been paid by living in luxury without troubles. And if he (Lazarus) has committed any fault he has been punished by living in great need and misery"⁽⁵⁾.

John 5, 19: 'The Son can do nothing of himself'. This is an interesting point and so is Isidore's interpretation: "This phrase does not mean a weakness of the Son, but on the contrary it signifies strength, for it is impossible for Him to do something opposite to the Father. Christ said this because of some people who were looking at Him as if He was ἀντίθεος i.e. against God. Do not think that I cannot do something without the Father's consent; it is impossible. It is not possible for me to do something opposite to the Father's purpose; it is not excusable to set myself against the Father"⁽⁶⁾.

Also interesting is the interpretation concerning John 10, 29: "If 'no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand' why are many lost? I say that no man can pluck out from the strongest and invincible Right Hand those who have prepared

+ in

1. II 76, 517D-20A

2. cf that of Herodotus, VI 125, quoted in Liddel-Scott: Dictionary... II 42: "...ἰδόντα δὲ τὸν Κροίσον γέλως εἰσῆλθε..."

3. IV 123, II 97A. cf Chrysostom: De compactione I 3 Montf. I, 154B

4. IV 116, II 89C

5. V 221, I 465A

6. III 335, 993D-96A. cf also I 353, 384BC

themselves by orthodox faith and by best life and are familiar with God. But someone could deceive them. That is to say, no one can pluck them by force and tyranny; but he could do it by false thought and deceit. But it is done not because of the invincible Hand, but because of the indolence of the independent men. For perdition does not happen because of weakness in him who guards, but, it happens because of indolence in those who are guarded"(1).

On 'Jesus wept' (John II, 35) Isidore says: "Why? Because Lazarus was a friend of the Saviour and hence Lazarus was a righteous man, otherwise he could not be a friend of the holy Righteousness, i.e. of Christ. For Christ does not love by grace but by judgement. And since Lazarus was righteous and had finished gloriously the arena of this life, he by all means was in rest and honour. Then Christ would raise him up and for that reason He wept. As if He was saying: I call again to stormy life he who had entered the port; I call again for struggles he who had been crowned"(2).

Referring to Acts 4, 16 Isidore notes: "The Jews having caught and imprisoned and struck the Apostles, were in perplexity and they were speaking as if they were defeated; they had been defeated by those means which they thought that they could overcome. For, what they were thinking would be the humiliation of the Apostles, that was becoming the glory of the Apostles"(3).

Let us take some more examples from the Epistles:

Rom. 8, 18 is concerned with the future glory; Isidore says: a) "If someone can gather all the prosperity from the beginning of men's existence till now and compare it with the glory of the future, he will find the former countless times lesser than the latter. For as soul is more honourable than body, so much the future glory differs from the present prosperity"(4). And in another of his letters Isidore says: b) "Inasmuch as Paul could not describe the future prosperity either clearly or in part, he named it with regard to what is the most amiable to us, i.e. glory. For it seems to be the summit of virtue. c) Paul by saying that the glory shall be revealed means that it is now hidden and that it awaits the sufferings of triumphant combatants"(5).

Rom. 12, 18: 'if it be possible live peaceably with all men'. Isidore interprets as follows: a) "When you see piety being harmed or weak men being injured, do not prefer peace to truth"(6).

-
1. III I22, 824D-25A
 2. II I73, 624C-25A
 3. III I82, 873A
 4. V 72, I369A
 5. IV 63, II20D-21A
 6. III 284, 960B

b)"Do not think that peace is always good. For many times it is more fearful than all war"(1). "If it be possible. For some times it is impossible, e.g. when the matter concerns piety or righteousness or sobriety or virtue in general. For how could a pious man be at peace with an impious one or a righteous with an unjust or a chaste with a lewd?"(2) d) "what does 'if it be possible' mean? Do not, either give ground for hate or have within reason an enemy"(3).

Rom. 13, 1: 'There is no power but of God'. Isidore interprets: "Paul did not say there is no ἀρχὴν i.e. ruler or prince but of God, but he speaks of the essence of the matter and says: there is no ἐξουσία i.e. power but of God. For the existence of powers in men is a work of God and likewise for some men to reign and for others to be reigned is the work of God. Now I say that power and reigning had been established by God, so that the order of the world be saved"(4). And if any wicked ruler has got power we do not say that he has been established by God, but that God permitted him to get it"(5).

1 Cor. 6, 10: Isidore says: "Paul did not say that all whom he mentions shall be equally punished, but that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God. In other words: All these shall be excluded from the future glory, but they shall be judged according to the quantity and quality of their sins. For the accuracy of the divine tribunal is great"(6).

1 Cor. 9, 21: 'I became as without law'. Isidore interprets: "Paul became as without law when speaking to the Athenians he did not start from the Prophets or from the Law but he gave his instruction from the altar, that is to say, converting them by dogmas which were familiar to them. Hence he did not say 'without law' but 'as without law'(7). 'Being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ': "Paul said it for two reasons: a) Because it is an impartial matter (ὡς ἀδελφικόν) - for in one essence there is no difference-; b) Because he behaved not only according to the Law which is attributed by everyone to the Father, but also according to the heavenly and perfect law of Christ. That is to say, whereas I became not ἀνομος i.e.

1. IV 36, 1088C

2. IV 220, 1313D-16A

3. Ibid. 1316A

4. Ἰνα μὴ ὁ νόμος εἰς ἀπομίμιν ἐκτρέφῃ

5. II 216, 657D-60B. of Chrysostom: ad Rom. LXIII I Montf. IX 752C-753A

6. IV 42, 1093B

7. II 138, 580D-81A. cf also III 346, 1004B

without law according to the old Law, I became *ἐννομος* i.e. with law according to the Gospel; Not out of the law, but also according to Grace"(1).

i Cor. 15, 29: The meaning of baptism for the dead. Isidore says: "The divine Apostle said it so calling the nature of bodies and comparing it with the pure nature of the soul. For the latter is immortal and without end and the former is liable to ruin and change. Now we are baptized for the bodies which are naturally dead because we believe we will turn them into incorruptibility. And this is the meaning of the aforesaid. If our bodies rise not at all why do we believe in turning them into incorruptibility by baptism?"(2)

ii Cor. 12, 9: 'My strength is made perfect in weakness'. Isidore interprets this as follows: a) "The divine strength is made perfect in weakness, as the Chosen Vessel said, because illiterate men excel orators and custom officers preach poverty. And even our Lord corrected the alteration of things to a heavenly state not by a royal authority but *κατ' οἰκονομίαν* i.e. by 'economy', by a slavish poverty"(3). b) The divine strength is made perfect in weakness because the Apostles while whipped had the whip of the whippers, while persecuted were masters of the persecutors and while dying were conquering the living"(4).

With regard to Gal. 4, 4 'made of a woman' Isidore with liveliness expresses his opinion as follows: "What are you doing Paul? Do you call the Virgin 'woman'? Yes, he says, I call her 'woman' for the nature, but I keep her in my mind as a virgin. For the virgin is woman even if she is untouched. She is woman because of her sex and structure; and she is virgin because of her integrity and purity"(5).

Concerning ii Tim. 4, 1 'Jesus shall judge the quick and the dead', Isidore says that he can interpret this in three ways: a) Both the soul and the body will be judged not separately but together. As they had been united here, so they will be judged there being united. b) Jesus on the one hand will *διακρίναι* i.e. separate the living, that is to say those who lived the ever-living life and that beloved by God, and He will give them as a reward everlasting rewards; and on the other hand He will *κρίναι* i.e. judge those who have been dead by sinning and who through their indolence buried the talent which had been given to them and He will punish them. c) Jesus will judge those who will still be alive and also those who had died before them"(6).

-
1. II 138, 581AB
 2. I 221, 321B
 3. I 428, 420AB
 4. III 182, 872C
 5. III 176, 868C
 6. I 222, 321CD

Hebr. 2, 15: 'And deliver them who through fear of death werebondage'. We understand it, says Isidore, in four ways: a) "It is not death but judgment after death which anticipates sins. For if men will keep in mind the divine Court and consider it always, then they could not dare to do any bad action. b) Since men would die, they committed a lot of sins and therefore they were afraid of death. And this is why Christ came, to deliver them also from this bondage. c) Christ came to deliver them from the fear of death which was equal with non existence and to enable them to understand the perfect Court after death. For thus they eagerly followed the way which leads to virtue being encouraged by the hope of the wreaths and they were avoiding sin because of the fear of future punishments. d) Inasmuch as many people being afraid of death because they believed that death was leading to non existence, were accepting to do and suffer many disgraceful acts unwillingly and in order that these men might not be punished by those who were stronger, Christ came to men to teach them that death is preferable to vice and that men ought to prefer death rather than do and suffer some disgraceful action. For death will be destroyed by the resurrection whereas disgraceful actions will finish with punishments" (1).

And now our last example concerning James 2, 20: 'Faith without works is dead'. Isidore says: a) "Although piety precedes and is first, nevertheless it needs the accurate life, so that the perfect and highest success and prosperity will be apparent. Therefore we must with all our power care for the accurate life in order that we, showing the accuracy of our life, will be victors in everything and even keeping silent we might muzzle our opponents who would dare to speak against us" (2). How could Faith stand without virtue by which it might act? As the best musician could not show his art without a flute, so piety being shown without works seems dead and inactive not only to those out of the Church but to the divine Scriptures as well. For they say 'faith without works is dead' " (3):

These examples we have so far cited concerning the Literal Interpretation of Isidore, twenty five in number, are few out of the total number. But perhaps one could say that they are many. But how could we say otherwise about this type of interpretation and how could we ascertain Isidore's success if we should not cite a certain number of examples? Thus we think that the cited examples are just sufficient. And let it be noted that these examples are not carefully selected so that our esteem of Isidore may increase, but they are just a part of the whole and represent the Literal type.

-
1. IV 146, 1229B-32B
 2. IV 226, 1321B
 3. V 162, 1420C

Surveying these examples we may say that in spite of Isidore's laconic way of thinking and writing, they are rather extensive interpretations. A contemporary systematic Exegete would be briefer. But Isidore was interpreting only some passages and he ought to prove his opinion and not express it dogmatically, according to his rule. Also we must say that this was a custom of the age. And, of course, these examples show us Isidore's facility in dealing with Exegesis and his theological equipment.

We judge these examples as successful; and we could say the same for all the literal interpretations of Isidore of the N.T., although some examples would need a little more elucidation or extension.

b) Allegorical Interpretations

We have said that in most cases Isidore follows, and hence he represents, the Antiochian School concerning the interpretation of the Scriptures, and we have cited some examples of his grammatico-historical type of interpretation. But it is also true that he does not reject the allegorical kind even though the N.T. examples belonging to that kind hardly exceed three dozen.

We must stress from the beginning that Isidore usually interprets allegorically those passages which are appropriate for such an interpretation, when for example the Bible itself speaks allegorically or metaphorically or parabolically⁽¹⁾ or when a certain spiritual gain is generally expected. Because how could we interpret literally e.g. Matt. 7, 18 'a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit'? 'For if the Saviour was

I. As a matter of fact we cannot interpret these passages otherwise. Not only Isidore, but other Great Fathers also, interpret in the same way. Basil the Great, e.g. who says: "Τοὺς δὲ τοιοῦτους λόγους ὡς ὄνειράτων συγκρίσεις καὶ γραῶδεις μύθους ἀποτερψάμενοι, τὸ ὅτι οὕτως οὕτως νοήσωμεν, καὶ τὴν διάκρισιν τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ στερεώματος γενομένην, κατὰ τὴν ἀποδοθεῖσαν αἰτίαν δεχόμεθα.." (In Hex. III 9 Gern. I 44), interprets Matt. 21, 33 'I planted a vineyard and hedged it round about' as follows: "Τὰς ἀνθρώπους ψυχὰς δηλονότι λέγει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, αἱς φραγμὸν περιέθηκε, τὴν ἐν τῶν προσταγμάτων ἀσφάλειαν καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων" (In Hex. V 6 Gern. I 64). This is an allegorical interpretation and indeed St Basil could not interpret it literally. St Basil's homilies on the Psalms (especially on XLVIII and XLIV) supply us with abundant examples of allegorical interpretations.

speaking about trees, let your mind be superior to that; but if he was speaking about men and had used an example—because what is natural to the trees is optional for us—let a l l e-
g o r y be upset"⁽¹⁾. Also, when our Lord says that the grain of mustard is the kingdom of heaven, Matt. 13, 31 we are obliged to find why He assimilates the heavenly realm with a grain of mustard seed. Isidore says that "the comparison of the kingdom of heaven with mustard is done because of the results of the latter. The word of the divine preaching is short when it is sowed and is declared briefly, not only for its shortness, but for the simple and common words too. But when it is cultivated it grows up and it exceeds all preachings which have been admired till now, because it brings forth truth and, it does not decorate falsehood. Nothing is more than truth"⁽²⁾. Among the interpretations of Isidore there are also pure allegories which show his relations with the Alexandrian School and of which we shall cite a number.

Thus, referring to Matt. 3, 10 Isidore says: "John the Prophet seeing the unfruitful intention of the Jews assimilated them to unfruitful trees, saying that the axe lies at their root. Axe is the sharp and abridged division of the Gospel by which (i.e. axe) every tree which does not bear good fruit is felled, not torn out by the roots, because the roots, i.e. the law are left for the new people to be grafted to"⁽³⁾.

On the 'winnowing-fan' and 'threshing-floor', Isidore says: "The Lord says that winnowing-fan is the ecumenical Church in which He gathers all harvest of mankind. Threshing-floor is the righteous judgment which for everyone commands the right class and burns those who look like straw and the ~~utabish~~ ^{utabish}. But those whose works are pure and have produced fruits of repentance, He will gather into the appropriate granary, which He also calls salutary abode or mansion"⁽⁴⁾.

We have said that Isidore allegorizes especially those passages which have been written allegorically or metaphorically; let the following example be its proof. The Biblical verse is Matt. 7, 6. Isidore interprets: "This verse signifies the divine word. For the divine word is a really holy and most valuable pearl. Dogs and swine are not only those erring in dogmas but those erring in actions as well. Trampling of the pearl is the dispute and quarrel of dogmas or actions by those who attempt to overturn dogmas or those who abuse the best life. Well this is the reason why Christ said: Do not cast the word as cheap and easily obtained in order that it be not insulted and you will not be laughed at by those who neither say nor do anything

1. IV 81, II44AB

2. IV 76, II36BC. L. Bober (p. 56-63) classifies this interpretation among the literal ones.

3. I 64, 224C-25A. L. Bober (p. 56-63) classifies this interpretation among the literal ones.

4. I 65, 226AB

right" (1). In another of his letters and on the same thing, he says: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, i.e. to the Jews who have many times received the divine word and again turned back to the same vomit, or to those who believe in heresy, who are going towards the true word and turn back to their previous bad disposition. Neither cast ye your pearls before swine, i.e. before those who are mixed together with their passions and live a life like swine, lest they trample them in their evil habits cursing the divine name and run again and rend you. Because the communication of mysteries to those people is an unwakened rendering" (2). For them who communicate it contemptuously" (3). Continuing his interpretation of the same Biblical verse Isidore says that it refers to the priesthood: "Several people say that this commandment commands that the priesthood is not to be given to lascivious and impure men, lest they insult it and assault those who ordained them, rendering the dignified glory which they had before" (4). And finally he says that it may be referred to the sacraments and holy Baptism: "If that means that the divine sacraments must not be given to sinning lay men, consider it. And if that prohibits the giving of the holy Baptism to those pretending to accept the Faith but not avoiding their present habits, consider it" (5).

Four continuous verses of Scripture, Matt. 24, 16-19 give Isidore grounds to interpret them allegorically. These allegories are found in one and the same letter. Thus on 'let them which be in Judaea flee in to the mountains' Isidore says: "It means those who are attached to piety (what Judaea means) must look for the high refuge and must be watched by their avowal" (6). Isidore's opinion concerning 'let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house' is: "He who disdained the present house, who scorned the residence which is here, who became great as to life and who expelled his own passions, let him have with him nothing, neither timidity nor indolence nor empty glory nor love for riches all of which ~~are~~ are coming down" (7). Again on 'neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes', Isidore writes: "He who has put off the old man and has denied the carnal one must put on the new man which renewed him in the knowledge of God and purged him from the mud" (8). And finally Isidore elucidates Matt. 24, 19

1. IV 181, 1273A
2. $\rho\eta\mu\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\alpha\nu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$
3. I 143, 280A
4. IV 181, 1273B
5. *ibid.* Chrysostom also connects this verse with sacraments (*De Compactione I Montf. I, 161E*)
6. I 210, 316B
7. *ibid.* 316BC
8. *ibid.* 316C

'woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days' as follows: It refers to those souls which have the divine love within and which do not dare to speak freely and bring forth the avowal of God and the life according to Him. Also it refers to those souls which have a childish and imperfect idea about the divine forbearance and which do not hope to get rewards, but have been laid bare because of a threat or insult and are lacking in future hopes" (1).

Isidore interprets allegorically also Matt. 24, 41 (cf Lk 17, 34-5) concerning the 'mill' and the women grinding at. "Mill, he says, is the present life's noise which unsteadily passes over us and which changes things as quickly as the mill. That 'women grinding' signifies those who differ according to the life in one thing or class; e.g. asceticism or virginity or continence or purity or hospitality (or faith) are done by many people, but not with the same mind or in the same rank (2). 'The one shall be taken and the other left': Some care for activity and vigilance; some others live with indolence and negligence; of those the former are to be taken, the latter are to be left when the Lord will come in His glory" (3).

Another parable is interpreted by Isidore in the same way. The point is the hiding of talents and usury. 'Thou oughtest to have put my money to the exchangers;' It refers to those who did nothing about a neighbour's salvation, and means: You ought to, tell, to confirm, to protest; you ought to show a blameless life (4). Also this affirmation of Christ refers to those who could tell and preach about a neighbour's salvation and who did not do it (5). The Lord calls 'usury of hearing' the evidence of the works (6).

An allegorical interpretation of Peter's denial is noteworthy but on the whole it is unsuccessful, for there was no reason to allegorize these passages. Thus on Matt. 26, 34 'before the cock crow' Isidore says: "It means: before the day of resurrection comes. For these cocks crow when the dawn is coming and while there is still darkness. Then, when the life-giving East was coming, the crow of the cock became an accuser of the denial, signifying the abolition of the night of malediction and the rise of the light of life" (7). Peter's denial, says Isidore, signifies the denial of all mankind, Matt. 26, 70; 72; 74: "The chief of the apostles having denied thrice the Lord, suggested the sin of all

+ it.

1. Ibid. 3160D
2. I 285, 349C
3. I 283, 349AB
4. IV 177, 1268B
5. V 201, 1453A
6. III 398, 1036D
7. I 357, 385C

men who thrice denied the Creator⁽¹⁾. Mankind denied God thrice⁽²⁾. Firstly, When God gave the first commandments⁽³⁾. The first denial is the transgression of the commandment which was forbidding the tasting of the fruit of the tree in the middle of paradise⁽⁴⁾. Secondly, when the written law was given⁽⁵⁾. The second impiety within the law is the adoration which the Jews offered to the golden calf⁽⁶⁾. Thirdly, in the incarnation of the Word our God⁽⁷⁾. The third disrespect is the resignation of grace. For they said⁽⁸⁾ 'we have no king but coesar' and denied the Lord of glory⁽⁹⁾.

