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Preface

Paul Fouracre, University of Manchester

‘God’s anger was shown so clearly that a star appeared in the heavens – the star astrologers call a comet: when it rises, they say, the earth is convulsed with hunger, with the swift succession of kings, with the movement of peoples, and the clashing of swords threatens it’. These are the words of a Frankish hagiographer writing probably in the early 680s. He (we can be almost certain that it was a ‘he’) was describing the interregnum of 675/6 which led to the death of his hero, Leudegar, bishop of Autun. The passage just quoted came from Isidore’s *Etymologies* (3.71.16). For an author who rarely moves beyond the scriptural in his borrowings, it is remarkable to see him turning to Isidore in this way. The borrowing is testimony both to the rapid dissemination of Isidore’s works across Western Europe and to their importance as tools for explaining human vicissitudes in a turbulent world.

Several of the chapters in this volume derive from a day workshop that was held at the Instituto Cervantes in Manchester in April 2013. The aim in putting together the volume was to combine these pieces with some specially-commissioned studies in order to create the first English-language collected volume on Isidore. Drawing on the strong scholarly tradition in the study of Isidore in France and Spain, as well as the increasing number of new editions of key Isidorian texts, the volume incorporates original contributions from established and early career scholars that provide a chronologically and geographically coherent overview of Isidore’s impact across Western Europe in the early medieval period, from Spain, Ireland, England, Italy and Francia.

The debt Western European learning of the Early Middle Ages owed to Isidore as a transmitter and translator of the classical tradition is more or less a given in narratives of intellectual history. A collection of essays that clarifies, highlights nuances and further explains his contribution is therefore most welcome. It is particularly useful to juxtapose the Iberian context of Isidore’s work with its reception in other cultures: the collection demonstrates, as the editors put it, ‘that there was not one Isidorian legacy but many’. And as Christopher Heath’s chapter suggests, we can identify that legacy in works which do not actually quote him. Heath’s thinking was in fact prompted by a question at a seminar in London where he presented a structural analysis of the works of Paul the Deacon. There, a distinguished classicist asked, ‘Where is Isidore in all this?’ Well, in linguistic terms,
strictly nowhere, but was it conceivable that Paul, writing in the later eighth century, was influenced by Isidore? Careful research reveals that indeed he was: Paul's praise of Italy turns out to owe a great deal to Isidore's *Laus Spaniae*. One reason for thinking that Paul must have been familiar with Isidore's work is that he was a fixture of the Carolingian cultural project into which Paul was himself co-opted. Laura Carlson explains how the Carolingian intelligentsia were reliant on Isidore to formulate their views on spirituality, especially in relation to image and language. Interestingly it was another Spaniard, Theodulf of Orléans, who led the thinking here, and Theodulf was very proud of his Iberian heritage. Melissa Markauskas further shows how Carolingians reached for their Isidore to help them navigate Patristic material. In short, for the Carolingians Isidore was also the ‘go to’ for political ideas, for explanations of natural phenomena, for the definitions of orthodoxy and heresy, and for the conception of Iberia itself. It is surely no coincidence that when the Carolingians tried to put that religious definition into practice by presenting themselves as the standard bearers of orthodoxy, they turned their fire upon Adoptionism, a peculiarly Spanish (and frankly rather obscure) heresy. More surprising at first sight is to find the influence of Isidore's *Synonyma* upon Felix's *Life of Guthlac*, for this is set in the early eighth century in the badlands around Crowland, still today a remote spot in the Lincolnshire fens. But as Claudia di Siacca makes clear, it is not that surprising given the fact that Isidore was, in the words of our editors, 'a staple figure of early Anglo-Saxon libraries'.

Isidore's influence spread like the Atlantic tide, up from Spain, round the British Isles and down into Francia, as well as by land across into Francia from the south. The two pulses met in Alcuin and Theodulf, the Northumbrian and the Spaniard, two bitter rivals at Charlemagne's court. Despite their differences (porridge versus spicy sausage, according to Theodulf), they shared political ideas about how society could be 'corrected' and how it should be ruled that were ultimately derived from Isidore. The historical importance of this political/cultural narrative demands that we get it right. When, exactly, did Isidore's works reach Ireland, Marina Smyth asks. How did Isidore make use of Pliny? Critically, answers Mary Beagon. Did Isidore really wish to preserve a separate sphere of secular learning? Definitely not, argues Andrew Fear. These are questions and answers that bring us closer to understanding the Isidorian phenomenon. As important is understanding the context in which Isidore wrote, and how the whole project evolved. Jamie Wood is enlightening on Isidore's family and the importance of Leander's encounter with Pope Gregory I. Finally, Michael J. Kelly unsettles us with the suggestion that there was actually a Spanish ‘school’ in opposition to
Isidore’s legacy. What, one wonders, would the early medieval intellectual world have been like if they had succeeded in crushing it?

This last question points to an elephant in the room: evaluation. Was Isidore’s legacy massive because his works were brilliant? Was his elision of secular and Christian scholarship so successful that it set a template that could not be improved upon? Did the legacy actually prevent alternatives being developed? Or might it have been the case that there was simply no effective competition because no one else had such a command of ancient learning? This would certainly seem to be true for the *Etymologies* – hence our Frankish hagiographer turning to them for the meaning of comets. It does look, too, as if Isidore’s political ideas were about all that were available to early medieval thinkers, from pseudo-Cyprian to Hincmar, from late seventh-century Ireland to late ninth-century Francia (hence Alcuin and Theodulf agreeing on rule and justice and very little else). Jacques Fontaine hinted that it was the poverty of the barbarian intellect that threw Isidore into such sharp relief and made his works so desirable to distant peoples. But if it were Isidore who set the terms for relating knowledge to God, showed the relationship between the natural and the divine orders, and the way for rulers to obey a divine mandate, then should we also hold him responsible for the unremitting masculinity of discourse in all of these areas? His conception of Christian order was, after all, predicated on the subordination of women. Starting from a counterfactual basis, these may be unfair questions, and certainly a collection of essays around the theme of *Transmitting and Transforming Knowledge: Isidore of Seville and his Reception in the Early Middle Ages* has no brief to pose or answer them. But it is testimony to the clarity with which these essays bring out the importance of Isidore’s transmission and Christianisation of knowledge that such questions creep into the readers’ minds. In other words, Isidore is good to think with, and always fascinating to read about, as will become very clear in what follows.
1 Introduction

Andrew Fear and Jamie Wood

‘The Great Doctor of our times, the newest ornament of the Catholic Church, last in time but by no means least in the field of doctrine [...] the most learned man in these latter times, he whom one should name with reverence, Isidore [...]’

Such was the judgement on Isidore of Seville of the bishops who had gathered for the eighth Council of Toledo in 653, some 18 years after his death. Later ages have agreed – Dante placed the *ardente spiro* of Isidore alongside Solomon and Boethius in Paradise; in the eighteenth century Isidore was elevated to the status of *Doctor* of the church by the intellectually minded Pope Innocent XIII; and in the late twentieth century he was to become unofficially the patron saint of computer programmers and of the Internet.

Long the subject of detailed analysis in Spanish and French scholarship, the past decade has witnessed a flowering of interest in Isidore in the Anglophone world. As well as playing an important role in the ecclesiastical and

---

1 We would like to thank the staff of the Instituto Cervantes for their support and the participants at the workshop we held there in 2013 for their feedback on the papers that were delivered there, as well as the members of the Medieval Studies Research Group at the University of Lincoln for comments offered on an early draft of the introduction to this volume. Thanks must also go to the four anonymous reviewers of the manuscript and to staff at Amsterdam University Press, especially Erin Dailey and Tyler Cloherty, for their support in bringing this volume to publication.

2 *Nostri seculi doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholicae novissimum decus, praecedentibus aetate prostremus, doctrinae comparatione non infimus... in seculorum fine doctissimus atque cum reverentia nominandas Isidorus*, Canon 2, which cites Isidore’s *Sententiae* as justification for this assessment. For the text of the council see Vives, ed., *Concilios Visigoticos e Hispano-Romanos* pp. 260-296, the quotation can be found on page 276.

3 *Paradiso* 10.130.


royal politics of the first third of the seventh century, as the accolades above demonstrate, Isidore had a considerable impact in the seventh century and throughout the medieval period, especially in the Latin world. Sources written and influenced by Isidore are fundamental to our understanding of the seventh century in Spain and it could be argued that his influence on the written record for the period lends him a higher historical significance even than the Visigothic kings who were his contemporaries. Yet Isidore did not work alone and we might do better imagining him as the best remembered of a coterie of prolific Spanish bishops in the late sixth and seventh centuries. As some of the studies in this volume demonstrate, his legacy was by no means uncontested: the later reception and transmission of his works was both extensive and highly variable in both form and content. The chapters in this volume explore the relationship between the historical situation in which Isidore worked and his posthumous legacy; it is through putting these contexts in dialogue with one another that we can better understand both early seventh century Spain and the remouldings of Isidore’s works and image later in the Middle Ages.

Isidore was probably born in the city where he would later become bishop in around AD 601. Very little is known of his family who were of Hispano-Roman, not Gothic, origin. Severian, his father, said in some later accounts to have been a high-ranking official, was a native of the province of Carthaginiensis in the south-east, but was forced to flee as a consequence of either the Byzantine invasion of the Peninsula in AD 552 or of finding himself on the wrong side of the civil war that was raging between King Agila and his rival Athanagild at that same time.6 Isidore is often said to have been born in the 560s/570s, but the sole foundation for this is an assumption that he became a bishop as soon as his age allowed. This is itself a problematic point, though we know that the two councils of the Trinitarian Church, those of Agde (506) and Arles (524), decreed that 30 was the youngest age for a man to be made a bishop or indeed a cleric of any kind and that this was confirmed by canons 19 and 20 of the fourth Council of Toledo in 633, which was presided over by Isidore. Nevertheless it is dangerous to assume that Isidore’s elder brother, Leander, whom he immediately succeeded as Bishop of Seville, died precisely at the time when

---

6 The most important biographical writings are collected in Martín, Scripta de vita Isidori episcopi Hispalensis. For a discussion of the traditions concerning Isidore see Fontaine and Cazier, ‘Qui a chasse de Carthaginoise Sévérianus et les siens?’ and Kelly’s chapter in this volume. For Isidore’s family see Wood’s chapter in this volume.
his younger sibling could take his place, so it may well be that Isidore's birth should be pushed back in time.

In his youth Isidore lived with his brother and, as Leander was a monk, he may also have taken up the monastic life, although this is not clear. The elder brother was well educated and seems to have taken personal care of Isidore's education. The prose style of Leander's surviving works is decidedly Ciceronian and this has led Fontaine to insist that Severian had given a good classical education to his son. Isidore in his brief biography of his brother describes him as ‘eloquent in speech, most outstanding in ability.’ Sadly most of Leander's work has been lost; all that remains are a rule for nuns and a homily delivered on the conversion of the kingdom to Trinitarianism (the De Triumpho Ecclesiae ob Conversionem Gothorum). From Isidore we learn that Leander also wrote 'two books against heretical dogmas (no doubt Arianism) full of learning from the scriptures'.

Leander sought, it seems, to cultivate a culture of learning within the Church in Spain in order to better serve the pastoral and spiritual needs of the population. Isidore succeeded his brother as bishop of Seville in 601 and remained in office until his death on 4th April 636, producing a large number of writings across a range of genres during his long episcopacy. We have two lists of Isidore's works. One was compiled by Ildefonsus of Toledo in his De viris illustribus at some point between 659 and 667, the other by Braulio of Saragossa not long after Isidore's death, in what is now known as the Renotatio librorum domini Isidori (praenotatio is also found). Braulio intended this document to be a supplement to Isidore's own De viris illustribus and his list is by far the more complete of the two. Besides 'many other minor writings' that he does not name, Braulio lists the following seventeen major works, perhaps in the order of their composition:

7 Leander, De Institutione virginum et contempt mundi 31.
8 Fontaine, Isidore de Séville, p. 6. Fontaine believes that Leander's prose is 'nettement superieure' to that of Isidore. For a detailed examination of Leander's prose style, see Martin, Saint Leander, pp. 13-27.
9 Isidore, De Viris Illustribus 41: suavis eloquio, ingenio prestantissimus.
10 duos adversus haereticorum dogmata libros.
11 See Michael J. Kelly's chapter in this volume for more on the relationship between these two texts.
12 Edition and translation into Spanish by Martín.
13 Multa alia opuscula.
14 This has been the assumption of most scholars and was the basis for de Aldama's chronology of Isidore's writings: 'Indicaciones sobre la cronología'. For doubts see Elfassi in Chiesa and Castaldi, p. 202.
The Differentiae (two books): a work which deals with the difference and correct usage of apparent synonyms and homophones. Its second book also deals with the differences between different categories of beings.  

The Prooemium: a summary of the contents of each of the books of the Bible.  


De ecclesiasticis officiis (two books): dedicated to his brother Fulgentius, the bishop of Écija. The first of the two books gives a history of the Catholic liturgy, while the second describes the duties of ecclesiastic officials.  

The Synonyma (two books): sometimes known as the Liber lamentationum, this is in fact a religious work set as a dialogue between Man and Reason. Man laments his fallen state, while Reason consoles him by showing how he might still be saved. The work takes its name from the ‘synonymous style’ of arguing, where the points made are repeated via the use of synonyms. The popularity of this technique gave rise to the so-called stylus Isidorianus in the Middle Ages.  

De natura rerum: dedicated to the Gothic King Sisebut, this is an exposition of the natural world and phenomena of nature. After the Etymologies, it was perhaps the most widely read of Isidore’s works.  

De numeris: an examination of the mystical significance of the numbers found in the Bible.

---

16 Edition by Andrés Sanz.  
18 Edition by Lawson, translation into English by Knoebel.  
19 Edition by Elfassi; translation into Spanish by Viñayo González; translation into English by Throop.  
20 Edition and translation into French by Fontaine; translation into Italian by Trisoglio.  
21 Edition by Arévalo, PL 83. 1293-1302. The authenticity of this text has been challenged. McNally, Isidorianae and Der irische Liber de Numeris, believes the original Isidorian work to be lost and this text to be a product of an eighth century Irish author. However Dekkers and Gaar, Clavis patrum Latinorum, consider that it could be a genuine work by Isidore.
De nominibus legis et evangelorum [often referred to as the Allegoriae]: a discussion of the allegorical meaning of Biblical names.  

De haeresibus [now lost]: this work is likely to have dealt with Arianism, but also the Acephalites whom Braulio tells us Isidore expressly opposed. 

Sententiae (three books): a systematic treatise on church doctrine and the Christian life. One important source for the work is the Moralía of Gregory the Great. 

Chronicon: Isidore’s Chronicle draws heavily of that of Eusebius as translated by Jerome. 

De fide Catholica contra Judaeos (two books): allegedly written at the request of Isidore’s sister, the abbess Florentina. This treatise is ostensibly a polemic aimed at persuading Jews to convert to Christianity, but in fact is a theological work which has a Christian audience as its target. 

De viris illustribus: a series of brief biographies of Church Fathers and essentially a continuation of St Jerome’s work of the same name. 

Monastica regula: a discussion in praise of monastic life with practical advice on its practice. 

De origine Gothorum et regno Suevorum et etiam Wandalorum: a history of the Gothic people with (in the second redaction alone) shorter sections on the Sueves and Vandals down to Isidore’s own day. 

22 Edition by Arévalo, PL 83.97-130. 
23 See Etymologies 8.5.66. The De Haeresibus edited by Vega and later corrected by Bejarano is normally regarded as Pseudo-Isidorian, see Díaz y Díaz, De Patristica Española, pp. 37-39, but contra Vega, El “Liber de haeresibus”. 
24 Edition by Cazier; translation into Italian by Trisoglio. 
26 Edition by Arévalo, PL 83.449-538; edition of book one by Ziolkowski. For a discussion of the work’s purpose, see Bat-Sheva. 
27 Edition by Codoñer. Martín, El Catálogo De Los Varones Ilustres, argues that this is probably the earliest of Isidore’s works. 
28 Edition by Campos Ruiz, translation into German by Frank. 
29 Edition and translation into Spanish by Rodríguez Alonso, translation into English by Wolf (without the sections on the Sueves and Vandals) and Ford.
Quaestiones (two books): an examination of various Biblical cruces derived mainly from earlier Church Fathers.  

Etymologiae or Origines: Isidore's last, and major, work, which was posthumously divided by Braulio into 20 books. It was a compendium of classical and Christian knowledge arranged according to the etymologies of words and became a standard point of reference in the Middle Ages. 

Apart from these works, a small collection of thirteen of Isidore's letters has also survived. Not on Braulio's list is the De ordine creaturarum, a further treatment of the natural world which also incorporates the supernatural heavens. This has often been accepted as Isidore's work, but may well have been composed by an Irish monk of the seventh century. The plethora of other writings attributed to him are later, false accreditations, though are a testament of his intellectual standing over the centuries.

For Braulio, through Isidore God had allowed Visigothic Spain 'to mirror the learning of antiquity', as the bishop had brought back to light the works of 'the ancients', thus stopping his own generation growing old through its boorishness. As well as contemporary and earlier Christian authors, Isidore makes many direct references to pagan authors as diverse as Aesop, Apuleius, Aristotle, Caesar, Cicero, Lucretius, Ovid, Plato, the Elder Pliny, Quintilian, Sallust, Solinus, Suetonius (in particular his lost encyclopaedia, the Prata), Varro, and Virgil. Other classical authors, such as Verrius Flaccus, who wrote his On the Meaning of Words in the Augustan period, and the late fourth century grammarian Servius, also influenced Isidore's work. It is difficult, of course, to know with how many of these authors Isidore was...

30 Edition by Arévalo, PL 83.201-434. The two books or of very uneven size that for the New Testament being very much shorter (PL 83.201-208). McNally, who believes that the text of this book is not by Isidore, has produced a revised edition. The much larger book on the Old Testament (PL 83.207-434) is often known as the Mysticorum Espositio Saxramentorum.
31 Edition by Lindsay. Reproduced with a Spanish translation by Oroz Reta & Marcos Casquero. For an annotated English translation, see Barney, Lewis, Beach and Berghof, The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville.
32 Bischoff, 'Die europäische Verbreitung'; Reydellet, 'La diffusion'; McKitterick, 'Glossaries and Other Innovations', pp. 45, 49-50, 67, 71. See also the study by Carlson in this volume.
33 Edition by Arévalo, PL 83.893-914, translation into English by Ford.
34 Edition and translation into Spanish by Díaz y Díaz. For study and English translation see Smyth, 'The seventh-century Hiberno-Latin treatise Liber de ordine creaturarum'.
35 nostrum tempus antiquitatis in eo scientiam imaginavit [...] ad restaruanda antiquorum monumenta ne usquequaque rusticitate veteresceremus [...]}, Martín, ed., Scripta de vita Isidori Hispalensis episcopi, pp. 199, 205.
directly acquainted; he would probably have known the majority only at second hand via quotations in such authors as Augustine and Cassiodorus. It does seem likely however that Isidore had first-hand access to Cicero, Quintilian, Virgil, Lucretius, and Martial. He may also have possessed some of the works of Ovid and Sallust. The so-called Versus in bibliotheca, a series of couplets modelled on Martial which were intended to be placed under the busts surmounting the book cases in the cathedral library in Visigothic Seville, mention the Greek Christian authors Origen and John Chrysostom. Isidore devotes one chapter of his De viris illustribus to the latter, but it is more likely that he knew John and Origen’s works in translation rather than the original.

Braulio asserted that Isidore’s learning was holistic – he had given an account of all branches of knowledge. The Renotatio ended with a eulogy of the bishop that was self-consciously adapted from Cicero’s praise of the polymath of his own age, Varro. The breadth of his work and the sources he drew on have sometimes led to him being described as the last scholar of the ancient world. Nothing could be further from the truth. For Isidore the road to hell was indeed paved with ignorance: ‘ignorance is the mother of all error and the nurse of vice... the uneducated man is easily deceived, the fool swiftly falls into sin’. Nevertheless, he was also hostile towards secular learning merely for its own sake; pagan poetry in particular was something he detested. For the bishop the world was a mirror of heaven and

36 Fontaine, Isidore de Séville.
37 For a general discussion of Isidore’s sources, see Hillgarth, ‘The Position of Isidorian Studies’. Although it is sometimes asserted that Isidore knew Greek and Hebrew, as he is described in the late twelfth century Vita S. Isidori as Latinis Graecis et Hebraeis litteris instructus, there is no good evidence that this was the case. For an overview of this problem, see Domínguez de Val, Historia de la antigua literatura latina, pp. 27-30. There is an edition of the Versus by Martín. For a discussion of the problems they raise, see Hamblenne, ‘Les Tituli bibliothecae’.
38 The adapted text is Cicero, Academica Posteriore 1.3.
39 ‘Le dernier savant du monde ancien’ – the view of the French historian Montalambert, cited by Brehaut, An Encyclopaedist of the Dark Age, preface. Brehaut correctly notes that Isidore was also the ‘first Christian encyclopaedist and immediately adds ‘His writings, therefore, while of no importance in themselves, become important as a phenomenon in the history of European thought.’
40 Synonimia 2.65, ignorantia mater errorum est, ignorantia vitiorum nutrix ... indoctus enim facile decipitur. Stultus in vitia cito dilabitur.
41 One of Isidore’s concerns was that it was the pagan poets who had first distorted the meaning of words in order to fit the metrical schemes of their poetry (Differentiae 1, praef.), but his main animus was that such poetry was founded in pagan religion and thus: Ideo prohibetur christianus figmenta legere poetarum quia per oblectamenta inanium fabularum mentem excitant ad incentia libidinum. Non enim solum tura offerendo daemonibus immolatur, sed etiam eorum
knowledge of it was but a protreptic to draw the mind away from mundane matters towards first the moral truth that they encapsulated, and finally the theological truth which in turn lay behind the moral truth.42 If there was a choice to be made, knowledge of the divine was to be put before that of the world:

‘It will be of no harm to anyone, provided that he speaks truly of God, that through his simplicity he has insufficient knowledge of the elements. For though someone may be unable to discuss the natures of the incorporeal and corporeal, a good life lived with faith will make him blessed.’43

Far from being part of the rearguard of the classical world, Isidore was at the forefront of a new Christian order. But this new order by no means despised learning. Ideally the good man would be an educated man: ‘All wisdom comes from knowledge and conjecture,’ Isidore believes, ‘but an opinion derived from knowledge is better than one derived from conjecture as the former is true, whereas the latter is open to doubt.’44 It is perhaps unsurprising therefore that the fourth Council of Toledo over which Isidore presided in AD 633, insisted that there should be an educated secular clergy and made provision for cathedral schools to be set up in every diocesis.45

While Isidore’s prose style may not be as ‘classical’ as Leander’s, Henderson has shown that he was not insensitive to careful prose composition.46 According to Braulio, he could adopt his style to his audience and was outstandingly eloquent when the occasion demanded. The practical nature of the prose in his works shows that he wished them to be of real use, not showcases for his rhetorical ability. His greatest wish was to spread knowledge and thus his faith. In the short term he laid the foundations for the so-called ‘Isidorian renaissance’ of Visigothic Spain, of which his friend

dicta libentius capiendo. ‘The Christian is forbidden to read the compositions of their poets because by the pleasure of their inane fables they provoke the mind to incitements of lust. For a man burns not merely from offering incense to demons, but by too willingly plucking at their words.’ Sententiae 3.13.1
42 This is described by Isidore as the trimodium intelligentiae genus, ‘threefold form of knowledge’, Differentiae 2.154.
43 Nihil obesse cuiquam si per simplicitatem anquam de elementis indigne sentiat, dummodo de Deo vera pronuntiet. Nam quamvis de incorporeis corporeisque naturis nequeat quisque disputare, beatum tamen illum facit vita recta cum fide, Sententiae 2.1.1.
44 Omnis sapientia ex scientia et opinatione consistit. Melior est autem ex scientia veniens quam ex opinione sententia. Nam illa vera est, ista dubia, Sententiae 2.1.8,
45 Canons 24, 25.
46 Henderson, The Medieval World of Isidore of Seville.
and posthumous editor of the *Etymologies*, Braulio of Saragossa, was a key part. In the long term the influence of his work in both its geographical and temporal extent show the degree to which that wish was fulfilled.

