

ST ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

By
Rev. C. FOUSKAS

Chapter V GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. 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 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 Intro-

duction' 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 interpreted 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: 1) Allegorical method¹: (a. Prophecies which refer to Christ. b. Mystical interpretations c. tropological ones). ii) Grammaticohistorical method² (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'; 44 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

1. loc. cit. pp. 32-47.

2. ibid. pp. 56-107.

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 monograph¹ 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. Heumann² and Niemeyer³ cite little more than one dozen examples from Isidore's interpretations. Therefore their results cannot be of general importance. The number of their examples is too limited and the selection, indicates their prejudice against Isidore. Diamantopoulos⁴ 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 number⁵.

2. On St. Isidore'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. 12,41 and Lev. 14, 10f 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 ἐρμηνείᾳ, of the Scriptures, I shall give a direct answer lacking in symbolisms⁶. 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

1. De Arte hermeneutica S. Isidori Pelusiotae, Cracoviae 1878.

2. loc. cit. 22-25

3. loc. cit. pp 95-102

4. loc. cit. pp. 621-26/1926.

5. Unfortunately we were not able to see Joasaph's work on Isidore's interpretations

6. III 84,789C.

mystical interpretations and change the letter into the Spirit, although they many times say some beneficial things to those who hear them...»¹. 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...»².

To distinguish allegorical from literal interpretation, Isidore uses some characteristic words or phrases. Thus allegory is meant by ἀλληγορία³, or θεωρία⁴ or τὸ πνεῦμα⁵, in opposition to the γράμμα or ἀπόρρητος ἔννοια⁶, or βαθύτερος καὶ εἰλικρινέστερος νοῦς⁷, or κεκρυμμένη καὶ παρακεκαλυμμένη διάνοια⁸, or κεκρυμμένα αἰνίγματα⁹, or κεκρυμμένη ἀλήθεια¹⁰, τοῖς παχέσι κεκαλυμμένη τοῖς δὲ λεπτοῖς γεγυμνωμένη¹¹. 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 μεϊζόνων πραγμάτων¹², or because Moses διὰ σκιῶν καὶ συμβόλων τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑπέγραψε¹³, or because σκιὰν εἶχεν ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ οὐκ αὐτὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων¹⁴.

Despite all these conceptions, Isidore is not a representative of allegory. His allegorical interpretations of the N.T. are only 15%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'¹⁵.

In opposition to the πνεῦμα which referring to interpretation means the allegorical type, Isidore uses the word γράμμα¹⁶, which signifies

1. II 81, 521C.

2. IV 117, 1192B.

3. III 84, 789C; IV 129, 1209C.

4. II 81, 521C; III 84, 789C; IV 117, 1192A; IV 203, 1292A.

5. II 81, 521C.

6. I 360, 388A.

7. IV 149, 1233C.

8. I 53, 216B.

9. I 193, 305C.

10. II 138, 580C.

11. I 71, 232A.

12. I 362, 388B.

13. IV 157, 1241B.

14. IV 141, 1221C; cf. Hebr. 10,1.

15. Ephes. 4,12.

16. II 81, 524C.

the literal interpretations. Other words which denote this type of interpretation and which have been used by Isidore, are: ἡ ἐρμηνεία¹, or τὸ πρᾶγμα², or interpretation καθ' ἱστορίαν³, or προχείρω⁴, or πρόχειρος νοῦς⁵ or πρόχειρος ἐκλήψις⁵.

Besides allegory, Isidore knows the grammatico-historical interpretation⁷, 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»⁸. In some cases he obliges us to combine allegory and literal exposition⁹.