The phrase 'rise, let us be going', Matt. 26, 46, ought to be literally interpreted but Isidore preferred to interpret it allegorically, for a certain spiritual profit: "Christ said 'rise, let us be going' in order that we might not be attached to the earth, because of superstition which is a terrible passion removed with difficulty and is an obstacle for the heavenly prizes"⁽⁹⁾.

Concerning Christ's malediction of the fig-tree, Isidore gives the following allegorical interpretation: "Christ cursed the fig-tree not without reason, but to show to the ungrateful Jews that He had the power of punishment also. This tree is the tree of transgression in the middle of paradise, the leaves of which the first man and woman took and made cloths. And this tree has been cursed by Christ with philanthropy⁽¹⁰⁾, in order that it might no more bring fruit which causes sin"⁽¹¹⁾.

Noteworthy is Isidore's interpretation of the deafening of Zacharias, Lk I, 20: "Zacharias deafening did not take place by ecstasis. For he used to be in association with God's epiphany and with an angelic vision, since he as a priest was administering with purity the mysteries; but in the type of his silence, the silence of the Law was signified⁽¹²⁾. When the wisdom of the

1. I 356, 385B

2. *ibid.*; I 358, 385C; I 359, 385D-388A

3. I 356, 385B

4. I 359, 385D

5. I 356, 385B

6. I 359, 385D

7. I 356, 385B

8. I 359, 385D-388A

9. IV 48, 1097D-II 100A. cf also III 147, 840D-41A

10. The same idea is found in Chrysostom, ad Theodorum Lapsym I Montf. I, 6B: "Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπαθείς τὸ θεῖόν ἐστι, καὶ κολάζῃ, καὶ τιμωρῆται, οὐ μετ' ὀργῆς τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ μετὰ κηδεμονίας καὶ φιλίας" (αὐθροπία καὶ κολλῆς)

cf also De Statuis VII 3 Montf. II, 1020

11. I 51, 213BC

12. I 131, 269B

Gospel shone forth, the education of the Law stopped. Thus Zacharias, having heard the good news of the new and paradoxical salute, is deafened" (1).

Noteworthy too is the interpretation of our Lord's transfiguration, Lk 9, 29-30: "Our Lord and Saviour's transfiguration on the mountain was signifying before hand our resurrection from death. And the presence of Moses and Elias showed Christ's sovereignty upon the living and the dead" (2).

Concerning the two malefactors, Lk 23, 39 Isidore thinks that they were representing two people: "The one people showed foolishness till his death and did not acknowledge even the last captivity which he underwent by the Romans. The other people did not despair of redemption even in the last resort and corrected himself by theology" (3).

On the first miracle of Christ, John 2, 1-II Isidore says: "The first miracle of the Lord did not happen simply. Because He treated the necessity of the wedding and filled up the omission of the Law. For the Law was baptising only by water whereas Christ perfected and sanctioned it by His own blood uniting both in Himself and joining the Law with Grace" (4).

John 18, 10: Peter smites the Malchus' ear. What does it mean? It means how impetuous and hot-blooded was the chief of the Twelve. But for Isidore it has a secret meaning: "Inasmuch as Jews were guilty of disobedience and they did not obey the Law which taught them to hear completely these truths which Christ would teach them, Peter smote the servant's ear. This action ought to be done to the priest who was the disobedient servant of the Law and who needed a sword for the cutting of his contradiction" (5).

Of the Epistles there are but few examples of allegorical interpretation. Thus in 1Cor. 13, 41 Isidore, as many others, allegorizes the glory of the sun, moon and stars. He says: "We are permitted to pronounce as similar to the sun those who accepted and preserved virginity, to the moon those who accepted and preserved chastity, and to the stars those who accepted and preserved the honourable marriage" (6).

Remarkable is the interpretation of 11Cor. 4, 7: "we have this treasure in earthen vessels": "I think that this line, says Isidore, has two meanings: a) we have this treasure, that is the hea-

-
1. I 257, 337AB
 2. I 239, 329B
 3. I 285, 336C; cf I 286
 4. I 393, 404B
 5. I 291, 353A
 6. III 351, 1009BC

venly wealth and the supreme gifts which are higher than our worth in this mortal body which had reasonably[†]called ὀστράκινον i.e. like a shell, since it was made from the earth.b) we have the wealth of the divine wisdom in the sacred Scriptures in which His wealth is contained in poor and common words and examples"(1).

We see clearly the method of the Alexandrian School in symbolizing and allegorizing, in Hebr. 9,4-5: "The 'ark' and the 'mercy-seat' which was a covering, ἐπίθεμα of the ark, were the symbol of a man who keeps the divine words, who has God's benevolence and who is guarded by the divine powers as the Psalmist says(2). But these things are more naturally signs of Christ who fulfilled the Law and who became the propitiation for our sins. He who fulfills the Law, he propitiates the sins of the world(3). The 'manna' signifies that he who keeps the divine commandments will share a divine delight and food. And the 'Aaron's rod that budded' means that those who transgress the divine commandments and those who unworthily get the priesthood will be corrected"(4).

Let us now cite the last example which as a summary of Isidore's allegorical interpretations shows where and how he allegorized the N.T. The Biblical verse is Jude 13: "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever"; "I think that these words, says Isidore, are applied to those men who commit unpardonable faults and are not referred to stars or clouds or waves or trees all of which are used as examples by the Scriptures. The Scriptures accuse those who by their intention present the same characteristic, that is to say unsteadiness which is natural to stars, clouds, waves and trees"(5).

Less than two dozen examples have so far been cited for illustrating Isidore's allegorical interpretations of the N.T. This number is almost half of the total number of Isidore's N.T. allegorical interpretations. All N.T. allegorical interpretations found among Isidore's letters are approximately one ninth of the total number of his N.T. interpretations.

Whatever opinion we form from the cited examples, is also valid for the whole of Isidore's N.T. allegorical interpretations. And the impression from Isidore's allegory is that although he reminds us of the Alexandrian School, he nevertheless avoids carefully all the exaggerations of the well known old Alexandri-

+ been

1. II 4,460B

2. Ps. II 8, II and I 6, 9

3. IV 73, II 32C

4. ibid. II 33AB

5. IV 58, II 9AB. L. Bober (p. 56-63) classifies this interpretation among the literal ones.

an allegory. He reminds us rather of the Neo-Alexandrian School, for his allegory is, we may say, conservative in most cases and is especially applied to parables or allegorical expressions of the N.T. which we cannot interpret otherwise. After Isidore's allegorical treatment of some N.T. passages a concrete and certain spiritual profit is to be expected. We judge Isidore's allegory of the N.T., all things considered, as successful in the most examples⁽¹⁾.

c) Combination of literal and allegorical interpretations

About a dozen examples from Isidore's N.T. interpretations justify us in saying that he in some cases tried to interpret certain passages literally and at the same time allegorically. Not only the nature of these passages but mainly his intention to edify his addressees gave us this type of interpretation which is not unknown to other Fathers too. We cite half a dozen examples which will better illustrate what we mean and show Isidore's capacity.

Matt. 10, 16: "Be wise as serpents": "The Lord commands us to be as wise as serpents, that is to preserve in every temptation our head, which is our Faith. Because even if a serpent is found in misfortunes and plagues, however great, ———→ it keeps its head unhurt⁽²⁾. Be wise as serpents, says the Lord, and He means that we have to imitate neither the serpent's capacity for poisoning and striking nor their cunning and deceitfulness, but to lay aside the old man, i.e. vice as a snakeskin⁽³⁾ and to preserve faith⁽⁴⁾ as the serpent his head and to care little for the body⁽⁵⁾. 'Be harmless as doves': The Lord commands us to be as harmless as doves in order that we will imitate not its foolishness⁽⁶⁾ but its simplicity and compound this simplicity with the above explained wisdom⁽⁷⁾."

1. The allegorical interpretations of the O.T. differ slightly from those of the N.T., but here we are dealing only with the N.T. interpretations.
2. I 126, 268A; cf Chrysostom: De Statuis, IV 5 Montf. II, 66C: "Ἐκεί-
νος (ὁφίς) τὸ λογικὸν προέτα, ἀπαν σῶμα, ὥστε διασῶσαι τὴν κεφαλὴν"
3. "Ἴνα τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον ὡς περ λεβηρίδα ἀπεικονώμεθα"
4. cf Chrysostom, loc. cit.: "Οὕτω καὶ σύ καὶ χρήματα, καὶ σῶμα, καὶ
τὴν κακοῦσαν ζωὴν, καὶ πάντα προέσθαι, δέξῃ ὥστε διατηρῆσαι τὴν εὐ-
σέβειαν, μὴ ἀδύμει."
5. II 175, 625CD-28A
6. Osee 5, 7
7. II 175, 628A

Because wisdom compounded with simplicity is a most perfect virtue, something divine⁽¹⁾. And if the one will be separated from the other, then wisdom becomes and is cunning, and simplicity degenerates in foolishness. For the former is capable of committing crimes and the latter of cheating"⁽²⁾.

On the piece of money, Matt. 17, 27 Isidore says: "The piece of money which was hidden in the fish and which Peter had been commanded to get, was signifying our nature covered by passions and which the Lord invites and restores in the original"⁽³⁾. "Give it unto them for me and thee". The Lord had been taxed when he was brought in the womb of his mother and paid tribute unto Caesar, legislating for us to submit to the State when it does not prevent piety"⁽⁴⁾. The Lord ordered the tribute to be given for His own sake for He became man and was, as we, under the same law; Neither does He allow us to oppose the king when he harmlessly sets in order and shows forth the activities of the divine power"⁽⁵⁾.

Matt. 27, 51: "The veil of the temple was rent": "The way towards the holy place in the temple was hidden and blocked by a veil and this was signifying that the sanctification of our Lord had not yet been given, but was preserved in his presence. But when he rent the veil and uncovered to the Gentiles the secret of the holy place which was covered to the Jews since they were ungrateful, He opened for us the way towards the heavenly relationship"⁽⁶⁾. Why in Christ's passion the earth did quake and the rocks rent? a) In order to show that he who was crucified was the Lord of terrestrial and subterranean things⁽⁷⁾. b) In order to accuse the stupidity of the Jews, for, whereas things were crushed by fear, they were becoming stones and they were insensible towards fear and ungrateful for beneficence"⁽⁸⁾.

The πρόχειρος and μυστική interpretation is also applied by Isidore on John 6, 48: "I am that bread of life": "The Lord is by Himself called 'bread'. He is so called according to the mere conception because he became the food of salvation for all men. And according to the secret meaning, because he joined and purified human nature and inflamed it by his own fire of the Godhead, and became one person with it and one worshipped hypostasis"⁽⁹⁾.

I. "Ἡ φρόνησις τῇ ἀπλότητι κερνωμένη, θεῖόν τι χρῆμα, φημί δὲ ἐντελεστάτην ἀρετὴν αποτελεῖ"

2. II 175, 625C

3. I 206, 313B

4. I 48, 212B

5. I 206, 313B

6. I 252, 336A

7. I 253, 336B

8. I 254, 336BC

9. I 360, 388A

We cite two examples from the Epistles: Colos. 4, 6: 'Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt': "We must season, says Isidore, our talks with salt, not too much not too little in order that they might be pleasant and nutritious to grateful men and in order to catch the minds of those who hear them. And the 'salt' of exhorted talks is the testimony of the divine word, the fear of the last judgment and the speech concerning the heavenly realm" (1).

The last example is on Hebr. 4, 13: 'All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him': "None can escape from the brilliant and sleepless Eye or do something secretly, for all things are naked to him even if they appear as secret" (2). The γυμνὰ and τετραχλισμένα had been written metaphorically, ἐκ μεταφορᾶς, by the wise Paul, of the victims which were being brought for sacrifice. For as these animals are naked from every garment after the taking away of their skin, so it will happen in the great day of the Lord with us. That is, the uncovering, ἀνακάλυψις, and lack of disguise of our secret actions will be apparent in that day when none could escape but everyone would be uncovered" (3).

As it is understood from these examples, Isidore tries to apply the μυστικὴν and ἀπόκρυφον interpretation in one and the same passage. He avoids exaggerations and what he says interpreting in such a way, is not strange. We think that the combination of literal and allegorical interpretations of the N.T. by Isidore are worthy of mention.

d) Alternative Interpretations

=====

Among Isidore's N.T. interpretations there are some examples, less than twenty in number, which we characterize as examples of alternative interpretation, that is passages for which Isidore gives many interpretations at the same time. These alternative interpretations undoubtedly show Isidore's ability in dealing with Exegesis, his prolific mind, his intention to elucidate a passage as best as possible and of course his significance as an Exegete. Here are some examples:

Matt. 5, 28: Concerning adultery in the heart. Nine of Isidore's letters deal with this passage and all he says of it, we may classify in four paragraphs: a) "Whom does the Lord establish as

=====

1. IV 49, 1100B
2. IV 47, 1097C
3. I 94, 248AB

guilty of adultery by these words? Not those merely seeing and being defeated, because it happens many times involuntarily; but those seeing and acting. Because whosoever continually and carefully seeing, even if he will not make it by his body⁽¹⁾, will in his soul make sin⁽²⁾. Did not the Lord tell that he will be punished as an adulterer who merely and per transitum (ἐκ παρόδου) sees and lusts, but whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, that is whosoever by antecedent thought attracts the passion, putting it as his work, continuously waiting for and feeding the passion by continuous and incessant sight, has committed adultery with her already in his heart. In other words, whosoever would make it, if it would be possible⁽³⁾. b) Why did the Lord condemn it? For lusting is born from sight⁽⁴⁾, suspecting before hand not only the act, but its image also⁽⁵⁾. Because the curious sight is considered as adultery⁽⁶⁾. Also He wants men to be pure not only from adultery and prostitution, but from lusting sight as well⁽⁷⁾. Moreover, our spiritual struggle from the beginning is to be easier. Because there is no such a difficulty in not seeing as there is for vanquishing after seeing⁽⁸⁾. c) The validity of this verse refers to women also. Hence, every woman who sees a man and lusts, has committed adultery with him already in her heart⁽⁹⁾. Thus, and according to the question what would be a woman's responsibility if she caused a man to be defeated, we must understand that if a woman is walking prudently and modestly and not hunting to catch those she meets, she is not responsible. On the contrary, (if she is not walking prudently and modestly and if she is hunting to catch those she will meet) she is responsible and too much⁽¹⁰⁾. d) If anyone says that it is necessary to look on a woman (recalling i Tim. 2, 5) in order to have a spiritual struggle, let him learn that a legal fight is only that which has been ordered by the Impartial Judge, not by everyone's indolent superstition⁽¹¹⁾.

Matt. 5, 38-9: 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'. As Isidore interpreted the aforementioned passage, so did he with regard to the passage in question. "a) why did Moses command it? I think that in order that the Jews might not be inexcusable and bitter to those who injure them, and to avoid injustice calculating what they would suffer if they were unjust⁽¹²⁾. In o-

1. Cf Chrysostom, De Statu 18 XV, 4 Montf. II, 185d: "καὶ γὰρ ὁ τὰ ἄλλα τριὰ περιτρυφούμενος καλλῆ, καὶ μὴ μοιχεύσῃ, τέως ἐπεθύμησε, καὶ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ἀπόφασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μοιχός"

2. II 278, 709BC: "Διὰ γὰρ τῆς θείας θεραπέυων τό πάθος, διὰ τῆς συγκαταθέσεως τό αἶμα πληροῦ"

3. III II, 733D-36A; see also III 66, 773C-76A

4. 'Επειδὴ ἐν τοῦ ὁρᾶν τό ἐρᾶν τίμνεται

5. III 254, 933A

9. III 12, 740C

6. IV 109, 1176A

10. ibid. 737A

7. IV 204, 1292C

11. IV 122, 1195C (V 139 is identical)

8. V 65, 1364D-65A

12. "Ἰνα, τῷ δέει τοῦ καθεῖν α ὁρᾶν, ἀπέχωνται τοῦ τολμᾶν.

ther words: Moses suspended faults by the fear of punishment⁽¹⁾ Besides this commandment is full of justice only if we examine it in promptu; but if we will understand it, it is full of philanthropy also⁽²⁾. b) As to Christ's commandment 'that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also' that is not opposite of what Moses said. But the former is greater and an order of highest morality⁽³⁾. Because those words of the O.T. have been ordered so that men act not at all - for those thirsting blood could not gladly hear to suffer - and these words of the N.T., in order to suffer eagerly. It is good to do no evil, but it is better to suffer eagerly⁽⁴⁾. c) Let it be noted too, that in Christ's stadium there is a different law for crowning than in Olympic games. Because Christ legislated that the one struck be crowned, not the striker⁽⁵⁾. Because there, the striker and beater is crowned; here, the one struck and made to suffer is worthy of elevation. Here, the retaliator and here one who turns the other cheek is proclaimed as a victor in the theatre of the angels. For victory is decided not by defence but ἐν τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν i.e. by suffering⁽⁶⁾. This is a new order for crowning, since the way of struggles is also new⁽⁷⁾. d) If now we wish to compare the above mentioned two commandments, we say that of both Testaments one is the Legislator. But the Law prohibited only the bad acts because the Jews were refractory. The Gospel, legislating to the spiritually improved, suspends even the bad thoughts, rightly chastising not only sins, but by all means preventing bad thoughts from becoming works⁽⁸⁾.

Another example of a Biblical passage interpreted in the same way by Isidore, is Matt. 6, 1-3 concerning almsgiving: "a) who is charitable? He mainly is charitable who on the one hand does good and on the other hand does not uncover the stranger's misfortunes⁽⁹⁾. b) Secrecy is possible as to the inner disposition: Is it possible for the charitable to remain secret? I say that this verse examines the inner disposition of the charitable. For every-

+ the

I. II 133, 576AB

2. IV 86, II48B

3. Isidore's letter has 'Philosophy' instead of 'morality'. But as 'philosophy' in Isidore hardly means philosophy, we think that 'morality' in this case stands well.

4. II 133, 576C: Καλὸν μὲν γάρ τὸ μὴ δοῦν τι κακόν, κρεῖττον δὲ τὸ καὶ προθύμως πάσχειν". See I 98, 249B

5. II 169, 621A

6. III 126, 828B

7. 1b1d. 828C; IV 175, 1265C

8. IV 209, 1303A

9. IV 41, 1092C

one who gives alms does not do that necessarily wanting it to be apparent. And even if the giving of alms cannot be hidden, however the charitable one must not be exhibited. For he who is doing it, humiliates the receiver and preaches the payment and commendation of himself⁽¹⁾. c) Secrecy is put in order that vanity, ostentation and love of honour may be torn out: When thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; Why? For, after doing well, vanity and ostentation follow. Hence, Christ says, nothing good has to be done passionately and no proud thought must follow it. But if you do good acts you have also to be without parade or pride and have not⁽²⁾, to seek here congratulations but to expect the future wreath⁽³⁾. Jesus tears up by the roots everywhere the love for honour, ordering that almsgiving be not published and even that one of the two hands be ignorant of it⁽⁵⁾. By this verse Christ suspends ambition and ostentation and turns the love for honour from men to that of seeing God⁽⁴⁾. d) Almsgiving with ostentation. Those who give alms with ostentation, do not act it by love for virtue or by good will, but uncover the stranger's misfortunes, since they wish to be called charitable⁽⁵⁾. And, finally, almsgiving with ostentation is better than not giving at all⁽⁶⁾.