The aim of this volume is not, however, to offer a ‘maximalist’ interpretation of Isidore’s impact. Isidore exercised agency in writing his works and intervening in the world around him, yet so too did those who worked with him, notably Braulio, in the early seventh century, as well as those who interacted with and sought to mould his legacy in the decades and centuries that followed. As Michael J. Kelly’s chapter demonstrates, Seville was not the only intellectual centre in the Spain of Isidore’s day. Other cities strove to establish – and in the case of Toledo succeeded – their ecclesiastical and literary dominance within Spain.

Recent studies have begun to reconceptualise the ways in which knowledge was preserved and transmitted in the Roman and post-Roman worlds. Scholars have explored how information moved between different contexts, in the process charting the varying ways in which cultural objects were transmitted, translated and transformed. Such work has demonstrated how the people of the medieval world – writers, copyists, translators, teachers, students, and other audiences – engaged actively with the cultural legacy of the ancient classical and Christian past. They did not simply pass on the knowledge and traditions that they had inherited from earlier civilisations, even those from which they claimed ancestry and legitimacy, but developed what they had received in many new ways that were designed to respond to contemporary needs.

It is within this context of creative and contextually-grounded engagement with the cultural world of Graeco-Roman and Patristic antiquity that this volume seeks to understand Isidore. Work over the past half-century has demonstrated that the construction of Isidore’s main works was determined, above all, by the context in which he was operating and his desire to influence the society for which he saw the Hispano-Visigothic church as responsible. Political, religious and social considerations influenced Isidore’s writings, but studies have revealed that those writings were intended, in

---

47 For a ‘minimalist’ view on the impact of Isidore, see: Collins, *Visigothic Spain*.
48 Notable recent work on the Roman context includes König, Oikonomopoulou and Woolf, eds., *Ancient Libraries*; König and Woolf, eds., *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*.
turn, to influence the contexts from which they emerged. As has already been noted, Isidore was not writing in a vacuum and his works represented part of a thorough programme of spiritual education that was intended to have a positive impact on the training of the clergy of Visigothic Spain and, through them, the population as a whole.

The first three chapters in this volume examine some of the innovative ways in which Isidore was influenced by, and made use of, the works of, earlier classical and Christian writers. Jamie Wood’s ‘A Family Affair: Leander, Isidore and the Legacy of Gregory the Great in Spain’ examines the rapid and wide-ranging influence of Pope Gregory I (d. 604) in seventh-century Spain. Gregory’s works were cited extensively in Spain within a few years of his death and he found eager biographers among the episcopate there. The chapter argues that the cultivation of Gregory’s memory aligned well with the efforts of Leander and Isidore to promote an image of their family as a coherent and powerful unit of exceptional Christian leaders. Gregory’s meeting with Leander in Constantinople in the early 580s opened up a channel of communication between Rome and Spain that resulted in the early dissemination of Gregory’s works there and provided Isidore with the opportunity and the ammunition to build up Gregory’s image in Spain. Two imperatives underpinned Isidore’s positive portrayal of Gregory and attempt to harness his legacy. First, his writings, especially the *Moralia in Job*, provided vital resources for Isidore’s efforts to promote the education of the clergy and, through them, the evangelisation of the population. Second, the association with Leander enabled Isidore to bolster the status of members of his own family, especially Leander, as foundational figures in the history of the Spanish Nicene church.

From Isidore’s engagement with the Patristic canon, the next two chapters move on to his use and refutation of classical interpretations of the natural world. In ‘Variations on a Theme: Isidore and Pliny on Human and Human-Instigated Anomaly’, Mary Beagon examines the use Isidore made of Pliny’s *Natural History*, written in the late first century AD, when discussing human and animal anomalies in the *Etymologies*. The chapter demonstrates that Isidore’s engagement with Pliny’s work was by no means uncritical. Rather than simply copying Pliny’s work, Isidore adapted his source so that it accorded with his own ideas about a divine plan that had no room for natural creativity which, if admitted, would undermine the entire

Isidorian project of rational categorisation. Isidore's theory of etymology also required the imposition of a sort of natural order on the text that mitigated any possibility of deviation from the divine plan.

Andrew Fear’s ‘Putting the pieces back together: Isidore and De natura rerum’ examines Isidore’s De natura rerum (DNR), arguing that the work was written to respond to a specific problem – the appearance of a number of disconcerting natural ‘omens’ at the beginning of King Sisebut’s reign in the early 610s. Isidore used this context to develop a Christianised vision of the natural world in order to reject excessive ‘superstition’ at the same time as firmly integrating the natural world into a Christian framework. Rather than, as scholars such as Fontaine have suggested, wishing to preserve a separate sphere of secular learning, Isidore actually wished to elide secular and Christian scholarship. The very title De natura rerum presents a challenge to Lucretius’s didactic poem the De rerum natura written in the first century BC. Lucretius’s work became a classic in the ancient world and was still read in Visigothic Spain. In it, Lucretius, as a follower of the Greek philosopher Epicurus, presents an entirely atheistic picture of the world whose phenomena carry no meaning beyond themselves. Isidore, deliberately using a title which closely parallels the previous work, mounts a determined refutation of Lucretius, using his themes to argue for a “natural theology” and that in fact only a belief in God can elucidate the natural world.

Isidore thus played the role of a kind of filtering agent, receiving, transforming and reconfiguring existing learning in order to make it useful for the Christian present in seventh century Spain. Alongside work that has explored how Isidore reacted to previous authorities, classical/pagan and Christian, perhaps the strongest trend in recent Isidorian scholarship is to examine the later reception and transmission of his memory and his works across the Latin West. Much of this work has stressed the variability and creativity of the ways in which later writers made use of Isidore’s works. The chapters in the second half of this volume underline the fact that Isidorian legacy was by no means monolithic and was at times contested, even within Spain.

Isidore’s legacy was by no means unproblematic for the bishops of seventh century Spain, especially those of Toledo who were striving to establish

their city as the ecclesiastical centre of the kingdom. The Isidorian legacy and the lustre that it lent to Seville were highly problematic in this regard.\textsuperscript{52} Michael J. Kelly’s chapter, ‘The Politics of History-Writing: Problematizing the Historiographical Origins of Isidore of Seville in Early Medieval Hispania’ argues that conflict over Isidore’s memory began almost immediately upon his death in 636. Kelly posits the existence of two ‘schools’ within seventh-century Iberia – that of Isidore/Seville and that of Agali/Toledo – and suggests that competition between the two was manifested, above all and amongst a range of different media, by the production of historical texts that constructed very specific memories of past events and people. Above all, it was in historiographical texts produced by and about Isidore that this conflict played out in the later seventh century and beyond.

Marina Smyth’s ‘The Reception of Isidore’s Writings in Early Medieval Ireland’ opens a series of chapters that explore concrete instances of the reception and reuse of Isidore’s works outside Spain in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. Some of the earliest traces of Isidore’s works outside Spain can be found in manuscripts of Irish provenance and it has long been assumed that Irish monks played a key role in the preservation and transmission of the Isidorian legacy.\textsuperscript{53} Smyth explores the longstanding assumption that, due to trading contacts between Spain and Ireland, the complete works of Isidore found their way to Ireland very soon after his death in 636.\textsuperscript{54} This assumption has been rendered increasingly untenable by recent studies of the early manuscript transmission of Isidore’s works.\textsuperscript{55} The chapter pays particular attention to the \textit{De Natura Rerum} and the various books of the \textit{Etymologiae} in order to generate a more nuanced profile for the transmission of Isidore’s works in Ireland.

‘Isidore of Seville in Anglo-Saxon England: The \textit{Synonyma} as a Source of Felix’s \textit{Vita S. Guthlac}’, by Claudia Di Sciacca, focuses on Anglo-Saxon England. Scholars have long debated the extent to which Bede was influenced by Isidore (both positively and negatively), but more recent works have begun to examine the transmission and impact of Isidore’s works on other early Anglo-Saxon writers.\textsuperscript{56} Isidore is now recognised as one of the staple

\textsuperscript{52} Wood, ‘Playing the Fame Game’.
\textsuperscript{53} See Warntjes, \textit{The Munich Computus}, for the most recent treatment of Isidore’s specific legacy in Ireland, Irish-influenced institutions, and the manuscripts that they produced.
\textsuperscript{54} See Hillgarth, ‘Visigothic Spain and Early Christian Ireland’ for more general contacts between Visigothic Spain and Ireland.
\textsuperscript{55} E.g. Warntjes, \textit{The Munich Computus}.
\textsuperscript{56} E.g. Di Sciacca, \textit{Finding the Right Words}, and Hussey, ‘Transmarinis litteris’ both explore the transmission of the \textit{Synonyma}. For the influence on Bede see: Fanning, ‘Bede, Imperium,
figures of Anglo-Saxon libraries. Di Sciacca investigates the *Synonyma* as a source for one of the founding and most popular texts of Anglo-Saxon hagiography, the Latin life of the hermit-saint Guthlac, a highly literary work authored by the learned monk Felix, an elusive figure of whom nothing is known except that he dedicated his *Vita S. Guthlacii* to Ælfwald, king of the East Angles (c. 713-749). The setting of Guthlac’s life itself is Crowland, a demon-infested islet in the fenland between Mercia and East Anglia, and the Mercian-East Anglian associations of the saint and his *uita* seem to offer precious evidence as to the circulation of the *Synonyma* in an age and area of Anglo-Saxon England where knowledge of this Isidorian text is otherwise hardly documented. Moreover, an appreciation of the *Synonyma* within the milieu that produced the *Vita S. Guthlacii*, a locale which seems to have nurtured an interest in eremitic values and a detailed knowledge of some of the key hagiographies concerning the founders of Eastern monasticism, namely the *Vita S. Antonii* and *Vita S. Pauli eremitae*, offers new and tantalising insights into the literary corpus with which the Isidorian text was probably associated. Such an appreciation can therefore help to further sketch out the Anglo-Saxon library to which the *Synonyma* belonged.

Christopher Heath’s ‘*Hispania et Italia: Paul the Deacon, Isidore and the Lombards*’ fills a surprising gap in scholarship on early medieval historiography by exploring Isidore’s influence on the works of Paul the Deacon in the eighth century. Heath demonstrates that despite the somewhat peripheral role that Spain and the Visigoths played in the *Historia Langobardorum*, there are indications that Isidore had a significant influence on specific sections of the work, such as the ethnographic and historical-geographical materials. Moreover, there are indications that certain key parts of Paul’s work were crafted with an eye to the *Laus Spaniae* of Isidore. Just as Isidore used previous historians creatively in order to present his Visigoths as a legitimate people in political and religious terms, so Paul the Deacon made selective use of Isidore in order to demonstrate that the Lombards were a *gens* with a long and illustrious history.57


of Isidorian material in the Carolingian period. Markauskas demonstrates that Isidore’s *De ortu et obitu Patrum* was frequently used as a source for the homiliary, but was clearly marked as a secondary authority through the collection’s organisation and visual presentation of Patristic material. Rylands MS Latin 12 thus provides an interesting instance of Isidore’s reception in a Carolingian liturgical context, where daily Patristic readings expounding the gospels were valued alongside supplementary biographical material concerning the saint for that day. In this context, it was Isidore’s ‘data’ rather than his ‘authority’ that was desired. He emerges as a second-level authority who was important, but not so illustrious as to merit explicit citation like the Fathers of the Church.

In the final chapter, ‘Adoption, Adaptation, & Authority: The Use of Isidore in the *Opus Caroli*’, Laura Carlson delves into the broader influence of Isidore on the Carolingian intelligentsia, a massive topic in need of further study. The chapter discusses the prevalence of Isidore in the eighth-century *Opus Caroli regis contra Synodum*, the largest extant work on Carolingian spirituality and a text which serves as a signpost to not only his rapid rise to the status of almost Patristic authority, but also his contribution to the development of a Carolingian linguistic philosophy. Isidore’s growing status and accessibility within the eighth-century Carolingian intellectual landscape is easily confirmed by both the extant number of his works, not to mention the frequency with which Carolingian writers cite him. The chapter demonstrates that the exposition on the relationship between images and language in the *Opus Caroli* derived from Isidore’s linguistic philosophy, developed in his *Etymologiae*, which advocated the widespread applicability of classical linguistic disciplines, such as grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic within the context of Christian spirituality.

Alongside other chapters in the second half of this volume, the exploration of Carolingian-era uses of Isidore by Heath, Markauskas, and Carlson provide further evidence for the flexibility with which Isidore’s legacy was treated from 636 onwards. Just as the chapters by Beagon, Fear, and Wood demonstrate that Isidore himself interacted with his sources freely and was not constrained by any particular need to remain ‘faithful’ to the writings of his predecessors, the chapters on the western European transmission of Isidore’s work demonstrate that there was not one Isidorian legacy, but

---

Furthermore, these legacies were by no means fixed – they were made and remade in response to specific historically-grounded agendas. It is beyond the scope of this volume to examine the continued transmission and transformation of Isidore’s works and his image in post-Carolingian Europe (and beyond). It is enough to note that creative adaptation continued to typify the ways in which Isidore was used by later writers and to hope that future publications will explore what is, given the central role of ‘Isidorian’ methods for organising and transmitting knowledge, a fundamental element of the medieval thought-world.

The interplays between text and context examined in the various studies in this volume demonstrate the need to understand the varied and creative ways by which Isidore’s works, wholly and in part, were transmitted and transformed over time. In summary, it is necessary to comprehend the origins and early receptions of Isidorian texts if one is to unpick their later transformations. The chapters in the first half of the volume thus establish the context from which to understand those in the second half, which provide an overview of the different ways in which Isidore’s works were received across early medieval Western Europe. Both sections create the necessary context from which to develop a fuller understanding of later receptions of Isidore’s work in the post-Carolingian era.
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2 A Family Affair

Leander, Isidore and the Legacy of Gregory the Great in Spain

Jamie Wood

Gregory Hippo, as much as you are distinguished for your teacher Augustine,
So much is Rome for its Pope Gregory
Leander
You are held to be not much unequal to the ancient Doctors,
Leander the Bishop: your works teach us this

Quantum Augustino clares tu Hippone magistro
Tantum Roma suo praesule Gregorio
Leander
Non satis antiquis doctoribus impar haberis
Leander vates hoc tua dicta docent

Introduction

There is no doubt that Pope Gregory I (r. 590-605) had a deep and lasting impact on the religious life of early medieval Spain. It would be easy, with the benefit of hindsight, to look back from Gregory's status as one of the fathers of the Latin Church and see this as an inevitable outcome of his exemplary life and work in organising the papacy and sending missions to the Anglo-Saxons. Yet, his memory was by no means unchallenged in Rome in the decades after his death and no hagiography was authored there until the ninth century. A famous Life of Gregory was written at Whitby in northern England around the year 700 which drew on interest in his cult in later seventh century England, Ireland and Gaul, as well as Rome. This

1 Isidore, Versus 13-14, Sánchez Martín, ed., Isidori Hispalensis Versus, p. 225.
2 Collins, Early Medieval Spain, pp. 60 and 73: the influence of Gregory's 'work on the Spanish Church at this time cannot be minimised'.
3 Thacker, ‘Memorialising Gregory the Great’.
chapter will demonstrate that beginning in the first decade of the seventh century, Gregory’s status as a Father of the Church was actually established more quickly and maintained more solidly in Spain than elsewhere in Latin Europe.

The verse above, by Isidore of Seville (d. 636), is thus the first bloom of the Gregorian legacy in seventh century Spain. The extremely positive view of Gregory was not solely the result of his position as bishop of Rome, however. Relations between the papacy and the bishops and kings of seventh century Spain were infrequent and often fractious, so the memory of Gregory cannot be attributed solely to royal or papal initiative.4 Although there had been ecclesiastical contacts between Rome and Spain throughout late antiquity, such interactions had never been intense, at least insofar as they can be pieced together from the surviving evidence.5 This chapter will argue that Gregory’s popularity in the early seventh century was due to his connection to Leander of Seville and thus to his brother Isidore of Seville. It was not derived from respect for the papacy as an institution, nor did it result from the active cultivation of Gregory’s memory in Spain by later popes or their agents. Rather, it was the family connection to Isidore and Isidore’s intense engagement with some of Gregory’s key works that conditioned the interest of bishops and even a Visigothic king later in the seventh century.

A number of Gregory’s hagiographical, exegetical and pastoral writings were transmitted to Spain during his lifetime and almost immediately used as sources and taken up as models by Spanish writers such as Isidore of Seville, Taio of Zaragoza and the author of the collective hagiography known as the Lives of Fathers of Mérida.6 Figures from Isidore to Eugenius of Toledo engaged with, and sometimes sought to replicate, Gregory’s self-presentation as monk, reluctant leader, theologian, and even hypochondriac.7 Historical as well as literary circumstances contributed to the rapid spread of Gregory’s popularity within Spain. He wrote letters to Spanish laymen and churchmen, including several to Leander of Seville, Isidore’s brother, and received a letter from King Reccared I (r. 586-601) announcing the conversion to the Visigoths from Arian to Nicene Christianity.8

It was Isidore of Seville, however, who made the earliest and most extensive use of Gregory’s writings. The rapid adoption of Gregory’s works was

4 King, Law and Society, p. 123.
5 Ferreiro, ‘The Iberian Church’.
8 For a survey of these contacts see Orlandis, ‘Gregorio Magno’.
aided by the fact that his legacy was so flexible: his focus on the pastoral role of leaders could be applied to thinking about monastic, episcopal and even royal authority. The influence of Gregory’s Regula Pastoralis on Spain is brought out by Fernández Alonso, La cura pastoral, pp. 125-129; Wood, The Politics of Identity, p. 143: as part of this process the king’s role became increasingly analogous to that of the episcopate; Martin, La géographie du pouvoir, p. 348: on the role of the king as a pastor to his people. Cf. Gregory’s thought on the key role of episcopal ministry within church and society, Markus, Gregory the Great, pp. 17-33.

Other works by Gregory, such as the Moralia in Job, could have served as educational texts in an additional sense by providing learners with models for conducting exegesis, for example. Gregory’s works, alongside those of Jerome, provided Isidore with useful aids for the study of scripture, primarily for use by those who had to expound the scriptures in public or for monks, Collins, Early Medieval Spain, p. 63.

Although the theological and pastoral weight of Gregory’s surviving writings cannot be ignored and they certainly contributed to the depth and longevity of his impact in Spain, this chapter argues that the key to his influence lies in the connection to Leander of Seville and, through Leander, to Isidore. A meeting with Leander in Constantinople in the mid-580s opened up opportunities for the exchange of texts and letters and, more importantly, created a close association that Isidore was able to exploit as part of his efforts to boost the status of the Spanish Church and his own family. Importantly too, via Leander, Isidore had easy access to a number of Gregory’s writings, which proved extremely useful in his efforts to create compendia of Christian knowledge for use by Spanish ecclesiastics.

Gregory’s Contacts with Hispania

The relative number of Gregory’s letters to Spain is low, at least in comparison with the volume of letters to other western provinces, especially Italy. However, as has already been noted, such communication took place at significant moments such as the conversion, was conducted with important figures such as Reccared I and Leander of Seville, and was accompanied by the exchange of gifts and texts. It may also be significant that letters were exchanged with a geographically disparate area, encompassing a large part of what would later become Visigothic Hispania: from the Byzantine-controlled territory in the southwest, to the capital at Toledo, and the small province in Gaul, Narbonnensis. Gregory also intervened directly to try to

9 The influence of Gregory’s Regula Pastoralis on Spain is brought out by Fernández Alonso, La cura pastoral, pp. 125-129; Wood, The Politics of Identity, p. 143: as part of this process the king’s role became increasingly analogous to that of the episcopate; Martin, La géographie du pouvoir, p. 348: on the role of the king as a pastor to his people. Cf. Gregory’s thought on the key role of episcopal ministry within church and society, Markus, Gregory the Great, pp. 17-33.

10 Gregory’s works, alongside those of Jerome, provided Isidore with useful aids for the study of scripture, primarily for use by those who had to expound the scriptures in public or for monks, Collins, Early Medieval Spain, p. 63.

11 For an overview of Gregory’s contacts with and writings about Spain see: Thompson, The Goths in Spain, pp. 41, 66, 73, 76-77, 90, 94, 109-112.

