



New Sources of Isidorian Angelology (*Sententiae* I.10)

JACQUES ELFASSI
UNIVERSITY OF LORRAINE-METZ

ABSTRACT

Isidore devotes a long chapter of his *Sententiae* (I.10) to the angels. The sources of this chapter were studied by Pierre Cazier and Attilio Carpin. However, it is possible to add thirteen other sources not yet identified: in the Bible, in Ambrose, Augustine, Cassian, Gregory the Great and Quodvultdeus. The identification of these new sources leads, conversely, to reject certain comparisons suggested by Cazier. These discoveries shed a new light on chapter I.10 of the *Sententiae*, both from a theological point of view (reference to Phil 2:6 in §8 and §16) and from a literary one (there are some fine examples of rewriting). In §18, the comparison of the *Sententiae*, the *Etymologiae* and their common source, Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob*, makes it possible to question the relative chronology of Isidore's works (without definitive conclusion, however). Finally, the analysis of §17 leads to the conclusion that Augustine's *De diuinitate daemonum* probably did not circulate in Visigothic Spain.

ESSAY

In 1998, Pierre Cazier published the first critical edition of the *Sententiae* of Isidore, Bishop of Seville (c. AD 600 to 636).¹ Cazier also intended to do a minor edition for the collection "Christian Sources," without critical apparatus but with a French translation.

¹ Pierre Cazier, *Isidorus Hispalensis Sententiae*, CCSL 111 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).



Unfortunately, death interrupted this project: he left a French translation at the Institut des Sources Chrétiennes in Lyons, which is still unpublished, but he did not have time to write an introduction and specific notes for this new edition. In agreement with Jean-Marc Vercruysse, a disciple of Cazier, I am working on this, and presently I am reviewing the sources. Indeed, one of the great merits of Cazier is to have identified many sources of the *Sententiae*, but he did this work before the development of electronic databases, which have facilitated greatly this kind of research: although the book was published in 1998, it is issued from a thesis of 1984 and it was already set in 1994.²

For this article, I have chosen to concentrate on *Sententiae* Chapter I.10 devoted to angels, for two reasons: the first is the length of the chapter, which allows us to examine a significant number of passages, and the second is the existence of a monograph which usefully complements the work of Cazier.³ My aim is to show that even in a chapter which has already been relatively well studied, both by a philologist (Cazier) and a theologian (Attilio Carpin), there are still some discoveries to be made.

***Sententiae* I.10.7:**

Prius de caelo cecidisse diabolum quam homo conderetur. Nam mox ut factus est, in superbiam erupit, et praecipitatus de caelo est. Nam iuxta ueritatis testimonium ab initio mendax fuit, et in ueritate non stetit [Io

² It is presented as such in Pierre Cazier, *Isidore de Séville et la naissance de l'Espagne catholique*, Théologie historique 96 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1994), 5, n. 1.

³ Attilio Carpin, *Angeli e demòni nella sintesi patristica di Isidoro di Siviglia* (Bologna: Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2004), 13-15, 21-23, 26, 37-40, 45-47, 50, 52-58, 89-102 and 190.

8.44], quia, statim ut factus est, cecidit. Fuit quidem in ueritate conditus,
sed non stando confestim a ueritate est lapsus.

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO (c. 354-430) *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 42.11 (CCSL 36.1.25-27):

Homicida ergo ille ab initio. Et unde homicida ? Et in ueritate non stetit.

Ergo in ueritate fuit, sed non stando cecidit.

In addition to the reference to John 8:44, Isidore employs the wording *fuit* [...] *in ueritate* [...] *sed non stando cecidit*. The parallel, suggested by Cazier, with Augustine *Gen. litt.* XI, 23.30⁴ is more distant: Isidore repeats from Augustine the idea that the devil fell from the very moment of its creation, but there is no textual parallel. This reference should probably be rejected.

I would be more inclined, on the other hand, to accept the source proposed by Carpin:⁵ Augustine, *Gen. litt.* XI.16.21. Admittedly, here also there is no clear textual parallel between Isidore and Augustine,⁶ but it seems that the first borrowed from the second the idea that the fall of the devil took place before the fall of man, and *mox ut factus est* could be a rewriting of *ab initio ex quo ipse creatus est*.

Sent. I.10.8:

Diabolus [...] se Deo aequalem existimans.