Concerning 'Our Father', Matt. 6, 9-13 Isidore gives us an excellent interpretation, especially from the point of view of edification. a) Characterization as to the content: "The prayer which the Lord taught to His disciples includes no earthly thing but all heavenly things and is aiming at the benefit of the soul. For it does not teach us to obtain either authority or wealth or beauty or strength or anything which is easily decayed. Because it is useless to seek the enjoyment of something which if we possessed it we should be demanded to abstain from it"⁽⁷⁾. b) Concerning its shortness: "I was always admiring and I just now am wondering about the wondrous philosophy of 'Our Father' which is short. For, if the utterance of the words is simple it does not happen that the meaning of the words is also simple, because he who is only a listener cannot recite this

1. IV 227, 1321BC

2. I 84, 241A

3. III 142, 837D-40A

4. IV 159, 1244C; III 34, 756B

5. IV 159, 1245A

6. IV 41, 1093A

7. II 281, 712BC: Ὡν γάρ καί παρόντων ἀπέχεσθαι κλεινόμεθα, τούτων ἀπόντων αἰτεῖν τὴν ἐπόλαυσιν, περιττόν.

prayer, but he can who is the hearer and the maker"(1). c) Who have the right to recite the 'Our Father' and who have not:

<u>The text:</u>	<u>Those have the right:</u>	<u>He has not the right:</u>
Our Father	Who prove the genuineness of the son	Who does not act properly to the esteemed son
Hallowed be thy name	Who do nothing accursed	Who does such things which defame the sublime name
Thy kingdom come	Who avoid all these acts giving pleasure to the devil	Who is in the comradeship of the tyrant (i.e. devil)
Thy will be done	Who denote it by acts	Who does nothing which God wants and who pretends virtue
Give us this day our daily bread	Who are separated from luxury and gluttony and yet deny them	Who lives in luxury and dissipation and has before hand gathered many supplies not only for food, but for gluttony too.
and forgive us our debts	Who forgive those who have offended them	Who is implacable and cruel
as we forgive our debtors	(no interpretation)	Who bears a grudge and immensely defends himself
and lead us not into temptation	Who are leading neither themselves nor others into temptation	Who is casting himself into temptation and crossing every way which leads to risks. Because he seemingly is ridiculous and rather worthy of indignation
but deliver us from evil	Who fight relentlessly against Satan	Who is eagerly following the devil. For it exceeds every irony.
for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory.	Who fear His words and demonstrate them by works"(2).	Who despises Him who is the source of every power and glory"(3).

d) Some more elucidations of 'bread' and 'this day': "Bread. It has seemed to some wise men that it had been said rather for the divine word which feeds the incorporeal soul and which, as

1. IV 24, IO73A
2. ibid. IO76AB
3. ibid. IO73AD

it were, is in the essence of soul and is joined with it. And for this reason has been said ἐκ σούλου bread, since the word essence relates to the soul rather than to the body. And even if it has been said for daily bread which relates to the synthesis of the body, this becomes in the same manner spiritual too. For, to seek nothing more than bread alone, it might be a characteristic of a spiritual and brilliant and philosophical mind⁽¹⁾. Our 'ἐκ σούλου bread', i.e. what is proper either to the soul or is self-sufficient for the body⁽²⁾. 'This day': It means the daily economy⁽³⁾.

As adultery (Matt. 5, 28) is a thorn in Isidore's flesh so is fornication. We better understand it if we bear in mind that he interpreted 1 Cor. 6, 18: 'He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body', in ten ways or rather he gave us ten interpretations of the same passage. "Explaining this line, says Isidore, we can give ten interpretations: a) Paul did not say that he who commits fornication sins by the body but he sins against his own body; he injures his body, he contaminates it, he renders it accursed. b) The apostle used this phrase in order to correct the fornicator and perhaps he exaggerated the sin a bit, as we do when we wish to correct a sinner and we say 'this sin is the worst', not because it really is, but because we wish to deliver him from it. c) As a man who throws wheat or any other seed into the sea sins against the seed for he prevents it coming to birth, so he who throws his sperm into a concubine, sins against his own body, for the concubine not only destroys the sperm but she also prevents it from being born. d) The fornicator sins against his own body since he fornicates and suffers from it⁽⁴⁾. For if he did not endure, he would not have been destroyed; and if he have been destroyed, he had also been corrupted; and if he had been corrupted, he had been disgraced. e) Again, if a child will be born to him who had intercourse with a concubine, this child will be educated to fornication. f) If someone will have intercourse with a slave, the child born will be a slave; then, how does he not sin who studies to bring forth a slave? g) For, even the child born is injured, since it is called illegitimate and becomes dishonoured everywhere, and if it will enter a council-chamber or a court it will be put away; and because of this expulsion the fornicator is ashamed. For he left a memorial to his lewdness. h) Inasmuch as the fornicator becomes one with the prostitute woman since he makes his members a concubine's members, he really sins against himself. j) Inasmuch as the Church is a body and we are

1. II 281, 712C

2. IV 24, 1073C

3. *ibid.*

4. Καθ' ὃ δρᾷ καὶ πάσχει. This reminds us that of Sophocles (Frag. 209): "Τὸν δρᾶντα γὰρ τε καὶ παθεῖν ὀφείλεται."

members in particular, the fornicator sins against all. For his transgression goes to the members of the Church and because of this Paul ordered him to be cut off until he repents. k) Inasmuch as those who are married become one body by law (Gen. 2, 24; 1 Cor. 7, 4), reasonably a man who commits prostitution sins against his wife, i.e. against his own body; and a woman who commits prostitution sins against her body, i.e. against her husband who became her body" (1).

Finally we cite our last example of 'alternative interpretation' concerning the office of a bishop, 1 Tim. 3, 1-6. a) The greatness of the office: "This office is too great and everyone cannot correspond with it, because it is higher than reigning. For a bishop rules divine things and a king rules earthly things" (2). b) What must a bishop be: "Those who wish to be bishops must differ from those who will be their congregation as much as a shepherd differs from sheep. He who has got the office of a bishop must everywhere be seen to be as a statue of every philosophy" (3). c) "Do the candidates for this office possess the proper qualifications? That is to say, are they vigilant to such a degree that they have the eye of their soul wakeful? Have they the necessary sobriety not only for themselves, but for others as well? Have they modesty so that they could amaze by their walking, look and voice those who behold them? Are they hospitable so as to give hospitality to unknown and ungrateful poor men? Did they understand the teaching of the Lord by study and, therefore, has the grace descended upon them so that the sources of spiritual speeches dwell in their tongues? Have they leniency so that they would never insult anyone? Are they so ἀφιλάργυροι as to give even these which they rightly gather to those who need them? Are they so forbearing so that they could endure those who accuse and insult them without reason?" (4) d) A bishop cares for everything about his flock: "All the needs of the flock of the bishop are hung upon him. What are these needs? The difficulties of his clergymen, the food for those who are hungry, the drinks for the thirsty, the cloths for those who are naked, the protection of those who are injured, the care of those who cry their orphanhood, the help of widows, the combat against those who injure, the reproof of those who try to get unlawfully the authority, the healing of ill men, the restoration

-
1. IV 129, 1208A-1212A
 2. III 216, 896A
 3. ibid. 896BC
 4. ibid. 896BD

of those who have been scandalized by strong desires, the emancipation of those who are in prisons, the consolation of those in suffering, the correction of those who make mistakes"(1).

e)"The episcopate is not authority or rest or luxury as some people thought(2), but it is work, not rest. It is care, not luxury. It is a responsible function, not an unexamined ruling. It is fatherly guardianship, not tyrannical independence. It is an economic protection, not an unexamined ruling"(3). f)I praise with high esteem the work of episcopate, for it is divine; but I do not praise the strong desire for it, for this desire is fallacious. I do not say that if a man desires the office of a bishop acts well. Because even the best men must not have this desire; even they have to expel it from themselves"(4). g)Those who desire the office of a bishop must see the pains of it and see if they can face them. They must see the risks and not only the honour; they must see the deaths, not the luxury; they must see the plots and cares, and not expect rest; they must learn that if a man will get this throne, he is ordained to combat legally and not to live in luxury without danger"(5).

Six examples of 'alternative interpretations' have been cited. They are enough to prove that Isidore is a skilful and prolific Exegete. The fact that he was an admirer and follower of laconicism and that he was simply writing letters and was not dealing systematically with Exegesis, along with the fact that he gave us such examples of alternative interpretations oblige us to put Isidore in his right position, which is the position among the other great Exegetes of his age. It is a pity that he did not leave us systematic Biblical expositions.

e) Unsuccessful Interpretations

We are not surprised that among Isidore's N.T. interpretations are some examples which could be characterised as unsuccessful. These, compared with the total number of Isidore's interpretations are but few. Besides, in some cases, not only Isidore but other Fathers too, interpreted in the same way; even in these cases Isidore appears to follow the ecclesiastical Tradition. Here we try to discuss the unsuccessful examples of Isidore's N.T. interpretations.

-
1. *ibid.* 897BC
 2. *ibid.* 897C
 3. *ibid.* 900A
 4. *ibid.*
 5. *ibid.* 900BC

Matt. 3, 4 concerning the locusts and the wild honey of John the Prophet. Isidore says: "The locusts on which John the Prophet was feeding were not animals looking like scarabs as some men being ignorant of the matter think; God forbid. But they were ends of herbs or plants. And the wild honey was not any grass or herb, but it was mountain honey, made by wild bee, which was most bitter and hostile to every taste" (1).

With regard to the ἀκρίδες eaten by John the Baptist, Isidore is evidently wrong. The word ἀκρίς means the insect locust. Niemeyer (2) thinks that "omnem vero operam perdidit ea explicaturus quae de Joannis Baptistae cibo tradiderunt evangelistae.. Itaque verbum ἀκρίς paroxytonon, et ἀκρίδης oxytonon commutavit inter sese". Rosenmueler (3) also thought that the ἀκρίδες were insects. Isidore's opinion was probably formed from the fact that he did not want John to eat animals, which, although excused by the Law (4), were still animals, whereas John the Baptist was for Isidore the perfect example of fasting and dressing especially for monks. This opinion of Isidore's is, however, represented by the great majority of the Fathers (5) which means that Isidore keeps the Tradition. Lucien Gautier (6) says that "an ancient tradition of the Christian Church held that the locusts eaten by the Baptist were not insects, but the pods of husks of a tree, the carob or locust tree" and that in our times Cheyne resuscitated this old interpretation. But although we agree that Isidore is here wrong, we do not think that he confused the words ἀκρίς and ἀκρίδης. For, the word ἀκρίς means the summit of a mountain or highlands (7) and therefore there is no connection of ἀκρίς and food.

Referring to the μέλι ἀγρίον Isidore says that it was not any grass or herb. L. Gautier (8) sees in the 'wild honey' the designation of a vegetable and nutritive substance, because "to collect nourishment of this kind in the thickets along the Jordan would have been an easier task for the Baptist, and would have required less time, than to hunt for the honey of bees". This 'wild honey' could be a kind of a honey from a tree, but we agree with Isidore that "it was mountain honey made by wild bee". Even if the supposition of Gautier that the honey of trees was more easily obtained were true, we are not obliged to

1. I 132, 269C; cf also I 5, 184A

2. loc.cit. p. 99

3. ibid.

4. Levit. II, 22

5. See: Henri Grégoire: Les sauterelles de saint Jean-Baptiste in Byz. V p. 109-128

6. DCG II p. 14

7. See e.g. Liddell-Scott, loc.cit. I 93

8. loc.cit. I p. 446-7 note

accept the fact that John was feeding on such honey. We do not think that John was hunting for honey!

Matt. 5, 25: 'Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him'. There was any reason for interpreting this verse allegorically. Isidore however interpreted it in this way: "The Lord divinely called 'adversary', ἀντίδικον the will of the body against the spirit; 'way', ὁδόν the life which our generation passes inconstantly; and 'good will', εὐνοίαν towards the body, the consciousness of its revolution" (1). Apart from the allegorical interpretation of this verse - Christ's words ought to be interpreted here literally - we think that even Isidore's thought that 'ἀντίδικος' is the will of the body against the Spirit, is not correct (2). The interpretation is unsuccessful (3).

Niemeyer (4) with whom Diamantopoulos (5) agreed, thinks that Isidore's interpretation of Matt. 12, 40 is unsuccessful and that Isidore proved the opposite from what he tried to prove and that he did not understand it. We think that Niemeyer and Diamantopoulos are wrong. Isidore's interpretation here is good and remarkable. His opinions are correct. More precisely speaking, Isidore is to elucidate the verse: 'As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth'. Two things in this verse need elucidation: a) That Christ really fulfilled the model of Jonah, and b) that He remained in the sepulchre three days and three nights. Let us follow Isidore's exposition which will enable us to judge whether he succeeded or not:

First explanation: "He who promised to fulfil the Jonah's model, τύπον, which He knew accurately (for He was present with Jonah when he was thrown into the bottom and when he was cast up from the bottom) He had surely fulfilled it having remained in the grave as long as Jonah in the whale's belly. Second explanation: Christ had been crucified at the sixth hour of the Friday. From the sixth hour unto the ninth hour there was darkness; it was night. Again, from the ninth hour it became light; it was day. Again, the night of Friday. Again the Sabbath; the night of Sabbath. The dawn of Sunday. Third explanation: Christ died on Friday; it is one day. He was in the sepulchre all the Sabbath. He rose from the sepulchre at the end of the Sabbath as the first day of the week began to dawn; and this is a day; because the whole

+ not

-
1. I 80, 237C
 2. of e.g. V 529, 1525C: "The body is not opposite to the soul, but it is soul's organ and guitar"
 3. cf. Diamantopoulos, 1926/623
 4. loc.cit. p. 98-9
 5. loc.cit. 1926/626

is understood from its part...Moreover, if the Lord had risen in a time less than He was promising, He, by all means, will be adored by everyone"⁽¹⁾.

We are not examining only one letter but all Isidore's letters. Thus, despite Niemeyer's opinion⁽²⁾ we can easily use also the letter II 212 which is on the same subject, although Isidore here seems to interpret John 2, 19 because Matt. 12, 40 does not occur in this letter. In this second letter Isidore says among others: "If a debtor promised to his creditor that he would pay the loan to him after three days and we see him paying earlier than he promised, will we judge him as a liar or will we admire him as telling the truth more than properly? I think we must admire him and so by all means will those who deny that Christ fulfilled the model of Jonah. Then, what is the fault if even Christ told that he would raise himself up in three days and he did it earlier in order to show his power, to mortify those who were guarding Him and to muzzle the Jews? ...He said that He would raise Himself up on the third day. You have Friday, you have also Saturday until the setting of the sun; He raised himself up after Saturday, having touched both and completed the intermediate day. Because He said that He will raise himself up in three days, not a f t e r three days; 'destroy this temple, He says, and in three days I will raise it up' (John 2, 19). And the Prophet foretelling: 'after two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight' (Hosea 6, 2). And if those who deny that Christ fulfilled the model of Jonah allege the phrase 'three days and three nights', I should say that Christ fulfilled the promise by touching these days and nights. For, twenty four hours are called one day. And if one is born either at the first or at the last hour, or if he dies, the whole day is numbered for him. For example: If someone is born when the sun is to set on the first day of the month we say that he was born on the first day of the month. And if another person is born shortly after the sun set⁽³⁾, we say that he was born on the second day of the month. How do we say that the one was born on the first day and the other on the second day, since only one hour, and perhaps even not a complete hour, has passed? Thus it becomes clear and lucid to everyone that the former completed the whole first day and the latter the second day which are completed by twenty four hours, only by touching these days. Then,

1. I II4, 257D-60A

2. loc.cit. p.98

3. Note that Isidore enumerates the day in accordance with the Jewish custom, derived from Gen. I, 5: "the evening and the morning were one day".

if even the accurate understanding of the time cries loudly that Christ remained three days and three nights in the sepulchre why do those who insist that the promise has not been fulfilled vex themselves?"⁽¹⁾.

To sum up all[†] Isidore says of the three days and nights of Christ in the sepulchre and of the fulfilment of the model of Jonah, two things are really proved: a) That Christ by having remained in the sepulchre, fulfilled the model of Jonah, and b) that Christ remained in the sepulchre three *ἡμεραι* by having touched Friday, Saturday and Sunday. This corollary is true even if we do not accept the three hours of Friday—from the sixth to the ninth—as a night, as Isidore among other things suggested. On the whole we think that Isidore's interpretation on Matt. 12, 40 is very successful and remarkable.

The interpretation of Matt. 13, 33 is judged by Diamantopoulos⁽²⁾ as unsuccessful. Isidore's interpretation of the parable of leaven is as follows: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, that is our Lord Saviour's sinless incarnation which leavened the whole world and the hypostasis of the body which had been taken from our substance and from the Theotokos Mary, and which renewed mankind, as it existed from the beginning, to recreation"⁽³⁾. As the expression 'the kingdom of heaven or of God' has many⁽⁴⁾ meanings in the N.T., it was most natural that many Fathers interpreted this expression in many ways, depending on the particular usage of the expression. One interpretation of Matt. 13, 33 among many others is that of Isidore. We do not insist that this interpretation is very successful, but also we deny the opinion that it is unsuccessful. It is just an opinion, worthy, however, of mention.

Isidore's interpretation of Matt. 17, 27 concerning the stater, a piece of money⁽⁵⁾, is a combination of allegorical and literal interpretation. Diamantopoulos⁽⁶⁾, citing only the allegorical interpretation in order to state that Isidore here did not succeed, is wrong. Besides, not only the letter I 206, but I 48 also supplies us with material appropriate for interpreting the passage. On the whole we think that the interpretation of Matt. 17, 27 is successful.

Niemeyer⁽⁷⁾ thinks that Isidore's interpretation of Matt. 20, 23 is unsuccessful. Diamantopoulos⁽⁸⁾ is against Niemeyer. We also think that Isidore's interpretation of Matt. 20, 23 is good.

+ that

-
1. II 212, 652C-53C
 2. loc.cit. 1926/621
 3. I 201, 312B
 4. See e.g. George H. Gilbert, LCG I 932-5
 5. V. Supra p. 214
 6. loc.cit. 1926/621
 7. loc.cit. p. 97
 8. loc.cit. 1926/626

Here is what Isidore says: "The Lord avoids fulfilling the application of the mother of Zebedee's children, not because it is impossible for him; for what He wills He can; but He refused it because it was absurd... It is not mine to give reward to those who merely seek it, but to those who take pains with it; for a righteous judge does not overlook the pains so that the indolent are recompensed"⁽¹⁾. Don't you agree that this interpretation is successful?

Matt. 22, 21: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's". Isidore interprets this verse as follows: "The Lord wills us to consider that if there is something materialistic or an amount of error or if indolence which is in us introduced by any idol of illusion, these are from the creator of malice and we have to attribute them to him. On the contrary, if there is any symbol of virtue or a sign of modesty or any gain of vigilance and safety, we have to consider that they are gifts of God, and we must bring to Him the proper praise for them"⁽²⁾. What Isidore says is true and good, but the allegorical interpretation of Matt. 22, 21 is not successful. Balanos⁽³⁾ and Diamantopoulos⁽⁴⁾ agree.