12 Orlandis, ‘Gregorio Magno’.
uphold religious discipline and resolve ecclesiastical disputes within Spain, to encourage Nicene orthodoxy, and to act as a diplomatic intermediary between the Visigothic kings and the Byzantine government.13

There were a number of different means by which communication was established with Spain. Diplomacy was perhaps the most important of these and although such interactions were reciprocal in nature, with Spaniards requesting advice, information and intervention, responding to Gregory’s messages and sending gifts to him, the sources suggest that Gregory was the more active ‘partner’ in this exchange. This can be seen most clearly in the exchange of gifts. The relatively few letters that survive record the dispatch of relics to Reccared, a pallium for Leander and copies of Gregory’s Regula Pastoralis and Moralía in Job.14 It is important to note that this was not a one-way exchange and that gifts were sent to Gregory from Spain, but the overall pattern was for materials and texts to be sent out from Rome to Spain.

In terms of diplomatic exchanges, it was while Gregory was acting as papal apocrisarius (envoy) in Constantinople in the first half of the 580s that he first came into contact with Leander, who was conducting an embassy with the emperor on behalf of Hermenegild, a Visigothic prince who had rebelled against his father, King Leovigild (r. 568–586). There were later exchanges of letters and gifts with Reccared, Leovigild’s successor, about the conversion of the Visigoths to Nicene Christianity. The king also requested that Gregory obtain a copy of an old treaty that had been made between the Visigoths and the Byzantines, and Gregory sent messages to Duke Claudius, the governor of Narbonnensis, in Visigothic-controlled southern Gaul.15 As well as direct contact with Spain, there is evidence that Gregory obtained information from intermediaries. He sent legal advisors to the Byzantine-controlled province in south-eastern Spain to assist bishops who had been deposed, supposedly illegally, and also used clergy to act as intermediaries with the Visigothic kings.16 Information also seems to have been gathered from people who had travelled there, perhaps for trading purposes, because in the Dialogues Gregory says that he heard about the death of Hermenegild from ‘many who come from Spain’.17 Of course, our

17 Gregory, Dialogues 3.31.
record of Gregory’s involvement in Spain is highly dependent on the vagaries of the surviving documentation, which is the result of the choices made by those who compiled the Register of Gregory’s letters. Nevertheless, in comparison with earlier, and certainly with later, bishops of Rome, Gregory seems to have communicated actively with Spain.

**Early Citations of Gregory in Spain**

A significant factor in the early and rapid rise in Gregory’s popularity in Spain must have been the fact that his writings circulated there at an early date. Gregory sent preliminary versions of some of what were to become his most influential works to Leander, for example. Other sources suggest that Gregory’s writings were desired by discerning bishops in Spain as early as the 590s. We have already observed that Leander received early versions of the *Moralia in Job* and the *Regula Pastoralis* and Licinianus of Cartagena, a bishop in Byzantine-controlled Spain, sent a letter to Gregory about the *Regula Pastoralis* and asked for a copy of some of Gregory’s homilies on the book of Job. Apparently, he found out about Gregory’s work on Job when Leander was travelling through Cartagena, presumably during his return from Constantinople.

Definite citations of Gregory’s works in Spain can be traced to the first decade of the seventh century. Isidore’s use of Gregory will be explored in more detail later in this chapter, but he was making use of the *Moralia in Job* in some of his earliest works and mentioned both it and the *Regula Pastoralis* in the biography of Gregory that he incorporated into the *De viris illustribus* (written sometime between 604 and 608). The level of engagement with Gregory’s writings, especially the *Moralia*, increased substantially during the subsequent two decades. As was indicated by the quotation with which this chapter began, Isidore’s admiration for Gregory was made even more explicit in various biographical and encomiastic accounts of his life and achievements. Engagement with the Gregorian legacy extended beyond Isidore, however. We have evidence that Gregory’s *Dialogues* were circulating elsewhere in southern Spain by the 630s because the *Vita Sanctorum*.

---

18 The letters were widely read in Spain. Hillgarth, ‘La conversión de los visigodos’, p. 28.
20 For date of *De viris illustribus*, see Martín, ‘Une nouvelle édition critique’, pp. 141-4.
Patrum Emeritensium, a text that was redacted in two stages in 633 or shortly thereafter and then sometime between 666 and 681, refers to the text as a model for its collection of hagiographies.21 Collins has commented that despite the fact that the Vita Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium makes only minimal direct use of its model, it ‘would be fair enough to say that the spirit of Gregory informs the work as a whole, even if in a rather primitive way’. 22 All of this suggests that Gregory’s name had become by the 630s a ‘tag’ that added value to a text, whether or not his work was used as a specific source of information.

Family Values: Leander, Isidore and Family

Despite the quite low number of communications with Spain during Gregory’s papacy, such contacts do represent an increase on previous bishops of Rome and those exchanges that did happen took place at a high level and occurred at important historical moments, for the Spanish Church at least. Gregory’s works were transmitted to Spain, alluded to and cited very rapidly. The earliest peak in Gregory’s popularity occurred in Spain in the early and mid-seventh century and can be largely attributed to the influence of Isidore and his followers. The connection to Leander was important here because it put Gregory’s works in the hands of Isidore, an unofficial literary executor who wielded considerable influence and who had an interest in promoting his own family.

Scholars have long debated the origins of the family of Leander and Isidore. The short biography of Leander in Isidore’s De viris illustribus, written

21 Vitæ sanctorum patrum emeretensium, Prefatio, Maya Sánchez, ed., Vitæ sanctorum patrum emeretensium, pp. 3-4: Virorum orthodoxorum maximeque catholicorum prossus uera esse nullus ambigeat miracula, qua sanctissimus egregiusque uates, Romane presul urbis, Gregorius inflam-matus paracliti carismate Spiritus Dialogorum in libris ueridico edidit prenotationis stilo; qua olim scilicet omnipotens Deus servulis per sui beni placitis propter honorem nominis sui patrare dignatus est, trans. by Fear, Lives of the Visigothic Fathers, p. 45: ‘No orthodox believer and above all no Catholic ought to disbelieve in the miracles which that most holy and famed bishop, Gregory, Bishop of the city of Rome, fired by the grace of the Comforting Spirit, set down in his books of Dialogues, writing them with a pen which told the truth: miracles which in olden times Almighty God thought it fit to work for the glory of His name through humble servants who were indeed pleasing to Him.’ For the two stages of redaction see: Velázquez, Vidas de los santos Padres de Mérida, pp. 11-15. See also: Collins, Early Medieval Spain, p. 88.

22 Collins, ‘Merida and Toledo’, p. 193; cf. Velázquez, Vidas de los santos Padres de Mérida, pp. 33-6 for a more positive appraisal of Gregory’s influence on the work, which extended to other works besides the Dialogues.
at some point between 604 and 608, is the best evidence, but its account is opaque at best. The *De viris illustribus* lists thirty-three famous Christians, mainly Spaniards, who lived in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries. The text fits within the context of an emerging interest in biographical and hagiographical writing in Visigothic Spain in the early-seventh-century. Leander refers in passing to his homeland in his *De institutione virgum* but does not provide any specific details. It is difficult even to ascertain the geographical origins of the family. Isidore's *De viris illustribus* states that their father, Severianus, lived in the province of Carthaginiensis and that the family was later forcibly moved to Baetica, although no clear indication is given of who was responsible for this move. Roger Collins has suggested, based on onomastic evidence, that the family had African roots, although this must remain conjectural in the absence of confirmation from other sources. It is clear that the family were influential because of the decision, either by the Visigothic kings or the Byzantine government, to move them away from the frontier province of Carthaginiensis. It is striking too that all three brothers became bishops, both mother and daughter took up the monastic life, and we know that both Leander and Isidore lived as monks before taking up episcopal office. Leander seems to have occupied himself primarily with administration, although at least two of his works have survived, and Isidore's literary output is nothing sort of monumental. The family thus seems to have been of considerable status, was able to establish its power base in the province of Baetica in southern Spain after being moved there sometime in the mid-sixth-century, perhaps investing heavily in ecclesiastical institutions and offices in order to hedge their bets against a changeable political climate.

More is known about the interactions between Leander, Isidore and their parents and siblings than about their family background. This is because both Leander and Isidore make both specific and passing references to members of their family in their writings. Most notable is Isidore's biography of Leander in the *De viris illustribus*. Isidore's *De viris illustribus* was largely designed to establish the status of Leander as a worthy historical figurehead for the Spanish Church to stand alongside figures such as Gregory and Augustine, a point underlined by the quotation from the *Versus* with which this chapter began. There are references to Leander's maltreatment by the Arian kings of the Visigoths, his role in the fight against heresy and

24 For a thorough review of the evidence, see: Fontaine and Cazier, ‘Qui a chassé’.
the conversion of King Reccared to Nicene Christianity, and his work in
organising the Church. For Isidore, therefore, Leander represented the ideal
Spanish bishop, a bishop, furthermore, whose profile resembled very much
his own.  

The *De viris illustribus* also presents Leander – and, as author of the text,
Isidore – as protecting and promoting their family. Letters were exchanged
between family members, they dedicated texts to one another, and there
were cases where they looked after one another (or at least presented them-
selves as doing so). We shall see in what follows that this family did not just
‘stick together’. The textual productions of Isidore and Leander strained to
demonstrate this coherence rhetorically. In addition to referring briefly to
their father, in the *De viris illustribus* Isidore states that Leander wrote
letters to his brother, Fulgentius, and his sister, Florentina. Although it is often
described as a monastic rule for nuns, one of Leander’s few surviving works,
*De institutione virginum*, actually took the form of a letter to Florentina. In
the text Leander makes reference to his brothers, to their mother and to his
homeland in an effort to persuade Florentina, a virgin who had dedicated
her life to God, to adopt the monastic life in the manner that he prescribed.

Isidore also dedicated texts to his siblings. The prefatory letters to *De
fide Catholica contra Iudaeos*, written in 614/5, are to his sister Florentina
and that of the *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, written sometime between 598 and
615, to his brother Fulgentius, Bishop of Écija. In dedicating these works
to his brother and sister respectively, Isidore modelled himself on Leander,
demonstrated his commitment to his family and drew them into his own
efforts to provide useful educational resources for Spanish churchmen. The
*De fide Catholica contra Iudaeos* was intended for Florentina’s edification
and Drews has argued that Isidore’s overall aim was to make her a co-heir
in his programme of educating the clergy about the errors of Judaism. It
is interesting to note that the later end of the range of possible dates for
the *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, a text that provides an overview of the various
offices of the contemporary Church and which was in all probability used
by the clergy of the Visigothic kingdom to ensure the pastoral care of the

---

27 Isidore, *De viris illustribus* 28.
29 Drews, *The Unknown Neighbour*, pp. 39-46, 83, 113; the Spanish translators of the text also
interpret it as being underpinned by an edificatory aim, Castro Caridad and Peña Fernández,
*Sobre la fe católica*, p. 19.
population, corresponds to the date of the *De fide Catholica contra Iudaeos*.\(^{30}\)

Just as he depicted Leander as a protector and organiser of the Catholic Church in Spain, Isidore seems to have deliberately associated Florentina and Fulgentius with his own efforts to train the clergy there.

Leander and Isidore derived considerable rhetorical capital from emphasising the connectedness of their family network. For example, in comparison to earlier texts in the *De viris illustribus* tradition Isidore laid particular stress on the writing of texts on virginity by famous men.\(^{31}\) Of the five men Isidore outlined as having written on virginity, he stated that four of them dedicated the texts to their sister, compared to none of the illustrious men mentioned by Jerome or Gennadius, whose works he was continuing. This seems to have been part of a deliberate attempt to centre the *De viris illustribus* on Leander as the archetypal Spanish bishop.\(^{32}\)

Textual connectivity between brother and sister enabled Isidore to better pattern the text and the model of illustriousness that it was generating on Leander.

In focussing a key element of the *De viris illustribus* on his siblings, Isidore followed a path that had already been trodden by Leander who, in attempting to persuade Florentina to adopt a monastic lifestyle, had emphasised the cohesiveness of the family unit. In the *De institutione virginum* Leander stresses the dislocation of his mother (and himself) from their homeland in a passage redolent of Augustine’s account of his mother’s travails in Italy in the *Confessions*.\(^{33}\) Connections to various fourth century ascetic writings have also been suggested, including those by Jerome and Basil the Great.\(^{34}\)

Whatever literary predecessors Leander referred to, the religious life of reading, study and prayer that he outlined for Florentina and her companions, was modelled on the Virgin Mary and their mother. According to Leander, travel was out of the question because Florentina was, like their mother, who had been forced to leave her home city, ‘a sojourner’ and should remain so for the rest of her life.\(^{35}\)

Metaphors of refuge and exile are used to describe the life that Florentina has embarked on. Their mother’s physical

---

30 Knoebel, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, pp. 13-15 for an overview of the text.
31 15.1% of Isidore’s authors had written on virginity, while 9.9% of Gennadius of Marseilles’ had and 3.7% of Jerome’s; for further discussion see Wood, ‘Playing the Fame Game’, pp. 626-8.
32 Leander to his sister; Osius of Córdoba to his sister; Bishop Avitus to his sister; Severus of Málaga to his sister; Julianus Pomerius (undirected).
35 Leander, *De institutione virginum* 21.4, 31.3.
exile thereby becomes a model for the spiritual exile of the daughter.\textsuperscript{36} Leander depicted his mother in this way both to persuade Florentina, and presumably her fellow nuns, to adopt a life of withdrawal from the world and to provide them with a model for how to think about and cope with their separation. Family thus served a persuasive and an educative function.

In \textit{De institutione virginum} Leander also notes that he is fearful for the well-being of Fulgentius, who he had sent homewards on some unspecified business, and also stresses the importance of caring for Isidore, the youngest member of the family.\textsuperscript{37} In the \textit{De viris illustribus} Isidore records that among Leander’s letters was one to Fulgentius on the fear of death.\textsuperscript{38} This letter does not survive and therefore we cannot be sure if it was consolatory and hence evidence of Leander taking direct responsibility for the psychological well-being of his brother. Leander may also have been providing his brother with resources for use in preaching and pastoral activities with his congregation, further confirmation that Isidore saw some value in emphasising the epistolary interconnections between Leander and the rest of his family. The records of the second and third councils of Seville, held in 619 and 624 and presided over by Isidore, both contain references to disputes that involved or originated in Écija, Fulgentius’ bishopric.\textsuperscript{39} Fulgentius attended the second council and, although the acts of the third council are not extant in their entirety, reference to a dispute in the bishopric demonstrates that he must have passed away by the time it was held. Family interest in the city perhaps resulted in it receiving significant attention from Isidore, the leading ecclesiastic in the province of Baetica, and his fellow bishops. For Leander and Isidore, therefore, there was considerable rhetorical value to be derived from presenting their family as a cohesive unit, the members of which stuck together.

**Gregory and Leander**

Another way for Isidore to bolster the status of his family, and of Leander in particular, was to emphasise their connections to other illustrious ecclesiastics. In the \textit{De viris illustribus} Leander is said to have written numerous letters to his fellow bishops and the importance of the dedication of the \textit{De
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institutione virginum to Florentina in terms of the overall literary profile of the illustri has just been examined. Yet the association with Gregory was perhaps the most important strand of Isidore’s efforts to focus the De viris illustribus on Leander. He stresses their direct contacts through the exchange of letters and also patterns the entries on Gregory and Leander on one another: they engage in similar kinds of activity such as authoring theological treatises, fighting heresy and organising the Church through letter writing. As we saw at the start of this chapter, Isidore associates Leander and Gregory with one another by collocation in the Versus, a poem by Isidore that outlines the contents of the library in Seville, in which the verse on Leander is immediately after the one on Gregory. Given these associations, it is hardly surprising that Fontaine has suggested Gregory and Leander were ‘inseparable’ in Isidore’s imagination.

All of this is not to deny that Leander and Gregory were connected in life as well as in Isidore’s posthumous promotional activities and their relationship has been the subject of a recent monograph by Martyn. It is well-known that Gregory and Leander met in Constantinople at some point between 579 and 582/5. Gregory’s Dialogues attribute the conversion of the Visigothic prince Hermenegild from Arianism to Catholicism to the efforts of Leander, stating that he heard about these events from travellers from Spain. In one of Gregory’s letters to Reccared, the king who converted the Visigoths to Catholicism later in the 580s, he granted a pallium, a sign that its holder possessed one of the principal seats of Christianity, to Leander. This was in recognition of Leander’s role in the conversion of Reccared and was no doubt at least partially influenced by their friendship. Gregory dedicated the Moralia in Job to Leander, and signals the influence of the Spanish bishop on the inception of the work in the letter to Leander which prefaced the book.

A number of letters from Gregory to Leander have survived, although none of the replies remain, while Isidore’s biography of Leander in the De
viris illustribus suggests that their correspondence after meeting in Constantinople may have been even more extensive. According to Collins, this important and ongoing ‘channel of communication […] meant that most of Gregory’s works very quickly became available in the Visigothic kingdom and they came to exercise, with the sole exception of […] Augustine, the greatest single influence upon the learning of the Spanish Church in the seventh century.’ It is to this influence that we now turn, beginning by examining the use Isidore made of Gregory.

Gregory and Isidore

In addition to his efforts to associate Leander with Gregory, Isidore made extensive use of Gregory’s writings as a source. These included explicit references to Gregory’s writings, what we might nowadays describe as un-referenced citations, and the biography in the De viris illustribus. Indeed, the De viris illustribus may have been designed to celebrate the lives of Leander and Gregory together, both of whom had died shortly before the text was written.

Gregory’s illustriousness is signalled even by the seemingly insignificant conventions used to establish his dates: he took office under the Emperor Maurice (r. 582-602) and died in the reign of Phocas (r. 602-610). Only one other bishop, John of Constantinople, with whom Isidore may also have been striving to associate Gregory and Leander, receives this level of chronological detail. Isidore heaps plentiful praise on Gregory:

With the pricking [of conscience] of the full fear of God and with the highest humility, so endowed with wisdom through the grace of the Holy Spirit, that not only in the present is there no doctor equal to him but there never has been at any time. […] It is said nevertheless that this same highly distinguished man […]. Happy and rather too happy, he who through all his study is able to understand [Gregory’s] words.

compunctione timoris Dei plenus et humilitate summus, tantoque per gratiam Spiritus Sancti scientiae lumine praeditus, ut non modo illi

48 For overview of contents of the surviving letters, see Martyn, Gregory and Leander, pp. 1-14.
49 Collins, Early Medieval Spain, pp. 60-61.
praesentium temporum quisquam doctorum, sed nec in praeteritis quidem par fuerit unquam. [...] Fertur tamen idem excellentissimus uir [...]. Felix tamen et nimium felix, qui omnium studiorum eius potuit cognoscere dicta.

According to Isidore the key reason for Gregory’s excellence was the quality of his writings, especially those to Leander. In the edition, only eight lines are devoted to writings not directed to Leander. This includes the Pastoral Rule, which was written at the start of the episcopate to Bishop John of Constantinople, the third member of the international episcopal triumvirate that Isidore centred on Leander:

In which he teaches what sort of person comes to the duty of office, indeed how he should come to live, or [how] he should desire to teach his subjects [...] And he has written other moral books, and he has expounded through public sermons the whole text of the four gospels, a work unparalleled to us.

In quo docet, qualis quisque ad officium regiminis ueniat, uel qualiter dum uenerit uiuere uel docere subiectos studeat. [...] et alios libros morales scripsisse, totumque textum quattuor euangeliorum sermocinando in populis exposuisse, incognitum scilicet nobis opus.53

At fifteen lines, Gregory’s writings to Leander thus take up almost twice as much space in the edition as those to other recipients. Isidore lists two letters to Leander, one of which was the preface to the Moralia in Job. The other warned against the practice of triple immersion at baptism, presumably the reply to the letter on baptism that Isidore mentions Leander sent to Gregory. Amongst other points, the letter stated:

He said that it can be by no means blame-worthy to submerge infants in baptism, whether once or thrice, when through three immersions it can denote the persons of the Trinity, and through one the unity of the Divinity.

Reprehensibile, inquit, esse nullatenus potest infante[m] in baptismate mergere, uel semel uel ter, quando in tribus mersionibus personarum Trinitatis, et in una potest Diuinitatis singularitas designari.54

---

54 Isidore, De viris illustribus 27, Codoñer Merino, ed., El “De viris illustribus”, p. 149.
Disputes over baptism were a common feature of theological controversy in late sixth century Spain, between Nicene bishops and between Nicene and Arian authorities. The emphasis on baptismal practices and the use of Trinitarian formulae in the *De viris illustribus* is hardly surprising given the pivotal role that Leander played in the conversion of the Visigoths from Arianism to Catholicism in the late 580s.

Most importantly, the *Moralia in Job* was apparently written at the request of Leander and underlined Gregory’s skills as an exegete:

And the same man also, at the request of bishop Leander, interpreted the book of holy Job according to its mystic and moral meanings, and explained with a fount of bountiful eloquence the full history of its prophet in thirty-five volumes. Through these, how great the mysteries of the sacraments were indeed uncovered, and how great the moral precepts are for promoting love of eternal life or how great the decoration of words makes this clear, no one has the wisdom to explain, even if all his skill were to be turned solely to that of speech.

*Idem etiam, efflagitante Leandro episcopo, librum beati Iob mystico ac morali sensu disseruit, totamque eius prophetiae historiam in triginta quinque voluminibus largo eloquentiae fonte explicuit. In quibus quidem quanta mysteria sacramentorum aperiantur, quantaque sint in amorem aeternae morum praecepta vel quanta clareant ornamenta verborum, nemo sapiens explicare ualebit, etiam si omnes artus eius uertantur in linguam.*

Again, Isidore emphasised two aspects of the work: first, that it was written at the request of Leander; second, its technical (i.e. exegetical), moral and literary excellence. As we shall see in the sections that follow, this was more than a lot of rhetorical hot air. Isidore and his fellow bishops made extensive and creative use of the *Moralia* in the following decades. Alongside works such as Augustine’s *City of God* and Isidore’s *Etymologies* and *Sententiae*, it quickly became one of the key resources for the churchmen of seventh-century Visigothic Spain.