⁴ A little misprint must be corrected in the edition of Cazier: “*Gen. litt.* XI.23.3”, should read “*Gen. litt.* XI.23.30”.

⁵ Carpin, *Angeli e demòni*, 96.

⁶ Hence the cautious ‘cf.’ before the reference to Augustine.

Cf. Phil 2:6:

Cum in forma Dei esset non rapinam arbitratus est esse se aequalem Deo.

The formulation *se Deo aequalem existimans* is reminiscent of Phil 2:6. Isidore implicitly contrasted Christ, who had not sought to be the equal of God, and the devil, who was not even satisfied by pretending to be the equal of God.

Sent. I.10.9:

Diabolus ideo iam non petit ueniam, quia non compungitur ad poenitentiam. Membra uero eius saepe per hypocrisin deprecantur quod tamen pro mala conscientia adipiscere non merentur.

GREGORY THE GREAT (Pope: 590-604), *Moralia in Iob* XXXIII, 23, 42 (CCSL 143B, I.1-4):

Non parcam ei et uerbis potentibus ad deprecandum compositis [Jb 41.3]. Quis hoc, quod legisse se nequaquam nouit, existimet; quia culparum suarum diabolus sit ueniam petiturus?

The parallel here may seem limited, but it is probable: before Isidore, Gregory is the only writer to have associated *diabolus* and *ueniam petere*, and the influence of *Moralia in Iob* on Isidore is established. The verb *deprecantur* may also be inspired by *deprecandum* in the verse of Job.

Sent. I.10.14:

Inter angelos distantia potestatum est, et pro graduum dignitate ministeria eisdem sunt distributa, aliisque alii praeferuntur tam culmine potestatis quam scientia uirtutis. Subministrant igitur alii aliorum praeceptis, atque oboediunt iussis. Vnde et ad prophetam Zachariam angelus angelum mittit, et quaecumque adnuntiare debeat praecepit.

GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moralia in Iob* XXVIII.1.9 (CCSL 143B, 1.189-197):

Sed quia in conspectu conditoris angelica ministeria ordinata graduum positione distincta sunt, ut et pro communi felicitate beatitudinis opificem suum simul uidentes gaudeant; et tamen pro dispositione dignitatis aliis alii subministrent, ad prophetam angelum angelus mittit; et quem secum de Deo gaudere communiter conspiciet et docet et dirigit, quia eum et per superiorem scientiam uirtute cognitionis, et per praestantiores gratias culmine potestatis excedit.

Gregory's text here has been rewritten, but the borrowings are recognizable:

ministeria ordinata graduum positione distincta sunt > pro graduum dignitate ministeria eisdem sunt distributa; aliis alii subministrent > subministrant igitur alii aliorum praeceptis; ad prophetam angelum angelus mittit > ad prophetam Zachariam angelus angelum mittit; et per superiorem scientiam uirtute cognitionis, et per praestantiores gratias culmine potestatis > tam culmine potestatis quam scientia uirtutis.

The identification of this source leads to the rejection of the link proposed by Cazier with Gregory, *Homiliae in euangelia* II.34.11, which, in any case, is very remote from *Sent.* I.10.14. The rapprochement with Isidore, *Etymologiae* VII.5.6-7 is also questionable: admittedly, there is the shared idea of the hierarchy of angels and the same reference to Zechariah, but the texts are distant.⁷

***Sent.* I.10.16:**

Malus uero inde est diabolus, quia non quae Dei, sed quae sua sunt
requisiuit.

AMBROSE OF MILAN (c. 340-397), *Expositio de psalmo CXVIII* VIII.37.2 (*CSEL* 62, p. 172 l. 20-22):

Dominus enim Iesus non rapinam arbitratus est esse se aequalem Deo
neque quae sua sunt requisit.

The relative clause *quae sua sunt requisit* is taken literally from Ambrose. As in *Sent.* I.10.8, Isidore contrasts the devil to Christ by referring tacitly to Phil 2:6 (the reference here is very implicit, whereas it is evident in Ambrose). The parallel that Cazier indicates (with caution) with Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei* XII, 1 is very unlikely: there is no textual coincidence.