Matt. 24, 19 is allegorically interpreted by Isidore⁽⁵⁾. The Biblical verse itself is a parabolical⁽⁶⁾ expression and everyone can interpret it only allegorically. Is Isidore's interpretation here good? Diamantopoulos⁽⁷⁾ thinks that it is not; but if he interpreted this verse, he would give us an interpretation at least equally strange. We must then understand that Isidore's interpretation is just an opinion which we cannot judge as unsuccessful.

We have already said⁽⁸⁾ that the allegorical interpretation of Matt. 26, 70-4 is unsuccessful.

I. I 137, 273A. Cf Didymus the Blind, Adversus Eunomium IV 3 in Garnier's edition of St Basil's works I 419D: Τὸν λαμβανόντων οὐν ἐστὶν ἀξίους ἑαυτοῦς ποιῆσαι τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εὐωνύμων καθέδρας τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐ τοῦ δυναμένου διδόναι, καὶ ἀδικος ἢ αἰτησις ἦ"

2. I 209, 316A

7. loc. cit. 1926/622

3. loc. cit. p. 60 note

8. V. supra, p. 209-10

4. loc. cit. 1926/621

5. V. Supra p. 208-9

6. Christ is here speaking about His future coming and the end of the world. When everything will be destroyed and we "shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (1 Cor. 15, 52) there will not be any need for anyone to fly into the mountains or to get anything out of his house or to return back from the field to take his cloths. It is evident that all these are "signs" (Matt. 24, 3) which have the purpose of describing how terrible and fearful that day will be. Compare the whole 24th chapter of Matthew and note especially the 32d verse: ἀπό δε τῆς συνῆς μάθετε τὴν ἢ ν παραβολήν: Not a parable as AV and Moffat's translation have, but the parable, that is the parabolical meaning of what I say, says Christ.

Trying to elucidate the meaning of the name 'tetrarch' attributed to Herod, Mark 6, 18 Isidore thinks that "Herod has been called tetrarch not only because he was reigning in a quarter of the paternal kingdom but also because the four general kinds of vice (i.e. adultery, injustice, murder and inconsiderate oath) prevailed upon him"⁽¹⁾. In other words Isidore knows the historical reason why Herod has been called tetrarch and his opinion here is correct. But the other interpretation of the term tetrarch is really forced. He does not succeed here.

The interpretation of Mk 13, 32 (or Matt. 24, 36) is according to us good. Isidore says: "The Lord was not ignorant of that day and hour, but He was refusing to declare some futile problems. For how was it possible for Him who created the day and hour and in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom? It was not because He did not know how to foretell the signs and fearful things of the last day, but, as I said, He did not declare the answer to one futile question"⁽²⁾. Niemeyer⁽³⁾ who thinks that this interpretation is not good, is evidently wrong. Diamantopoulos⁽⁴⁾ is also against Niemeyer. It was especially L. Bober⁽⁵⁾ who answered Niemeyer's objection.

Lk 1, 20: on the deafening of Zacharias, has been unsuccessfully interpreted by Isidore⁽⁶⁾. There is no need for interpreting this passage allegorically.

Diamantopoulos⁽⁷⁾ thinks that Isidore's interpretation of Lk 2, 23 is "strange and opposite to the usual conception of the O.T.", but unfortunately he does not state the place of the O.T. to which Isidore's interpretation is opposite. We do not think that Isidore's conception is opposite to Exod. 13, 2 or 13, 12-5 or to Numbers 18, 15-6. On the contrary we think that Isidore's interpretation of Lk 2, 23 is clever and indicates his good erudition. He says: "That 'every male that openeth the womb..' has not been said for every πρωτότοκον i.e. first-born - let not those who are illiterate think so - but only for the one (that) which opened the womb ἐν τῇ τίκτεσθαι i.e. in the time of his birth. For coition and carnal union opens every womb; but our Lord Jesus Christ having been conceived immacu-

1. IV 96, II 57 BC

2. I II 7, 26 IA

3. loc.cit. p. 97

4. loc.cit. 1926/626

5. loc.cit. p. 93 footnote 4

6. V. Supra p. 210-II

7. loc.cit. 1926/624

lately opened προερχόμενος i.e. by passing her who brought forth Him, and after that He again left her locked"(1).

Lk 6,1 concerning the second Sabbath after the first. Niemeyer(2), whom Diamantopoulos(3) follows thinks that Isidore's interpretation of this passage is unsuccessful because he distinguished the Passover and the feast of Unleavened bread. We have a different opinion. Isidore says that every feast is called by the Jews 'Sabbath' and that, therefore, the δευτερόπρωτον Σάββατον was the second day of the Passover and its proof is the fact that the Apostles were accused for they 'plucked the ears of corn and did eat' a job which they were not allowed to do during the feast according to the Law. Isidore does not distinguish Passover and the feast of Unleavened bread, but he says that Jews were sacrificing the lamb on the evening of the Passover and on the next day they were celebrating the feast (or the days) of Unleavened bread, which are true. "The feast proper began with the evening of the 14th Nisan..and was succeeded by the days of unleavened bread which some times gave a name to the whole festival (Lk 22,1)"(4). Apart from that, contemporary Scholars do not agree as to what sabbat it was(5). We think that Isidore's testimony is good evidence for elucidating the whole subject and for the writing δευτερόπρωτον which also occurs in many ancient MSS(6). Let us now cite the interpretation: "This Sabbath is called δευτερόπρωτον 'the second after the first' for it was the second after Passover and the first of the unleavened bread. Because (the Jews) sacrificing on the evening of Passover, were celebrating on the next day the feast of the unleavened bread which they were calling δευτερόπρωτον, 'second after the first'. And the fact that the Apostles were accused of plucking the ears of corn and eating, proves that this opinion is true...And if this day is called 'Sabbath' do not be astonished, for the Jews called every feast Sabbath"(7).

Neither is the interpretation of John 10,30 unsuccessful as Niemeyer thought(8). Isidore interprets this passage successfully. But of course we have to understand that 'hypostasis' here

1. I 23, 196D-97A

2. loc.cit. p.98

3. loc.cit. 1926/625

4. J.T.L. Maggs, DCG II 325

5. See e.g. F.E. Robinson, DCG II 541

6. Al. Souter, loc.cit., in loc.

7. III 110, 816BC

8. loc.cit. p.97

means 'person': "It is of great foolishness or rather of insanity, writes Isidore, to say that one hypostasis of the Father and of the Son appears in the Bible..It had been said I and my Father a r e o n e' not I and my Father a m one. Then the word 'one' signifies the one substance; the word 'are' means the two hypostasis" (1). Diamantopoulos also disagrees (2) with Niemeyer.

John 14,31: 'Arise, let us go hence': Isidore says: "The Saviour said these words in order that we, remaining attached on earth because of a preconception or rather prejudice which is a dangerous passion and which cannot be easily healed, might not be prevented from the heavenly prizes" (3). There is no need to interpret this passage allegorically. We think that Isidore's interpretation is here unsuccessful.

Finally Niemeyer (4) is not content with the interpretation of Isidore on iCor. 6, 18 because he did not interpret it in ten ways but rather tried to defend in ten ways Paul's statement: 'He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body'. It is true that Isidore also defends what the apostle Paul said, but at the same time he also interprets the Biblical verse if not in ten ways, he undoubtedly does it sufficiently and successfully (5).

We have examined in this section seventeen Of Isidore's N. T. interpretations alleged to be unsuccessful. We think that only seven interpretations are not successful. And hence, since Isidore interpreted 340 N.T. passages, he is a skilful and important Exegete.

-
1. I 138, 273BC
 2. loc.cit. 1926/626
 3. IV 48, 1097D-1100A
 4. loc.cit. p.99-100
 5. V. Supra, p.220-I

C h a p t e r V

GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. On the material cited and examined

a) Isidore is mainly known as an interpreter of the Scriptures and his knowledge of the Scriptures is profound.

b) He quite successfully deals with the question why the Scriptures are called *Διαθήκη* and why they were written.

c) He gives some noteworthy metaphorical expressions of the Scriptures, and deals with their authority, inspiration, plainness, lucidity and reading. Isidore's opinions here are worthy of special mention.

d) He examines the relationship of the two Testaments and says that there is one Authority for both; that there is an interior concord of both; that the O.T. has a preparatory character of the N.T.; that there are some differences with regard to the instructions given by both Testaments and that the superiority of the N.T. over the O.T. is unquestionable. His teaching on these points is orthodox and remarkable.

e) Of the Biblical text which Isidore uses about fifty passages could improve the textual criticism of the N.T. and many other passages could enrich the critical apparatus which so far scarcely refers to Isidore's letters.

f) He criticizes and tries to restore seven N.T. passages and succeeds in the five examples. His attempts are worthy of special mention.

g) With ~~the~~ regard to the number of N.T. passages, Isidore interprets 346 passages. Among these passages are 92 for which there is no text cited. But there are some 49 additional N.T. passages cited and not interpreted and thus the whole number of the cited N.T. passages exceeds three hundred.

h) He supplies us with some material appropriate for an 'Introduction' to the N.T., that is with various notes on eleven passages of which eight are successful.

i) Concerning the interpretation of the Scriptures, Isidore gives some seven or eight noteworthy rules and uses two methods of interpreting the N.T.: That is, interpretation by reference to the Scriptures (about 35 examples altogether) and interpretation by reference to exterior witnesses for strengthening his opinion.

j) Classification of the interpretations according to their contents is not everywhere possible, because many inter-

preted passages deal at the same time with doctrines, moral truths, Church discipline etc. Many Scholars divide Isidore's letters into 'exegetical', 'moral-ascetical' and 'dogmatical' ones. We personally think that this division is not applicable. L. Bober divides Isidore's interpretations into two large categories: i) Allegorical method⁽¹⁾: (a. Prophecies which refer to Christ. b. Mystical interpretations. c. tropological ones). ii) Grammaticohistorical method⁽²⁾ (a. How Isidore interprets allegories and parables, p. 56-63. b. Interpretation of some peculiar verses, p. 63-8. c. Interpretation of passages of chronological nature, p. 69-72. d. How he elucidates alleged ideas, p. 72-5. e. How he explains the apparently contradictory passages, p. 75-6 and f. Selected examples of the order of the books of the Scriptures, p. 77-107). We distinguished between the method and the types of interpretation and for technical and essential reasons we preferred to classify Isidore's N.T. interpretations into the following categories: Literal Interpretations, allegorical ones, alternative interpretations and those supposed to be unsuccessful.

k) To illustrate Isidore's thought and to strengthen our own opinions on many points and yet not to extend the Thesis to a great length, we have cited from Isidore 105 interpreted passages out of 346, except of many quotations we cited in the first part of the present Thesis. In other words, we have cited less than the one third of the total number. More precisely speaking we have cited 7 interpretations in the section 'textual criticism'; 11 interpreted passages as material appropriate for an 'introduction' to the N.T.; 15 examples to show his method of interpretation; 25 examples of literal interpretations; 20 specimens of allegorical interpretations; 8 examples of literal and allegorical kind, another 6 examples of alternative interpretations and 13 examples in the section 'unsuccessful interpretations'. We thought it necessary to cite all these examples because otherwise we could not form the right idea about Isidore's conceptions, use, criticism and interpretations of the N.T. L. Bober, who composed a special monograph⁽³⁾ concerning the hermeneutic art of Isidore cites only 64 examples from the N.T. interpretations. We think that they are not enough, moreover since he 'systematically' dealt only with Isidore's Exegesis. Heumann⁽⁴⁾ and Niemeyer⁽⁵⁾ cite little more than one dozen examples from Isidore's interpretations. Therefore their results cannot be of

1. loc.cit. pp. 32-47

2. locibid. pp. 56-107

3. De Arte hermeneutica S. Isidori Pelusiota, Cracoviae 1878

4. loc.cit. 22-25

5. loc.cit. 95-102

general importance. The number of their examples is too limited and the selection indicates their prejudice against Isidore. Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁾ cites just a few selected examples and the selection indicates their prejudice against Isidore. Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁾ cites just a few selected examples from the O. and the N.T. in order to prove that Isidore belongs to the Alexandrian School of interpretation and that Isidore was not an important interpreter. Diamantopoulos is wrong and unjust because he gave us a mutilated and therefore a false picture of Isidore's interpretations and because he stated as general conclusions what were only local remarks. Other Scholars did not cite examples of interpretations or they cited a very limited number⁽²⁾.

2. On StIsidore's attitude towards Literal and Allegorical Interpretations

Isidore clearly distinguishes between literal and allegorical interpretations. He apparently seems to prefer the allegorical interpretation. Thus, interpreting Deut. 12, 11 and Lev. 14, 10 he says: "I had of course to say about their mystical meaning, τὰς θεωρίας αὐτῶν. Because there can be applied to them best an allegorical interpretation, ἀλληγορία, which could profit those whose minds are familiar with mystical interpretation. But since I know that many people think that those who say such things avoid the struggle because of illiteracy; and since I also know that you delight in the things, τοῖς πράγμασι, and only in the literal interpretation, τῇ ἐκφρασί, of the Scriptures, I shall give a direct answer lacking in symbolisms"⁽³⁾. In certain cases he seems to defend the allegorical interpretation against those who are accusing it: "Inasmuch as I do not know how you accused those who indicate the mystical interpretations and change the letter into the spirit, although they many times say some beneficial things to those who hear them...."⁽⁴⁾. But although Isidore in some cases prefers allegory, he declares that he does not force others to do so: "If you do not wish, I should not oblige you to allegorize..."⁽⁵⁾.

To distinguish allegorical from literal interpretation, Isidore uses some characteristic words or phrases. Thus allegory

1. loc.cit. pp.621-26/1926

2. Unfortunately we were not able to see Joasaph's work on Isidore's interpretations

3. III 84, 789C

4. II 81, 521C

5. IV II7, II92B

is meant by ἀλληγορία (1), or θεωρία (2), or τὸ πνεῦμα (3), in opposition to the γράμμα, or ἀπόρητος ἔννοια (4), or βαθύτερος καὶ εἰλικρινέστερος νοῦς (5), or κεκρυμμένη καὶ παρακεκαλυμμένη διάνοια (6), or κεκρυμμένα αἰνίγματα (7), or κεκρυμμένη ἀλήθεια (8), τοῖς παῖσι κεκαλυμμένη τοῖς δὲ λεπτοῖς γεγυμνωμένη (9). With reference to the O.T. in particular, he applies the allegorical interpretation, because many things in the O.T. have been said εἰς τύπον μελλόντων πραγμάτων (10), or because Moses διὰ σκιῶν καὶ συμβόλων τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑπέγραψε (11), or because σκιὰν εἶχεν ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ οὐκ αὐτὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων (12).

Dispite all these conceptions, Isidore is not a representative of allegory. His allegorical interpretations of the N.T. are only 15%. He allegorically interpreted mainly those passages which were suitable for such an interpretation. The greatest part of his allegories are successful and the general impression is that he is quite moderate in his allegory. In allegorizing he tries to offer something better, 'for the perfecting of the saints' (13).

In opposition to the πνεῦμα which referring to interpretation means the allegorical type, Isidore uses the word γράμμα (14) which signifies the literal interpretations. Other words which denote this type of interpretation and which have been used by Isidore, are: ἡ ἐρμηνεία (15), or τὸ πᾶν (16), or interpretation καθ' ἱστορίαν (17), or προχειρῶς (18), or πρόχειρος νοῦς (19), or πρόχειρος ἐκλήψις (20).

Besides allegory, Isidore knows the grammatico-historical interpretation (21) and follows it: "But I, although the meaning of the context refers mainly to the soul, do not deny even the letter (that is although I must interpret here allegorically, I do not refuse to interpret literally). Because even here the same meaning will be saved" (22). In some cases, he obliges us to combine allegory and literal exposition (23).

1. III 84, 789C; IV 129, 1209C
2. II 81, 521C; III 84, 789C;
IV 117, 1192A; IV 203, 1292A
3. II 81, 521C
4. I 360, 388A
5. IV 149, 1233C
6. I 53, 216B
7. I 193, 305C
8. II 138, 580C
9. I 71, 232A
10. I 362, 388B
11. IV 157, 1241B
12. IV 141, 1221C; cf. Hebr. 10, 1
13. Ephes. 4, 12
14. II 81, 524C

15. III 84, 789C; IV 17, 1064D-
1065A; III 18, 744C
16. III 84, 789C; IV 157, 1241C
17. IV 203, 1289D-92A
18. I 53, 216B
19. IV 203, 1289B
20. I 310, 388A
21. III 84, 789C
22. II 81, 524C
23. IV 203, 1289D-92A

The sum of Isidore's literal interpretations are 85%, which means that for him literal interpretations were a rule. Allegorical interpretations were exceptions. His success in interpreting literally is greater than in interpreting allegorically.

After all these remarks and especially after the exposition of Isidore's interpretations, it is easily understood that he preferred the grammatico-historical interpretations rather than the allegorical ones. This by no means means that Isidore belonged to the Exegetical allegorical School of Alexandria, as Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁾ insists. Neither does it mean that Isidore belonged to the Exegetical School of Antioch, as Batiffol⁽²⁾, Bardenhewer⁽³⁾, Aigrain⁽⁴⁾ and others think. We personally think that along with Athanasius the Great or Basil the Great⁽⁵⁾, Isidore belonged to the Neo-Alexandrian School which so much differed from the old allegorical one.

3. Evaluation of St Isidore's Interpretations

As it was to be expected, Heumann attacked Isidore as being an inexperienced interpreter and as having made many mistakes⁽⁶⁾. Schroeckh's⁽⁷⁾ conceptions are similar to Heumann's. Niemeyer thinks that Isidore "some times successfully used the gift of the interpretation. But having attempted to interpret the difficult passages of Christ and of the Apostles, he either followed other Fathers or did not exactly expose the right meaning of these passages. If he used the critical art in a better way and if he did not delight so much in excessive allegory, we should count him together with the best interpreters who at that time were illustrious"⁽⁸⁾. —————> Bareill⁽⁹⁾ and Diamantopoulos⁽¹⁰⁾

1. loc.cit. 1926/624

2. loc.cit.

3. Patrology, p.379

4. loc.cit. p.16-7

5. of Basil: in Ps. XXVIII 3, Garn. I, 167E: Τάχα δέ καί μυστικώτερον... in Ps. XXIX I, Garn. I, 177D: καί τοις κατὰ μέν τὸ σωματικόν... κατὰ δέ τὸ νοητόν... in Ps. XXXII 6, Garn. I 196B: 'Εξήγησις ἐστὶ... 197B: Δυνατόν δέ καί ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ πάθους καιρὸν ἀναγαγεῖν ταῦτα. in Ps. XXXIII 13, Garn. I 223C: Πότερον δέ ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως μέναι, καί ἀρροδοῦναι τῇ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον προσπιπτούσῃ ταῖς ἀνοαῖς ἡμῶν ἐννοεῖα.....; —————>

A good deal of St Basil's homilies on the Psalms bear witness of his allegorical or anagogical interpretations. See also: In Hex. V 6 Garn. I 64 on Matt. 21⁹³; Adversus Evnomium III 7 Garn. I, 394C-395 etc.