---

55 Wood, ‘Religious Strategies of Distinction’. For a brief comment on the impact of these debates on the material record, see Chavarria, ‘Churches and aristocracies in seventh-century Spain’, p. 6.
Isidore’s Use of Gregory

Isidore’s highly positive appraisal of Gregory is reflected in the extensive use he made of Gregory in virtually every one of his writings. Gregory is not always Isidore’s main source, but he is usually prominent, from the Etymologies, a compendium of late antique scholarship and Isidore’s magnum opus, via exegetical and grammatical writings, to the De ecclesiasticis officiis, a guidebook to the various offices of the Church. The most extensive borrowings took place from the Moralia in Job, a clear reflection of Isidore’s highly positive opinion of the work. The Isidorian text with the highest level of reliance on Gregory was the Sententiae, three books of spiritual instruction probably written in 614/5. Isidore’s earliest biographer, Braulio of Zaragoza, picked up on the reliance of the work on Gregory’s Moralia shortly after Isidore’s death, he published: ‘three books of Sentences, adorned with choice selections from the books of Pope Gregory’s Morals’ (Sententiarum libros tres, quos floribus ex libris papae Gregorii Moralis decorauit).

One of the main intellectual trends within Visigothic Spain was the compilation and summarising of the writings of Church Fathers such as Augustine and Gregory. Recent work has demonstrated the creative uses Isidore made of his sources. He is no longer seen as an unreflective ‘cut-and-paster’ who sought to ‘save’ the knowledge of the ancient world and make it useful for the medieval period. Isidore and other writers from seventh century Spain formed anthologies that synthesised the work of earlier Christian (and often non-Christian) writers. Their purpose was

57 Díaz y Díaz, Introducción General: pp. 194-195: the main Christian sources for the Etymologies are Augustine, Jerome and Lactantius; less important, but still used frequently are Tertullian, Cassiodorus, Ambrose and Gregory the Great. See Fontaine, La culture classique for specific details of borrowings; Barneby et al, Etymologies, p. 15: books 6 to 8 of the Etymologies constitute the ecclesiastical and theological part of the work for which the primary sources are Augustine and Jerome, who are used extensively, as well as Gregory the Great, Lactantius’ Divine Institutions and Tertullian.
58 Díaz, ‘Visigothic Political Institutions’, p. 342 suggested that Isidore’s views on unction may have been influenced by Gregory. Ullman, The Carolingian Renaissance, pp. 74, 76, however, considers that Isidore would have had no knowledge of the Pope’s point of view, and that when he wrote, unction did not exist as a practice.
59 Knobbel, De Ecclesiasticis Officiis, p. 5: Isidore’s Differentiae, Proemia and De Ecclesiasticis Officiis contain material from Gregory the Great’s Moralia in Job.
60 Martín, ‘Une nouvelle édition critique’, pp. 141-5.
not solely to preserve received Christian knowledge, but to facilitate better understanding among the ecclesiastical elites and, through them, the general public. Texts such as the Sententiae adapted carefully-selected parts of the writings of earlier authors to generate original works that met contemporary pastoral objectives.

Isidore did not simply use Gregory’s Moralia in Job, his main source when writing the Sententiae, as a mine of quotations, but carefully selected material in order to mould one of the monuments of late antique exegesis to new purposes. The key problem confronting Isidore was not lack of material, but what to do with the vast amount of material, Gregorian and other, that he had at his disposal. The list of definite and possible uses of Gregory’s works in the Sententiae runs to four and a half pages in the index fontium of the modern edition, with the Moralia in Job accounting for three and a half of those pages.

Given what is known about Isidore’s working methods, and the wealth of sources at his disposal, it was inevitable that a reference work such as the Sententiae would engage in a process of selection, editing and augmentation. His construction of the Sententiae aligns well with practices that have been observed in other Isidorian writings. In many instances he shortened sources by excerpting and summarising them. This might have been at least partly due to the fact that he possessed incomplete versions of the source works or because he was reliant on collections of excerpts. Isidore was interested in communicating as effectively as possible with his audience and, in his mind, the best way of doing this was to write with brevity rather than in an overly rhetorical style. Although the admonition to write simply and with clarity, even when producing quite complex works, was commonplace by the time of Isidore, I have argued elsewhere that Isidore deliberately wrote works that were characterised by their brevity in order to improve the readability, communicative potential and ultimately the didactic power of his work. Sometimes these works were indeed quite brief

62 Orlandis, Historia, p. 322.
63 Isidore, Sententiae, ed. by Cazier, pp. 355-359 (only books 3, 11, 13, 16, 20, 22 and 35 of the Moralia are missing from the list). Despite the extensive use that Isidore made of Gregory’s works in the Sententiae, there are no explicit references to Gregory by name in the text. This is in line with Isidore’s citation practices in relation to Augustine, who is not mentioned by name either, despite the frequent use made of his works. Even biblical authors are only mentioned by name infrequently, usually when Isidore makes a direct citation.
64 Numerous examples throughout the text; on this Isidorian practice generally see: Mullins, The Spiritual Life.
66 Wood, ‘Brevitas’.
but, on other occasions the claim to brevity meant that Isidore was dealing in a relatively concise way with long sources rather than that his works were objectively ‘brief’ themselves. So, although the Sententiae is actually quite a long work, in comparison to the wealth of Patristic and other sources on which it draws, it is characterised by brevity and hence, to Isidore’s mind at least, clarity. Isidore also tended to reduce or remove Gregory’s digressions in order to turn the interpretations in a more acceptable direction, for example, in his efforts to combat what he saw as eastern heresies.67

Isidore sometimes rearranged material taken from the Moralia in other ways, adding information taken from elsewhere in the text, condensing and merging two chapters into one, splitting apart chapters that had been together previously.68 Another practice was to collate Gregory’s words with those of other, usually Patristic, authors.69 Augustine was the main choice here, although on occasion the Moralia was spliced with other works by Gregory, such as the Regula Pastoralis.70

All of this is not to deny the extent of Isidore’s own contribution, which was significant and went beyond editing his sources, processes which are indicative of his deep engagement with the source texts. On the most basic level, and still pointing towards his compilatory attitude, there are multiple examples of intertexts between the Sententiae and other Isidorian writings. Sometimes earlier writings by Isidore, such as the Differentiae, served as sources for the Sententiae, while on other occasions material from the Sententiae could be found in later works, such as the Etymologiae.71

Finally, as was noted above, in other places Isidore introduced his own reflections, often at the close of the chapter, in order to alter the meaning or emphasis of the Gregorian source.72 This brief overview of the use Isidore made of Gregory’s works, primarily the Moralia in Job in the Sententiae, has demonstrated Isidore’s role as an active and thoughtful editor of his source.

67 On Isidore’s hostility to eastern heresies and his splicing of patristic sources, including Gregory, see: MacCoull, ‘Isidore and the Akephaloi’.
68 E.g. Gregory, Moralia in Job 18.43.68 is used in Isidore, Sententiae 2.1.4, 3.16.7 and 3.21.2.
69 E.g. Isidore, Sententiae 1.8 (De mundo), Cazier, ed., Isidorus Hispalensis Sententiae, pp. 21-25 is composed primarily from a range of Augustine’s works (Confessiones, De Civitate Dei, De Genesi ad litteram l. xii and De Genesi contra Manichaeos), but includes extracts from the book 6 of the Moralia at the beginning and near the end.
70 E.g. Isidore, Sententiae 3.34 (De indignis prapositis), Cazier, ed., Isidorus Hispalensis Sententiae, pp. 273-5 is composed of a combination of extracts taken from books 7, 24, 25 and 32 of the Moralia in Job and the Regula Pastoralis 1.1.
71 For list of commonalities between the Sententiae and other Isidorian texts see: Cazier, ed., Sententiae, p. 359.
72 Mullins, The Spiritual Life, pp. 60-63.
His aim was to compose a new text that was useful for his audience in the present. This inevitably involved addressing specific points which had not necessarily been of concern or interest to Gregory and turning the contents of his predecessor’s work in new directions.73

Another reason for Isidore’s intense engagement with Gregory’s works is that their approaches to scriptural reading and exegesis were similar in intention and in practice. In the preface to the *Moralia in Job*, written in the form of a letter to Leander, Gregory explained that it was the job of those who had a higher level of training and skill in scriptural interpretation to provide access to the secrets of the Bible to those who were less educated.74 In the *De institutione virginum* Leander suggests that the untrained avoid reading biblical books such as the *Song of Songs*.75 Leander’s advice that certain scriptural passages should be interpreted spiritually rather than historically was not intended to limit access to scripture, but rather to ensure that knowledge was channelled through appropriate intermediaries or was opened up after appropriate training had taken place. Isidore’s ideas about the practice, purpose and pedagogy of reading drew extensively on Gregory and others and in later centuries their works were excerpted and spliced together by later commentators such as Smaragdus of St Mihiel.76

The views of Gregory, Leander and Isidore were therefore highly congruent with one another on the purpose of scriptural exegesis.

**After Isidore: Visions of Gregory the Great in Seventh-Century Spain**

Isidore’s highly positive appraisal of Gregory was shared by his successors as leaders of the Spanish Church. The depth of this continuing engagement with the Gregorian legacy is demonstrated by further positive judgements on his status, by attempts to procure additional copies of his writings, and by ongoing and active engagement with his work. Braulio of Zaragoza (d. 650), Eugenius II of Toledo (d. 657), Ildefonsus of Toledo (d. 667), Julian of Toledo (d. 690) and Valerius of El Bierzo (d. c. 695), all made extensive use of

---

73 For a similar point about other Isidorian writings see: Uitvlugt, ‘The Sources of Isidore’s Commentaries’.
74 See DelCogliano, *Gregory the Great*, pp. 66-67 for Gregory’s reading and exegetical techniques as elucidated in the letter to Leander that introduced the *Moralia in Job*.
75 Leander of Seville, *De institutione virginum* 16, Campos Ruiz and Roca Meliá, eds., *Santos Padres Españoles II*, pp. 54-55.
Gregory in their writings on a range of topics. As with Isidore, scholars have identified processes of attributed and unattributed citation, epitomisation and adaptation across a swathe of writings.77

The most striking case of engagement with Gregory after Isidore is that of Taio of Zaragoza (d. post-656) who, before he became bishop, journeyed to Rome in the early 640s, possibly on the instruction of King Chindaswinth, to find, copy and bring back works by Gregory which were not at that time available in Spain.78 It is difficult to identify with any precision the specific works that Taio brought back from Rome, although it seems certain that he extended what was available in Spanish libraries.79 The output of all this work, in addition to the copies of Gregory’s writings that Taio brought back from Rome, was a text which later came to be known as the Sententiarum Libri V, a series of extracts abridged from different parts of Gregory’s corpus and combined with other writers such as Augustine.80 Taio describes, in a letter to Bishop Quiricius of Barcelona, how he spent his nights working on the project while Zaragoza was besieged by the usurper Froia in 653-4.81 Although the work has been described as ‘poorly organized’,82 such value-judgements are increasingly being overturned in favour of interpretations which see successors of Isidore such as Taio as excerpting and compiling Gregory’s works in a systematic fashion for highly practical purposes.83


78 Miguel Franco, ‘Ecos del Epistularium’; Madoz, Tajón de Zaragoza; Orlandis, Historia, pp. 405 and 409 suggests that the story that Chindaswinth ordered Taio to go to Spain was a later invention. Martin, La géographie du pouvoir, p. 257, however, argues that the fact that Taio was allowed to leave the country and made it to Rome and back suggests that the mission had royal backing.

79 Barlow, Iberian Fathers, vol. 2, p. 95, n. 32; Orlandis, Historia, p. 407: Taio brought back Gregory’s homilies on Ezequiel and perhaps the Dialogues and the commentary on the Song of Songs. See also: Palacios Martín, Tajón de Zaragoza.


81 Thompson, The Goths in Spain, pp. 199-200; Collins, Visigothic Spain, pp. 84-85.

82 O’Callaghan, History, p. 87.

83 E.g. DelCologlano, Gregory the Great, pp. 49-50: ‘Taio systematizes Gregory’s thought in five books [...]. Each of the five books has numerous chapters, each of which is devoted to a particular subtheme.'
Sometimes Gregory’s works were copied almost verbatim, but even copying and pasting can, in some cases, be highly creative exercises, especially when done with specific aims in mind. A letter from Braulio of Zaragoza to Taio in 649/50 reveals that the aim of Taio’s visit to Rome was to obtain copies of the ‘books of the holy Pope Gregory’ (codices sancti pape Gregorii) which had not previously existed in Spain. Barlow suggested that Taio was trying to locate copies of Gregory’s later works because, as we have already seen, some of them were circulating in Spain even before the end of the sixth century. Braulio’s letter, in which he requests a copy of the books of Gregory and promises to return them whenever Taio asks, reveals that there was a demand for such works among the Visigothic ecclesiastical elite. Braulio quoted directly from the beginning of Gregory’s Moralia at the start of the letter, suggesting that the text was well-known enough to function as a common reference point for two educated churchmen. Braulio noted that Taio, and presumably other members of his circle, studied the writings of the Church Fathers to such an extent that their words (eloquia) remained ‘nested in your heart’ (in pectore tuo [...] nidauerint). Taio engaged with the memory of Gregory and journeyed to Rome for practical purposes: to make available edificatory works for his fellow bishops and to enable them to use the insights from Gregory’s writings to instruct others.

At about the same time as Taio travelled to Rome and then worked up his summary of Gregory’s writings, there was an increase in interest in Gregory in the city of Toledo, the centre of Visigothic royal government and in the process of establishing itself as the ecclesiastical head of the kingdom. In the second canon of the eighth council of Toledo in 653 Gregory was honoured as follows:

And also holy Pope Gregory, to be honoured for both his books and his merits, and also due to his merit to be preferred in ethical matters to almost anyone else, explains thus in his books on moral matters [in his Moralia] [...]

84 Hillgarth, ‘Popular Religion’, p. 19, n. 3.  
86 Barlow, Iberian Fathers, vol. 2, p. 95, n. 32.  
Beatus etiam papa Gregorius et libris et meritis honorandus, atque in ethicis adsertionibus pene cunctis merito praferendus, sic in libris infert moralibus [...] 

The same canon also honoured Isidore as:

The distinguished doctor of our century, the newest ornament of the Catholic church, though the last when compared with the previous in terms of time, but not least in terms of doctrine, and furthermore, the most learned in the end times, and to be named with reverence, Isidore, in the second book of his Sententiae relates to the same purpose: [...] Nostri quoque seculi doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholicae novissimum decus, praecedentibus actate prostremus, doctrinae comparatione non infimus, et quod maius est in seculorum fine doctissimus, atque cum reverentia nominandus Ysidorus in libro Sententiarum secundo haec pro tali narrat negotio [...].

This is followed by a quotation from the Sententiae and one claiming to be from Isidore's Synonyma. It is also possible that the description of Isidore as doctor egregius may be a deliberate lexical pun on (or at least a reference back to) Gregory/ Gregorius. Earlier in the second canon of the eighth council of Toledo, direct quotations were taken from and references had been made to Ambrose and Augustine, before the sections on Gregory and Isidore. All of this suggests that by the mid-seventh century, deliberate efforts were being made to associate Isidore with earlier Latin Church Fathers. Isidore was being positioned as the father of the Spanish Church, and the association with Gregory played a pivotal role in generating a direct line of descent from Ambrose and Augustine.

A few years later Ildefonsus of Toledo (659-667) extended Isidore’s De viris illustribus. In the process he wrote a new biography of Gregory, adding the Dialogues, Commentary on the Song of Songs and the 22 Homilies in Ezechiel to the list of writings. Martin has argued that, in contrast to Isidore's largely intellectual biographical catalogue, Ildefonsus was inspired by Gregory's Dialogues to stress the miracles that had been performed by

89 Vives, ed., Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos, pp. 276-7; see also Fontaine, Génesis y originalidad, p. 289.
90 Barlow, Iberian Fathers, vol. 2, p. 95, n. 32; on later addition of the commentary on the Song of Songs to lists of Gregory's works, see: DelCgliano, Gregory the Great, p. 29.
his illustrious men. It may also be the case that Ildefonsus's extension of Isidore's biography of Gregory was part of a broader effort by the bishops of Toledo to demonstrate the excellence of their bishopric in opposition to Seville and other powerful ecclesiastical centres in Spain, as Michael J. Kelly explores later in this volume. On this reading, control over the dissemination of Gregory's writings and the definition of his memory was one way to demonstrate Toledan superiority within Spain.

Gregory's works thus had an impact on the pastoral aims of the bishops of the Visigothic kingdom and on how the basic tenets of Christianity might best be communicated to the clergy and, through them, the people. This began during Gregory's lifetime as Spanish bishops responded to texts and letters that Gregory had sent there advising them on how to care for those in their charge. Licinianus of Cartagena, for example, wrote to Gregory in the 590s to say that if he obeyed Gregory's advice in the *Regula Pastoralis* to refrain from ordaining the ignorant, then he would not be able to ordain anyone at all in his area. Although they form a relatively small proportion of the contents of Visigothic-era homiliaries from Spain, Gregory's sermons were also used by the preachers of the period, further demonstrating his direct influence on the pastoral efforts of the bishops and clergy there.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored the reception of the writings of Gregory I in Spain during the Visigothic period, especially in the writings of Isidore of Seville in the early seventh century. Isidore received the works of Gregory so enthusiastically because of the very close association between Gregory and Leander, Isidore's brother. Contemporary sources suggest that Leander and Isidore were particularly interested in emphasising the status of the members of their family, the coherence of the family unit and in particular its role in the development of the Church in Spain during the late sixth and

---

91 Martin, *La géographie du pouvoir*, p. 216; for more on differences between Ildefonsus and earlier texts in the *De viris illustribus* tradition see Galán Sánchez, ‘El De viris illustribus’, pp. 71-74, 79-80.
92 See also Wood, ‘Playing the Fame Game’, pp. 628-40.
early seventh centuries. The connection to Gregory, Bishop of Rome at the time of the conversion of the Visigoths from Arianism to Catholicism and a correspondent of Leander, was cultivated in order to bolster the historical status of Leander and because his writings had proved practically useful in Isidore’s campaign to educate the clergy of the Visigothic kingdom. Due to the close association with Leander, the early circulation of his writings in Spain, and their usefulness to Isidore, Gregory virtually became a member of the family of Leander-Isidore.

The Isidorian stamp of approval was particularly important for the posthumous reputation of Gregory in Spain. Gregory and his writings retained their prestige in Spain after the fall of the Visigothic kingdom in the early eighth century. Works such as the *Moralia* were copied and circulated in the centuries that followed\(^\text{96}\) and by the mid-eighth century the story of Taio’s journey to Rome had taken on a distinctly legendary tone.\(^\text{97}\) In later centuries, however, Gregory’s works became popular not only because they were useful in the present and because of the association with Leander (and Isidore), but also because they created a connection to the Catholic-Visigothic past. Not only was Gregory the pope at the time of the conversion of the Visigoths to Catholicism, a conjunction that probably seemed more significant with hindsight than it did at the time, but he wrote a biography of the Visigothic prince Hermenegild which became highly popular in late medieval and early modern Spain.\(^\text{98}\) Gregory presented Hermenegild as a martyr rather than the traitor of the accounts of John of Biclarum and Isidore and it was this version that served as a model of Catholic leadership for the Hapsburg monarchs.\(^\text{99}\) Gregory’s writings, bolstered by their close association with Leander and Isidore, the fathers of the Spanish Church, thus retained their utility for the educated elite of early modern Spain as they had for the ecclesiastical elite of the early medieval period.

---

97 Orlandis, *Historia*, pp. 405-409 for Taio’s journey to Rome and the resultant development of legendary accounts.
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3 Variations on a Theme

Isidore and Pliny on Human and Human-Instigated Anomaly

Mary Beagon

It is impossible to say for certain whether Isidore actually read Pliny's *Natural History* at first hand. As anyone who has ever considered the question of Isidore's (or indeed Pliny's) sources knows only too well, it can be almost impossible to tell what the authors of encyclopaedic and compilatory works such as the *Natural History* or the *Etymologies*, reliant as they were on multiple secondary sources, used directly and which at one or more removes. Material deriving ultimately from Pliny permeates the entire *Etymologies*; whether it was sourced at first hand or derived from an intermediary is impossible to say for certain.¹ All we can be sure of is a pervasive Plinian flavour or echo to much of Isidore's material. Threads of thought, recognizable from a reading of Pliny, recur in the books of the *Etymologies*. This chapter will examine one such thread, human anomaly. The aim is not primarily to locate inspiration from Pliny in Isidore but to consider how each treated an idea of central importance to their respective worldviews.

The animal kingdom for Pliny occupies five out of 37 books of his *Historia Naturalis* (*HN*), while for Isidore two of the twenty books of the *Etymologies* (*Etym.*) cover similar ground. In both writers, the human animal has a special relationship with the creative divinity, in Pliny's case Stoic nature and in Isidore's the Christian creator God. For Pliny, indeed, the rest of creation is geared for the most part towards man's needs (*HN* 7.3). For Isidore, who implicitly recalls the Stoic pantheistic view of nature at the beginning of *Etym.* 11,² the human body uniquely is raised upright for contemplation

¹ Oroz Reta, ‘Présence de Pline’, pp. 295-306 notes numerous echoes, in *Etym.*'s treatment of mineralogy, of the actual wording deployed by Pliny in his treatment of the same topic in *HN* 36-7. This certainly suggests Isidore had access to works containing excerpts from the *HN*, if not to the work itself.

² ‘Hanc (i.e. naturam) quidam Deum esse dixerunt, a quo omnia creata sunt et existunt’: ‘Some people say that this (i.e. nature) is God, by whom all things are created and exist’. Trans. Barney et al., *Etymologies*, p. 231. (This translation of the *Etymologies* is used throughout this paper. Pliny *HN* 7 translations are from my own 2005 translation and commentary. Other translations are my own except where otherwise indicated). Later he acknowledges this more explicitly as a
of the Creator (11.1.5); another classical topos, specifically referenced in this case to lines quoted from the beginning of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 1.84); while his mind (*mens*), the superior part of the soul (11.1.11), is the cause of his being said to be the image of God (*imago dei*).