⁷ It is not a new source, but I take the advantage of this reference to *Etym.* VII to mention a little inadvertency of Cazier: *Etym.* VII.5.4 must not be linked with *Sent.* I.10.5 but with *Sent.* I.10.15.

Sent. I.10.17:

Triplici enim modo praescientiae acumine uigent, id est subtilitate naturae, experientia temporum, reuelatione superiorum potestatum.

AUGUSTINE, *De Genesi ad litteram* II.17.37 (CSEL 28.1, p. 61 l.18-25)

Quod cum ad decipiendos homines fit, spirituum seductorum operatio est : quibus quaedam uera de temporalibus rebus nosse permittitur partim subtilioris sensus acumine, quia corporibus subtilioribus uigent, partim experientia callidiore propter tam magnam longitudinem uitae, partim sanctis angelis, quod ipsi ab omnipotente Deo discunt, etiam iussu eius sibi reuelantibus, qui merita humana occultissimae iustitiae sinceritate distribuit.

Isidore summarized Augustine drastically, but used some of his words or expressions: *acumine, subtilioribus > subtilitate, uigent, experientia, reuelantibus > reuelatione*. Identifying the likely source leads to the rejection of the one proposed (with caution) by Cazier: *De diuinitate daemonum* III.7. Another reason to reject the hypothesis that this Augustinian booklet could be the source of the *Sententiae* is that it does not seem to have been otherwise known by Isidore, nor by any of his contemporaries writing within Visigothic Spain.⁸

⁸ See José Carlos Martín, “La biblioteca cristiana de los Padres hispanovisigodos (siglos VI-VII),” *Veleia* 30 (2013): 259-88, esp. 261 (which uniquely mentions the *Sententiae* relying on Cazier’s authority).

Sent. I.10.18 (second sentence):

Qui [sc. apostatae angeli] tamen diuina potestate coercentur ne tantum
noceant quantum cupiunt.

GREGORY THE GREAT, *Homiliae in euangelia* II.34.10 (CCSL 141, l. 229-232):

Potestates etiam uocantur hi qui hoc potentius ceteris in suo ordine
perceperunt, ut eorum ditioni uirtutes aduersae subiectae sint, quorum
potestate refrenantur, ne corda hominum tantum temptare praeualeant
quantum uolunt.

Parallel passage: ISIDORE, *Etymologiae* VII.5.18:

Potestates sunt, quibus uirtutes aduersae subiectae sunt, et inde
Potestatum nomine nuncupantur, quia maligni spiritus eorum potestate
coercentur, ne tantum mundo noceant quantum cupiunt.

The editors of Book VII of the *Etymologies*, J.-Y. Guillaumin and P. Monat, saw that Gregory was the source of Etym. VII.5.18.⁹ The passage allows a very interesting comparison of the *Sententiae*, the *Etymologiae* and their common source, the *Moralia in Iob*. At first glance, the comparison of the texts suggests that Isidore first summarized Gregory in the *Etymologiae* (“potestates [...] uirtutes aduersae subiectae sint... potestate refrenantur ne corda hominum tantum temptare praeualeant quantum uolunt > potestates... uirtutes aduersae subiectae sunt [...] potestate coercentur ne tantum mundo noceant quantum cupiunt”) and only then reproduced the text of the

⁹ Jean-Yves Guillaumin and Pierre Monat, *Isidore de Séville. Étymologies. Livre VII. Dieu, les anges, les saints* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2012), 194 n. 11.

Etymologiae in the *Sententiae* (resuming the sentence “potestate coercentur ne tantum mundo noceant quantum cupiunt,” and removing only *mundo*). Thus, there would be a clue in favor of a late date of the *Sententiae*, apparently later than the *Etymologiae*.¹⁰

However, this reasoning is fragile. Indeed, the opposite hypothesis is entirely plausible: it may be that Isidore first summarized Gregory in the *Sententiae*, then resumed this summary in the *Etymologiae* by complementing it with its first source. Such a scenario may seem complex, but other passages of the *Etymologiae* show Isidore quoting one of his earlier works while re-using his original source.¹¹

A third hypothesis could even be proposed. To compose an encyclopedia as vast as the *Etymologiae*, Isidore probably used ‘index cards’ or various preparatory texts.¹² These working papers probably served his other works, as is proven by the many internal parallels to the work of the Sevillan. In the case presented here, therefore, Isidore could have summarized Gregory in a working document and then used this document independently on different dates, as when writing the *Sententiae* as in the *Etymologiae*. This third scenario is very hypothetical: it is probable that Isidore prepared and used drafts, but there is no evidence that these documents were involved in the process of