The sum of Isidore's literal interpretations are 85⁰/₁₀, 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 grammaticohistorical interpretations rather than the allegorical ones. This by no means means that Isidore belonged to the Exegetical allegorical School of Alexandria, as Diamantopoulos¹⁰ insists. Neither does it mean that Isidore belonged to the Exegetical School of Antioch, as Batiffol¹¹, Bardenhewer¹², Aigrain¹³ and others think. We personally think that along with Athanasius the Great or Basil the Great¹⁴, Isi-

1. III 84, 789C; IV 17, 1064D-1065A; III 18, 744C.

2. III 84, 789C; IV 157, 1241C.

3. IV 203, 1289D-92A.

4. I 53, 216B.

5. IV 203, 1289B.

6. I 310, 388A.

7. III 84, 789C.

8. II 81, 524C.

9. IV 203, 1289D-92A.

10. loc. cit. 1926/624.

11. loc. cit.

12. Patrology, p. 379.

13. loc. cit. p. 16-7.

14. cf Basil: in Ps. XXVIII 3, Garn. I 167E; Τάχα δὲ καὶ μυστικώτερον... in Ps. XXIX I, Garn. I, 177D; Καὶ εἶκε κατὰ μὲν τὸ σωματικόν... κατὰ δὲ τὸ νοητόν... in Ps. XXXII 6, Garn. I 196B; Ἐξήγησίς ἐστι... 197B: Δυνατὸν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ πάθους καιρὸν ἀναγαγεῖν ταῦτα. in Ps XXXIII 13, Garn. I 223C. Ἡότερον δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως μείναι, καὶ ἀρκεσθῆναι τῇ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον προσπιπτούσῃ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ἡμῶν ἐννοεῖται...; 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. 21,33; Adversus Evnomium III 7 Garn. I, 394C-395 etc.

dore 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 mistakes¹. Schroeckh's² conceptions are similar to Humann'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»³. Bareill⁴ and Diamantopoulos⁵ 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 Simon⁶ 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»⁷. Kurtz⁸ 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». Balanos⁹ 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.

1. loc. cit. p. 22-5.

2. loc. cit. p. 526f.

3. loc. cit. p. 100.

4. DTC VIII, 90.

5. loc. cit. 1926/627.

6. *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 tant du Vieux que du Nouveau Testament».

7. loc. cit. p. 108: «...illum in eruendo sensu grammatico-historico non solum eruditum et solertem interpretem fuisse, sed etiam insigni acumine ingenii praeditum...»

8. loc. cit. I 286.

9. lo. cit. p. 60-1.

P.A. Schmid sees Isidore's strength in Exegesis¹ and says that he was an eminent Exegete² 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 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 ten³ in number out of 346 of the N.T. There are also two⁴ 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.

1. loc. cit. p. 82: «Isidors Staerke liegt in der Exegese».

2. loc. cit. p. 2.

3. Matt. 3,4; 5,25; 22,21-25, 70-4; Mk. 6,48; Lk. 4,20; John 14,31; Acts 28,15; Phil. 4,3; Hebr. 7,11.

4. Matt. 13,33; 24,19.

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 Niemeyer¹, Glück², Bouvy³, Balanos⁴, Diamantopoulos⁵ and P. A. Schmid⁶. Others who wrote something noteworthy with regard to Isidore's teaching are Du Pin⁷, Ceillier⁸ and Bareill⁹. 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. 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; 640-45; 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 *ὑπερφύλης* and *μηδαμόθεν ἄλλωσιμος*¹. The divine Nature is *ἀκατανόμαστος*². The knowledge of the essence of God is neither necessary nor possible³. There are not natural proofs for the *ὑπὲρ φύσιν* truths⁴. The word *πῶς* is not applicable to God⁵. «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 it⁸ 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 Faith, «for we must know and believe that God exists and we must not bother about what He is»¹⁰. On the other hand the Scriptures give us the accurate and splendid faith concerning God¹¹.

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, 893G; III 232, 913C.

8. II 93, 537B.

9. II 56, 500A: cf IV 126, 1204C.

10. II 299, 728A.

11. *ibid.* 725C.

c) What is God?