For the Christian writer, then, the human animal is of dual aspect: a body formed from the soil but raised upright from the soil to face upward, and a soul. Isidore then proceeds to categorize the constituent parts of this double nature: nearly three quarters of book 11 is devoted to an etymological creation-by-verbal-dissection of a generic *imago hominis*. In his study of the *Etymologies*, John Henderson contrasted Isidore’s man, ‘one and alone’ to the ‘rhetoric of plenitude’ which overflows in book 12 with its emphasis on the numbers, variety and diversity of the rest of the animal kingdom. The effect is perhaps exaggerated by Isidore’s cramming the whole of the rest of the animal kingdom into one book, whereas Pliny uses four, rather longer, ones to complete his survey. The fact remains, however, that Isidore’s catalogue of parts (11.1-2) produces a single, photofit, image. Pliny, to be sure, gives a generic treatment of human physiology in relation to that of animals in the later sections of *HN* 10 and 11, following in the tradition of the Aristotelian comparative biology of *On the Parts of Animals* and *On the Generation of Animals*. However, his dedicated treatment of humanity in *HN* 7 is a riot of diversity, variation and exception. Sometimes characterised as a book of records, the average or mean is not what *HN* 7 is about. Discussions of human lifespan, reproduction, stature and death are predominantly discussions of the exceptional rather than the norm.

**Deviant Nature? Variety and Monstrosity**

If we look at the treatment of the human face by each author, it is true that Isidore mentions its function in distinguishing each individual human (*Etym.* 11.1.35), but only after noting its generic function in characterizing the human animal as human. Pliny, however, revels in the innumerable possibilities which nature, more skilled than any human *artifex*, can produce from just a handful of generic physical features (*HN* 7.7).

---

3 ‘Duplex est autem homo: interior et exterior. Interior homo anima et exterior corpus’ (11.1.6).
Should we read any significance into this difference of emphasis, other than the fact that naming of generic parts is intrinsic to Isidore’s project, just as emphasizing the infinite *varietas* of nature is intrinsic to Pliny’s? At this point, we should consider the last quarter of *Etym.* 11, where Isidore, in a sense paradoxically, attempts to define and categorize beings which defy categorization according to the orderly arrangement of parts as previously defined. For Isidore, the impression is that these ‘portents’ are a source of anxiety: at first sight, they appear to be *contra naturam*. Indeed, he quotes Varro’s definition of such beings as ‘seeming to have been born contrary to nature’, but he explains that in fact they are part of the divine plan, inscrutable as that may be to mere humans; they are not contrary to nature, only contrary to what is known nature. His explanation is heavily dependent, indeed almost word for word, on Augustine (‘portentum ergo fit non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura’, *Civ. Dei* 21.8). His particular categorization carefully distinguishes the seriously anomalous *portenta, ostenta, prodigia*, which are divine indicators and die soon after birth, from the less serious variations, for example, people with extra digits who are *portentosa* or portent-like, but within the parameters of the acceptably natural.

As far as these individual anomalies are concerned, Pliny is not interested in deconstructing and de-mythifying them. There is some categorization in their general arrangement; for example, we have multiple births, hermaphrodites and sex-changers (*HN* 7.33-6), but application of the term *prodigium* and its associates is neither frequent nor of any particular significance. In this, Pliny’s attitude is very different to that of Isidore or Augustine. Indeed, his comment that hermaphrodites were once regarded as portents but now as pets (*deliciae, HN* 7.33) may indicate underlying changes in social attitudes in the first century AD, when negative religious interpretations of physical anomaly are in decline, at any rate among the trend-setting wealthy of Rome; though there was no simple temporal or social shift either now or many centuries later and attitudes even in the early modern era remained complex.

After dealing with individual monstrosities, however, Isidore continues to a more difficult and controversial set of anomalies: the reputed existence

---


of entire monstrous races of peoples\(^7\) for which the *locus classicus* is of course Pliny *HN* 7.9-32, but which, for Isidore, could equally well have come via an intermediary; and once again Augustine’s exhaustive examination in *Civ. Dei*, this time 16.8, is an obvious one. Augustine had adopted Pliny’s general stance on such oddities: ‘The observer who cannot see the whole (of God’s plan) is offended by what seems to be the deformity of a part’ (*Civ. Dei* 16.8).\(^8\) We may compare this with Pliny *HN* 7.6: ‘Indeed the power and might of nature lacks credibility at every point unless we comprehend her as a whole rather than piecemeal’.\(^9\)

Pliny’s brisk survey of these monstrous races combined enthusiasm with a certain detachment betrayed by his use of third person authority (a feature of wonder literature)\(^10\) and indirect speech. No one had after all actually seen any of these people: if they did exist they added to the cheerful exuberance of the nature deity, created as ‘playthings (*ludibria*) for herself and wonders for us’ (*HN* 7.32). If they did not exist, his overall depiction of *varietas naturae* was not seriously dented. For the Christian writer, however, the possible existence of such anomalies may have posed theological problems. Hence, I think, it is not sufficient to interpret Isidore’s similar use of third person authority and indirect speech merely as a sign of scepticism; it seems also to betray a feeling of anxiety. Were such beings human, and therefore part of the divine salvation plan? This anxiety is clearly enunciated in Augustine: the individual anomalies, undeniably born to human parents in our society, are not a problem; they are clearly descendants of Adam. So, too, therefore, are the monstrous races, provided that their categorization as human is correct (*Civ. Dei* 16.8). We should of course remind ourselves at this point that it is soul not body which makes *imago dei*, according to Isidore (*Etym*. 11.1.11). But identifying what is ensouled without a recognizable set of physical features as described in the earlier part of *Etym*. 11 is the crux. Such races are so very different that deception is a danger, as Augustine recognizes: ‘If we did not know that monkeys, long-tailed apes and chimpanzees are not men but animals, those

\(^7\) A third group, of one-off mythical monsters (*Etym*. 11.3.28-39), is dismissed from consideration as being symbolic representations of the truths at the heart of old stories, e.g. harlots who lured people to destitution or ‘shipwreck’ become the Sirens (12.3.30).


\(^9\) ‘Naturae vero rerum vis atque maiestas in omnibus momentis vide caret si quis modo partes eius ac non totam conceptatur animo’.

natural historians who plume themselves on their collection of curiosities might pass them off on us as races of men, and get away with such nonsense’ (Civ. Dei 16.8).11

Let us return to Isidore’s definition of the human facies. As we saw, he mentions its function as a repository for the uniqueness of each individual but without embroidering on this in the manner of the Plinian celebration of varietas. However, he also describes it as the part of the body which above all reflects the characteristic form of a human being (‘Facies dicta ab effigie. Ibi est enim tota figura hominis (et uniusculiusque persona) cognita’ (Etym. 11.1.33-4). It is therefore perhaps significant that, while by no means all the monstrous races’ deformities are primarily facial, many are and he specifically mentions the stories of ‘the monstrous faces of the nations in the far east’ (Etym. 11.3.18: ‘In ultimo autem orientis monstruosae gentium facies scribuntur’). More generally, the human head is the body’s primary organ, where all senses and nerves originate, the source of all activity: to the extent that it ‘plays the role of the soul, so to speak’: ‘animae ... quodammodo personam gerit’ (11.3.25-6). For this primary indicator of soul to be seriously malformed, even missing as in the case of those such as the Blemmyae, with mouth and eyes in their chest (11.3.17) is clearly problematic for the correct categorization of the human. Another case in point is that of the dog-heads or Cynokephali. These, however, give themselves away as being non-human in Isidore’s categorization by their barking (Etym. 11.3.15).12 They cannot talk and words, according to Isidore’s definition, are signs of the mental processes by which people show their thoughts to one another in speaking (Etym. 1. 9.1). Therefore they cannot possess human mind and mind, as we saw, is the most elevated aspect of the human soul and links man to God. The problematic nature of this religious conundrum is reflected in Augustine’s extremely tentative conclusion to his discussion: ‘I must therefore finish the discussion of this question with my tentative

11 ‘Nam et simias et cercopithicos et sphingas si nesciremus non homines esse, sed bestias, possent illi historici de sua curiositate gloriates velut gentes aliquas hominum nobis inpunita vanitate mentiri’. Trans. Bettenson, City of God, p. 663.
12 cf. Aug. CD 16.8. For the complex tradition of thought instigated by the ‘taxonomic ambiguity’ of the Cynokephali, see Romm, The Edges of the Earth, p. 79; Beagon, Pliny on the Human Animal, pp. 152-154. For the importance of speech as a marker of humanity, see Friedman, Monstrous Races, p. 29, who points to four other monstrous races who, implicitly or explicitly, lack speech. However, of these, only one, the Trogodytæ, makes non-human sounds, rather than being unable to make any kind of noise due to their facial configurations. The source for the squeaking of the Trogodytæ is Herodotus 4.153, rather than Pliny, who mentions them but without comment on their non-human speech (HN 5.44-5; 7.23; see Beagon, Pliny on the Human Animal, p. 154). This may explain why they are not mentioned by Augustine or Isidore.
and cautious answer. The accounts of some of these races may be completely worthless; but if such peoples exist, then either they are not human; or, if human, they are descended from Adam.’ (Civ. Dei 16.8).13

Theological difficulties may have been enhanced by some of the contexts in which monsters had appeared in earlier pagan accounts. Strange-looking creatures had been central to some classical creation theories, such as those of Empedocles and Lucretius, which avoided purposive design. Their hallmark was randomness. Empedocles’ scheme had included the random production of body parts, which then joined, equally randomly, to produce creatures, some viable but many, like his man-faced oxen,14 not. Lucretius deliberately set out to avoid the idea of a teleological creator God. Random combinations of atoms in the earth produced a variety of creatures, only some of which were viable and found compatible breeding partners to produce a species. Even these, however, were subject to early extinction by the law of survival of the fittest (Lucr. RN 5.837-854).15 A possible link with non-purposive creativity might, then, have further lessened Isidore’s enthusiasm for the idea of monstrous races.16 The distancing techniques used by many classical authors take on new significance in his catalogue. On the other hand, such theories tended to emphasize the non-viability of oddities and thence the unlikelihood of races of such creatures being perpetuated. It was, on the contrary, Pliny’s teleological Stoic Natura which had enshrined them in an enduring tradition. We shall return to this later.

Deviant Minds? Maternal Impressions

Our second example of human variation relies in a sense on human rather than divine creativity. Both Pliny and Isidore discuss a belief with a very long history; the ability of visual and mental stimuli experienced by the mother to modify the physical appearance of her unborn offspring.17 The

13 ‘Quapropter ut istam quaestionem pedetemtim cauteque concludam: aut illa, quae talia de quibusdam gentibus scripsta sunt, omnino nulla sunt; aut, si sunt, homines non sunt; aut ex Adam sunt, si homines sunt’. Trans. Bettenson, City of God, p. 664.
14 Empedocles DK fr.61; Arist. Phys. 2.8, 198b16-32.
15 Campbell, Strange Creatures, pp. 33-35; cf. Campbell, Lucretius on Creation, pp. 103-123.
16 For Isidore’s opposition to Lucretius’ non-teleological view, see A. Fear, this volume, on Isidore’s own work entitled De Rerum Natura.
basic idea can be found as early as Empedocles, whom Aetius (5.12.2 = Dox. Graec. p. 423) cites to explain why some children do not resemble their fathers: ‘Empedocles says that foetuses are shaped by what the woman visualized around the time of conception. For often women have fallen in love with statues and paintings and have produced offspring which resemble them’. Many writers from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (De Imit. 6.1) to Augustine (Contra Iulian. 5.14.51) repeat the story of the ugly king who fathered handsome children by making his wife look at beautiful statues during intercourse. Medical acceptance is seen in similar references in Galen (14.253-4 Kühn), Soranus (Gyn. 1.39) and later medical authorities. A rationale might be found in Aristotelian physiology, according to which the female genetic material is essentially passive and impressionable. In the cases described above, the normal process by which the active male principle dominates and imprints its form on female matter is hijacked by an outside force such as the sight of a beautiful statue.

Pliny’s version in HN 7.52 introduces an element almost unique in the ancient testimony in allowing the father, as well as the mother, to be susceptible to such outside influences, effectively doubling the potential for variations and divergences from the expected patterns of heredity to emerge in the newborn infant.

Resemblances offer considerable food for thought. They are believed to be influenced by many chance occurrences, including sight, hearing, memory and images absorbed at the very moment of conception. Even a chance thought which briefly crosses the mind of one or other parent may form or confuse the resemblance. This is the reason why there are more variations within the human race than there are among all the other animals. The swiftness of men’s thoughts, his mental agility and the versatility of his intelligence produce a wide variety of features; whereas the minds of the other animals are sluggish and exhibit a uniformity in keeping with their particular species.

18 Ἐμποδοκλῆς τῇ κατὰ τὴν σύλληψιν φαντασίᾳ τῆς γυναικὸς μορφοῦσθαι τὰ βρέφη· ανδριάντων καὶ εἰκόνων ἠράσθησαν γυναῖκες καὶ ὅμοια τούτοις ἀπέτεκον. Trans. Inwood, Poem of Empedocles, p. 192.
19 GA 716a47; 767a36-768b1; 728a28-b30.
Similitudinum quidem immensa reputatio est et in qua credantur multa fortuita pollere, visus, auditus, memoriae haustaeque imagines sub ipso conceptu. Cogitatio etiam utriuslibet animum subito transvolans effingere similitudinem aut miscere existimatur; ideoque plures in homine quam in ceteris omnibus animalibus differentiae quoniam velocitas cogitationum animique celeritas et ingenii variedas multiformes notas inprimunt, cum ceteris animantibus immobiles sint animi et similis omnibus singulisque in suo cuique genere.21

The key to superior variety is superior brain power. The quality of mens or ratio, deliberative thinking, was uniquely human in Pliny’s view, not only in moral terms, as in the Stoic equation of moral excellence, virtus, with ratio, but also in terms of pure intelligence or brain power; note the emphasis on ‘swiftness [...]’, agility [...] versatility’ and compare what he has to say of Caesar’s ‘innate mental agility, with the penetrating speed and rapidity of fire’ (7.91: ‘proprium vigorem celeritatemque quodam igne volucrem’). This mental superiority was the key to man’s pre-eminence in the world of nature.22 It offered a link with the macrocosmic ratio of nature herself, and by maximizing his potential for versatility and variety not just in creative but even as here in procreative activities, allowed him to mirror in microcosmic form the varietas of nature, the artifex of creation. The only other source to suggest that the thoughts of both mother and father are involved is the pseudo-Aristotelian Problemata (10.10) where, too, a contrast is made with the other animals who for the most part focus on the act itself. Here, however, the Plinian emphasis on the gulf in mental processes between man and animal which causes it is absent.

Pliny, then, celebrates man’s super-charged brain power and the wondrous effects it can have, even on the (self) creation of man himself. But if the animals are too dull to produce mental fantasies of such strength that they affect their unborn young, some sources do credit them with reaction to direct visual stimuli: Oppian describes how horse-breeders parade finely adorned stallions before their brood mares and pigeon-fanciers hang purple-dyed cloths near the female birds (Cyn. 1.328-48). It is animal-breeding which is the cue for Isidore’s discussion in book 12, the section of the Etymologies devoted to animals. The main source is Christian rather than classical: Jerome’s commentary on the story in Genesis of Jacob’s ploy to breed variegated sheep and the tone, unlike Pliny’s, is largely negative.

21 Trans. Beagon, Pliny on the Human Animal, p. 70.
22 Beagon, Roman Nature, pp. 55-91; 133-137.
However, the fact that his focus is on animals is not in itself a contradiction of Pliny’s emphasis on the phenomenon as pertaining largely to the superior human mind. Not only are the sheep’s reactions purely sensory but they are in any case ‘set up’ by the superior ingenuity of the human breeder. This is already clear in the Oppian passage, where the cleverness of the horse and dove breeders is stressed in tones of admiration rather than condemnation: ‘O what a heart, what a mind have mortal men! They do what they like’ (*Cyn.* 1. 330-1).\(^23\) Isidore’s main source, Jerome, had stressed the natural cunning of Jacob: ‘So Jacob devised a new artifice and fought against the nature of the black and white flock with an artfulness produced by nature herself.’\(^24\) The tone is ambiguous: Jacob’s wits may be a product of nature, but they are being deployed in the undermining of a natural process: ‘contra naturam […] pecoris […] pugnavit’. The attitude is reminiscent of Pliny’s condemnation of ambitious and arrogant modifications of nature, a misuse of humanity’s superior *ratio*, a topic to which we shall return shortly. Isidore lays an even more negative emphasis on the unnaturalness of the ploy, which is introduced with comments on a more straightforward breeding trick: crossing species to produce hybrids, in this case mules. Ana, Esau’s great-grandson, was said to have done this *contra naturam* (*Etym.* 12.1.57). ‘Indeed’, Isidore continues, ‘human intervention has forced animals of different species to breed with one another and has thus developed another type of animal by means of an unnatural combination. Thus too Jacob obtained similarities of colours contrary to nature, for his sheep conceived offspring similar to the image of the ram mounting them from above that they saw as a reflexion in the water.’\(^25\) He doesn’t actually give the explanation of what Jacob had done to alter the reflexions, but clearly intends to apply the same elements of ‘human intervention’, coercion and unnaturally, to Jacob’s breeding system.\(^26\)

For Isidore, to act *contra naturam* is to contravene the natural order as laid down in the divine plan of creation: a presumptuous and sinful

---

\(^{23}\) ὡ πόσση κραδίε, πόσση μεράπεσσι πέλει φρήν. / ἔρξαν ὄπως ἐθέλουσι:


\(^{26}\) He goes on to mention the examples of mares and doves, though here the doves are beguiled by pictures of handsome doves, cf. *Corp. Hipp. Gr.* 2.11.7.2-8: horses can be shown paintings like the doves here, as well as actual stallions.
challenge from the human mind to the superior mind of God. It is interesting that no such disapproval of hybridization appears in Pliny’s *Natural History* since he can be as condemnatory of human challenges to nature as his Christian counterpart. The key is motivation and purpose: Pliny’s reservations about human modifications to nature centre on moral considerations of arrogance, greed and decadent living.\(^27\) Thus the only exception to his positive attitude towards hybridization is in his discussion of trees in *HN* 12.11-12 where he criticizes the breeding of a type of plane-tree which doesn’t shed its leaves in winter and the practice of creating dwarf varieties for fancy hedging. In both cases, the criticism derives from the fact that both types are purely decorative and serve no useful purpose: a plane tree’s natural function, he says, is to give shade in summer but to allow light through in winter. In contrast, there is much on grafting and hybridization of fruit, which is regarded as a useful practice, giving nature a legitimate helping hand in the pursuit of *salus humana*. Similarly, the hybridization of domesticated animals, such as mules, is described enthusiastically in *HN* 8.171-5, and the high quality of Spanish donkeys for mule-breeding is praised (*HN* 8.170). Interestingly, Isidore makes no reference to Spanish horse and mule breeding, though it is possible that the detailed catalogue of horse types and colours (*Etym.* 12.1.41-56) reflects this local interest. Jerome, indeed, says that the Spaniards practise Jacob’s trick on their horses.\(^28\) This sentence immediately follows one that Isidore quotes verbatim and which we will discuss shortly.

Finally, it should be noted that Pliny does not mention any instances of maternal impressions in animals, even when devised by humans. Presumably these might detract, however slightly, from the emphasis he wishes to place on the supremacy of the human mind. Isidore, on the other hand, uses the practice to criticize human presumptuousness even where the outcome is useful, rather than the destructive luxuries to which Pliny confines his moral reservations on human ingenuity.

So much for the first half of Isidore’s passage on maternal impressions. In *Etym.* 12.1.60, he turns to humans and thence to the rationale behind the phenomenon:

---

27 Beagon, *Roman Nature*, pp. 33-50; 55-79

28 ‘... cum hoc ipsum etiam in equarum gregibus apud Hispanos dicatur fieri’ (*Quaest. Heb. Ad Gen.* 30.32-33). ‘For this very thing is reported by the Spaniards to happen even among herds of horses’ (trans. Hayward, *Hebrew Questions*, p. 67).
Whence also people advise pregnant women not to gaze at repulsive animal faces, such as cynocephali or apes, lest they should bear offspring resembling what they have seen. Indeed, the nature of females is such that, whatever sort of thing they look at or imagine in the extreme heat of pleasure, while they are conceiving, is the sort of progeny they will bear.

Inde est quod quidam gravidas mulieres iubent nullos intueri turpissimos animalium vultus, ut cynocephalos et simios, ne visibus occurrentes similes foetus pariant. Hanc enim feminarum esse naturam ut quales perspexerint sive mente conceperint in extremo voluptatis aestu, dum concipiunt, talem et subolem procreant.

A noticeable variation on the theme as seen so far is the idea that impressions can affect the woman even after the act of conception. Striking too is the idea that the sight of a creature of another species might affect the foetus, though this was a possibility mooted already in Soranus, who warns against viewing monkeys during conception (Gyn. 1.39). Michael Reeve, in his ground-breaking article on the history of this idea, speculated that both notions, which were to have such a pronounced effect on the development of the tradition in later centuries, may owe their dissemination largely to the popularity of Isidore. However, the idea that a woman may be affected during pregnancy is not in fact completely new: it is already there in Oppian, who says that the Spartans show their wives images of handsome young men ‘when their bellies are swelling’ (ὅτε γαστέρα κυμαίνουσι, Cyn. 1.359).

The implications of this, slightly later, section of Oppian’s discussion seems to have escaped the notice of commentators. It is also there to an extent in a bizarre passage in Augustine’s City of God (Civ. Dei 18.5), in which he suggests that demons display to the cow pregnant with the next Apis a phantom bull which only she can see, thus ensuring that the calf will be a lookalike of its predecessor. Note too the implication in Aristotle that the woman’s mind should be kept as undisturbed as possible since children are affected by the mother before birth as plants are by the earth (Pol. 1335b).