¹⁰ Indeed, this work has been dated either from the years 612-615 (by Jose A. de Aldama and José Carlos Martín), or from the end of Isidore’s episcopate around 633 (Cazier). See a summary of the different hypothesis in Jacques Elfassi, “Isidorus Hispalensis ep., *Sententiae*,” in *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo. Mediaeval Latin Texts and their Transmission. Te.Tra. I*, Millennio Medievale, 50; Strumenti e Studi, n. s. 8, ed. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Castaldi (Firenze: Tarnuzze, 2004), 209-18, especially 210-11.

¹¹ See María Adelaida Andrés Sanz, “Lactancio e Isidoro de Sevilla: sobre dos usos distintos de una misma fuente (Lact. *Opif.* 7-18: Isid. *Diff.* [II] 17 y *Etym.* XI 1),” in *Actas del XI Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos. 15 al 20 de septiembre de 2003. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela*, ed. Antonio Coruña and José Francisco Gonzáles Castro (Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 2006), 41-51.

¹² See Jacques Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l’Espagne wisigothique* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1959 [repr. 1983]), 763-84, as well as the useful article: Ana Isabel Magallón García, “El método de trabajo de Isidoro de Sevilla,” *Veleia* 17 (2000): 267-78.

rewriting; it is more tempting to think of florilegia than of texts already elaborated. But I would not totally exclude this hypothesis, and in any case I think it is useful material for reflection upon by specialists of Isidore. Unfortunately, the disappearance of the ‘archives’ or ‘drafts’ of Isidore forbids any definitive affirmation of their contents and their use.

Sent. I.10.18 (third sentence):

Boni autem angeli ad ministerium salutis humanae deputati sunt, ut curas administrent mundi, et regant omnia iussu Dei, testante apostolo [Hbr 1, 14]: Nonne omnes, inquit, sunt administratorii spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos qui hereditatem capiunt salutis?

GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moralia in Iob* IX.16.26 (CCSL 143, l. 111-114):

Ipsae etenim orbem portant, quae regendi mundi curas administrant Paulo attestante, qui ait: Nonne omnes sunt administratorii spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos qui hereditatem capiunt salutis?

The verse Hbr 1:14 is rarely quoted by the Fathers: a search through the *Library of Latin Texts* of the expression *spiritus administratorii* reveals only four references to Jerome, one to Fulgentius of Ruspe and two to Gregory. The sorting was therefore easy to do. In this case, this extract of the *Moralia in Iob* is probably the source of Isidore, as confirmed by two other parallels: *regendi* > *regant*; *mundi curas administrant* >

curas administrent mundi. There is also a micro-variant in the biblical text: *capiunt* (where the Vulgate has the future *capiant*), present both in Gregory and Isidore.¹³

Sent. I.10.20:

Singulae gentes praepositos angelos habere creduntur, quod ostenditur testimonio angeli Daniheli loquentis: Ego, inquit, ueni ut nuntiarem tibi, sed princeps regni Persarum restitit mihi [Dn 10, 12-13]. Et post alia: Non est qui me adiuuet, nisi Michael princeps uester [Dn 10, 21].

1) GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moralia in Iob* XVII.12.17 (CCSL 143A, l. 26-36):

Sed quia certa angelorum ministeria dispensandis singulis quibusque gentibus sunt praelata, cum subiectorum mores aduersum se uicissim praepositorum spirituum opem merentur; ipsi qui praesunt spiritus contra se uenire referuntur. Is namque angelus qui Danieli loquebatur captiuis Israelitici populi in Perside constitutis praelatus agnoscitur. Michael autem eorum qui ex eadem plebe in Iudaeae terra remanserant praepositus inuenitur. Vnde ab hoc eodem angelo paulo post Danieli dicitur: Nemo est adiutor meus in omnibus his, nisi Michael princeps uester.

¹³ I have also studied this passage (as both following §20 and §21) at a conference on April 23, 2012 in Lyons, in the Institut des Sources Chrétiennes, within the context of the seminary “BiblindeX”, in a paper I titled: “The exploitation of biblical citations in the research of sources: the example of Isidore of Seville”. In principle, an article issued from this conference should be published in the second volume of the *Cahiers de BiblindeX*, edited by Laurence Mellerin.

2) GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moralia in Iob* IV, 29, 55 (CCSL 143, l. 8-10):

Quia uero angeli hominibus praesint per prophetam testatur angelus
dicens: Princeps regni Persarum restitit mihi.

3) QUODVULTDEUS (d. 450), *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei*, Dimidium
temporis 4.6 (CCSL 60, l. 29-32):

Nam tunc esse bellum factum Michael et angeli eius ut pugnarent cum
dracone, et Danihelo angelus ostendit dicens missum se esse ut pugnaret
cum principe regni Persarum: Et non est, ait, qui me adiuuet nisi michael
princeps uester.

Parallel passage: ISIDORE, *Etymologiae* VII.5.28:

Nam quia angeli et locis et hominibus praesunt, per Prophetam testatur
angelus dicens: Princeps regni Persarum restitit mihi.

The first source was seen by Cazier. I add the second because of the quote from Dn 10:12-13 and the parallel with *Etym.* VII.5.28. The extract of Quodvultdeus (3) is apparently still farther away, but this passage seems to be the only one before Isidore with the text of Dn 10:21: *non est qui me adiuuet*; apparently, it is also the only one to associate Dn 10:13 and Dn 10:21. Moreover, this relationship is reinforced by a textual parallel: *Danihelo angelus ostendit dicens* > *ostenditur testimonio angeli Daniheli loquentis*. The text of Dn 10:12 (*ego ueni ut nuntiarem tibi*) is also very different from the Vulgate (*ego ueni propter sermones tuos*), but I confess that I did not find its source.

Sent. I.10.21:

Item omnes homines angelos habere probantur, loquente Domino in euangelio: Amen dico uobis quia angeli eorum semper uident faciem Patris mei, qui est in caelis [Mt 18, 10]. Vnde et Petrus in actibus apostolorum, cum pulsaret ianuam, dixerunt intus apostoli: Non est Petrus, sed angelus eius est [Act 12, 15].

CASSIAN (c. 360-435), *Conlatio* VIII.17.1 (*CSEL* 13, p. 233 l. 17-21 and 23-25):

Nam quod unicuique nostrum duo cohaereant angeli, id est bonus ac malus, scriptura testatur. Et de bonis quidem saluator ne contemnatis, inquiens, unum ex pusillis istis: dico enim uobis quod angeli eorum in caelis semper uident faciem patris mei qui in caelis est. [...] Nec non etiam quod in Actibus apostolorum de Petro dicitur, quia angelus eius est.

Verse Act 12:15 (*angelus eius est*) is rare in the patristic tradition, and this text of Cassian seems to be the only one, before Isidore, to associate it with Mt 18:10.

Sent. I.10.26:

Veniens autem Christus pacem in se angelis et hominibus fecit. Eo quippe nato, clamauerunt angeli: In terra pax hominibus bonae uoluntatis [Lc 2, 14].

1) Cf. Eph 2:15:

In semet ipsum [...] faciens pacem.

2) GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moralia in Iob* XXVIII.8.19 (CCSL 143B, l. 2-10):

Iam per diuinam gratiam omnibus liquet, quem scriptura sacra angularem lapidem uocet, illum profecto qui, dum in se hinc iudaicum illinc gentilem populum suscipit, in una Ecclesiae fabrica quasi duos parietes iungit, illum de quo scriptum est: Fecit utraque unum [Eph 2, 14]. Qui angularem se lapidem non solum in inferioribus, sed et in supernis exhibuit, quia et in terra plebi israeliticae nationes gentium et utramque simul angelis in caelo sociauit. Eo quippe nato clamauerunt angeli: In terra pax hominibus bonae uoluntatis.

Parallel passage: ISIDORE, *Etymologiae* VII.2.39:

Lapis angularis, uel quia duos parietes e diuerso, id est de circumcissione et praeputio, uenientes in unam fabricam Ecclesiae iungit, uel quod pacem in se angelis et hominibus facit.