God is the supreme being «for nothing is above Him»¹. «God, being light ἀτίδιον is ἐναρχος»². The word ἀθάνατος is also applicable to that which was born and does not die; The word ἀφθαρτος is also applied to those which have been created and which do not decay. Therefore God is ἀτίδιος i.e. without origin and without end, «for the ἀτίδιον is mainly peculiar to the divine essence. The ἀτιδιώτης is ἀειζωότης»³. God is almighty but His omnipotence has no relation with evil things⁴ for He can do everything but He wishes the best⁵, that is He wishes and does what are appropriate for Him⁶. God is the Creator of angels, of waters and clouds⁷, of animals⁸ and of man⁹ and He is Ποιητής καὶ Ἄρχων καὶ Ἐφορος καὶ Προνοητής καὶ Κηδεμών»¹⁰. God is φοβερός, but He is also ἀγαθός for every one¹¹. He is εὐεργετικός, δεκτικός τῶν γνησίως μεταγινωσκόντων, ἀπαραλόγιστος and μελίχιος¹². He is not the cause of evil things¹³. God is just¹⁴, μακρόθυμος¹⁵, Whose patience is insuperable¹⁶. He also is Philanthropist¹⁷. «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»¹⁸, in other words God is omniscient. God is perfect, ἀναλλοίωτος and ἀμετάβλητος, «καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχει» for He is unchangeable and superior to eve-

1. IV 183, 1276A.

2. I 248, 333A.

3. III 149, 841B; III 18, 744C; III 63, 772D.

4. II 117, 557C; IV 47, 1097C.

5. δύναται μὲν πάντα βούλεται δὲ ἄριστα... cf I 353, 384C: Ποίησις Θεοῦ, αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἡ βούλησις.

6. II 117, 557D: Τὰ πρόποντα Αὐτοῦ.

7. I 343, 380AB.

8. II 119, 560B.

9. III 95, 801A; 804AD; III 115, 556C.

10. II 299, 725D.

11. IV 47, 1097D; I 343, 380A. I 388, 401B; II 85, 528C.

12. IV 47, 1097C.

13. I 240, 329B.

14. II 217, 660C; II 222, 661C; II 279, 709C; III 71, 780C; IV 47, 1097C;

V 366, 1548C.

15. II 160, 613D; II 222, 661C; V 649, 1633C.

16. III 196, 881A.

17. III 71, 780C; V 260, 1488C.

18. IV 47, 1097C; V 368, 1548C.

ry change¹. God is sinless². God is ἀπαθής³ «for the Deity not only does not suffer, πάσχειν οὐ δύναται, but even is not touched or is not seen»⁴.

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»⁵. The order and the harmony of the world on the other hand, proves that God exists, «for where there is τάξις, there a τᾶξιαρχος is necessary»⁶. «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»⁷.

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 ἐν ἰδίαις ὑποστάσεσι γνωριζομένην... 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»⁸. The adored and blessed Trinity is not a certain τριπρόσωπος ὑπόστασις, as Sabellius thought, says Isidore. Deity is one but the ὑποστάσεις are three. The οὐσία of Deity is one, and the three Persons of the Holy Trinity share in the same οὐσία, but ὑπόστασις is a different thing and every Holy Person has its own ὑπόστασις⁹. We do not accept, Isidore carries on, that «the one God is only

1. V 359, 1541C and 1544A.

2. I 435, 421C.

3. IV 166, 1257A.

4. I 124, 265A.

5. V 28, 1344D-45A.

6. IV 186, 1277A; IV 58, 1113C.

7. IV 186, 1277A.

8. I 67, 228A.

9. I 247, 332D-33A.

Father, as the Jews think. We enlarge the Deity into a holy and consubstantial Trinity¹. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is found even in the O.T. and even Philo and others understood it². «Those who are called in the sacred Scriptures ἐνικῶς, characterize the divine Nature; for the Holy and most royal Trinity is consubstantial. But those who are called in plural number, τῆς τῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐστὶ διαφορᾶς. For the Deity is enlarged to three ἰδιότητας and again is diminished to one οὐσίαν in order that neither is polytheism understood because of the διαφορὰ τῶν φύσεων³, 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»⁴. «The blessed Trinity is ἀίδιος 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 κρεῖττον καὶ πάσης ἐπινοίας ὑψηλότερον⁵. For if the Deity with regard to ἰδιότητες is divided, διαιρεῖται, 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 ὑποστάσεις⁶. In other words the divine ὑποστάσεις of the Holy Trinity are equal with themselves because the essence of the divine Trinity is one⁷ and because the divine and most royal Trinity is consubstantial⁸. Thus we have ἔνωσιν of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit⁹.