Isidore’s explanation, however, focuses on the mechanics of impressions at the time of conception, taking as its lead a comment he has lifted word for word from Jerome on Jacob’s sheep: ‘The nature of females is such

29 Here Isidore, like Pliny in HN 8.216 cf. 7.31 and Solinus 2.58 p. 143 Münzer, evidently refers to the baboon, to which the term *cynocephalus* was also applied.
that, whatever sort of thing they look at or imagine in the extreme heat of pleasure while they are conceiving, is the sort of progeny they will have'.\textsuperscript{32} The manuscripts bar one all follow this with: ‘etenim animal in usu Venerio formas extrinsecus intus transmittit, eorumque satiata typis rapit species eorum in propriam qualitatem’ (‘Thus in the act of procreation, the animal transmits external forms to the interior and since she is filled with the images of those things, she combines their appearance with her own particular quality’).\textsuperscript{33} We should understand here \textit{animal} in the sense of living creature, whether human or otherwise. André, however, in his 1986 edition of book 12,\textsuperscript{34} chose the reading \textit{anima}, attested in just one manuscript, but bringing the explanation much closer in wording to other, more precise, descriptions of the process. He justified his choice by reference to Pliny’s use of \textit{animum} in ‘cogitatio etiam utriuslibet \textit{animum} subito transvolans effingere similitudinem aut miscere existimatur’ (‘Even a chance thought which briefly crosses the mind of one or other parent may form or confuse the resemblance’, \textit{HN} 7.52). Augustine Contra Iulianum 5.14.51 (PL 44, 812) is, however, even closer, using the exact term \textit{anima} and applying it to animals not just of the human variety: ‘nam colores virgarum quas variavit Iacob, afficiendo transierunt in \textit{animas} pecorum matrum atque inde rursus eadem affectione transeundo apparuerunt in corporibus filiorum’. (‘The various colours of Jacob’s rods affected the breeding ewes and passed to their souls; then, passing from the souls of the ewes by the same kind of influence, these colours appeared in the bodies of their lambs’). Isidore, as befitted a categorizer of words, recognised a nuanced difference between \textit{animus} and \textit{anima}. Although they can both essentially signify ‘soul’, \textit{anima} is indicative of \textit{vita}, life, while \textit{animus} is indicative of \textit{consilium}, deliberation (\textit{Etym.} 11.1.11), and he goes on to associate the latter with \textit{mens}, mind: \textit{mens} ‘knows’, \textit{sciát}, while \textit{animus} ‘wills’ \textit{velít}. \textit{Anima} can be the generic word for soul, but more specifically it refers to the basic life force, as can be seen in his categorization of different aspects in \textit{Etym}. 11.1.13: when it enlivens (\textit{vivivicat}) the body, soul is \textit{anima}, when it wills (\textit{vult}), it is \textit{animus}, when it knows (\textit{scit}), it is \textit{mens}, when it recollects (\textit{recolit}), it is \textit{memoria}, when it judges correctly (\textit{rectum iudicat}), it is \textit{ratio}, when it breathes (\textit{spirat}), it is \textit{spiritus}, when it senses (\textit{aliquid sentit}), it is \textit{sensus}. \textit{Animus}, together with \textit{mens}, \textit{memoria} and \textit{ratio} belongs to the more sophisticated activities

\textsuperscript{33} Thus Lindsay, \textit{OCT} vol 2, (no page refs). Trans. Barney et al. \textit{Etymologies}, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{34} André, \textit{Etymologiae XII}, pp. 84-85.
which tended to be associated with man. Aristotle describes the increase in sophistication of the soul the higher up the biological ladder a living thing is. Animals have not merely the nutritive soul of plants but also sensation ranging from just touch in the lower orders to the five senses higher up. This ‘sensate’ soul can exercise imagination and desire (de An. 3.10-12; EN 1.1102b 13) and manifest them in courage, timidity, etc.; but only humans have nous = mind and reasoning ability.\textsuperscript{35} Thus, both animus and anima are more appropriate readings in the Isidore passage than animal, since all our other Latin texts have one or the other.\textsuperscript{36} Animus is, however, restricted to Pliny: it is particularly suited to his context, which focuses purely on mental images and in humans only, rather than on the perception of visual material; whereas anima, as well as being closer to animal for a possible textual slip, suits Isidore’s more general reference to primarily sensual impressions and a female sex which embraces all animals, not just humans.

Unlike Pliny, but like all the other sources except the Aristotelian Problems, Isidore keeps to the idea of female-only impressionability. Here again, his word derivations underscore his interpretation of ‘feminarum […] naturam’. Mulier comes from mollities, softness (Etym. 11.2.18), while one derivation of femina is from the Greek for fiery force, because the female desires more vehemently, ‘for females are said to be more libidinous than males’ (Etym. 11.2.24)\textsuperscript{37} and the heat of their desire – ‘in extremo voluptatis aestu’ – is emphasized in the sentence Isidore takes from Jerome.\textsuperscript{38} Jerome in turn had made play of the double desire of the flock who, after the heat of the day, were eager to drink as well as to copulate (‘[…] so that out of two-fold desire, while they were eagerly drinking and being mounted by the male animals […]’ etc.).\textsuperscript{39} They were thus ready to absorb both the male seed and the cunningly variegated reflexion in the water. The admixture of the heat which prompts thirst for water and thirst for sex is found in Pliny, who comments that the great number of hybrid creatures spontaneously produced in Africa is due to the crowding together of the different species in the heat of the day at the scarce watering-places (HN 8.42). This, incidentally, takes us back to Isidore’s starting place: hybrid animals bred contra naturam

\textsuperscript{35} Some animals have resemblances of intellectual understanding but not the real thing: Arist. HA 588a.
\textsuperscript{36} cf. also Caelius Aurelianus 1.50, animae and the use of ψυχή in the Greek of Aristotle, Soranus Gyn. 1.39 and the Problemata 10.10.
\textsuperscript{37} ‘Ali Graec a etymologia feminam ab ignea vi dictam putant, quia vehementer concupiscat’.
\textsuperscript{38} Above, pp. 67-68 and nn.30 and 32.
by man. It is surely significant that he does not acknowledge in the sections of *Etym.* 12 devoted to wild animals the existence of ‘natural’ wild hybrids such as these; those listed in *Etym.* 12.1.60 are all domesticated animals artificially bred; the emphasis is on hybrids as essentially perversions devised by humanity rather than a natural variation ordained by the Creator.40

**Conclusion**

On the topic of human anomaly, we have seen that Isidore in the *Etymologies* reprises two ideas given a particularly memorable treatment in Pliny’s *HN* over 500 years earlier. On the types of human monstrosities and maternal (or, of course, in his case, parental) impressions, Pliny emphasizes the potential for variety in the human form, since the former exemplifies the inexhaustible variety of *natura creatrix* and the latter illustrates how the rational creativity of nature is mirrored microcosmically in her highest creation, man. Humanity is enjoined to attempt to see the apparent oddities as part of overall *naturae vis et maiestas* (*HN* 7.7). It is a power that is exuberant to the point of capriciousness: the monstrous races are playthings for her, wonders for us: *ludibria sibi, nobis miracula* (*HN* 7.32). When he describes the potential for variation wrought directly by impressions processed by the human mind at conception, Pliny underlines the link between human and divine ratio by stressing the role of the mind’s imagery, rather than visual stimuli and doubles the potential for variation by stressing the paternal as well as the maternal involvement, specifically ruling out the capacity for this sort of mental creativity on the part of other animals. Here, too, there is a feeling of uncontrolled creativity, of the irresponsible capriciousness of

40 This is not to say that Isidore necessarily believes that nature cannot produce hybrids spontaneously. Another, stranger, form of inter-species mutation is attributed to her at the end of book 12, where the spontaneous generation of one life-form from the dead remains of another is mentioned; a staple of biological theory which was not seriously challenged until the seventeenth century (Harris, *Things Come to Life*; especially pp. 14-17). The mythical/folk tales of metamorphosis which begin the paragraph are reported at one remove in typically paradoxographical terms: ‘they write’, ‘they assert with historical confirmation(!)’, ‘they claim’. However, the transformation of the appearance of criminals into wild beasts, assisted by charms and poisons, is recounted without such literary intermediaries and returns us to the theme of devious/deviant human activity. That (self) corruption of the soul can trigger change in the body is not out of line with the belief in the transmission of changes from mind to body through maternal impressions and, more specifically, with the engineering of the latter by a superior mind deploying tricks of nature.
random thoughts which ‘briefly cross the mind’ (*animo subito transvolans, HN* 7.52).

For Isidore in contrast, uncontrolled inventiveness and inexplicable or unnatural forms not only raise difficult questions about the divine purpose and the relationship between the creator God and ingenious humanity; they also disrupt the order which lies at the heart of his project and undermine his rationale of categorization. The individual human monstrosities, though explained in a similar way as part of an overall divine plan whose entirety is beyond the comprehension of men, are brought under some sort of control in the *Etymologiae* by marshalling them in accordance with meaning, extremity and types of deformity. As for the monstrous races mentioned earlier, it was noted that their lack of a head, the prime physical indicator of the possession of a soul, raised questions as to their correct categorization as humans. As humans, they do not make sense. Would even God have gone that far?

Deviations caused by the human mind are viewed with considerable distrust. Pre-birth impressions are limited to women and females generally, and are a sign of weakness – the ease with which their minds and bodies can be overpowered – rather than an indication of an intellect whose power rivals the creative deity’s. In the case of animals, indeed, the intellect of man is involved, but the tone is critical: his cunning is directed towards unnatural ends, the creation of species not ordained by God. As for Isidore’s deity, He may be inscrutable in his creation of monstrosities, but the undisciplined, wild frivolity suggested by Pliny’s *natura* happily creating *ludibria* for herself seems far removed from the Christian’s ultimately rather serious divine plan.

This leads to a second, more specific, point about Isidore’s overall project: for etymology to work, it requires a basis of rationality from which to derive a word’s meaning.41

However, not all words were established by the ancients from nature; some were established by whim, just as we sometimes give names to our slaves and possessions according to what tickles our fancy. Hence it is the case that etymologies are not to be found for all words, because some things received names not according to their innate qualities, but by the caprice of human will.

41 On Isidore’s recognition of the limits of etymology as a methodology to promote understanding, see Merrills, *Isidore’s Etymologies*, p. 311.
According to Isidore, then, words which derive not from nature but from human whim cannot have etymologies. In addition, Adam ‘conferred names on all the animals, assigning a name to each one from its visible conformation according to the position in nature that it holds’ (12.1.1). Humanity may make the words, but God made the creatures. It is certainly not for man to manipulate those natural conformations. A deus ludens is not an impossibility: the Christian creator in a sense sets the rules, and is the ultimate arbiter of the ‘natural’, as Isidore himself says even more clearly in Etym. 11.3.1: ‘the nature of everything is the will of the Creator’. However, it would make the task of revealing an overall logic in the world's verbal manifestation much more difficult. Caprice, either of man or God, would seem to lie outside the concept of the Etymologies. Sporting with nature undermines the natural order of etymology itself.
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44 On the reinforcing of the relationship between humanity and God effected by the latter’s giving the former permission to name the parts of creation and Isidore’s idea of language as a symbol of a divinely-created reality see Laura Carlson, this volume, 215-218.
45 ‘Voluntas Creatoris culiusque conditae rei natura sit’ (Etym. 11.3.1).


Putting the Pieces Back Together

Isidore and De Natura Rerum

Andrew Fear

The enormous achievement and success of Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies* has tended to eclipse the other works of this prolific author. Arguably the most significant of these is his earlier and much smaller *De Natura Rerum* (*DNR*) which comprises 48 short chapters, occupying a mere 55 columns in the *Patrologia Latina*.¹

The *DNR* is often known as the *Liber Rotarum* because of the six circular diagrams with which it is illustrated. These are likely to be Isidore’s own as the text makes reference to *figurae* or diagrams at the points where they occur. Isidore can therefore be credited with popularising, if not devising, this standard mnemonic device of the Middle Ages which reached its apogee in the works of his fellow Spaniard Ramon Llull.² Four of the diagrams contain an illustration of a human bust in the centre, a fact of some significance, and a further diagram (that illustrating chapter 11) contains the even more significant motto *Homo Mundus Annus*. The final chapter of the *De Natura Rerum*, dealing with the parts of the world appears, like chapter 14 of book 13 of the *Etymologies*, to have been illustrated with a T-O map, again popularising this way of envisaging the world which was to remain dominant in the medieval imagination. The best-known example in Britain is the *mappa mundi* found in Hereford cathedral.³

Though slight, the *DNR* became a standard point of reference and copies of the work spread across all of Western Europe and had a powerful influence on later writers, setting a template for discussion in this field. Bede’s homonymous *De Natura Rerum* owes much to Isidore’s *DNR*, as do books 9-11 of Hrabanus Maurus’s encyclopaedia *De Universo*.⁴ The work itself is composed in four sections. It begins with seven chapters of hemerology, the science of the measurement of time, a topic which remained a particular

---

¹ *PL* 83963-1018. The best modern edition is that of Fontaine, which also contains a translation into French. The work has also been translated into Italian by Trisoglio. For the work’s diffusion, see Fontaine, ‘La diffusion carolingienne du *De Natura Rerum*’.


³ See Harvey, *Mappa Mundi* and Kline *Maps of Medieval Thought*.

⁴ Bede, see the discussion in Kendal and Wallis who also provide an English translation. Hrabanus: *PL* 111 257-330, translated into English by Throop.
concern of Isidore’s throughout his life: the subject is also discussed at length in the *Etymologies*. These chapters deal mainly with definitions of certain lengths of time, beginning with the day (on the grounds that this is what makes creation and its order visible) and in particular the question of when it begins. Surprisingly Isidore is not dogmatic about this question – he lists a variety of different starting points, but gives no firm conclusion as to which is preferable. However, from the diagram accompanying the discussion, it appears that his own preference was for the ‘Egyptian’ system of calculating the day from dusk to dusk. After dealing with the day, Isidore goes on to the definitions of ever-longer periods of time ending with the year. Hemerology is followed by twenty chapters of astronomy, which in turn give way to nine chapters on meteorology. These deal with phenomena such as thunder, lightning, and rain, followed in their turn by a section on miscellaneous natural phenomena such as the flooding of the Nile and the eruptions of Mount Etna. The work was then probably brought to a close with a concluding chapter which deals with the divisions of the world.

Some of the *DNR*’s legacy in retrospect cannot be evaluated positively. The T-O map found at its end, implying, as it does, that the earth was flat, left a mixed blessing. Moreover, the notion of a flat earth runs throughout the work. Chapter 10 deals with the ‘five circles’, *quinque circuli*, of the Earth. At this point Isidore is giving a version of the zonal theory derived from Hyginus’s *De Astronomica*. Hyginus’s *zones* were so named as they girdled a spherical earth. However, in his explanation of Hyginus’s ideas, Isidore has applied the theory of *zones* to an underlying conception of a flat earth which the sun passes on one side. This perversely means that the Arctic and Antarctic zones are placed adjacent to one another as they have both to be located on the side of the earth opposite to that passed by the sun. While educated society in the early medieval world believed that the earth

5 The latter has implications for the monastic day and the time of creation. See for example the conclusions of Archbishop Ussher in 1658: ‘In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth, Gen. 1, v. 1. Which beginning of time, according to our Chronologie, fell upon the entrance of the night preceding the twenty third day of Octob[er] in the year of the Julian [Period] 710. The year before Christ 4004. The Julian Period 710.’
7 Fontaine argues that this chapter only appeared with the second recension of the work, but see the discussion by McCready, ‘Isidore, the Antipodeans, and the Shape of the Earth’, esp. n.35.
8 See Brehaut, *An Encyclopedist of the Dark Age*, pp. 49-50, Destombes, ‘Newton’s Commentary on the Emerald Tablet of Hermes Trismegistus’ and McCready, ‘Isidore, the Antipodeans, and the Shape of the Earth’. For a contrary viewpoint see Stevens, ‘The Figure of the Earth’.
9 Hyginus, *De Astronomica* 1.6.
was a sphere – this, for example, was the view of Bede – the popularity of the *DNR* may well have led to a continuing and widespread ‘semi-educated’ view that the world was flat. This notion may have been equally perpetuated by Isidore’s sarcastic rejection of the antipodes found in the *Etymologies*.\(^\text{10}\)

The *DNR* was therefore a great success, to the benefit or detriment of mankind, but what prompted Isidore to write the work in the first place? The piece is often referred to as a ‘text-book’;\(^\text{11}\) however, though Isidore was greatly concerned with improving education – the *Etymologies*, for example, has often been seen precisely as a handbook for educating the contemporary priesthood – there is no reason to believe that this was his intention when writing the *DNR*. The work may well have taken on this role in later years given its concise nature and its heavy use by the Church Fathers, but nothing in it makes any reference to education being the initial motive for its composition.

Rather, according to its preface, the work was a direct product of a royal command, having been commissioned by the Visigothic king, Sisebut (612-620). Caution needs to be exercised before accepting such a claim, as it could simply be an attempt by the bishop to increase his readership and add lustre to the work. However, here there do seem to be grounds to accept that the king did indeed ask Isidore to write such a work. Isidore’s letters to his colleague Braulio of Saragossa, where he implies that he is a confidant of the king\(^\text{12}\), provide some tenuous support, but Sisebut’s own poem on solar and lunar eclipses, dedicated to Isidore and thanking him for composing the *DNR*, seems conclusive.\(^\text{13}\)

When addressing Sisebut in the preface to the *DNR*, Isidore says that although his king already rejoices in intelligence, eloquence, and is an able writer in a variety of genres (as well as poetry, Sisebut wrote hagiography\(^\text{14}\)), he has nevertheless commissioned the *DNR* because he wished to have

---

10 *Etym.* 9.2.133.
11 See, for example, Stevens, ‘The Figure of the Earth’, p. 268.
13 For an edition of this poem see Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville: Traité de la Nature*, pp. 328-35. The king’s dedication to Isidore can be found in lines 166-169.
14 17-21: ‘ipse enim mihi dedit horum quae sunt scientiam veram ut sciam dispositionem orbis terrarum et virtutes elementorum, initium et consummationem et medietatem temporum et meditationem omnium morum mutationes et divisiones temporum, anni cursus et stellarum dispositiones, naturas animalium et iras bestiarum vim ventorum et cogitationes hominum differentias arborum et virtutes radicum, et quaeacumque sunt absconsa et inprovisa didici omnium enim artifex docuit me sapienta’. The king was the author of the short *Vita et Passio S. Desiderii* = PL 80 377-384.
further knowledge: knowledge without which ‘that famous wise king’ could never have said,

‘For he hath given me certain knowledge of the things that are, namely, to know how the world was made, and the operation of the elements. The beginning, ending, and midst of the times: the alterations of the turning of the sun, and the change of seasons. The circuits of years, and the positions of stars’.

The wise king here is Solomon, and Isidore’s quotation is drawn from the *Wisdom of Solomon*. Solomon was certainly held up as a model ruler in the early medieval period and we could therefore see *DNR* as part of a propaganda campaign by the king to be acknowledged as the new Solomon, and hence the ideal ruler, of Spain.

However, it is not without significance that Isidore’s quotation from the *Wisdom* is carefully edited. In full the passage in *Wisdom* goes on to speak of:

The natures of living creatures and the furies of wild beasts: the violence of winds, and the reasonings of men: the diversities of plants and the virtues of roots, and all such things as are either secret or manifest.15

None of this latter wisdom features in the *DNR*. Isidore’s selective quotation is obviously to his advantage as it connects his work more firmly with Solomon, but it also casts some light on the circumstances of the *DNR*’s genesis. Isidore, and perhaps his monarch, seem more concerned about the propagation of some sorts of knowledge than others. At the time of writing there appears to have been a recrudescence in the peninsula of heresy centred on astronomical phenomena. Braulio, when writing to Fructuosus of Braga in AD 651, speaks about the dangers of Priscillianism as if it was a living threat to the church.16 Priscillian, an extreme ascetic, who enjoyed the dubious distinction of being the first Christian to be executed by an Orthodox Christian emperor, was, and remains, a controversial figure, but astrology, rightly or wrongly, featured strongly in the reasons for his execution.17 Whether Priscillian’s cult had survived some two hundred and

16 Braulio, ep. 44.
17 Priscillian was executed in AD 385 by the usurper Magnus Maximus. His guilt remains doubtful and various respectable ascetics, most notably Martin of Tours, urged Magnus to acquit him. For modern studies see Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila* and Cabrera, *Estudios sobre el Priscilianismo en la Galicia Antigua*. 
fifty years is certainly open to doubt, but it is plausible that ‘Priscillianism’ was used as a portmanteau term for astronomical/astrological-based heresies and that Braulio’s concerns were genuine. Sisebut was a deeply pious ruler and the existence, or indeed the growth, of heresy in his realm is likely to have been a cause for personal concern as well as a potential political threat to his rule.

The probable date of the poem suggests that there may well have been another, much more pressing, set of reasons for the king to commission the DNR. Its composition is best dated to the very beginning of Sisebut’s reign. This can be seen from the fact that the king’s own poem on eclipses, written to thank Isidore for the DNR, refers to his campaigns in the north of the peninsula against the Basques and Cantabrians. The Chronicle of the Pseudo-Fredegar places these campaigns before those Sisebut waged against the Byzantines. As these date to AD 615-616, the DNR must predate Sisebut’s northern actions and the first year of Sisebut’s reign, AD 612, seems not unreasonable for the composition of the DNR.

This had been a time of alarming phenomena in Spain. In AD 611 there had been two total eclipses of moon visible in the peninsula which would have turned the moon red, and on 2nd August in the same year a total eclipse of the sun occurred. This was visible in the peninsula and its line of totality may have fallen just to the north of Visigothic capital Toledo. The obvious response to such matters at the time would have been to turn to the Bible for solace. What Sisebut’s subjects would have found there, however, is likely to have given cold comfort to them or to their king. According to chapter six of Revelation such eclipses presaged the beginning of the end of the world:

And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood.

18 For a possible parallel, see the use of ‘Pelagian’ in early medieval Ireland, O’Croinin, ‘New heresy for old’.
19 See Hen, ‘A Visigothic king in search of an identity’.
20 usque nivosus cum teneat Vasco nec parcat Cantaber horrens.
22 This is the view of Fontaine, Isidore de Séville: Traité de la Nature, p. 5. For his information Fontaine drew on Oppolzer, Canon der Finsternisse, a list of historical eclipses. However, recent calculations by NASA suggest that the line of totality in fact lay in the Algarve rather than central Spain.
23 Revelation, 6.12.
These signs lead to the collapse of all earthly kingdoms with their rulers fleeing in terror:

And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; And said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: For the great day of His wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?