6. loc.cit. p.22-5

7. loc.cit. p.526f

8. loc.cit. p.100

9. DTC VIII, 90

10. loc.cit. 1926/627

adopted and repeated Niemeyer's conclusion.

Other Scholars on the contrary, declare that Isidore was an eminent interpreter, whose interpretations are successful on the whole. Thus, Richard Simon⁽¹⁾ thinks that Isidore is one of the most skilful commentators of both Testaments. L. Bober insists that "Isidore was not only a learned and experienced interpreter, but also that he was endowed with a notable innate sharpness"⁽²⁾. Kurtz⁽³⁾ puts Isidore above other Alexandrians by saying: "His exegesis, too, which always inclines to a simple literal sense is of far greater importance, than that of the other Alexandrians". Balanos⁽⁴⁾ says that "Isidore is unquestionably one of the most expert interpreters of Scripture at that time" and the opinion of some too severe critics cannot diminish his worth; an interpreter who interpreted so many passages cannot be judged from some mistaken interpretations but from the majority of his attempts where he excelled. P. A. Schmid sees Isidore's strength in Exegesis⁽⁵⁾ and says that he was an eminent Exegete⁽⁶⁾ who loved the Scriptures and tried to expose their high truths.

Heumann, Schroeckh, Niemeyer, Bareill and Diamantopoulos examined a very limited number of Isidore's interpretations. Their selected examples which fluctuate from one to two dozen in number are especially examples of allegorical interpretations, mainly cases where Isidore was not successful. This fact denotes their prejudice against Isidore or at least it shows that they had not the right to announce as a general conclusion what was correct for only some interpretations. General conclusions are not derived from particular cases. Or, if they are derived, they are not true.

Apart from that, their opinions on 'which interpretations are not successful' is not everywhere correct. The unsuccessful interpretations of Isidore are less than they thought. These unsuccessful interpretations are only *ten*⁽⁷⁾ in number out

-
1. Histoire Critique des principaux commentateurs du N. Testament, Rotterdam 1693, p. 306-7: "...il mérite cependant d' être mis au rang de plus habiles Commentateurs^t du Vieux que du Nouveau Testament".
 2. loc. cit. p. 108: "...illum in eruendo sensu grammaticohistorico non solum eruditum et solertem interpretem fuisse, sed etiam insigni acumine ingenii praeditum..."
 3. loc. cit. I 236
 4. loc. cit. p. 60-1
 5. loc. cit. p. 82: "Isidors Staerke liegt in der Exegese"
 6. loc. cit. p. 2
 7. Matt. 3, 4; 5, 25; 22, 21; 26, 70-4; Mk 6, 18; Lk I, 20; John I 4, 31; Acts 28, 15; Phil. 4, 3; Hebr. 7, 11.

+ tant

of 346 of the N.T. There are also two⁽¹⁾ other interpretations for which it is difficult to state that they are unsuccessful. They simply are two opinions among many other opinions of other ancient interpreters. In other words, with regard to Isidore's interpretations of the N.T., the mistakes are 3%, whereas his success is 97%. This loudly cries that Isidore unquestionably is a successful interpreter. We have cited approximately one third of his N.T. interpretations, but our conclusion depends on the examination of the whole number of his N.T. interpretations. What we have said for the cited examples is more or less valid for all his N.T. interpretations. We have, however, cited and examined all Isidore's interpretations supposed to be unsuccessful. Hence, if our opinion is correct, our conclusion must be correct, too: Isidore of Pelusium, being endowed with rare mental and spiritual gifts, having been acquainted with the best education of his age and having dedicated himself to careful and pious study of the holy Scriptures, interpreted them sufficiently and in the most cases excellently. His success with regard to the N.T. interpretations is unquestionable. These, being strengthened by the fact that Isidore was not occupied with a systematic interpretation of the Scriptures but was only occasionally answering some questions, oblige us to number him with the great and best Exegetes of his time.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY OF ST ISIDORE'S DOCTRINAL TEACHING

To the question why we have put this chapter in the second part of our Thesis, there is a threefold answer: First, since there is not any third and separate part dealing with Isidore's whole teaching, this chapter could equally be put in the first or in the second part. Second, By putting this chapter in the second part we obtain an equality of the two parts. And third, much of Isidore's teaching here displayed is derived from his interpretations whether cited or not in the proceeding five chapters. And when this teaching is not directly derived from the interpretations it definitely completes them.

It is not our intention here to display in detail all Isidore's teaching. This could be a second Thesis; and indeed there is plenty of material for such a monograph. Our purpose here is to display as systematically and at the same time as summarily as possible Isidore's conceptions on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity about which he wrote. We omit Isidore's ethical teaching because an exposition of the moral truths which occupy the greatest part of his letters is outwith the title of our Thesis.

Almost all those who dealt with Isidore showed something of his teaching. Of special mention must be Niemeyer⁽¹⁾, Glueck⁽²⁾, Bouvy⁽³⁾, Balanos⁽⁴⁾, Diamantopoulos⁽⁵⁾ and P.A. Schmid⁽⁶⁾. Others who wrote something not worthy with regard to Isidore's teaching are Du Pin⁽⁷⁾, Ceillier⁽⁸⁾ and Bareill⁽⁹⁾. But we personally think that no one dealt systematically and sufficiently with Isidore's doctrinal teaching, except Schmid who sufficiently indeed dealt with Isidore's Christology only. Our outline of Isidore's doctrinal teaching is synoptic but yet it is, we think, systematic and since we deal with almost everything which Isi-

-
1. loc.cit. pp.61-102
 2. Summa doctrina moralis
 3. loc.cit. pp.102-26
 4. loc.cit. pp.55-167
 5. loc.cit. 1926 pp.538-45;610-15;665-74
 6. Die Christologie Isidors...
 7. loc.cit. pp.7-32
 8. loc.cit. pp.600-40
 9. loc.cit. DTC VIII pp.84-98

dore wrote concerning the Christian doctrines, this outline is also complete. There is no special paragraph in this chapter on the Heresies, because almost everything related with them is displayed under other headings. Thus we obtain a more systematic exposition of the Christian doctrines and at the same time we avoid unnecessary repetition. All the conceptions included in this chapter belong to Isidore. We simply found and showed them having added only the necessary headings or phrases in order to make the best sense.

I. Theology in general

a) Is the knowledge of God possible?

To learn God's Nature is impossible, because this learning is *ὑπερφύς* and *μηδαμῶθεν ἀλώσιμος* (1). The divine Nature is *ἀκατονόμαστος* (2). The knowledge of the essence of God is neither necessary nor possible (3). There are not natural proofs for the *ὑπὲρ φύσιν* truths (4). The word *πῶς* is not applicable to God (5). "Although God is glorious and much more brilliant than the sun, it is impossible for us to see Him, for the natural eyes are not appropriate for such a seeing. But it is not impossible to think of God, for by His providence He sends His rays especially to those who have a pure mind. Still it is most difficult to understand Him, for He is above and greater than what could be understood" (6).

b) What and how can we learn of God?

What we must know of God is "that God exists, not what He is" (7). We can of course learn something of Him if He wishes it (8) and "if we are able to receive this knowledge which now is incomprehensible, but which will be understandable in the future life" (9). We must, however obtain this knowledge through

-
1. II 93, 537C
 2. I 453, 432B
 3. II 299, 728A
 4. I 405, 409A; IV 211, 1305A
 5. I 476, 441C; IV 183, 1273D
 6. II 186, 636C
 7. III 214, 893C; III 232, 913C
 8. II 93, 537B
 9. II 56, 500A; of IV 126, 1204C

Faith, "for we must know and believe that God exists and we must not bother about what He is"(1). On the other hand the Scriptures give us the accurate and splendid faith concerning God(2).

c) What is God?

God is the supreme being, "for nothing is above Him"(3). "God, being light αἰδιον is ἀναρχος "(4). The word αἰδιον is also applicable to that which was born and does not die; The word αἰδιον is also applied to those which have been created and which do not decay. Therefore God is αἰδιος i.e. without origin and without end, "for the αἰδιον is mainly peculiar to the divine essence. The αἰδιότης is αἰδιωότης "(5). God is almighty but His omnipotence has no relations with evil things(6) for He can do everything but He wishes the best(7), that is He wishes and does what are appropriate for Him(8). God is the Creator of angels, of waters and clouds(9), of animals(10) and of man(11) and He is "Ποιητής καὶ Ἀρχὼν καὶ Ἐφορὸς καὶ Προνοητής καὶ Κηδεμὲν "(12). God is φοβερός but He is also ἀγαθός for everyone(13). He is εὐεργετικὸς, δεκτικὸς τῶν γυναικῶν μεταγινωσκόντων, ἀπαρραδ-γιστος and μελίχλιος (14). He is not the cause of evil things(15). God is just(16), μακροθυμὸς(17), whose patience is insuperable(18). He also is Philanthropist(19). "None can escape from the brilliant and sleepless Eye or do something secretly, for all things are naked to Him even if they appear as secret"(20), in other words God is omniscient. God is perfect, ἀναλλοίωτος and ἀμείωτος "καὶ αἰεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὁμοίως ἔχει" for He is unchangeable and superior to every change(21). God is sinless(22). God is ἀπα-θής (23) "for the Deity not only does not suffer, πάσχειν οὐ δύναται, but even is not touched or is not seen"(24).

1. II 299, 728A
2. ibid. 725C
3. IV 183, 1276A
4. I 248, 333A
5. III 149, 841B; III 18, 744C;
III 63, 772D
6. II 117, 557C; IV 47, 1097C
7. δύναται μὲν πάντα βούλεται
δὲ ἀριστα..... cf I 353,
384C; Ποίησις Θεοῦ, αὕτη ἐστὶν
ἡ βούλησις.
8. II 117, 557D; Τὰ κρέποντα Αὐτῷ
9. I 343, 380AB
10. II 119, 560B
11. III 95, 801A; 804AD; III
115, 556C
12. II 299, 725D
- 13.

13. IV 47, 1097C; I 343, 380A
I 388, 401B; II 85, 528C
14. IV 47, 1097C
15. I 240, 329B
16. II 217, 660C; II 222, 661C;
II 279, 709C; III 71, 780C;
IV 47, 1097C; V 366, 1548C
17. II 160, 613D; II 222, 661C;
V 649, 1633C
18. III 196, 881A
19. III 71, 780C; V 260, 1488C
20. IV 47, 1097C; V 368, 1548C
21. V 359, 1541C and 1541A
22. I 435, 421C
23. IV 166, 1257A
24. I 124, 265A

d) Proofs of the existence of God

We cannot see or touch God, we cannot understand His essence, but we can be sure that God exists. We can prove that God exists, because the world exists. "The creatures bear witness to their Creator. Without an architect a house is not built, neither is a ship built without a shipbuilder, neither can a musical organ exist, without him who makes these organs" (1). The order and the harmony of the world on the other hand, proves that God exists, "for where there is $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$, there a $\tau\alpha\zeta\iota\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$ is necessary" (2). "Then we must see Him Who is invisible by the mind, through the world; we must see Him not by the eyes, but by the mind, not by seeing" (3).

2. The Holy Trinity

a) In general

Writing on the Baptism of our Lord, Isidore displays his conceptions concerning the Holy Trinity. He writes: "This is my beloved Son' God and Father announced from heaven while the Son was being baptized, in order to show the genuine and natural Son Who was doubted among those who were not natural but adopted and to reveal the divine and adored Trinity of the Godhead $\epsilon\nu\ \iota\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \dot{\iota}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota\ \gamma\nu\omega\rho\iota\zeta\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$... Because while the Son was being baptized, the Father testified and the Holy Spirit descended proving the Son consubstantial with the Father and with His own self" (4). The adored and blessed Trinity is not a certain $\epsilon\nu\pi\acute{\rho}\omicron\sigma\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \dot{\iota}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$, as Sabellius thought, says Isidore. Deity is one but the $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$ are three. The $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ of Deity is one, and the three Persons of the Holy Trinity share in the same $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$, but $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$ is a different thing and every Holy Person has Its own $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$ (5). We do not accept, Isidore carries on, that "the one God is only Father, as the Jews think. We enlarge the Deity into a holy and consubstantial Trinity" (6). The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is found even in the O.T. and even Philo and others understood it (7). "Those who are called in the sacred Scriptures $\epsilon\nu\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$, characterize the divine Nature; for the Holy and most royal Trinity is consubstantial. But those who

-
1. V 28, 1344D-45A
 2. IV 186, 1277A; IV 58, II 13C
 3. IV 186, 1277A
 4. I 67, 228A
 5. I 247, 332D-33A
 6. II 142, 585A; cf III 27, 748D-49A
 7. II 143, 585BC. See the whole letter which is very important

are called in plural number, τῆς τῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐστὶ διαφορὰς. For the Deity is enlarged to three ἰδιότητες and again is diminished to one οὐσία in order that neither is polytheism understood because of the διαφορὰ τῶν φύσεων (1), nor can the Jewish conception be understood, because of the one Person. For the identity of the nature is divided into ὑποστάσεις whereas the ἰδιότης of the ὑποστάσεις is joined into one οὐσία "(2)." The blessed Trinity is αἰδιος and the words πρὸ and μετὰ are not applied to It, neither are the words 'first' and 'second' and 'third' applied to It. Ἀριθμοῦ γὰρ τὸ θεῖον καὶ χρόνων κρείττον καὶ πάσης ἐκινολας ὑψηλότερον(3). For if the Deity with regard to ἰδιότητες is divided, διαίρεται, It is united, συνάπτεται, with regard to ἀξία and οὐσία. For the Deity being enlarged into ὑποστάσεις is united with regard to οὐσία which by all means is followed by the ἀξία" of the divine ὑποστάσεις (4). In other words the divine ὑποστάσεις of the Holy Trinity are equal with themselves because the essence of the divine Trinity is one(5) and because the divine and most royal Trinity is consubstantial(6). Thus we have ἕνωσιν of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit(7).

To sum up: The names Father-Son-Holy Spirit, many times occur in Isidore. He distinguishes between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. The words ὑπόστασις, ἰδιότης, and πρόσωπον with regard to the Holy Trinity mean in Isidore's letters the same thing. God is one, but the ὑποστάσεις are three. The three ὑποστάσεις are of the same substance and equal.

b) The Father

God the Father is γεννήτωρ(8), but He did not become Father at a certain time: He always is Father. "If God is always the same without any change, if He does not get anything or if nothing is added to Him, then αἰεὶ ἐστὶ καὶ Πατήρ, He always is Father. And if He is always Father, He always has the Son, αἰεὶ ἔσχε τὸν Υἱόν. There-

-
1. Θεοίς ^{here} must mean ὑπόστασις or ἰδιότης or πρόσωπον
 2. III II2, 817AB
 3. cf. II 18, 744D-45A; III 63, 772D
 4. III 149, 841BC
 5. I 59, 220C
 6. III II2, 817A
 7. I 97, 249A
 8. III 354, 992C

fore the Son is *συνάδελος* with the Father"(1). And if the Son is *συνάδελος* with the Father, it follows that the Father is not greater than the Son. But Christ Himself said 'my Father is greater than I' (2), how have we to understand it? Isidore says: "The word 'greater' has been said in comparison and not in superiority which cannot be compared. For if Christ has been made *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων* then neither can the 'greater' stand. For how can the immortal be compared with these which have been made *ἐκ μὴ ὄντων*? And if you acknowledge that Christ has been made *ἄρπυγος* and *ἀπαθείας* from the paternal *ὁμοιότης*, again you will not reach the precise meaning of why 'my Father is greater than I' has been said. For it has been said not in order to teach, but exclusively to comfort and to encourage the Disciples who were afraid... Both can stand, the 'greater' since the Father is *γεννητὴρ* and the 'equal' since Christ is God and consubstantial (3). Elsewhere the Father is called "God and Father" (4), or *Δεσπότης* (5).

c) T h e S o n

The greatest doctrinal theme which occupies Isidore, is Christology. There are many letters dealing with Christ's deity, manhood, hypostatic union of the two natures, His relationship with the Father, etc. Here we cite only the main lines of Isidore's teaching concerning Christology and the numbers of the respective letters as well for further study. Following Isidore's statement that "the main name of the *πρωτόγονος* is the characterization of the S o n which signifies the genuineness and expels the conception of creature" (6), we preferred the heading 'the Son' instead of 'Christology'. From the other names of Christ which occur in Isidore, the name 'Father' is worthy of special mention: "Χριστός δὲ ὁ πάντων Ποιητής καὶ Πατήρ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεός καὶ Σωτήρ" (7).

1. The *ἀδελός* and *ἀπαθείας* *γέννησις* of the Son from the Father

The most important letter on this subject is that addressed to the deacon Elias and dealing with John I, I. Isidore says: "The Scriptures call 'birth' of Christ His *ἄρπυγον* and *ἀδελόν* and

-
1. I 241, 329C
 2. John I4, 28
 3. III 334, 992BC
 4. I 67, 228A; I 313, 364B; III 335, 993C
 5. IV 24, 1073B
 6. V 28, 1344A
 7. I 460, 436B

ἀπερίτευτον and superior to any reason or thought π ρ ό ό ο υ from the Father, not in order to signify some passion, but in order to establish the ὁμοούσιον, i.e. the consubstantiality. For, indeed, those who give birth are consubstantial with those who receive birth. And in order that nothing newer be invented, the Scriptures say: 'in the beginning was the word'. Then they declare the relation of the Son with the Father: 'and the Word was with God'. Then they declare the ἄξιαν of the Son: 'and the Word was God'. All these are so declared in order that having learned the ὁμοούσιον from the Son, the ἀπαθές from the word, the οικειότητα with the Father from His being with God, and His ἄξιαν because He is God; and having expelled from every name that which is inappropriate, that is to say, having expelled the νεώτερον from the Son and the ἀνυπόστατον from the Word, we might know and adore Christ as God ἄδελφον and ὁμοούσιον, as having, dispassionately and not under time sprung from the Father" (1). In other letters we find that God the Father is always Father and therefore "the Son is always Son" (2) and He is συνδύσιος with the Father. We also find that "birth is mainly applied to the Son whereas it is improperly applied to other creatures. Birth is applied to the Son because of the truth[†] consubstantiality, whereas it is applied to creatures because of honour and adoption. For He, having wished, gave birth to us λόγῳ ἀληθείας" (3). In another letter Isidore declares that the "Word ἀπαθές ἐτέχθη or προσήλυθε " (4).