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 γεννήτωρ¹⁰, but He did not become Father at a certain time: He always is Father. «If God is always the same without

1. II 142, 585A; cf. III 27, 748D-49A.

2. II 443, 585BC. See the whole letter which is very important.

3. Φύσις here must mean ὑπόστασις or ἰδιότης or πρόσωπον.

4. III 112, 817AB.

5. cf. II 18, 744D-45A; III 63, 772D.

6. III 149, 841BC.

7. I 59, 220C.

8. III 112, 817A.

9. I 97, 249A.

10. III 334, 992C.

any change, if He does not get anything or if nothing is added to Him, then *ἀεὶ ἐστὶ καὶ Πατήρ*, He always, is Father. And if He is always Father, He always had the Son, *ἀεὶ ἔσχε τὸν Υἱόν*. Therefore the Son is *συν-αἰδιος* with the Father¹. And if the Son is *συναἰδιος* 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 *ἀχρόνως* and *ἀπαθῶς* from the paternal *ιδιότης*, 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 *γεννήτωρ* and the 'equal' since Christ is God and consubstantial³. Elsewhere the Father is called «God and Father»⁴, or *Δεσπότης*⁵.

c) The Son.

The greatest doctrinal theme which occupy 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 *πολυ-ώνυμος* is the characterization of the Son 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: *«Χριστὸς δὲ ὁ πάντων Ποιητὴς καὶ Πατὴρ καὶ Θεὸς καὶ Σωτὴρ»*⁷.

i. The *αἰδιος* and *ἀπαθὴς γέννησις* of the Son from the Father.

The most important letter on this subject is that addressed to the

1. I 241, 329C.

2. John 14, 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.

deacon Elias and dealing with John 1,1. Isidore says: «The Scriptures call 'birth' of Christ His $\xi\chi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\tau\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ and superior to any reason or thought $\pi\rho\acute{o}\delta\omicron\nu$ from the Father, not in order to signify some passion, but in order to establish the $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$, 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 $\acute{\alpha}\xi\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ of the Son: 'and the Word was God'. All these are so declared in order that having learned the $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$ from the Son, the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ from the Word, the $\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\eta\tau\alpha$ with the Father from His being with God, and His $\acute{\alpha}\xi\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ because He is God; and having expelled from every name that which is inappropriate, that is to say, having expelled the $\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ from the Son, the $\acute{\alpha}\nu\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ from the Word, we might know and adore Christ as God $\acute{\alpha}\tau\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$, 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 $\sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ with the Father. We also find that «birth is mainly applied to the Son where as it is improperly applied to other creatures. Birth is applied to the Son because of the truth and consubstantiality, whereas it is applied to creatures because of honour and adoption. For He, having wished, gave birth to us $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ »³. In another letter Isidore declares that the «Word $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\eta$ or $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon$ »⁴.

ii. 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, $\xi\mu\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\nu$, 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 $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$, i.e. an unexpected gain or find, then Christ

1. IV 142, 1224AB.

2. I 241, 329C.

3. III 31, 753A.

4. III 141, 837BC.

could not humiliate Himself, since His subordination¹ could be in advance a judgement for His office. But inasmuch as He was equal ἐκ φύσεως, by His Nature, and had His εὐγένειαν i.e. brilliant origin essentially and not granted by grace, He did not avoid humiliating Himself². '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»³. Christ is not «ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος» endowed with divine grace, but He is the only-begotten Son Who wished to be incarnated⁴. Christ is God⁵.

iii. The equality and consubstantiality of the Son with the Father.