Obviously, Sisebut had a strong personal interest in ensuring that his subjects did not see this passage as applying to the present, and in Isidore, who was extremely hostile to millenarian speculation, he found the ideal scholar to write a work ensuring that such pernicious notions did not spread.24

Isidore’s strategy to deal with these problems was to take a rationalising approach to remove any aura of mystery from the heavens or phenomena such as earthquakes or eclipses. The title of his work and its opening statement that his king wished to know about ‘nature’ and its ‘causes’ are themselves an act of persuasive definition, insisting that what is to be described forms part of the normal order of things, *natura*, and is not a set of supernatural signs or warnings from God. We are told firmly that the workings of nature can be perfectly well explained by ‘sober, sensible teachings’ and have nothing to do with ‘superstitious knowledge’.25 This is a perfectly orthodox approach. Augustine taught that both Scripture and science were of equal authority, and must always be interpreted so that they are in agreement. Because of that, the Bible had to be interpreted consistently with the natural world.26 Isidore effectively is presenting the opposite side of the same argument – the natural world must be regarded as in accord with the Bible. In his *Etymologies* we see him taking the same attitude when dealing with human prodigies, another phenomenon that caused much alarm in antiquity. There he notes that while pagans call such things ‘contrary to nature’, this cannot be the case as they must be part of

---

24 Isidore’s hostility to millenarian speculation can be seen at the end of the small chronicle that he inserts into the *Etymologies*. According to this his contemporaries were in the sixth age of man whose duration was known to God alone, ‘Residuum sextae aetatis tempus Deo soli est cognitum’. *Etym.* 5.39.42. For a discussion of millenarianism, see Landes, ‘Lest the Millennium be fulfilled’.

25 ‘Neque enim earum rerum naturam noscere superstitionis scientia est, si tantum sana sobriaque doctrina considerentur’, *DNR*, Praef. 2.

God's creation and hence part of the divine plan. As such, prodigies are not contrary to nature, but only contrary to nature as it is known to man.27

In taking this approach towards his brief, Isidore was adapting to his own very different ends the technique that the pagan poet Lucretius had used for the same purpose some seven centuries before. Lucretius was well-known in Isidore's day. Sisebut's poem on eclipses makes heavy use of his *De Rerum Natura* and Isidore too discusses at length, and with some sympathy, the theory of atomism in his *Etymologies.*28 As the title of his work, *De Natura Rerum,* shows, Isidore was a conscious imitator of Lucretius whose work was entitled *De Rerum Natura.* The title of the *DNR* is most unlikely to have been a *post eventum* creation as it is found in the *renotatio Isidori,* a list of Isidore's works compiled by his near contemporary Braulio of Saragossa. At first sight, Lucretius seems an ideal ally for Isidore. He too had wished to dispel the belief that various natural phenomena were divinely inspired through applying rationality to the natural world.29 He was also, as were Isidore and the Visigothic Church, deeply opposed to attempts to consult the supernatural through systems of divination. This was an enduring problem for the Church as can be seen by the fierce condemnation of the practice at the 4th Council of Toledo held under Isidore’s supervision at the end of AD 633.30

Fontaine portrays Isidore in the *DNR* as drawing on Lucretius and other pagan sources, along with the Church Fathers, most notably Ambrose's work on the creation, the *Hexameron,* to produce a synthesis of pagan and Christian learning to make his case:

27 ‘Portentum ergo fit non contra naturam sed contra quam est nota natura.’ *Etym.* 11.3.1-2.

28 *Etym.* 13.2.

29 *hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necessest non radii solis neque lucida tela diei discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque.*

‘So this terror of mind and darkness must be dispelled not by the rays of the sun or the bright shafts of daylight, but by observation and the laws of nature.’ Lucretius, *DRN* 1.146-8.

30 ‘Si episcopus quis, aut presbyter, sive diaconus, vel quilibet ex ordine clericorum, magos aut aruspices aut ariolos aut certe augures vel sortilegos vel eos qui profistentur artem aliquam, aut aliquos eorum similia exercentes, consulere fuerit deprehensus, ab honore dignitatis suae depositus, monasterii poenam excipiat, ibique perpetuae poenitentiae deditus scelus admissum sacrilegii luat.’ ‘If any bishop, priest, deacon, or anyone of the ordained clergy has been caught consulting mages, soothsayers, diviners, or indeed augurs or casters of lots or those who profess an art of this sort or others who exercise a similar arts, after being deposed from his rank, he will receive the penalty of being sent to a monastery and given perpetual penance to atone for his open sin of sacrilege.’ Canon 29.
‘Le mérite de Isidore est d’avoir voulu également utiliser ces auteurs chrétiens et ces sources antiques.’
It is to Isidore’s credit that he wished to use Christian authors and ancient sources.

He goes on to argue that the work has another important intellectual aspect – the conscious separation of secular and theological learning:

‘Isidore est soucieux de laisser à l’ordre rationnel et à l’ordre mystique leurs domaines respectifs.’
Isidore is concerned to leave the rational order and the spiritual order in their respective domains.

But, on reflection, it is difficult to maintain either of these positions. As we shall see, Isidore does not give equal weight to his Christian and secular sources nor can he be viewed as an early champion of granting secular learning its own domain, still less as seeing it as an equal partner to religious speculation. In fact the reverse is the case. While it is noticeable that Isidore’s *magnum opus*, the *Etymologies*, begins not with divine learning, as was common with medieval encyclopaedists, but a description of the fields of secular learning, it is also the case that he sees this learning as useful only if it is applied to religious endeavours. In the *Etymologies* the canonical seven subjects of classical education are portrayed as those which free the mind from worldly care and lead it to higher things.31 In another work, the *Sententiae*, Isidore, who had made a deep personal intellectual investment in the study of grammar and closely related subjects, strikingly compares grammarians to heretics. We are told that grammar is only better than heresy on the grounds that while the latter is always fatal, grammar can lead to salvation, if its teachings are refocused on better, i.e. religious, themes.32 The bishop’s attitude to the study of the natural

31 *Etym.* 3.71.41: Ordo autem iste septem saecularium disciplinarum ideo a Philosophis usque ad astra perductus est, scilicet ut animos saeculari sapientia implicatos a terrenis rebus abducerent, et in superna contemplatione conlocarent. ‘This order of seven secular disciplines is thus drawn from the philosophers up to the stars so that they might draw minds entangled in secular learning from earthly affairs and set them to the contemplation of higher things.’ *Etym.* 3.71.41.
32 Meliores esse grammaticos quam haereticos. Haeretici enim haustum lethiferi suci hominibus persuasendo propinabant, grammaticorum autem doctrina potest etiam proficere ad vitam, dum fuerit in meliores usus assumpta. ‘Grammarians are better than heretics. For heretics, while the learning of the grammarians can lead to life, providing that it is taken up for better purposes.’ *Sententiae* 13.11.
world was identical. Ignorance for Isidore is the mother of all evil. In the natural sciences it could easily lead to precisely the sorts of superstitious beliefs he detested. But while knowledge of the natural world would dispel such superstitions, if it was not correctly appreciated, like grammar, it could damn the soul in different, but equally deadly, ways. Lucretius was especially dangerous in this respect as his false views were presented in the seductive medium of poetry.

Isidore’s quarrel with Lucretius was one of ideology. The Roman poet had been an avowed Epicurean and Epicurus is praised throughout his poem. At times Epicureanism had been quarried with profit by early Christian authors: its ridicule of pagan religion was welcome, as was its insistence that this world will pass away. Jerome praises Epicurus’s advice to remain celibate and his championing of a simple diet. Nevertheless these Christian uses of Epicureanism were merely opportunistic: beneath them lay a sustained hostility towards the philosopher and his devotees as, undeserved though it was, Epicurus had long had an unenviable reputation in antiquity for promoting debauchery and atheism. According to Augustine, carnal pleasure, corporis voluptas, was the Epicureans’ highest good, and Epicurus is also attacked as a champion of sensual excess by other influential late antique authors such as Martianus Capella and Boethius. The charge of atheism served to blacken Epicureanism’s reputation still further. While in fact Epicureans like Lucretius were deists rather than atheists, this was of little help. No Christian could accept the contention that God did not create the world, had no care for what happened in it, or that the world

33 Ignorantia mater omnium errorum et ignorantia vitiorum nutrix ... Indoctus facile decipitur. ‘Ignorance is the mother of all error, the nurse of the vices ... the uneducated man is easily deceived’, Synonyma 2.65.
34 Isidore had a strong dislike of pagan poets: ‘Superficially the disquisitions of the gentiles glisten with the eloquence of their words, but within they are devoid of the wisdom of virtue, whereas superficially sacred eloquia seems inept in the way they are composed, within they gleam with the wisdom of the mysteries. It was for this reason, the Apostle said: “This treasure we possess in vessels of clay.”’ Gentilium dicta exterius verborum eloquentia nitent, interius vacua virtutis sapientia manent; eloquia autem sacra exterius incompta verbis apparent, intrinsecus autem mysteriorum sapientia fulgent. Unde et Apostolus: Habetemus, inquit, thesaurum istum in vasis fictilibus, Sententiae 3.13.3. The quotation is from 2 Corinthians 4. 7
35 Lucretius, DRN 5.92-96.
36 Jerome, Contra fovianum 1.48 and 2.11.
37 See for example, Cicero, De Natura Deorum 1.123.
38 Augustine, Civitas Dei 14.2, ‘summum bonum hominis in corporis uoluptate posuerunt.’
39 Martianus Capella, De Nuptiis philosophiae et Mercurii et de Septem Artibus Liberalibus 2.213.
40 Boethius, De Consolacione Philosophiae 3 prosa 2.
41 Lucretius, DRN 6.68-75.
contained no message for mankind. Still less would the Epicurean notion that there was no afterlife have been acceptable – Isidore does not think it even worthy of refutation. While Lucretius is keen to remove the fears of hell by demonstrating that death brings a final end, for the early Church Fathers the hope of reaching heaven and the fear of descending to hell were an important part of the Christian message. Finally, it is inconceivable that Lucretius’s anthropology as expounded in book five of the *De Rerum Natura* arguing that religion has evolved as a product of ignorance about natural events could have been smiled upon by Isidore. Given these problems, we can see that any alliance between the church and philosopher was merely one of convenience as their core beliefs are quite antithetical to one another. St Ambrose, a favourite author of Isidore, was happy to term his ecclesiastical opponents ‘Epicureans’, and Isidore himself attacks Epicurus in the *Etymologies* as a lover of *vanitas* not *sapientia* and as asserting that pleasures of the flesh are the greatest good. The bishop notes with satisfaction that because of this ‘even [pagan] philosophers have named him “the pig”.’

Above all for Lucretius nature is an entirely discrete field of study. The world needs no explanation other than itself: it was not created for a purpose nor does it serve a purpose. It is ignorance of these facts and the consequent rise of religion which has led to human misery, while the realisation of this truth leads to human happiness. Lucretius’s work begins with a paean of

---

42 Lucretius takes the classical line that there can be no creation *ex nihilo*: ‘nil igitur fieri de nilo posse fatendust.’ It must be admitted that nothing can come into being from nothing – *DRN* 1.205. See also *DRN* 5.187-194. Isidore would have been equally enraged by the preceding passage which argues that the world was not made for the benefit of mankind, in clear contradiction to *Genesis*. The Christian position that the world was indeed created *ex nihilo* by God is found in Ambrose’s *Hexameron* (1.16; 4.31), a work on which Isidore draws heavily in the *DNR* and is stated by Augustine, *Confessions* 11.5.7. The insistence on this doctrine is found as early as Irenaeus, *AH* 5.10.3.

43 See Augustine, *Ep*.104.3. In contrast Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 3.1023, declares hell exists only in the mind of fools. The anonymous seventh century Spanish author of the *Lives of the Meridian Fathers* (ch. 9) takes care to inform his readers that the deceased Arian king Leovigild is now ‘subjected to perpetual torments and eternally enslaved in the depths of hell, rightly bound down there to burn forever amidst the ever-seething waves of pitch’.


45 Ambrose, *Ep*.63. Ambrose wanted to influence the election of the bishop of Vercellae. The supporters of an alternative candidate, Sarmatio and Barbarian, are characterised as ‘Epicureans – not a school of philosophers, as they themselves say, but of unlearned men who preach pleasure, persuade to luxury, esteem chastity to be of no use’.

46 Isidore’s discussion of Epicureanism is found at *Etym*. 8.6.15-16.
praise to Epicurus for revealing this and thus crushing religion under foot. 47 Book six of the De Rerum Natura from which the bulk of the topics in the DNR is drawn begins with another similar encomium of Epicurus. 48 These are the conclusions from the study of nature which Isidore is anxious that his readers should avoid. For him it would be pointless to avoid the scylla of superstition merely to fall into the charybdis of atheism.

As Lucretius was well known in Visigothic Spain, 49 Isidore chose to confront the dangers he posed head on. By its title his book throws down a challenge to the Roman author. The De Natura Rerum is intended to replace its rival, the De Rerum Natura. To do this Isidore focuses not on Lucretius's methodology, which he found acceptable, but rather its conclusions. 50 For Isidore, Lucretius is right that a wrong-headed view of natural phenomena causes misery, but conceding this does not equally grant that a secular approach is the correct solution to interpreting nature. In contrast to Lucretius, Isidore was convinced that the natural sciences could not be divorced from an understanding of the divine, indeed he held that this could only be done through an act of deliberate perversity. Isidore’s world is a source of natural theology which allows the faithful believer to discern and confirm all around him God’s purpose and will. Therefore Lucretius had missed the main point as to why man should contemplate nature and had probably done so wilfully. In his later Sententiae, Isidore, speaking of the matters found in the DNR, complains bitterly: “The philosophers of this world speak a lot about the measurement of time, the course of the stars, and the movement of the elements. But they only have this information from God. Flying conceitedly like birds, they describe the air; plunging themselves into the depths like fish, the sea, and walking like herds, the land, but verily they have been unwilling to learn about their creator with all their mind.” 51 He continues: “The Way is Christ. Whoever does not walk in it, will by no means come to God. So the philosophers of this world,

47 Lucretius, DRN 1.62-79, esp 68-9 quare religio pedibus subiecta vicissim opteritur, nos exaequat victoria caelo. ‘Wherefore in its turn religion is crushed beneath our feet and our victory raises us to the heavens’.
48 Lucretius, DRN 6.1-45.
49 See the apparatus to Fontaine’s edition (Isidore de Séville: Traité de la Nature) and Riché, Education and Culture in the Barbarian West.
50 For example, Isidore seems attracted by the Epicurean theory of atomism, but only with the modification that the ‘swerve’ of atoms is produced by divine will and not at random.
51 Multum mundi philosophi praedicantur in dimensione temporum, cursuque siderum, ac discussione elementorum; et tamen hoc non nisi a Deo habuerunt. Volando enim superbe, ut
indeed recognise God, but, because the humility of Christ does not find favour with them, they cross into where there is no way and do not walk in the Way. And so as they melted away, they twisted the glory of the Lord into lies, and, abandoning the righteousness of the Way, have fallen into the morass of error.\textsuperscript{52} In his introduction to the \textit{DNR} Isidore speaks of the need to use sober \textit{doctrina}, or learning, to interpret the natural world, but also of the ‘true knowledge’, \textit{scientia vera}, which was given to Solomon to understand these things. It can be seen that for Isidore this true knowledge was a contemplation of the natural world through the mediation of the scriptures and faith. \textit{Contra} Fontaine, Isidore does not reserve a place apart for secular learning, but rather wishes to remove the possibility of such a space. For him the natural scientist is on but the first rung of the ladder of understanding and it is a perilous one, as partial apprehension of the truth could easily blind the unwary to true knowledge. The \textit{De Natura Rerum} attempts therefore both to reject the wilder and, worryingly, politically destabilising claims which some would read into natural phenomena, but also to re-Christianise natural science in order to turn society away from what Isidore saw as the equally wrong-headed secular approach to nature found in Lucretius.

Part of this process of reclaiming nature for Christ is carried out by the choice of authorities cited in the \textit{DNR}. Lucretius, despite inspiring the title of the work, is firmly relegated to a minor position in it and although other pagan authors, both of prose and poetry, are cited by Isidore, they are rarely the primary witnesses he chooses to produce for his readers. This is a deliberate ploy by the bishop. According to Howard Jones, ‘Isidore is a compiler, and Epicurus [in fact Lucretius] is just one line of ancient thinkers whose opinion on various topics is to be recorded in order to render the account as complete as possible’\textsuperscript{53} But it is naive to see Isidore as a simple collector of opinions and assert as does Jones that there is no sustained engagement with Epicurean arguments in the \textit{DNR}. Far from being the casual act of a compiler, Isidore’s relegation of Lucretius in his text is a conscious part of his strategy of re-Christianisation. He centres the bulk of his arguments around quotations from the Church Fathers, especially

aves, aerem; et demergentes se in profundum, ut pisces, mare; et ut pecora gradientes, terram descripsersunt, verumtamen tota mente Auctorem eorum intelligere noluerunt, \textit{Sententiae} 1.17.2.

\textsuperscript{52} Via Christus est. Si quis in ea non graditur, non est quomodo uniat ad Deum. Philosophi autem mundi utique Deum cognoverunt, sed quia displicuit illis humilitas Christi, in inuiu transierunt, et non in uia. Ideoque euanescentes, gloriis Dei in mendacio mutauerunt, et rectitudinem uiae relinquentes, in anfractus inciderunt errorum, \textit{Sententiae} 1.17.4.

\textsuperscript{53} Jones, \textit{The Epicurean Tradition}, p.138.
St. Ambrose's *Hexameron*, upon which he leans heavily, and passages from the Old Testament. His intention is to assure his readers that Christian learning is more than sufficient to explain the natural world. This message is re-enforced by his use of quotations from pagan authors. These are predominantly used in a supporting rôle to buttress the material he has drawn from the Church Fathers. This is not co-incidence or caprice. Isidore wishes to show that while pagan authors may be of some use, their blindness to the truth precludes them being major sources for understanding the world and that, so far from having a distinct set of insights about the world, the pagan past merely foreshadowed imperfectly the message of the Christian revelation which brought complete understanding in its wake. As for all men of his time, antiquity carried weight for Isidore, but true *gravitas* was to be found among the Christian, not pagan, classics. In the preface to the *DNR* Isidore makes this approach clear: 'We have made a concise record of all these matters according to what was written by men of old, and especially according to what has been written in the works of Catholic authors'.  

A good example of Isidore's technique can be seen in chapter 13 of the *DNR*, which deals with the seven planets. His discussion starts with a reference to Ambrose's *hexameron*, which in turn is a quotation from 'David', i.e. the Psalms (here *Psalm 148*): 'Praise him heavens of the heavens'. Isidore then goes on to say that 'pagan philosophers' have introduced the notion of seven heavens. Herein, he argues, lies their mistake, as in 'the books of the church', *ecclesiastici libri*, we are told about 'the heavens of heaven' and also that St Paul was taken up to the third heaven, but it is folly, and, perhaps, dangerous – Isidore speaks of *temeritas*, rashness – to speculate further on the matter. A similar approach is taken to the question as to whether stars have souls. Isidore again starts with patristic writing and the Bible. A pagan source, Virgil, is then used to back up the conclusion that this question will only be resolved on the Day of Judgement. Lucretius in the *DRN* categorically denies the possibility of the stars being animate. Isidore's careful use of Virgil aims to show his readers that Lucretius was out of step with learned opinion even in his own times.

Although the above examples show that Isidore was willing to use uncertainty as a weapon to undermine the statements of pagan authors, he

54 ‘Quae omnia, secundum quod a veteribus viris, ac maxime sicut in litteris catholicoorum virorum scripta sunt, referentes, brevi tabella notavimus,’ *DNR*, praef. 2.
55 For Paul’s journey see 2 Corinthians 12.1. This question is also debated at length by St Augustine throughout book 12 of his *On the Literal Meaning of Genesis*.
also attempts to create authority through certainty. Here the late antique convention of *brevitas* comes to his aid.\(^{57}\) Isidore describes the *DNR* as a short record, a *brevis tabula*, and concision is an important virtue for him, but he is also able to use this notion to give the *DNR* an air of authority. Often Lucretius is open-ended in his explanations of natural phenomena: he gives, for example, several alternative accounts of the flooding of the Nile.\(^{58}\) Isidore, on the other hand, tends to give one, definitive explanation. In the case of the Nile unfortunately he incorrectly settles on the Etesian winds as the cause of the river’s flooding. This creation of certainty perhaps led to the *DNR* becoming a basic textbook, but that was not the reason for the change of approach. This was to allow Isidore once more to make a point about the unreliability of pagan philosophy’s ability to explain the world. Pagan doubt is replaced by Christian certainty. This seems all the more the case when we ask why the flooding of the Nile or the eruptions on Etna are found in the *DNR*’s miscellany at all. It could be argued that Lucretius had created, or was already following, a canonical list of wonders and that it was therefore inevitable that Isidore would engage with these. If that was the case, we can see how Isidore turned the list to his advantage. Isidore, however, does not deal with all the material found in Lucretius. There is no mention, for example, of the ‘Avernian places’ on which Lucretius spends so much time in the *De Rerum Natura*. We are left with a selection of Lucretian material and once again this selection is deliberate, not capricious. After all, Isidore could easily have replaced the flooding of the Nile, which would have been of no immediate interest to his readership, with more local phenomena, such as the tidal range in the Straits of Gibraltar, which provoked considerable interest in antiquity.\(^{59}\) Isidore throws down a deliberate challenge to Lucretius and shows him wanting. This is equally true of the *DNR*’s account of Mount Etna which, despite Isidore’s protests of brevity, provides more information about the physical reasons for volcanic eruptions than is found in Lucretius’s account.\(^{60}\)

Isidore therefore takes great care both to invoke Lucretius and to marginalise him depending on the context. The main difference, however, between the two authors is not in the number or depth of the explanations of natural phenomena they give, but rather in the style of explanation presented.

\(^{57}\) For Isidore and *brevitas*, see Wood, ‘*Brevitas* in the historical writings of Isidore of Seville’.


\(^{59}\) They provoked, for example, visits from the pagan wise man Apollonius of Tyana. See Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 5.1–10.