+ and

11. The deity of Christ

Christ is God; but He is God not by adoption or grace. He is God because He had the deity before time, εμψυτον εσχεν πρό των αἰώνων, and when He came to us as a man, He did not lose His deity. These facts are illustrated in Isidore's interpretation of Phil. 2, 6-7, to wit: "'To be equal with God': If Christ was not equal with God, the example of the Apostle was useless since Christ did what He did obeying Him who ordered Him. If Christ was equal with God - He of course was equal - then the example is properly aiming at humiliation. If Christ's equality with God was an εἶματιον, i.e. an unexpected gain or find, then Christ could not humiliate Himself, since His subordination⁶ could be in advance

1. IV 142, 1224AB

2. I 241, 329C

3. III 31, 753A

4. III 141, 837BC

5. The text in Migne has: "ἵνα μή ἡ ὑπερισσεία πρόκριμα ποιήσῃ τῇ ἀξίᾳ". The meaning of this phrase is obscure; there is no word ὑπερισσεία. If we will change this word into ὑπηρεσία of which 'subordination' is a meaning, then this line could make sense.

a judgment for His office. But inasmuch as He was equal ἐν φύσει by His Nature, and had His εὐγένειαν i.e. brilliant origin essentially and not granted by grace, He did not avoid humiliating Himself⁽¹⁾. 'Christ made himself of no reputation' 'Christ, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God'. That is Christ did not seize deity and reign but He had it innate before Time, and He did not accept the taking away of His deity, but He, being Lord of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth did not abandon his heavenly position and at the same time He came to us⁽²⁾. Christ is not "φιλόσ ἀνθρώπος" endowed with divine grace, but He is the only-begotten Son who wished to be incarnated⁽³⁾. Christ is God⁽⁴⁾.

iii. The equality and consubstantiality of the Son with the

Father

Interpreting 1Cor. I, 24 'Christ the power of God', Isidore says: "Christ is power not ἀνυπόστατος but ἐνυπόστατος and almighty, the creator of ὑποστάσεις and equal in force with Him whose power He is"⁽⁵⁾. On John I4, 28 'my Father is greater than I', Isidore says that "the 'greater' can stand because the Father is γεννῆτορ but also the 'equal' stands well because the Son is God consubstantial"⁽⁶⁾, with the Father. "Since the rule of comparison is applied to those which are ὁμογενῆ, the comparison between the Son and Father proves that they are consubstantial"⁽⁷⁾. The phrase 'the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do'⁽⁸⁾, does not mean that the Father is greater than the Son, but "it declares the ἰσοτιμίαν and the ἰσοθεῖαν and the ὁμοούσιον"⁽⁹⁾ of the Son with the Father. The Son and Father are one in glory and in essence: "Christ promised⁽¹⁰⁾ that He shall come in the glory of His Father and by this verse He shuts the mouths of the heretics and blows out their rabies. For He did not say in 'such' a

-
1. IV 22, 1072AB
 2. I 139, 276A
 3. II 157, 612B; IV 166, 1257AB
 4. I 405, 409A; III 334, 992BL; IV 142, 1224A; IV 166, 1260A
 5. II 143, 585D
 6. III 334, 992CL
 7. I 422, 417AB; cf I 473, 441A; III 342, 1001B
 8. John 5, 19
 9. III 335, 997A
 10. Matt. 16, 27

glory in which the Father is, but showing⁽¹⁾ the most exact, He says He shall come in the same glory, in order that this glory may be considered as one and necessary the same. Then, those whose glory is one moreover their essence is also one⁽²⁾. "For everything which the Father has belongs also to the Son and vice versa"⁽³⁾. Christ is not "an interpreter of the Father, but He is Λόγος ἐνυπόστατος and has His own ἰδιότητα"⁽⁴⁾. Since the Father and the Son are of the same substance, They also have the same will. "Μία ἀρα οὐσία Πατρός καί Υἱοῦ ὡςπερ θέλησις"⁽⁵⁾.

iv. Christ the Man

The orthodox doctrine on this point and Isidore's teaching as well can be summarized in what he epigrammatically says: The second Man, that is Christ, "θεός ὢν ἀληθῶς, γέγονεν ἀνθρώπος ἀληθῶς"⁽⁶⁾. In more detail: "The true God of everything truly became man obtaining what He was not without changing what He was and the one existing Son who was and is ἀναρχος and ἀπέραντος, πρόσφατος and αἰδιος is now of two Natures"⁽⁷⁾. Christ did not become a κατὰ δόμησιν man⁽⁸⁾, but "having been incarnated in and from His Mother, He became ἀνθρώπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν similar with us in everything but without sin"⁽⁹⁾. "He who together with the Father reigns and keeps control of the supermundane things and administers the earthly things was incarnated"⁽¹⁰⁾. It is our God and Saviour⁽¹¹⁾, or God the Word⁽¹²⁾, or simply God⁽¹³⁾, or the divine Essence⁽¹⁴⁾ who was incarnated. Christ remained ἀτρέκτος i.e. unchangeable when He was incarnated⁽¹⁵⁾, "for God, having been

-
1. Instead of περιστάς which the Migne's edition has, we prefer Altemps' codex which has καριστάς, not only because we obtain the best interpretation, but especially because this opinion of Isidore's derives directly from Chrysostom: In Matthew LV 4 Montf. VII 630B: "ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπηκριβωμένον δεῖκνυς, ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὁδῷ, φησὶν, ἡξαι, ὡς μίαν αὐτὴν ὑποκτεύεσθαι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν"
 2. III I 66, 860AB
 3. II I 38, 581B
 4. III I 41, 837BC
 5. I 353, 384C; of also I 67, 246; 389; III 27; 31; II 2; I 49; 342; IV 99
 6. I 303, 357C
 7. I 323, 369B: "Ὁ ἀληθινός καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἀληθῶς, οὐτε ὁ ἦν, τραπεῖς, καὶ ὁ οὐκ ἦν προσλαβών, ἐκ φύσεων δυοῖν ὁ εἰς ὑπάρχων Υἱός, ἀναρχος καὶ ἀπέραντος, πρόσφατος καὶ αἰδιος"
 8. I 102, 252C
 9. I 121, 264A; I 123, 197A; I 289, 352C
 10. IV I 56, 1256B
 11. I 109, 256B
 12. IV 64, 1121B
 13. I 404, 408C
 14. I 42, 209A
 15. I 416, 413B

I 248,333A: 'Η ἀναρχος θεότης	κοινωνία τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης πτωχείας
I 303,357C: Θεός ὢν ἀληθὺς	γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ἀληθὺς
I 310,361C: Θεός	καταβῆναι φιλανθρωπῶς ἡύδκησε
I 323,369B: 'Ο ἀληθὴς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός	ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἀληθὺς
" : Υἱός ἀναρχος, ἀπέραντος, αἰδῖος	πρόσφατος
I 344,380B: 'Ο Θεός	διὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος
I 360,388A: Τῷ οἰκέτῳ πυρὶ τῆς θεότητος, ὁ Κύριος	τὴν ζύμην τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου φυράματος ἐνώσας καὶ καθάρως
I 405,409A: 'Ο Λόγος	σάρξ ἀληθὴς
I 419,416C: 'Ο Θεός	ἐνανθρωπήσας
I 436,421D: Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ (I)	ἐνσαρκος ἐπιφάνεια
I 496,452C: Θεὸς φύσις	σάρξ καὶ ὅστις
II 192,640D: Τὸ ἀφθαρτον ἡνώθη	τῷ φθαρτῷ
III 95,804A: Μονογενὴς Θεός	ἐπιδημήσας
III 130,820C: Θεότης	ἐνανθρώπησις
III 329,988C: 'Ο Πατὴρ Λόγος	ἀνθρωπείαν ὑποδύς φύσιν

The word φύσις in singular, used by Isidore occurs in many cases and means various things. Thus it means 'the divine Nature in Christ' (2), 'nature' (3), 'human nature' (4), 'devil's nature' (5), 'mankind' (6) etc. The word φύσεις, in the plural with regard to the Natures in Christ, occurs under the following forms:

- I 23,197A: 'Εξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν φύσεων προσκυνούμενος
- ibid. note 23: ἐν ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς φύσεσι προσκυνούμενος (7)
- I 236,328C: Δύο φύσεων ἕνωσις
- I 303,357D-60A: Ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἰς Υἱός ὢν Θεοῦ
- I 323,369B: Ἐκ φύσεων δυοῖν ὁ εἰς ὑπάρχων Υἱός
- I 405,409A: Ἐν ἐκατέραις ταῖς φύσεσιν εἰς ὑπάρχει Υἱός (τοῦ) Θεοῦ

To signify the union of the two Natures in Christ, Isidore uses the words: ἕνωσις (8), ἐνωθεῖσα (9), ἡνωμένος (10), ἡνώθη (11), ἡνωται (12), ἐνωθεῖς (13), ἐνώσας (14), ἐνώσει (verb) (15), εἰς (16), κοινωνία (17),

- 1. I 436 is identical with IV 229
- 2. I 416,413B; I 436,421D; II 157,612B; II 192,640D
- 3. I 102,252C
- 4. I 124,265A; I 193,305C; I 303,357C; II 2,456B; III 329,988C; IV 230,1324C
- 5. III 328,909C
- 6. III 195,860B
- 7. This form is more correct than the former one
- 8. I 42,209A; I 236,328C; I 247,333A
- 9. I 42,209A; IV 436,421D
- 10. I 59,221A
- 11. I 124,265A; II 192,640D
- 12. I 182,301B
- 13. I 199,309C
- 14. I 360,388A
- 15. I 248,333B
- 16. I 23,197A; I 199,309C; I 323,369B; I 405,409A
- 17. I 248,333A

συναρμολογησις(1), συμπλοκή(2), κατάβασις(3). The union of the two Natures in Christ is perfect(4), or true(5), or it happened truly(6) and neither division nor confusion is applied to this union(7). This union happened φιλανθρωπῶς(8).

To sum up all that Isidore says concerning the hypostatic union of Godhead and Manhood in Christ, we cannot do better than quote Isidore's own words: "The Lord united and purified the human nature and inflamed it by His own fire of the Godhead and became one Person with it and one worshipped Hypostasis"(9).

d) The Holy Spirit

The Holy Spirit is called by Isidore: Πνεῦμα(10), Πνεῦμα ἁγίου(11), Πανᾶγιον(12), Θεῖον(13), προσκυνοῦμενον(14), Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ(15), Ἀκτύλος Θεοῦ(16), Παράκλητος(17).

The Holy Spirit shares in and completes the Holy Trinity, being of the same essence as the Father and the Son: "The divine Spirit is not ποιητόν or κτιστόν or τῆς δοῦλης φύσεως, but He is συγγενές and ὁμοούσιον of the lordly, creative and royal essence, because: a) Our God and Saviour having become man, taught that the All-holy Spirit completes the divine Trinity; b) He is counted together with the Father and the Son in the epiklesis of the holy Baptism as releasing men from sin; c) He renders the usual bread on the mystical Table His own (i.e. Christ's) body of His incarnation; (The Holy Spirit also changes the wine into Christ's blood(18)). If the Holy Spirit is δοῦλον, let Him

1. I 199, 309C
2. I 219, 321A
3. I 310, 361C
4. I 193, 305C
5. I 405, 409A
6. I 23, 197A; I 303, 357C; I 323, 369B
7. I 419, 416C
8. I 124, 265A; I 310, 361C
9. I 360, 388A
10. I 59, 221A; I 97, 249B; III 77, 785A
11. I 59, 220C-21A twice; I 60, 221BC six times; I 67, 228A; I 106, 253C; I 109, 256C; I 250, 333C; II 5, 461A; III 106, 812BC twice; III 232, 932B twice; III 260, 944A
12. I 97, 249A; I 109, 256B; I 243, 332A
13. I 106, 253C; I 313, 364C; I 416, 413B; I 500, 453B; III 77, 785A; III 106, 812C; III 252, 932B; III 260, 944A; III 394, 1033B; IV 145, 1228D; IV 182, 1273C
14. I 500, 453B
15. I 119, 261C
16. I 60, 221C
17. II 260, 944A
18. I 313, 364C

not be counted with the Lord. If He is $\kappa\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$, let Him not complete or have relations with the Creator. But the Holy Spirit has been united and counted together - since we must obey Christ who is the accurate $\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ of such truths, who accurately teaches those truths referring to His own essence" (1). "The Comforter is $\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ of the divine essence and glory" (2) and is united with the Father and the Son (3).

Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is inexcusable, "inasmuch as His deeds being apparent prove those making the blasphemies foolish and ungrateful. Because whereas the passions were being cut out and demons expelled by the Godhead's power, the grumbling Jews calumniated that these miracles were made by Beelzebub. Now, this blasphemy, which is clearly against the divine essence is - the Lord said - inexcusable" (4). Interpreting Lk II, 20 "if I with the finger of God cast out devils" Isidore says that "Finger of God is the Holy Spirit. And the finger, to take an example from our body, is of the essence of the body. Thus Christ called 'finger' the Holy Spirit's Hypostasis which is inseparable and relative with the divine essence" (5). "The divine and worshipped Spirit, descended on the sacred Disciples ten days after Christ's Ascension or fifty days after the day of His resurrection, as He promised" (6). During Christ's baptism also, "the Holy Spirit descended ascertaining the Son consubstantial with the Father and with His own self" (7) and "He $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu\eta$ like a dove" (8). It is the Holy Spirit "whom we have received" (9) and who inspired the sacred authors to write the Holy Scriptures (10).

3. C o s m o l o g y

Creator, i.e. $\Pi\omicron\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (11) or $\Delta\eta\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon\rho\eta\varsigma$ is God (12) or "the most divine Son and Word of the Father is the Creator of everything" (13) or "the Saviour, as He is Creator, created men" (14), or

-
1. I 09, 256BC
 2. III 260, 944A
 3. I 97, 249A
 4. I 59, 221AB; I 60, 221B
 5. I 60, 221C
 6. I 500, 453BC; I 499, 453B
 7. I 67, 228A
 8. I 106, 253C
 9. I 250, 333C
 10. V. Supra pp. 150-I
 11. I 343, 380B; IV 73, II33A
 12. I 343, 380A; III 295, 972A; IV 183, I276A; V 162, I420A
 13. IV 202, I288D-89A
 14. IV 123, II96D

"Christ Who at the same time is Father and God and Saviour is the Creator of everything"(1), or "the 'Εννοεστικός Wisdom is that which made the centuries"(2), or "the Wisdom or the 'Ακρίβεια Νοῦς"(3). There is only one Creator(4).

God created the angels, the waters and the clouds(5), the animals in various species(6) and man(7). But He did not create evil(8), because He is ἀγαθός(9), and because "the creation of God is identified with His will"(10) and He wishes the best(11). When He creates, "He does it εύμαρως i.e. easily"(12) for He is omnipotent. God's creatures are admirable, because He is all-wise Creator(13) and because He "πρεπόντως created"(14).

After the creation, God did not leave His creatures alone, but He is their "ἄρχων and ἔφορος and προνοητής and κηδεμών"(15) and ἡγεμών(16). There is no fate which administers the universe(17), but "we insist that there is a Πρόνοια i.e. Providence"(18) "which rules and administers everything"(19).

4. Anthropology

Man was created by God(20) in His image(21) so that he should become His likeness by intention(22). The phrase 'κατ' εἰκόνα' i.e. 'in our image' referring to man is characterized by the ἀρχικόν. "As God reigns over everything, so does man over the earthly things. Then he has the ἀρχικόν which saves the royal image"(23). God gave to man ἀρχήν so that he might show virtue and preserve the 'likeness'(24).

The word ἄνθρωπος is common for both man and woman(25). "Man is κόσμος σύντροφος sharing in all the elements of the universe"(26). "Man is an image of ἀρχή and βασιλεία ; he is

1. I 460, 436B

2. I 429, 420B

3. II 115, 556B

4. V 28, 1344C

5. I 343, 380A; IV 73, 1133A

6. II 119, 560BC; II 115, 556C

7. II 115, 556C; III 95, 801A-4AB

8. I 240, 329B

9. I 343, 380AB

10. I 353, 384C

11. II 117, 557D

12. V. Supra p. 240

13. II 119, 560C

14. II 115, 556C

15. II 299, 725D

16. V 28, 1345A

17. III 26, 748C; III 102, 808BC;
III 135, 833D-36A; III 154,
845B-49C; III 191, 877A

18. III 26, 748C; II 222, 661C

19. II 119, 560C

20. III 95, 801D-804A

21. Gen. I, 26

22. III 95, 804A

23. ibid. 801BC

24. ibid. 801D

25. III 243, 921C

26. I 259, 337C

not an image of οὐσία. And if he commits good acts he will also be an image of virtue. For if we determine the ψῆμα soul to be immortal, we do not say that it is consubstantial with the most divine and Ἀπαρχὸν Nature; but we say that so much soul differs from the divine Nature as the creature from its Creator⁽¹⁾.

Woman was taken out of her husband⁽²⁾, and that is why she has been logically and admirably called γυνή. "For the word γυνή is derived from γονή i.e. birth. Then she shall be called γυνή which means γονίμη i.e. fertile, because she was taken out of her husband who would render her fertile. For a man being joined with a virgin, renders her γυναικα, i.e. fertile... Those who say that the word γυνή is derived from γυνή which means members are not worthy of mention"⁽³⁾. Woman's soul is immortal and incorruptible as is man's soul⁽⁴⁾ and therefore woman's soul was also created in God's image⁽⁵⁾. But, if it is so, then, "how did Paul call man 'image and glory of God' and woman glory of the man"? We shall say that woman from the beginning was equal in dignity to man and she had the same power. But since she had fallen she diminished and her power decreased and she became subject to man. He says: You did not keep the equality of privilege, then accept the diminution. 'Thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee'. Hence, whereas that which has been said by Moses⁽⁶⁾ signifies the power of woman before her sin, the apostolic saying⁽⁷⁾ indicates her submission after the sin"⁽⁸⁾. Man is ἡγεμονικώτερος than woman⁽⁹⁾.

Man (and woman) consists of body and soul⁽¹⁰⁾. The body "is not opposite to the soul, but it is soul's organ and guitar"⁽¹¹⁾. The body mortal⁽¹²⁾, earthly⁽¹³⁾, or ἡς πλείστον μετοχόν⁽¹⁴⁾ perishable⁽¹⁵⁾, παθητόν⁽¹⁶⁾, and the inferior part of man⁽¹⁷⁾.

+ is

-
1. III 95, 801A
 2. I 330, 373A; cf Gen. 2, 23
 3. III 243, 921BC
 4. III 95, 801A
 5. ibid.
 6. Gen. I, 26
 7. 1Cor. II, 7
 8. III 95, 801BC
 9. III 13, 741A
 10. III 217, 901B
 11. V 329, 1525C
 12. II 192, 640D; IV 204, 1292B
 13. IV 127, 1205A
 14. II 43, 485B
 15. III 235, 916B
 16. IV 204, 1292B
 17. III 95, 800C; V 329, 1225C

But the body "became mortal and κατητόν, after the transgression of the πρωτόπλαστος "(1). This means, according to Isidore, that the body originally was not mortal and κατητόν. This body, however, will be raised up and will be renewed (2). The soul is λογική (3), divine (4), immortal (5), imperishable (6), ἡγεμονικώτερα of the body (7) and the better part of man (8). It is man's soul which puts him above other animals, although they are faster, bigger, stronger, etc. (9). But the soul is not consubstantial with its Creator (10) or part of Him "for if, it was part of Him, it would not sin, it would not be judged" (11). Man, being λογικός (12), possesses the αὐτεξουσιότητος ὅρον (13), or men are αὐτεξούσιοι (14). Therefore "human nature is neither insusceptible of evil nor does it naturally possess evil. But accepting it by his will, he fails" (15).

5. Original Sin

The two words προπατορική ἁμαρτία which usually signify original sin, do not occur in Isidore. Instead, we find the phrases: "ἡ παράβασις τοῦ προπάτορος", or "ἡ παράβασις τοῦ Ἀδάμ" (16), or "τὸ πταίσμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ", or "τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ ὀλισθος" (17), or "πταίσματ' ἁμαρτίας τοῦ πταίσματος τῆς γυναικὸς" (18), or "προγονικὰ πταίσματα" (19), or "ὁ πρωτόπλαστος ἀνθρώπος ἀλογήσας τὴν ἀπάτην προὔτμησε" (20).