According to Cazier, the source of the passage is Gregory, *Homiliae in euangelia* I.8.2, but this seems doubtful: apart from the quotation from Lk 2:4, there is no exact parallel between the two texts.¹⁴ The source is probably the *Moralia in Iob* XXVIII.8.19. Both texts have in common a sentence (*Eo quippe nato clamauerunt angeli: In terra pax hominibus bonae uoluntatis*), and this extract of the *Moralia* is also the source of *Etym.*

¹⁴ Unfortunately, the text of Gregory, *Hom. in euang.* I.8.2 is too long to be copied here (thirty-seven lines in the *Corpus christianorum* [CCSL]). However, it is worth pointing out the general comment by Raymond Étaix, *Gregorius Magnus. Homiliae in euangelia*, CCSL 141 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), xxvii n. 32: “Le récent et savant éditeur des *Sententiae* d’Isidore indique dix références aux Homélies sur l’Évangile de Grégoire dans l’*index fontium* (CCSL 111, p. 355). Mais elles paraissent en général douteuses.”

VII.2.39, which similarly associates the name of Christ *lapis angularis* (cf. Eph 2:20) and the union between angels and men.¹⁵ *Etym.* VII.2.39 also relates to the theme of the ‘cornerstone’ the verse Eph 2:15, in a formulation almost identical to that of *Sent.* I.10.26 (*pacem in se angelis et hominibus facit / fecit*). This link established between Eph 2:15 and the ‘cornerstone’ probably comes, at least in the *Etymologies*, from Augustine, *In Ioh.* 9, 17,¹⁶ but it would no doubt be artificial to make this last text a source of the *Sententiae* while their only common point is the allusion to Eph 2:15.

The following table summarizes the four themes which Isidore orchestrates in different ways in the *Sententiae* and in the *Etymologies*:

	Augustine, <i>In Ioh.</i> 9.17	Gregory, <i>Mor.</i> XXVIII.8.19	Isidore, <i>Sent.</i> I.10.26	Isidore, <i>Etym.</i> VII. 2.39
<i>pacem in se [...] fecit</i> (cf. Eph 2:15)	x		x	x
union between angels and men		x	x	x
<i>Eo nato [...] bonae uoluntatis</i> (Lk 2:14)		x	x	
<i>lapis angularis</i> (cf. Eph 2:20)	x	x		x

¹⁵ See Jacques Elfassi, “Les noms du Christ chez Isidore de Séville (*Etym.* VII, 2),” in *La christologie et la Trinité chez les Pères*, ed. Marie-Anne Vannier (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2013), 241-72, esp. 252-53.

¹⁶ *His duobus parietibus de diuerso uenientibus ad pacem in seipso faciendam, lapis angularis factus est Christus* (CCSL 36.1. 8-10). On the link between Augustine, *In Ioh.* 9.17 and *Etym.* VII.2.39, see Guillaumin and Monat, *Isidore. Étym. VII*, 175 [= 36] n. 13; and Elfassi, “Les noms”, 252 et 270.

Review of new sources

Ambrose, *Exp. de psalm. CXVIII*, VIII.37.2 > *Sent.* I.10.16

Augustine, *Gen. litt.* II.17.37 > *Sent.* I.10.17

Augustine, *In Ioh.* 42.11 > *Sent.* I.10.7

Bible, Eph 2.15 > *Sent.* I.10.26

Bible, Phil 2.6 > *Sent.* I.10.8

Cassian, *Conl.* VIII.17.1 > *Sent.* I.10.21

Gregory the Great, *Hom. in euang.* II.34.10 > *Sent.* I.10.18

Gregory the Great, *Mor. in Iob* IV.29.55 > *Sent.* I.10.20

Gregory the Great, *Mor. in Iob* IX.16.26 > *Sent.* I.10.18

Gregory the Great, *Mor. in Iob* XXVIII.1.9 > *Sent.* I.10.14

Gregory the Great, *Mor. in Iob* XXVIII.8.19 > *Sent.* I.10.26

Gregory the Great, *Mor. in Iob* XXXIII.23.42 > *Sent.* I.10.9

Quodvultdeus, *Lib. prom. et praed. Dei*, Dim. temp. 4.6 > *Sent.* I.10.20

Rejected sources

Augustine, *Ciu.* XII.1: cf. *Sent.* I.10.16

Augustine, *Diu. Daem.* III.7: cf. *Sent.* I.10.17

Augustine, *Gen. litt.* XI.23, 30: cf. *Sent.* I.10.7

Gregory the Great, *Hom. in euang.* I.8.2: cf. *Sent.* I.10.26

Gregory the Great, *Hom. in euang.* II.34, 11: cf. *Sent.* I.10.14

Concluding Remarks

This essay may have seemed somewhat dry to some readers, as it consists mainly of a list of Isidorian passages and their sources. It is a defect which I willingly assume, for it seemed to me that the most important thing was to introduce the newest elements: from that, each reader can, by their own inclinations, propose a literary, theological or historical interpretation.