Interpreting i Cor. 1,24 '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»⁶. On John 14,28 'my Father is greater than I', Isidore says that «the 'greater' can stand because the Father is γεννήτωρ but also the 'equal' stands well because the Son is God consubstantial»⁷, 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»⁸. The phrase 'the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do'⁹, does not mean that the Father is greater than the Son, but «it declares the ἰσοτιμίαν and the ἰσοσθενές and the ὁμοούσιον»¹⁰ of the Son with the Father. The Son and Father are one in glory and in essen-

1. The text in Migne has: «ἵνα μὴ ἡ ὑπερισσεῖα πρόκριμα ποιήσῃ τῇ ἀξίᾳ». The meaning of this phrase is obscure; there is no word ὑπερισσεῖα. If we will change this word into ἀκρίβεια of which 'subordination' is a meaning, then this line could make sense.

2. IV 22, 1072AB.

3. I 139, 276A.

4. II 157, 612B; IV 166, 1257AB.

5. I 405, 409A; III 334, 992BD; IV 142, 1224A; IV 166, 1260A.

6. II 143, 585D.

7. III 334, 992CD.

8. I 422, 417AB; cf I 473, 441A; III 342, 1001B.

9. John 5,19.

10. III 335, 997A.

ce: Christ promised¹ 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 glory in which the Father is, but showing² 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 one³. «For everything which the Father has belongs also to the Son and vice versa»⁴. Christ is not «an interpreter of the Father, but He is Λόγος ἐνυπόστατος and has His own ιδιότητα»⁵. Since the Father and the Son are of the same substance, They also have the same will. «Μία ἄρα οὐσία Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ ὡςπερ θέλησις»⁶.

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, «Θεὸς ὢν ἀληθῶς, γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῶς»⁷. 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»⁸. Christ did not become a κατὰ δόκησιν man⁹, but «having been incarnated in and from His Mother, He became ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν similar with us in everything but without sin»¹⁰. «He who together with the Father reigns and keeps control of the supermundane things and administers the early things was incarnated»¹¹. It is our

1. Matt. 16,27.

2. Instead of περιστάς which the Migne's edition has, we prefer Altemps' co-dex which has παριστάς, 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 δεῖκνύς, ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκείνῃ τῇ δόξῃ, φησὶν, ἥξει, ὡς μίαν αὐτὴν ὑποπτεύεσθαι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν».

3. III 166, 860AB.

4. II 138, 581B.

5. III 141, 837BC.

6. I 353, 384C; cf also I 67; 246; 389; III 27;31; 112; 149; 342; IV 99.

7. I 303, 357C.

8. I 323, 369B: «Ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἀληθῶς, οὔτε θ' ἦν-τραπεῖς, καὶ θ' οὐκ ἦν προσλαβὼν, ἐκ φύσεων δυοῖν ὁ εἰς ὑπάρχων Υἱός, ἀναρχος καὶ ἀπέραντος πρόσφατος καὶ αἰδιος».

9. I 102, 252C.

10. I 121, 264A; I 123, 197A; I 289, 352C.

11. IV 166, 1256B.

God and Saviour¹, or God the Word², or simply God³, or the divine Essence⁴ who was incarnated. Christ remained ἀτρέπτος i.e. unchangeable when He was incarnated⁵, «for God, having been incarnated οὐ τέτραπται, οὐτε συγχέχεται, οὐτε διήρηται i.e. He was not changed, neither has He been confused nor divided. But He is one and the same ἄναρχος and ἀίδιος Son, the same after incarnation as He was before it»⁶. Christ became man «ἐκὼν, willing, to regenerate the people by His incarnation»⁷. The incarnation of Christ is an οἰκονομία which He did «for the salvation of the sinful men»⁸. The passion of Christ on the Cross «reached the flesh»⁹ and not His deity.

v. The two Natures of Christ.