Inasmuch as man was αὐτεξούσιος, that is he was free to think or to will or to do whatever he wished, it follows that it was possible for him to commit sin; this happened to the first man: "Human nature is neither insusceptible nor does it naturally possess evil. But accepting it by his will and indolence, he fails. This very event happened to the first man who so failed from the conditions of salvation" (21). The sin of the first man had a direct and certain result: "One woman sinned (I say Eve) and the whole human race condemned to die, although after the original sin many people succeeded and did not follow the ancestral transgression. Since the root died, the branches as heirs of the

1. IV 204, 1292B
2. I 284, 349B
3. III 95, 800C; V 162, 1417D
4. IV 124, 1197B
5. III 95, 801A; III 149, 841B;
III 235, 916D; III 295, 669B;
IV 124, 1197B; IV 125, 1197C;
V 491, 1612C
6. III 235, 916B
7. IV 125, 1197C
8. III 95, 800C
9. V 162, 1417D-20A
10. III 95, 801A

11. IV 124, 1197B
12. V 162, 1420A; II 135, 577A
13. II 129, 573B; III 281, 957C
14. III 122, 825A; V 357, 1541A
15. I 271, 344AB; I 272 is almost
the same with I 303, 357C
16. III 195, 880B
17. I 330, 372D-73A
18. III 95, 801BC
19. IV 141, 1221B
20. IV 204, 1292A
21. I 303, 357C; I 272, 344B;
IV 204, 1292B

condemnatory decision necessarily suffered the same passion, i.e. death⁽¹⁾.

"Devil, by promising man to appoint him God, rendered him worse than animals. For he did not only deprive him of the extant gifts, but he also caused him those disadvantages which were not extant, that is sweat, pains, death and corruptibility⁽²⁾. The aforementioned extract of Isidore is quite absolute concerning the ruin which man suffered after the sin. There is however another extract from his letters, which is more moderate: "Woman from the beginning was equal in dignity to man and she had the same power. But since she had fallen, she diminished and her power decreased and she became subject to man⁽³⁾... From the beginning, when the 'image' was shining in him (man) all beasts were subject to him and that is why he gave them names. But since he disobeyed, his power reasonably diminished; he did not lose all his power (so that the Grace could not be useless) but his power diminished"⁽⁴⁾. The first man had lost salvation but "the second Man who received in himself our own true nature, gave the salvation back to the first man"⁽⁵⁾, or, "the second Man divinely corrected the human nature which He received and He restored the previous 'image' to the first man"⁽⁶⁾.

6. Mariology

The names which are used by Isidore to denote the Theotokos, Mary, the Mother of our Lord, are the following: Theotokos Mary⁽⁷⁾, Mother of the Lord⁽⁸⁾, Mother of God⁽⁹⁾, Mother of our incarnated God⁽¹⁰⁾, Mother of the incarnated God⁽¹¹⁾, the κυήσασα our Lord

-
- I. IV 141, 1221B
 2. V 28, 1341CD; IV 204, 1292B
 3. III 95, 801B
 4. *ibid.* 804B: "Ἐπειδὴ δὲ παρήκουσεν, ἡκρωτηριάσθη αὐτοῦ εἰκότως ἡ ἀρχή, καὶ πάσης ἐν οὐκ ἐξεβλήθη (ἵνα μὴ ἔωλος ἡ χάρις εὐρεθῇ), ἡκρωτηριάσθη δέ"
 5. I 303, 357C
 6. I 272, 344B
 7. I 201, 312B
 8. I 141, 277A; I 121, 264A
 9. I 54, 216C
 10. *ibid.*
 11. *ibid.* 217B

Jesus Christ⁽¹⁾ and THE Virgin⁽²⁾.

The incarnation of Christ and His birth as well which "indeed are a great mystery"⁽³⁾, are by Isidore called ἀπόκρυφος βυθός⁽⁴⁾, ἀσκοπιμή or θεία οἰκονομία⁽⁵⁾, τόκος τοῦ Κυρίου⁽⁶⁾, πρόδοος τῆς σαρκώσεως⁽⁷⁾ and ἑνσαρκος ἐκφάνεια⁽⁸⁾. Christ was conceived ἀσκόρως⁽⁹⁾, or δίχα σπέρματος⁽¹⁰⁾, or σκορά did not take place⁽¹¹⁾ for His conception. Thus His conception was immaculate. On the question how could Christ be conceived and born without σκορά, Isidore says: "Nothing is strange with this mystery which is similar with all the mysteries and doctrines of the Law.. For it is written: 'the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept. And He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought he unto the man.'⁽¹²⁾ Before her, God created Adam of the dust of the ground. Then, here are a man from the dust of the ground and a woman from the man, and both are created without coition. Then, since woman owed her existence to man inasmuch as she was taken out of his rib without any σκορά the Mother of the Lord giving birth to Him δίχα σπέρματος, paid the duty. Thus it is not impossible to nature to bring forth a man without coition. But as it happened in the first man, so it happened in the Lordly Economy"⁽¹³⁾. Mary's womb "opened when our Lord Jesus Christ was being born. He προερχόμενος opened it and left it again locked"⁽¹⁴⁾. Thus the conception which took place in the Virgin⁽¹⁵⁾ Mary is μονογενής and μονότροκος⁽¹⁶⁾. She gave birth without any φθορά⁽¹⁷⁾, but παρθενικεύουσης τῆς φύσεως and ἡ πρόδοος τῆς σαρκώσεως τῇ ἀγγελῇ μετῶσιν οὐκ ἐποίησε⁽¹⁸⁾. In addition our Lord, wishing to fulfil the promise He gave to Abraham, "has chosen His Mother from Abraham's generation, and He was incarnated in her and from her and He truly became man as we are, having everything we have except sin"⁽¹⁹⁾.

-
1. I 23, 196D
 2. II 192, 640D
 3. I 219, 320D; II 192, 640C
 4. I 141, 276C
 5. I 219, 320D; I 141, 277A
 6. I 404, 408C
 7. ibid.
 8. I 436, 421D
 9. I 23, 197A
 10. I 141, 277A
 11. I 54, 216C
 12. I 141, 276C-77A
 13. I 23, 196D-97A
 14. II 92, 640L
 15. I 54, 216C
 16. ibid.
 17. I 404, 408C
 18. I 121, 264A
 19. Gen. 2, 21-2

7. Soteriology

If death is the result of every sin⁽¹⁾ and all are sinful⁽²⁾, moreover death was the result of the original sin⁽³⁾. The first man had lost salvation⁽⁴⁾ and this loss was the common inheritance of all mankind⁽⁵⁾. Therefore all men needed salvation, for "τὸ αὐτοῖς ἀπολόλα" ⁽⁶⁾ → "μεν"

Where did salvation spring from? "We were saved by Christ"⁽⁷⁾. The incarnation of Christ took place "for our human sins"⁽⁸⁾ and it extinguished "the sins of all mankind"⁽⁹⁾. "The delight of the life of the incarnation of Christ took place "for our human sins" and He destroyed death caused by sin, by His own death⁽¹²⁾. "God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation" so that His righteousness might be declared in His blood. For God placed His only-Begotten as ransom in order that grace should be valid. Because He, having received one victim for all and higher than the worth of all, He abolished hostility, pardoned condemnation, guided them to sonship and decorated all of them with immense riches"⁽¹³⁾.

Is salvation equally offered to all men? Yes and no. Yes, it is offered, because "Christ captured from the tyranny of the enemy those captives who have been subjected by the enemy through deceit"⁽¹⁴⁾. "Yes, it is offered, because all men were called to salvation. No, it is not offered, because all men did not obey. The πρόσκλησις of those who were called, brought them salvation, because the call did not happen by force, but was voluntary"⁽¹⁵⁾. "Salvation is not obtained by force or tyranny, but it is obtained by the obedience and by the goodness of men. And, that is why everyone has the κύριος of his own salvation"⁽¹⁶⁾. "Thus the eternal kingdom of Christ, accepting the multitude from every nation of men, ἀνάλογον τῇ πίστει τὴν σωτηρίαν ὀρίζεται"⁽¹⁷⁾.

1. III 33, 753C; III 261, 944B

2. IV 91, II68B

3. IV 141, I221B; IV 204, I292B; V 28, I341CD

4. I 303, 357C

5. IV 141, I221B

6. II 61, 504C

7. *ibid.*

8. I 436, 421D

9. I 42, 209A

10. I 168, 293B

11. IV 64, II21B

12. II 157, 612B

13. IV 73, II32C-33A; IV 100, II65AB

14. I 400, 405D

15. IV 51, II01AB

16. II 129, 573B

17. I 204, 313A

What are the means by which a man can be saved? Isidore gives testimony for the following three: It is firstly faith, in the *ἀγαθὸν* of which a man is saved⁽¹⁾. But Faith alone cannot save a man. "For Faith, having firstly justified, claims acts appropriate for itself without which (acts), salvation is not possible"⁽²⁾. Faith alone cannot save, "because it must be proved by works"⁽³⁾. "God the word, having come here and having claimed faith, *χάρτι ἐδικαίωσε*, because it was impossible for those who betrayed themselves to be saved... But when they believed, He reasonably claimed accurate righteousness. Thus, in the first (justification), grace justified; but God the word claimed that those who were justified should do good works for it was impossible for them to be saved by faith alone⁽⁴⁾. We must join faith and works and we must strengthen faith by the works. For faith would be dead without works"⁽⁵⁾. Hence, the second means of salvation is 'good works'.

The third means of salvation is 'divine grace', because a man cannot obtain salvation by himself. This is true, "for everything which is done by men is quickly destroyed, if the divine grace should not preserve it"⁽⁶⁾. The divine grace, or divine *ποιή* (7), or *ἀνεστὶν ποιή* (8), or *ποιή* of the divine Providence (9), helps men "to defeat easily the enemies (devil and evil)"⁽¹⁰⁾. Therefore we must not trust ourselves but we must leave the divine alliance to obtain the victory"⁽¹¹⁾. But the divine grace does not help everyone but those who wish their salvation and who work for it⁽¹²⁾. "He who wishes and takes pains and does everything (for it is not enough to wish only), learns, produces fruits and is saved"⁽¹³⁾. Hence only "he who practices virtue must call on the divine grace for help, whereas he who does not care for virtue, will not be helped even if he asked God"⁽¹⁴⁾.

To sum up: Isidore teaches that justification and salvation come as a result of faith and of co-operation between God and man, where God offers His grace and man His good will and good works.

-
1. *ibid.*
 2. III 73, 781A
 3. III 158, 853B
 4. *ὡς οὐκ ἐνόν ἀπὸ πίστεως μόνον σωθῆναι*
 5. IV 65, 1121C
 6. I 397, 405A
 7. V 127, 1524D; V 459, 1593A
 8. II 242, 684B; III 22, 745D; III 406, 1040D
 9. IV 171, 1264A
 10. III 22, 745D; II 159, 613C
 11. II 242, 684A
 12. II 2, 457A; II 27, 473D; III 271, 949D-52A; III 316, 981A; IV 13, 1061B; IV 171, 1264A; V 327, 1524D
 13. II 72, 516C
 14. V 459, 1593A; III 406, 1040D

8. Eschatology

There will come a day when "Christ, the Creator, the Father, the God and the Saviour of all will come in the glory He promised ἀποδοῦναι i.e. to reward or to punish everyone according to his works"(1). This will be Christ's most illustrious second coming(2). Before reward or punishment, a judgment will take place. For this judgment Isidore uses the following words: Κρίσις(3), γενική κρίσις(4), μέλλουσα κρίσις(5), ἀδέκαστος κρίσις(6), κρίσως λόγος(7), ἡμέρα φρικτὴ ἐξετάσεως(8). This judgment will undoubtedly take place(9) and will be general, in opposition to that which here is μερικῶς done(10). All people will be judged, but those who lived in the era of grace, will be judged more strictly(11). The judgement will take place before the angels and all mankind(12). Christ will be the judge(13).

In order that men will be judged all bodies will be raised up(14) in the same way(15). But the bodies will not be as they are now, earthly; They will be "etherial and spiritual. For we say that the body will be raised up not in the form in which it is now, but it will be transfigured to a better condition, and it will lay aside every corruptibility and passion"(16). In the Resurrection, the body will be ἀνέλωτον(17), κοῦφον, spiritual and etherial(18). Even the soul will be 'spiritual' in that day(19). Body and soul will be judged together(20). This future judgment will take place in order that all good men will be rewarded and all bad men will be punished, in order that ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἐκείνου ἀπονεμηθῇ or τὸ κρέπον ἀποδοθῇ(21). The punishment will be 'everlasting fire' and the reward will be 'life in the resurrection'(22).

-
- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. I 460, 436B | |
| 2. II 157, 612A | |
| 3. I 222, 321C; I 436, 424A; III 413, 1045C-48A four times; V 215, 1460C | |
| 4. III 201, 884B; III 413, 1048A | |
| 5. III 36, 756D | |
| 6. II 157, 612A | |
| 7. III 37, 757AB twice; V 215, 1460C | |
| 8. I 379, 396D | |
| 9. II 43, 485AC; II 157, 612AC; III 37, 757A; III 201, 884BC; III 413, 1045D | |
| 10. III 413, 1048A | |
| 11. I 472, 440D | |
| 12. I 333, 376A; II 223, 661D | 17. II 43, 485C |
| 13. V 221, 1465A | 18. III 77, 785A |
| 14. I 284, 349B | 19. <i>ibid.</i> |
| 15. V 179, 1432C | 20. I 222, 321C; IV 201, 1288C |
| 16. II 43, 485B | 21. I 267, 341B; V 179, 1432C; V 215, 1460C; V 302, 1513A |
| | 22. I 267, 341B; I 145, 280CD |

9. The Church

Referring to the Church, Isidore speaks of particular Churches, e.g. of the Church at Pelusium⁽¹⁾, or at Corinth⁽²⁾, or of Churches⁽³⁾ and of the Church. Apart from the word ἡ Ἐκκλησία he uses the words ἁγία or ὁσιως Ἐκκλησία⁽⁴⁾, Ἐκκλησία Κυρίου⁽⁵⁾ Δεσποτικὴ Νύμφη⁽⁶⁾ ἄμωμος καὶ παρθένος Ἐκκλησία⁽⁷⁾ Περιστερά τε- λεία⁽⁸⁾, Θεσμός⁽⁹⁾ Σῶμα Χριστοῦ⁽¹⁰⁾ and ἐν Σῶμα⁽¹¹⁾, to signify the same thing. Although he distinguishes between Ἐκκλησία and Ἐκκλησιαστήριον⁽¹²⁾, in one case⁽¹³⁾ Ἐκκλησία signifies the building. In another case Ἐκκλησία means the ancient gatherings.⁽²⁷⁾

Definition: "Church is the sum which consists of the saints who possess the accurate Faith and show the best behaviour"⁽¹⁴⁾.

One: Christians are the πλήρωμα of the Church and they all constitute one body⁽¹⁵⁾. The head of this body is Christ⁽¹⁶⁾. "Since all Christians) ἐσφραγίσθησαν in the name of Christ, they were united in one harmony"⁽¹⁷⁾.

Holy: Apart from what Isidore says in the definition of the Church which indicates his conceptions of the Church to be holy, he also says that the Church consists of spotless souls⁽¹⁸⁾.

Catholic: The Church is one, ἡ ἀπανταχοῦ τῆς ὑπ' ἡλίῳ⁽¹⁹⁾, or ἡ ἀπανταχοῦ⁽²⁰⁾, or ἡ πᾶνδημος τῆς οἰκουμένης Ἐκκλησία⁽²¹⁾ which is the body of Christ⁽²²⁾. The Church at Corinth or at Pelusium or other Churches⁽²³⁾ are members in particular⁽²⁴⁾.

Apostolic: "The Apostles who became wise by the divine Spirit decorated the Church as a lordly Bride, so that nothing worse could bother her and nothing better could be which ought to be added to the institution"⁽²⁵⁾.

As Christ declared, the Church is undefeated and even the gates of hell do not prevail against her⁽²⁶⁾. The Church was attacked,

1. I 174, 296C; I 178, 300A;
II 127, 565A-72C (eleven times)

2. IV 103, II 69CD

3. V 21, I 337A twice

4. II 246, 685A

5. I 205, 313A

6. III 394, I 033B

7. IV 5, I 053A

8. *ibid.* I 053AB twice

9. III 194, I 033B

10. IV 103, II 69C

11. IV 129, I 209C

12. II 246, 685AB

13. I 174, 296C

14. II 246, 685A: τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἁγίων τὸ ἐξ ὁρθῆς πίστεως καὶ πολιτείας ἀρίστης συγκεκροτημένον

15. III 195, 880C; IV 129, I 209C

16. III 195, 880CD

17. I 205, 313A

18. II 246, 685A

19. IV 103, II 69CD

20. *ibid.*

22. *ibid.*

23. V 21, I 337AB

24. IV 103, II 69C

25. III 394, I 033B

26. I 311, 364A

27. II 146, 593A

28. I 65, 225A

Ἐκκλησία ἐστίν.

but she was not defeated by anyone⁽¹⁾. And not only she was not defeated, but "her trophies are certain and brilliant throughout the earth and sea"⁽²⁾. Christ is the Lord and the Bridgroom of the Church⁽³⁾ and the Holy Spirit was guiding her⁽⁴⁾. The Church was given countless gifts decorating her⁽⁵⁾. "Let the spotless and virginal Church who possesses the correct Faith to God have the first rank; and let her be called perfect dove whose the worth is greater than that of all batallions"⁽⁶⁾.

10. The Sacraments

a) In general

The word *μυστήριον* occurs in Isidore but it means various things. Thus it means the great mystery of Christ's incarnation⁽⁷⁾, the delivery of the Eucharist at the last Supper⁽⁸⁾, Baptism⁽⁹⁾, etc. In the plural it means high doctrinal truths⁽¹⁰⁾, the mysteries of nature⁽¹¹⁾, etc. With regard to sacraments Isidore uses the word *μυστήρια*, but not distinctly. Thus he says *μυστήρια*, and does not name them⁽¹²⁾, or he names only Eucharist⁽¹³⁾. The sacraments are characterized as divine⁽¹⁴⁾, sacred⁽¹⁵⁾, and *ἁγία*⁽¹⁶⁾.