Nevertheless, I would like to close by drawing attention to four points:

1. From a theological perspective, perhaps the most remarkable passages of the *Sententiae* are §8 and §16, where Isidore, citing Ambrose and alluding to Phil 2:6, implicitly contrasts the devil and Christ.
2. From a stylistic point of view, one can observe how Isidore rewrote his sources (for example in *Sent.* I.10.14) or summarized them in only a few words (for example in *Sent.* I.10.17). One of the most remarkable aspects of the Isidorian rewriting is the use of synonymy: in *Sent.* I.10.18 (second sentence), *refrenantur* is replaced by *coercentur*, *uolunt* by *cupiunt*, while the Gregorian formulation *corda hominum temptare praeualeant* is reduced to the single word *noceant*; in this case, it is the comparison with *Etym.* VII.5.18, closer to Gregory the Great, which confirms the identification of the source.
3. For literary history, this sentence of *Sent.* I.10.18 makes it possible to compare the *Sententiae*, the *Etymologiae* and their common source, the *Moralia in Iob* of Gregory. Unfortunately, as shown, this comparison does not make it possible to fix the relative

dating of the *Sententiae* and the *Etymologiae*, but by accumulating this kind of data scholars may be able to form a clearer chronology of the works of Isidore.

4. In the field of the history of texts, it is probable, arguing by the present state of knowledge, that Augustine's *De diuinitate daemonum* did not circulate in Visigothic Spain (see above *Sent.* I.10.17).

Finally, I would like to recall here what I wrote in the introduction and which is one of the main principles of research: there are always discoveries to be made. Although I have complemented the work of Cazier and Carpin, it is plausible that my work is also incomplete: may the readers of this article complete it in their turn!

Bibliography

Andrés Sanz, María Adelaida. “Lactancio e Isidoro de Sevilla: sobre dos usos distintos de una misma fuente (Lact. *Opif.* 7-18: Isid. *Diff.* [II] 17 y *Etym.* XI 1).” In *Actas del XI Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos. 15 al 20 de septiembre de 2003. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela*, edited by Antonio Coruña and José Francisco Gonzáles Castro, 41-51. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 2006.

Carpin, Attilio. *Angeli e demòni nella sintesi patristica di Isidoro di Siviglia*. Bologna: Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2004.

Cazier, Pierre. *Isidore de Séville et la naissance de l’Espagne catholique*, Théologie historique 96. Paris: Beauchesne, 1994.

Cazier, Pierre. *Isidorus Hispalensis Sententiae*, CCSL 111. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.

Elfassi, Jacques. “Isidorus Hispalensis ep., *Sententiae*.” In *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo. Mediaeval Latin Texts and their Transmission. Te.Tra. I*, Millennio Medievale, 50; Strumenti e Studi, n. s. 8, edited by Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Castaldi, 209-18. Firenze: Tarnuzze, 2004.

Elfassi, Jacques. “Les noms du Christ chez Isidore de Séville (*Etym.* VII, 2).” In *La christologie et la Trinité chez les Pères*, edited by Marie-Anne Vannier, 241-72. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2013.

Étaix, Raymond. *Gregorius Magnus. Homiliae in euangelia*, CCSL 141. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Fontaine, Jacques. *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l’Espagne wisigothique*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1959 (repr. 1983).

Guillaumin, Jean-Yves and Pierre Monat. *Isidore de Séville. Étymologies. Livre VII. Dieu, les anges, les saints*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2012.

Magallón García, Ana Isabel. “El método de trabajo de Isidoro de Sevilla.” *Veleia* 17 (2000): 267-78.

Martín, José Carlos. “La biblioteca cristiana de los Padres hispanovisigodos (siglos VI-VII).” *Veleia* 30 (2013): 259-88.