«The divine Nature of the Son is ἀνέφικτος to every human mind»¹⁰. The great mystery of the divine οἰκονομία¹¹, i.e. the Deity's and Manhood's union in Christ, happened ἀρρήτως¹², or ἀφράστως¹³ and therefore «the ineffably united God with the cheapness of the apparent flesh is with difficulty conceived and is difficult to look at»¹⁴. Two 'things', πράγματα¹⁵, were united in Christ: The Deity and Manhood. Isidore expresses this truth by the following phrases:

	Deity	Manhood
I 10,185B:	Θεός	ἄνθρωπος γέγονε
I 23,197A:	Ἀληθῶς δὲ (ὦν καὶ) Θεός	ἀληθῶς (ἀληθῆς) γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος
I 42,299A:	Θεία οὐσία	ἡ ἐξ ἡμῶν αὐτῇ ἐνωθεῖσα ἀναμάρτη- τος σὰρξ
»	Ἀρρητος τοῦ Λό- γου ἕνωσις	πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον

1. I 109, 256B.

2. IV 64, 1121B.

3. I 404, 408C.

4. I 42, 209A.

5. I 416, 413B.

6. I 419, 416C.

7. I 256, 336D-37A.

8. I 236, 328; I 453, 432B.

9. II 132, 576A.

10. I 416, 413B.

11. I 219, 320D; II 192, 640C.

12. I 59, 221A.

13. I 219, 321A.

14. I 59, 221A.

15. I 248, 333B.

I 59,221A:	Ὁ ἡνωμένος ἀρρή- τως Θεός	τῇ εὐτελείᾳ τῆς φαινομένης σαρκὸς
»	Θεότης	σαρκωθεῖσα
I 109,256B:	Ὁ Θεός καὶ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν	ἐνανθρωπήσας
I 124,265A:	Θεοῦ	σαρκωθέντος... τῇ προσλήψει τῆς σαρκὸς
I 182,301A:	Τῷ βυθῷ τῆς Θεό- τητος ἵναι	ὁ Κύριος τῆς δόξης
I 193,305C:	Τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρα	τὴν ἐναμάρτητον φύσιν ἀναμαρτήτως δεξάμενον
I 219,320D-21A:	Τὸ πῦρ τῆς θείας οὐσίας	σαρκὶ ἀφράστως συνεπλάκη
I 248,333A:	Ἡ ἀναρχος Θεότης	κοινωνία τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης πτωχείας
I 303,357C:	Θεὸς ὢν ἀληθῶς	γένονεν ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῶς
I 310,361C:	Θεός	καταβῆναι φιλανθρώπως ἡυδόκησε
I 323,369B:	Ὁ ἀληθὴς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός	ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἀληθῶς
»	Υἱὸς ἀναρχος, ἀ- πέραντος, αἰδῖος	πρόσφατος
I 344,380B:	Ὁ Θεός	διὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος
I 360,388A:	Τῷ οἰκείῳ πυρὶ τῆς Θεότητος, ὁ Κύριος	τὴν ζύμην τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου φυράματος ένώσας καὶ καθάρας
I 405,409A:	Ὁ Λόγος	σὰρξ ἀληθὴς
I 419,416C:	Ὁ Θεός	ἐνανθρωπήσας
I 436,421D:	Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ¹	ἐνσαρκος ἐπιφάνεια
I 496,452C:	Θεῖα φύσις	σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα
II 192,640D:	Τὸ ἀφθαρτον ἡνώθη	τῷ φθαρτῷ
III 95,804A:	Μονογενὴς Θεός	ἐπιδημήσας
III 130,820C:	Θεότης	ἐνανθρώπησας
III 329,988C:	Ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ Λόγος	ἀνθρωπεῖαν 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: Ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν φύσεων προσκυνούμενος

1. I 436 is identical with IV 229.

2. I 416, 413B; I 436, 421D; II 157, 612B; II 192, 640D.

3. I 402, 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, 880C.

ibid. note 23: ἐν ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς φύσεσι προσκυνούμενος¹

I 236,328C: Δὺο φύσεων ἕνωσις

I 303, 357D-60A: Ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἷς Ὑῖδς ὧν Θεοῦ