Isidore does not state how many sacraments there are. Balanos⁽¹⁷⁾ is not correct when saying that Isidore considers as sacraments mainly two, to wit: Baptism and Eucharist. The letter II 52, refers only to two sacraments, but other letters refer to other sacraments. From what Isidore says here and there, two general remarks are especially noteworthy: a) without sacraments salvation is impossible⁽¹⁸⁾. b) The sacraments are valid even when the clergymen who administer them are bad, sinful and unworthy of their office⁽¹⁹⁾. In more detail Isidore speaks of the following sacraments and as follows:

1. III 5, 732A
2. II 157, 609D
3. III 408, 1041B
4. III 408, 1041A
5. IV 100, 1165B
6. IV 5, 1053A
7. I 219, 320D; II 192, 640C
8. III 364, 1017B
9. I 125, 265D
10. I 24, 197A
11. II 81, 521C
12. IV 168, 1260C; IV 181, 1273B

13. I 170, 393C; II 52, 496A; IV 168, 1257C
14. I 170, 293C; II 52, 496A; III 340, 1000C; IV 168, 1260C; IV 181, 1273B; V 569, 1645D
15. III 195, 880C; III 340, 1000C; III 364, 1017; V 569, 1645B
16. III 340, 1000C; III 364, 1017A; IV 166, 1257C; V 569, 1645A
17. loc. cit. p. 66
18. II 52, 496A; V 569, 1645D
19. II 37, 480CD-81A four times; III 340, 1000C; V 569, 1644B-45B twice

b) Baptism

Baptism is by Isidore called just Baptism(1), holy(2), or divine(3), *νιοθεσία*(4), *καλιγγενεσία*(5) and divine *τελετή*(6). That Baptism is sacrament, there is only one piece of evidence: "...*Σκουδαίως τὰ παιδία βαπτίζωμεν. Ἰσως δυσωπηθῇ ὁ ἄγγελος τὸ μὴ σ τ ῆ ρ ι ο ν . Ἀντί βαπτίσματος γάρ τῇ περιτομῇ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπέχρη- το*"(7). He who is baptized is called *βαπτιζόμενος*(8), *τελούμενος*(9), *μυούμενος*(10) and *φωτιζόμενος*(11).

The reason for Baptism is Christ(12) and it is done in the name of the Holy Trinity(13). A man through Baptism is embodied in the body of Christ(14), that is to say he enters the Church. In two cases(15) Isidore speaks of the Baptism of infants. They must be baptized so nearly not only for the remission of the original sin, but also because through the Baptism a man is endowed and decorated with many and splendid gifts(16). By Baptism we are regenerated(17) and justified(18) and we become sons of God(19), because it is *λυτήριον ἁμαρτίας* and a symbol of incorruptibility(20). The honour we get by Baptism is royal(21). Those who pretend to live the true Christian life but are not sincere are not allowed to be baptized(22).

The letter which follows, deals with Baptism. We cite it thoroughly in English because it is the most important part of what Isidore says on the subject:

I. I 66, 225C; II 61, 504C; III 195, 880B; IV 204, 1292B

2. I 109, 256C

3. IV 181, 1273B

4. IV 100, 1165B; V 197, 1449C;

5. IV 168, 1260C; III 195, 880B

6. II 37, 480D; V 569, 1644D

7. I 125, 265CD

8. V 569, 1644A

9. II 137, 480C

10. *ibid.* 480D

11. *ibid.* 481A

12. V 197, 1449C

13. I 109, 256B

14. III 195, 880C

15. I 125, 265CD; III 195, 880B

16. II 37, 480AC; III 195, 880BC

17. II 52, 496A; III 195, 880C;

IV 168, 1260C

18. II 61, 504C

19. IV 100, 1165B; V 197, 1449C

20. I 66, 225D

21. IV 168, 1260C

22. IV 181, 1273B

To the Count Herminius
Concerning the grace of Holy Baptism

- 880B "Inasmuch as your magnificence wishing to learn why the infants being sinless are baptized wrote (me), I thought it necessary to reply. Some people, saying not important things, think that infants are baptized to be purified from the filth which our nature got through Adam's transgression. I believe that this really takes place but not only this (for, then, Holy Baptism would not be so important), but that many other gifts which very much exceed our nature are given. For an infant who was baptized, did not receive only the absolution of the sin, but he was decorated with divine gifts too. Because he was not only released from hell, but he laid aside every cunning and was regenerated from above (for Baptism, as if it were contrived by a machine, is a divine regeneration which exceeds thinking) and he was redeemed, he became holy, he was brought up to sonship, he was justified and became a joint-heir with the Only-Begotten, he was embodied to the body of Christ by sharing in the sacred sacraments and he now belongs to His flesh. And as head is united with body so was he who was baptized united with Christ. Signifying these truths, the divine Paul, the treasurer of Christ's thoughts said once: 'He gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church' ⁽¹⁾, that is to say, above all gifts which God gave to the Church, He gave Christ to be her head. And at another time Paul said: 'much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life' ⁽²⁾. He did not say 'grace' but 'abundance of grace', showing that we did not receive a medicine equivalent only to the wound as some men of little account who do not feel the great divine donation say; but also we have received beauty and honour and glory and offices which exceedingly excel our woth. Then, do not think, o friend, that Baptism releases only from sins but think that it causes sonship, divine relationship and many other gifts which have been said or omitted. For the king of all did not only redeem the nature which was captured, but He also brought and put this nature to the highest honour" ⁽³⁾.
- 880C
- 880D
- 88IA

1. Ephes. I, 22
2. Rom. 5, 17
3. III 195, 880B-88IA

c) Confirmation

The only one passage we found in Isidore's letters apparently relating to Confirmation, is this: "... Ἐπειδὴ πάντες τῷ Χριστοῦ ὀνόματι ἐσφραγίσθησαν καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁρμο- νίαν ἠνέσθησαν" (I). Does the word ἐσφραγίσθησαν indicate the sacrament which follows Baptism and is called χρίσμα or σφρα- γίς? It is probable. But it is equally probable that this pas- sage refers to Baptism which is also called σφραγίς (2).

d) The Eucharist

Words or phrases used by Isidore to indicate the sacra- ment of Eucharist, are the following: Τράπεζα Κυρίου (3), τράπεζα μυστικὴ (4), θεία μυστήρια (5), ἄχραντα μυστήρια (6), ἱερὰ μυστήρια (7), θείων μυστηρίων μετέληψις (8), θείων δώρων διακονία (9), θεῶν δωροφο- ρεῖν (10), θείας τελετῆς μυσταγωγία (11), θεία λειτουργία and καρπῶν εὐλογία (12), τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀληθινόν Πάσχα (13), Κοινωνία (14) and most probably τὰ ἅγια (15).

It is the Holy Spirit who renders τὸν ἄρτον τὸν κοινὸν i.e. the usual (common also stands well) bread Christ's own incar- nated body (16). The same divine Spirit also changes the wine into Christ's blood (17). The Holy Gifts appear to be the body and blood of a man (18), but we unhesitatingly find them the body of Christ (19) and the blood of Christ (20). The word θυσία relating to the Eucharist does not occur in Isidore, but we find many times the word θυσιαστήριον (21) which does not only simply mean the Church building, but it means the place where the divine sacraments (especially Eucharist) are offered.

The results of the gifts of the Eucharist are the incorru- ptibility which Jesus the Saviour having been risen from the

-
- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. I 205, 313A | |
| 2. Compare here the definition of Baptism given by St Basil the Great: "Ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ Βάπτισμα σφραγίς τῆς πίστεως, ἣ δὲ πίστις, θεότητος συγκατάθεσις. Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρότερον, εἶτα τῷ Βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι..." (Grn. I 392E-393) | |
| 3. I 170, 393C | 12. I 313, 364B |
| 4. I 109, 256C | 13. IV 162, 1248C |
| 5. I 170, 393C; II 52, 496A; | 14. I 170, 393D; I 228, 325A |
| III 340, 1000C; V 569, 1645D | 15. I 120, 264A |
| 6. III 340, 1000C; III 364, | 16. I 109, 256BC |
| 1017A, IV 168, 1257C | 17. I 313, 364, 3 |
| 7. III 340, 1000C; III 364, 1017A | 18. IV 166, 1257C |
| 8. I 228, 325A | 19. I 123, 265A; I 109, 256BC; |
| 9. I 123, 264D | I 219, 321A |
| 10. I 349, 381C | 20. I 313, 364B |
| 11. ibid. | 21. I 118, 261B; I 120, 264A; |
| | II 16; II 76; III 340; V 569 |

dead granted⁽¹⁾, the remission of evil things⁽²⁾, the union with Christ and the participation in His Realm⁽³⁾.

e) Priesthood

Apart from the word *ιερωσύνη* which occurs in many letters of Isidore, the following words and phrases are used by him, to signify the same thing: *ιερωσύνης υπόθεσις* (4), *ιερωσύνης λειτουργία* (5), *ιερατική* (6), *ιερουργία* (7), *ἀρχή* (8), *λειτουργίας διαχείρισις* (9), *θεία λειτουργία* (10), *πατρική κηδεμονία* (11), *ἀποστολικός θεσμός* (12), *ἀποστολική ἀξία* (13), *ἀποστολικόν ἄλφειμα* (14), *πρῶτον θεῖον* (15), *μυσταγωγία* (16), *χρῆμα ἀγγέλοις πρέπον* (17), *χειροτονία* (18). For obtaining Priesthood Isidore uses the verb *χειροτονῶ* in various forms (19) and the phrases *εἰς ιερωσύνην προχειρίζεσθαι* (20), *τῇ ιερωσύνῃ ἐπιπηδᾶν* (21), *τὰς χειροθεσίας τῆς μυσταγωγίας ἐπιτρέπειν* (22), *τὴν τῆς ιερωσύνης λειτουργίαν κληροῦσθαι* (23). Deposition is meant by: *καθαιρεθῆναι* (24). To practice Priesthood is indicated by the words *ιεραθεῖν* (25), *θεῶν ιερατεῦειν* (26), *ιερατικὴν* or *ιερωσύνην μεταχειρίζεσθαι* (27), *ιερωσύνην μετέρχεσθαι* (28), *ιερωσύνην χορῶμαι* (29). Priesthood is characterized: *πολύφωτος* (30), *εὐαγεστάτη* (31), *ὁσιωτάτη* (32) and as the *τιμιώτατον* of everything which exists (33).

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. I 123, 265A | 21. IV 73, 1133B |
| 2. I 219, 321A | 22. I 26, 200A |
| 3. I 228, 325A | 23. II 50, 492D |
| 4. I 50, 213A | 24. V 569, 1645A |
| 5. II 50, 492D | 25. II 52, 493C; V 216, 1392D; |
| 6. I 156, 288B | V 268, 1493A |
| 7. III 17, 744B | 26. I 156, 288B; I 149, 284A |
| 8. II 264, 696C | 27. I 156, 288B; II 152, 493C-96A |
| 9. <i>ibid.</i> | 28. II 152, 496AB |
| 10. V 379, 1553C | 29. V 268, 1493A; V 216, 1393A |
| 11. II 234, 672C | 30. I 151, 284C |
| 12. III 394, 1033B | 31. V 379, 1533C (twice) |
| 13. <i>ibid.</i> | 32. <i>ibid.</i> |
| 14. <i>ibid.</i> 1033C | 33. II 52, 493C |
| 15. V 276, 1497A | |
| 16. I 26, 200A | |
| 17. V 276, 1497C | |
| 18. V 379, 1553D | |
| 19. II 264, 697A; IV 181, 1273B; | |
| V 216, 1393A; V 357, 1541A; | |
| V 569, 1644A-45A | |
| 20. V 276, 1497C | |

In a letter⁽¹⁾ Isidore deals with the ἄφαιστα and ἀνέγκτα μυστήρια, without naming them. But the episode of Uzziah⁽²⁾ to which he is referring signifies that he means Priesthood. Thus he considers and names the Priesthood sacrament, which is also ἀπόρητον⁽³⁾. Priesthood was founded by the Apostles and hence it is an apostolic office⁽⁴⁾. Referring to the successors of the Apostles he says that those save the ἀποστολικὸν χαρακτήρα who live as the Apostles lived⁽⁵⁾. Since Priesthood is above royalty⁽⁶⁾ and since angels are worthy of Priesthood⁽⁷⁾, it follows that those who are not pure are not worthy of it⁽⁸⁾. It is only through Priesthood that we are regenerated and share in the divine sacraments without which we cannot be saved⁽⁹⁾.

Many letters were written against simony and describing the duties of Clergy. Isidore gives testimony for all the degrees of Priesthood: Subdeacon, deacon (also archdeacon), presbyter (also archimandrite) and bishop (also archbishop).

1) Repentance

The word μετάνοια which occurs in many cases⁽¹⁰⁾ stands for repentance. Other words used by Isidore to indicate the same thing are: Μεταγνώσις⁽¹¹⁾, δεύτερον λουτρόν and ἐκούσιος κολυμβήθρα⁽¹²⁾, ἐπιστροφή⁽¹³⁾, ἐπάνοδος⁽¹⁴⁾, ἱατρικὸν κοινὸν⁽¹⁵⁾, ἐκάνορθωσις⁽¹⁶⁾, ἐπιστήμη⁽¹⁷⁾. To repent is meant by μετανόω in various forms⁽¹⁸⁾, γνῶσιμαχῶ⁽¹⁹⁾, μεταγινώσκω⁽²⁰⁾, and ἐξανίσταμαι⁽²¹⁾.

We did not find any direct passage in Isidore which could declare that he considered repentance as sacrament. But, apart from the great number of letters dealing with repentance, there is a passage which says that repentance got its strength from

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. I 24, 197AB | 12. I 408, 409C |
| 2. II Chron. 26, 16ff | 13. ibid. |
| 3. I III, 257A | 14. IV 163, 1252C-53A |
| 4. III 394, 1033BC | 15. III 177, 868D |
| 5. III 17, 744C; V 21, 1337C | 16. V 260, 1488C |
| 6. IV 213, 1313A | 17. V 253, 1485A |
| 7. V 276, 1497C | 18. III 54, 768AB; IV 60, 1117D; |
| 8. IV 181, 1273B | IV 96, 1161A; IV 101, 1168C |
| 9. II 52, 496AB | IV 149, 1236A; V 260, 1488B |
| 10. I 408, 409C; II 145, 589D; | 19. I 381, 397B; III 54, 768AB; |
| III 157, 852C; IV 26, 1077A | IV 149, 1236A |
| IV 74, 1133C; IV 96, 1161A; | 20. IV 26, 1077D; IV 47, 1097C; |
| V 120, 1396A; V 253, 1485A; | IV 60, 1117D; V 307, 1516A |
| V 260, 1488B; V 307, 1516A | 21. I 381, 397B |
| 11. I 200, 312A; I 240, 329C; | |
| IV 391, 1089C | |

the Judge: "... ἅλλα ταῦτα πάντα τὰ κακά μετὰ νοῖα εἰλικρινῆς θεραπεύειν ἐπίσταται, παρὰ τοῦ Κριτοῦ τὴν ἐπιστήμην ταύτην ἐγκεισμένην" (1). Depending on this passage and on the following testimonies, we venture to think that Isidore bears witness for repentance to be a sacrament.

The divine Philanthropy calls to repentance (2) and releases from sins (3) through repentance. Faults are cured by Repentance (4). The tears of repentance are as sweet to God as incense (5). Repentance is possible (6) but not to all (7). The ἱατρικόν is common but the cure is not common (8). God must help (9) and man must wish it and work for it. Then repentance becomes easy (10) and its proofs are in the many examples we learn from the Scriptures (11). Repentance is good and worthy of praise (12). Inasmuch as after the curing of the sins by Repentance ἡ εὐλαΐα ἐλέγχει τὸ πάθος (13), restoration to the ancient beauty is achieved by many pains (14). Repentance must be sincere (15). Repentance is possible in this present life and it is not possible in the life to come (16).

g) Marriage

The word γάμος occurs in many cases (17). It is accompanied by the words honourable (18), legal (19), apparent (20), good (21). It also occurs in the plural (22) under the same meaning. Other words used by Isidore for marriage are: δεσμός (23), συνάφεια (24).

-
- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. V 253, 1485A | 17. II 133, 576C; II 144, 589C; |
| 2. V 260, 1488B; V 307, 1516B | II 192, 640D; III 76, 784B; |
| 3. IV 14, 1064A; IV 47, 1097C | III 351, 1005D-1009C (nine |
| 4. II 145, 589D; V 120, 1396A | times); IV 112, 1180A (thrice) |
| 5. I 200, 312A | IV 114, 1188B; IV 119, 1193C; |
| 6. I 381, 397B; II 72, 516BC | IV 129, 1209CD; IV 192, 1280C- |
| 7. I 408, 409C | 1281AB (thrice); V 218, 1461B; |
| 8. III 177, 868D | V 253, 1484D |
| 9. I 408, 409C; II 72, 51620 | 18. III 351, 1008C-09C; IV 112, |
| 10. I 381, 397B | 1180A; IV 119, 1193C; IV 129, |
| 11. II 72, 516BC | 1209CD; IV 192, 1280C; V 218, |
| 12. I 408, 409C | 1461B; V 253, 1484D; IV 114, |
| 13. III 157, 852C | 1188B |
| 14. III 157, 852C; III 177, 868D | 19. IV 129, 1209CD; V 253, 1484D |
| 15. IV 47, 1097C; V 253, 1485A | 20. III 76, 784B |
| 16. II 108, 549B; IV 74, 1133C | 21. II 133, 576C |
| | 22. III 76, 784CD; III 351, 1008A |
| | 23. I 213, 317A; III 351, 1009A |
| | 24. I 213, 317A |

ἐνθεσμος συνάφεια(1), συμβίωσις(2), θεσμός(3), παιδογονίας θεσμός(4), γάμου συνθήκη(5).

Men were given marriage by God(6) and therefore marriage which is a legal union(7) is not prohibited by God. Marriage is not bad(8), but it is a legal and moderate ἀγαθόν(9). Marriage is necessary for procreation(10). The Church considers marriage as honourable(11). Marriage is good, but virginity is better(12). Isidore thinks that virginity comes first, abstinence follows and the honourable marriage comes last(13). Marriage stands between virginity and fornication and therefore the praise for marriage is moderate(14). Virginity differs from marriage as heaven from the earth and soul from body(15). In one and the same letter Isidore says that marriage is an obstacle to salvation(16) and that marriage can save those who keep it honourable(17). Marriage is indissoluble and divorce is allowed to be given only in the case of adultery. In the marriage man and wife become one body(18), and although they have the right of carnal coition, they are not allowed to do it always(19). If marriage is broken by death, the remaining spouse is not recommended to be married again(20).

Isidore's letters are printed without any order; they were written without any order appropriate for any systematic exposition or purpose. His conceptions, valuable or ordinary, on various subjects, are scattered and hidden here and there. Thus he who tries to collect his opinions and to put them in the right position referring to a concrete theme, does the same work as he who makes mosaics. Indeed, we believe that the collection of Isidore's conceptions related to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, constitute a good 'mosaic' of ideas, which can be put beside the 'mosaic' of Isidore's interpretations. These two parts of the same 'mosaic' together with the sketch of Isidore's life we wrote in the first part of the present Thesis, remind us of some beautiful mosaics of saints which are still preserved in many ancient Byzantine Churches or Monasteries: 'Mosaics' of saints who 'have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts'(21), who lived in the Spirit, walked in the Spirit, spoke and wrote 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power'(22), who seem as dying and behold they live.-

1. I 413, 412C
2. I 213, 317A
3. III 76, 784BD
4. III 351, 1008A
5. III 76, 785A
6. IV 192, 1280C
7. I 413, 412C
8. III 351, 1009A
9. ibid.
10. IV 192, 1280C
11. IV 112, 1180A

12. II 133, 576C
13. II 144, 589C
14. V 218, 1461B; V 253, 1485A
15. III 351, 1008C-09C
16. ibid. 1008B
17. ibid. 1008D
18. IV 129, 1209CD
19. IV 119, 1193C
20. I 213, 317A
21. Gal. 5, 24
22. 1Cor. 2, 4