I 323, 369B: Ἐκ φύσεων δυοῖν ὁ εἷς ὑπάρχων Ὑῖδς

I 405, 409A: Ἐν ἐκατέραις ταῖς φύσεσιν εἷς ὑπάρχει Ὑῖδς (τοῦ) Θεοῦ

To signify the union of the two Natures in Christ, Isidore uses the words: ἕνωσις², ἐνωθεῖσα³, ἡνωμένος⁴, ἡνώθη⁵, ἡνῶται⁶, ἐνωθείς⁷, ἐνώσας⁸, ἐνώσει (verb)⁹, εἷς¹⁰, κοινωνία¹¹, συναρμολόγησις¹², συμπλοκή¹³, κατὰβασις¹⁴. The union of the two Natures in Christ is perfect¹⁵, or true¹⁶, or it happened truly¹⁷ and neither division nor confusion is applied to this union¹⁸. This union happened φιλανθρώπως¹⁹.

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»²⁰.

d) The Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is called by Isidore: Πνεῦμα²¹, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον²², Παν-

1. This form is more correct than the former one.

2. I 42, 209A; I 236, 328C; I 247, 333A.

3. I 42, 209A; IV 436, 421D.

4. I 59, 221A.

5. I 124, 265A; II 192, 640D.

6. I 182, 301B.

7. I 199, 309C.

8. I 360, 388A.

9. I 248, 333B.

10. I 23, 197A; I 199, 309C; I 323, 369B; I 405, 409A.

11. I 249, 333A.

12. I 199, 309C.

13. I 219, 321A.

14. I 310, 361C.

15. I 193, 305C.

16. I 405, 409A.

17. I 23, 197A; I 303, 357C; I 323, 369B.

18. I 419, 416C.

19. I 124, 265A; I 310, 361C.

20. I 360, 388A.

21. I 59, 221A; I 97, 249B; III 77, 785A.

22. I 59, 220C-21A twice; I 80, 221BC six times; I 97, 228A; I 106, 253C; I 109, 256C; I 250, 333C; II 5, 461A; III 106, 612BC twice; III 252, 932B twice; III 260, 944A.

ἅγιον¹, θεῖον², προσκυνούμενον³, Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ⁴, Δάκτυλος Θεοῦ⁵, Παράκλητος⁶.

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 ποιητὸν or κτιστὸν or τῆς δούλης φύσεως, but He is συγγενὲς 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)⁷. If the Holy Spirit is δοῦλον, let Him not be counted with the Lord. If He is κτίσμα, 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 δογματιστῆς of such truths, Who accurately teaches those truths referring to His own essence)⁸. «The Comforter is κοινωνὸς of the divine essence and glory)⁹ and is united with the Father and the Son)¹⁰.

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)¹¹. Interpreting Lk 11, 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 inse-

1. I 97, 249A; I 109, 256B; I 243, 332A.

2. I 106, 253C; I 313, 364C; I 416, 413B; I 500, 453B; III 77, 785A; III 406, 842C; III 252, 932B; III 260, 944A; III 394, 1033B; IV 145, 1228D; IV 182, 1273C.

3. I 500, 453B.

4. I 119, 261C.

5. I 60, 221C.

6. II 260, 944A.

7. I 313, 364C.

8. I 109, 256BC.

9. III 260, 944A.

10. I 97, 249A.

11. I 59, 221AB; I 60, 221B.

parable and relative with the divine essence»¹. «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»². During Christ's baptism also, «the Holy Spirit descended ascertaining the Son consubstantial with the Father and with His own self»³ and «He ἐπεφάνη like a dove»⁴. It is the Holy Spirit «Whom we have received»⁵ and Who inspired the sacred authors to write the Holy Scriptures⁶.

(Continued)

1. I 60, 224G.

2. I 500, 453BC; I 499, 453B.

3. I 67, 228A.

4. I 106, 253C.

5. I 250, 333C.

6. V. Supra pp. 12-13.