\(^{60}\) Lucretius *DRN* 6.680–702.
Lucretius, following Epicurus, wished to show that nature was all that exists, and that the supernatural was not merely an otiose, but an actively pernicious delusion brought on by muddled thinking. For Isidore the reverse is the case. Far from proving that there is no supernatural world, nature allows us a glimpse into that world. Where Isidore feels that a naturalistic explanation of phenomena will avert the problems of superstition associated with them, this is what the DNR gives. More often however the DNR allegorises its subjects and makes a firm link between the natural and supernatural. This approach is in sharp contrast to that later found in the Etymologies, which shows no interest in allegorising its subject matter. But this reveals a difference of purpose, not a change of intellectual approach. In the Etymologies the words discussed are themselves allegories as their roots reveal their true meaning.61

We can also see Isidore’s keen interest in allegorical exegesis from his other works. His Allegoriae quaedam Sacrae Scripturae is an extended exposition of allegories which he believes to be present in the Old Testament, while the Liber Numerorum qui in Sanctis Scripturis occurrunt deals with the hidden significance of numbers occurring in the Bible. The DNR is another instance of this interest. Through allegory our world and the true heavenly world can be linked together and seen to be one whole. The DNR reverses the message of the De Rerum Natura: Nature does not disprove, but proves the existence of a world beyond it. It is partially explicable in its own terms, but also yields a higher interpretation and it is this allegorical explanation which is of greater value to the believer – something to which the pagan philosophers’ pride has blinded them. This contrast is explicitly pointed out in chapter 20 of the DNR which deals with solar eclipses. After giving a naturalistic explanation of the eclipse, Isidore continues: ‘This is what the physicists and the worldly-wise say. But our teachers say that mystically the mystery of this eclipse finds its completion in Christ’, and continues to give an exposition of the Passion.62 In chapter 15 of the DNR after a naturalistic description of the sun, we are told: ‘This pertains to its form, but according to a spiritual understanding (spiritualis intelligencia) the sun is Christ, for as the sun gives light and blazes forth and fosters the healthy at times of shade, but enflames those with fever with an inferno of redoubled heat, so Christ illuminates the believers in the faith with his

61 Etym. 1.29.
62 Hoc physici et sapientes mundi dicunt. Caeterum doctores nostri mystice hujus eclipsis mysterium in Christo dixerunt esse completum...
living spirit, but roasts those who deny him in the heat of eternal fire’.\footnote{Haec quantum ad naturam eius pertinet – at vero iuxta spiritualem intellegentiam Sol Christus est ... item sol inluminat et exurit et opaco tempore confovet sanos, febricitantes vero flagrantia geminati caloris incendit, ita Christus credentes fidei spiritu vegetante inluminat, negantes se aeterni ingnis ardore torrebit.}

Similarly in chapter 18, which deals with the moon, Isidore comments: ‘This same Moon can be seen to symbolise the Church because just as she takes her light from the sun, so the Church takes hers from Christ. And just as the moon waxes and wanes so the Church has her low and high points’.\footnote{Eadem luna etiam ecclesia accipitur. pro eo quod ista a sole sicut ecclesia a Christo inluminatur. sicut enim luna deficit atque crescit, ita ecclesia defectus habet et ortus.} By an extension of the same allegory, lunar eclipses, which turn the moon red, symbolise the persecutions of the church.\footnote{Figuraliter autem per lunae defectum Ecclesiae persecutiones intelliguntur quando martyrum caedibus et effusione sanguinis, tanquam illo defectu et obscuratione, quasi cruentam faciem luna ostendere videtur, ut a nomine Christiano terreantur infirmi. Sed sicut ista post defectum perspicua illustratione clarescit, adeo ut nihil detrimenti sensisse videatur, ita Ecclesia, postquam per martyrum confessionem suum pro Christo sanguinem fuderit, majore fidei claritate refulget, atque insigniori lumine decorata semetipsam latius in toto orbe diffundit. ‘Figuratively a lunar eclipse is understood as symbolising the persecutions of the church when there was the slaughter of the martyrs and an outpouring of blood, so when it gives way and is obscured the moon seems to present a blood-red face that the feeble might be terrified by the name of Christ. But just as after its eclipse it shines forth clearly with a clear light and is seen to have suffered no injury, so the church after she has poured forth her bloody witness of the martyrs for Christ, shines with a great light of faith and adorned with a more glorious light extends herself more broadly across the whole world.’ DNR 21.} The persecutions of the Church are understood to be symbolised by the eclipse of the Moon.

Such interpretations are the 	extit{doctrina sana} and 	extit{sapientia vera} referred to in the \textit{preface} of the \textit{DNR}. However Isidore’s world is not simply a theatre of divine intentions – for as well as displaying how the cosmos has been ordered by God, it also, being a model of man writ large, reveals how man too is a product of intelligent design. In chapter 9 of the \textit{DNR} Isidore notes that the world ‘mundus’ signifies everything in heaven and earth, but that ‘in a mystic sense’ \textit{mundus} signifies man, as he is composed of the four elements that compose the world. The world is the \textit{κόσμος} (cosmos), man the \textit{μικρόκοσμος} (microcosm). Isidore uses Greek script at this point and then immediately glosses the latter phrase ‘that is he is called the smaller world’.\footnote{Id est, minor mundus est appellatus.}

Isidore therefore aligns himself with a Christianised version of the Hermetic tradition which held that the earth was an accurate mirror of the celestial world: ‘as above, so below’. He appears to have been the first western scholar specifically to have used this Greek terminology. According
to this interpretation of the world, Nature not only provides the proof that all the world is an interconnected part of God’s design, but it also shows that man is the key link between heaven and earth: the culmination of creation. It is to emphasise this centrality of man to creation that the middle of four of the circular diagrams found in the manuscripts of the DNR contain a man’s bust at their centre and that a fifth, which shows the interconnection of the four elements, the four seasons and the four ‘humours’ of man, bears the hermetic motto drawn from Ambrose’s Hexameron – Mundus, Annus, Homo – the world, the year, man.

Isidore’s championing of this interconnected vision of creation was a key moment in intellectual history. Though not of his devising, it was his works, above all the DNR, that served to popularise and place this idea at the centre of Western European thought well into the modern period, as can be seen by its espousal by Sir Isaac Newton. The link it forged between the heavenly and mundane was to ensure that the natural world remained an important part of Western intellectual endeavours, albeit not in the autonomous fashion envisaged by Fontaine. Moreover, as the power of scientific positivism has waned in recent years, the potential of the work to continue its influence on Western thought shows no sign of abating in the near future.
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The Politics of History-Writing

Problematizing the Historiographical Origins of Isidore of Seville in Early Medieval Hispania

Michael J. Kelly

Introduction

In a volume dedicated to exposing and critically exploring the reception of Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636 AD) and the complicated historiography about him, what this chapter will do is take the reader back to the very origins of the historical memory of Isidore. It began in the year 636, in Seville, when the illustrious bishop died and the first historical representation of him was produced. This was followed by several other representations from writers around Hispania. The intention of this chapter is not only to introduce the reader to the inception of the written memory of Isidore, but also to problematize the natures of these first-generation historical representations. In so doing, the author shows that the long historiography on Isidore began as competing constellations for the memory of Isidore. There was never in pre-Islamic Iberia, a singular representation of Isidore or agreement about the meaning and extent of his works or the significance of his life. The differing accounts illustrate the vigor that history-writing played in the fierce struggles for authority endemic to early medieval Hispania. They also demonstrate that any comprehensive account of the reception of Isidore must begin by showing the disagreements that characterized the original historiography of Isidore, which was displaced in the generations after his death and outside his network and kingdom.

1 All dates are AD unless otherwise noted.
First-Generation Historical Representations

There are four first-generation representations and historical accounts of Isidore. The first is the praise obituary known as the *Obitus Beati Isidori* written by Redemptus, a cleric at or near Seville. The text is from 636 and is preserved in a problematic eighth-century manuscript at El Escorial (R.II.14).\(^3\) The second account of Isidore is Braulio of Saragossa’s (590-651), *Renotatio Isidori a Braulione Caesaraugustano episcopo edita (Renotatio)*, added to Isidore’s *De Viris Illustribus (DVI)*, and three of his letters (*Epistolae*), all of which are preserved in the ninth-century Toledan-Cordoban manuscript, León Cathedral 22 (c. 830-839).\(^4\) All that can be said of the dating of the *Renotatio* is that it was written before Braulio’s death in 651.\(^5\) The forty-four letters in the collection were written over the course of two decades and include letters to and from Isidore. Third is the second canon of the Eighth Council of Toledo held in December 653, the oldest extant versions of which come from ninth-century manuscripts.\(^6\) Finally, there is the representation of Isidore in Ildefonsus of Toledo’s (c. 607-667) *De Viris...*
Illustribus continuation, written around the middle of the 660s. The oldest remaining copy of this text is in the manuscript León Cathedral 22.7

Redemptus: Obitus Beati Isidori

This short text of about seven hundred and fifty words is the obituary of Isidore composed by a cleric named Redemptus. The account is based on the first-hand experience of the clerics around Seville who knew Isidore the most intimately, and were there for the last days of his life. This list includes, notably, John, Bishop of Ilipla and Eparcius of Italica (both relatively near to modern Seville). The Obitus Beati Isidori was the first posthumous account of Isidore. The point of the short text is to announce Isidore’s death and to demonstrate that he spent his last days honorably, in peace and in a proper Catholic manner.8

Braulio: Epistolae, Renotatio and Isidore’s De Viris Illustribus

The three letters of Braulio that were written after Isidore’s death do not provide a detailed narrative of Isidore’s life. They do, however, demonstrate Braulio’s fidelity to the positive image of Isidore as an authority encountered in the Obitus Beati Isidori. In letter 14, written to Fronimian, a priest near the tomb of St. Aemelian, and perhaps the brother of Braulio, Isidore is cited in regards to liturgical protocol.9 In another letter (22) to Eutropius, a bishop near Zaragoza, Isidore is noted because of his authority on the date of Easter. In letter 44, a response to Fructuosus (unknown-665), Braulio refers to Isidore as an incomparable man of learning (incomparabilis scientiae vir Isidorus), using him to prove a point concerning the age of the Biblical Methusala. In addition to providing evidence of his support for Isidore,

9 That he was Braulio’s brother is a weak argument based on Braulio’s dedication of the Vita S. Aemilianii to his ‘brother’ (frater), Fronimian. On Braulio’s family see note 17. For an edited version of the text see, PL 80, cols. 699-714, and for a translation see Lives of the Visigothic Fathers, ed. and trans. by Fear, pp. 15-43.
recently it has been argued that the letter collection was arranged by Braulio to advance a critical narrative about the monarchy in Toledo. This is consistent with the wider use of historical representations for subtle, sustained criticisms of the monarchy and others.10

The Renotatio of Braulio was added to Isidore’s De Viris Illustribus as a continuation, and offers a much fuller account of Isidore’s life and character than that in Braulio’s letters or in the obituary by Redemptus.11 The Renotatio tells when Isidore lived, [supposedly all of] the councils he attended, and that he successfully fought heresy.12 Braulio also spends significant space telling his readers that Isidore was an eloquent, intelligent and talented orator, and a skilled and knowledgeable writer. Braulio even graces his readers with an encomium to Isidore, quoted from Cicero, via Augustine’s City of God (6.2).13

The most important feature of the Renotatio, however, is the list and short explanation of each of Isidore’s works (missing a few small ones, Braulio says). Braulio lists seventeen works by Isidore in an order that is generally accepted as chronological.14 The list goes from Differentiae, Proemia (introductions to Holy Scripture), De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, [De] Origine[m] Officiorum (known widely, and incorrectly, since at least 1534 as the De Ecclesiasticis Officiis15) through his Sententiae, Chronicon (Chronicles), De Origine Gothorum and his last work, the Origines (Etymologies). Braulio also

10 See Miguel Franco, ‘Braulio de Zaragoza’.
11 In lines 29-30 of the Renotatio, in the middle of the list and description of Isidore’s works, Braulio adds, De viris inlustribus librum unum, cui nos ista subiuximus.
12 Isidore was at the Council of Gundemar in 610 and the Third Council of Seville in the 620s, yet Braulio does not include either. The reasons for excluding them concern the memory of Isidore that Braulio and perhaps his collection editor wanted to preserve. For discussion of these councils see Chapter 4 of Kelly, ‘Writing History, Narrating Fulfilment’.
13 On the quote see Barlow, Iberian Fathers 2, Braulio of Saragossa, p. 10.
14 Since Aldama’s thesis, there have been challenges to the chronology of Braulio’s list, from Jacques Fontaine to Pierre Cazier, the latest editor of Isidore’s Sententiae (Isidorus Hispalensis Sententiae, ed. by Cazier). The most recent is that of Carlos Martín, in his edition and introduction to the Renotatio. Carlos Martín admits that there are potential problems with the order of the works, but that any alternative conclusions on the chronology should wait for reassessments of each work and their respective manuscript transmissions. For the theses and arguments see Martín, La ‘Renotatio Librorum’, pp. 74-84, Aldama, ‘Indicaciones sobre la cronología’, and Fontaine, Isidore de Séville, pp 217 and 436.
15 See the introduction to the De Ecclesiasticis Officiis by Christopher Lawson who proves the original name of De Origine Officiorum through extensive manuscript and contextual research, Sancti Isidori Episcopi Hispalensis, ed. by Lawson. Carlos Martín maintains this naming of the text in his edition of the Renotatio (Martín, La ‘Renotatio Librorum’, p. 260).
provides a short description of each work and tells the readers for whom they were written.

Isidore's *De Viris Illustribus* was written about the year 619. It was a significant year in which he presided over the Second Council of Seville and finished the first version of the *De Origine Gothorum*. It was also when his pupil in Seville, Braulio, may have left Seville to return to Zaragoza. The year 619 is also when Bishop Maximus of Saragossa (c. 574-619) died, and his successor John (unknown-631), the brother of Braulio, took over the bishopric of Zaragoza. It was at that point – the end of Maximus and the transfer of the bishopric to Braulio’s family, the point at which Braulio himself may have returned to Zaragoza – that Isidore ended his *DVI*. In so doing, Isidore tied the bishopric and city of Zaragoza, and the family of Braulio in particular, to a list of illustrious Christian men. Furthermore, the inclusion of Zaragoza in a list that proceeded through Pope Gregory I (c. 540-604) and Leander (c. 534-c. 600), Isidore’s own brother and predecessor in Seville, connected Braulio’s family and the cities of Seville and Zaragoza as twin spiritual centres. The allusion to the conversion of the kingdom to build legitimacy for particular bishoprics is a literary device common in seventh-century Hispania.

In his editing of the *DVI*, Braulio appropriately repaid the favor to Isidore by supplying an addendum on Isidore to the *DVI* that continued the story.

---


17 On Braulio’s family see Valcárcel Martínez, ‘Sobre el origen geográfico de la familia de Braulio’.


19 In 619 there was also an inscription to Saturninus prespiter raised in Seville. The inscription, according to its inscribed dates, suggests that it refers to a local priest, but, given the relative lack of inscriptions from Seville, and all that had been happening between Zaragoza and Seville in the year it was presented, one wonders if this did not also serve as a reference to that S. Saturninus of the Eighteen Martyrs of Zaragoza, the sepulchral site next to which John was abbot and to which Eugenius II would flee to from Toledo. For the inscription see *Inscripciones Cristianas de la España Romana y Visigoda* (*ICERV*), ed. by Vives, no. 112, p. 38.
of Hispania’s spiritual centres and illustrious figures. It is with this text that the Renotatio is transmitted in the manuscript tradition. Thus, the Bishop of Zaragoza repaid the compliment from Seville with one for Seville, and the student also confirmed the legacy of his teacher, reinforcing and developing new channels between centres and networks of power.

Braulio was faithful to Isidore to such an extent that he respected his predecessor’s historical lacunae in relation to certain controversial ecclesiastical events. For example, in the Renotatio, Braulio notes Isidore’s role in the Second Council of Seville, yet he says nothing about the Third Council of Seville, which was presided over by Isidore. This council was particularly contentious since at it a certain bishop, Martianus, was stripped of his rank and see, which were transferred to one Aventius. This established a battle between Martianus and Aventius that would be played out on the streets around Baetica and eventually in the court at Toledo and subsequent councils. By remaining silent about this council in the Renotatio, Braulio followed the suppression of the records and memory of the council established with the Hispana, the conciliar collection edited by Isidore’s network in the early 630s, and reinforced at the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633 (also presided over by Isidore).

The Eighth Council of Toledo

The second canon of the Eighth Council of Toledo in 653 has the following to say about Isidore: ‘The illustrious doctor of our time, the newest glory of our Catholic Church’ (‘Nostri quoque seculi doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholicae novissimus decus’). These flattering words about Isidore presented nearly twenty years, and four plenary councils, after his death represent the first recognition of Isidore’s authority by the monarchy and church in Toledo. Followed by citations from two of his books, the Sententiae and Synonyma, this also marks the first moment at which Toledo sought to lay out its vision of the historical image and memory of Isidore.

20 MS León Cathedral 22 may contain an exact copy of the original version of Isidore’s DVI. See Barlow, Iberian Fathers 2, Braulio of Saragossa, p. 9.
21 For a full discussion of the Third Council of Seville and the evidence for it see Chapter 4.4 of Kelly, ‘Writing History, Narrating Fulfillment’.
22 Councils will be abbreviated throughout the article in the following manner: Third Council of Seville = III Seville.
23 VIII Toledo 2.
That this long overdue recognition of Isidore’s spiritual authority was to happen at VIII Toledo should be no surprise. This council was a serious attempt by Recceswinth (d. 672) to soothe the critical rifts caused by his father Chindaswinth (c. 563-653). Recceswinth hoped to achieve this through an interrelated combination of concession and clemency, the association of this council with III Toledo, at which King Reccared (559-601) had celebrated the conversion of the Visigoths to Nicene Catholic Christianity in 589, and the sublimation of any threats to Toledo’s authority. At VIII Toledo imaginary capital – in the sense of the council as the mirror to III Toledo – was ubiquitous, from superficial connections between the two names of the kings – Reccared and Recceswinth – to their personal lineages to Liuvigild (c. 525-586), to their votive crowns, to their shared presentations as good, holy king in juxtaposition to their fathers. Also significant was Recceswinth’s elevation of the bishops and bishoprics of Mérida and Seville to the top two spots as signatories of the Eighth Council of Toledo – although their bishops, Orontius (d. c. 661) and Antonius (d. c. 656), were not the most senior at the council – as their predecessors had been at III Toledo. This dual promotion associated VIII Toledo with III Toledo. VIII Toledo was one of only three plenary councils from the 630s to the end of the Visigothic kingdom in the 710s in which the signatory from Seville was positioned higher than that of Toledo.

Making clear its theological position, the first canon of VIII Toledo proclaims Toledo’s faith in the Holy Trinity, in consubstantiation, and in single baptism. The second canon, in which Isidore is cited, sets out to deal with deserters and traitors (refugis atque perfidis), in the context of the recent rebellion of Froia. Recceswinth had taken an oath to his father that

24 For discussion of the events leading to VIII Toledo and Recceswinth’s position in 653 see Chapter 5.2 of Kelly, ‘Writing History, Narrating Fulfillment’.
25 Some historians argue that this is no coincidence, in that Recceswinth was related, by marriages, to Reccared’s family (see Garcia Moreno, ‘La sucesión al trono’). For more on the idea of the Imaginary, as a primary order of identity and alienation, see Jacques Lacan’s Seminars and Écrits.
26 The votive crown was a practice imitating the Byzantines, and perhaps, specifically, the crowns in Hagia Sophia. It represented the symbolic connection between and opposition of the earthly diadem and Heavenly crown, and as such the duality of Christ, but also the cooperation between the Church and the monarch. As Isidore says in Sententiae 3.51.3, royal power is only effective when subordinate to the higher authority. On the votive crowns see, Molina Gómez, ‘Las coronas de donación regia del tesoro de Guarrazar’, El Tesoro Visigodo de Guarrazar, ed. by Perea, in particular the chapters by Arce, ‘El conjunto votivo de Guarrazar’, and Cortés, ‘Influencias bizantinas’, pp. 367-76, Fontaine, L’art préroman hispanique I, pp. 242-46, and the benedictio corone in the Liber Ordinum, col. 165 (Le Liber Ordinum, ed. by Fèrotin).
demanded blinding and capital punishment for attempted usurpers and their associates, a rule that was confirmed by holy authority. This commitment placed Recceswinth in a tough position. On the one hand, he needed to show clemency to the rebel Froia and his supporters (fautoribus), to show that faith and holy authority were above the law, while at the same time he had to maintain the integrity of oaths and the law, and deal with the real threat of rebellion. The council’s solution was to cite Isidore, after presenting him as a doctor of the church. After citing the authority of ancient writers and doctors of the Church – Ambrose (c. 340-397), Augustine (354-430) and Gregory I – and praising Isidore, the canon cites Isidore’s *Sententiae* 2.31.9, which says that an oath promised incautiously should not be kept. The canon goes on to cite Isidore again, this time from his *Synonyma* 2.58. As in the passage from *Sententiae*, it explains that promises given in bad faith should be rescinded: that which was unwisely offered should not be maintained because an oath should not comply with an evil deed. Toledo’s initial historical representation of Isidore was, then, deeply rooted in the context of a political negotiation between the royal power centred on Toledo and aristocrats who sought clemency for former rebels.

27 On the oath see the preface to VII Toledo, *omnes pene Hispaniae sacerdotes omnesque seniors vel indices ac ceteros homines officii palatini*, a definition Recceswinth essentially sums in up in his *tomus* when he says that *vos omnesque populum iurasse recolimus*. On the rebellion of Froia see the letter from Taio, Bishop of Zaragoza to the Bishop of Barcelona, Quiricius, Taio, Ep. ad Quiricium, *Sententiarum* 5, PL 80, col. 727ff. For discussion of the council and rebellion see Stocking, *Bishops, Councils and Consensus*, pp. 1-4 (the title of this text will be referred to in the rest of the notes simply as *BCC*), and, Castellanos, ‘Political Nature of Taxation’, 214. It is also possible that Eugenius II’s *carm.* 20 and 36 refer to a rebellion of Froia as well: the former speaks of a current war in terms similar to Taio’s description of Froia’s attack on Zaragoza and the latter of the return of *refugi* after the war. For discussion of the possibility of their reference to Froia’s rebellion see Farmhouse Alberto, ‘Three historical notes on Eugenius of Toledo’s *Carmina*’.

28 In the chapter, de iuramento, it reads, *Non conservandum sacramentum quod malum incaute promittitur, veluti si quispiam adulterare perpetuam cum ea permanendi fidem polliceatur; tolerabilia est enim non implere sacramentum, quam permanere in stupri flagitium*. The citation from the *Sententiae* that is in the Vives edition of the canon is slightly different from other earlier and later editions. For instance, in *PL* 83 it reads, *Non est conservandum*, and *quo* instead of *quod*, logically presents *adulterae over adulterare*, and reads *perpetuam* against *perpetuo* and *flagitio* over *flagitium*. Other than the differences with *perpetuam* and *flagitium*, the new critical edition of the *Sententiae* (CCSL 111) follows the *PL* version.

29 *In malis promissis rescinde fidem, in turpe votum muta decretum quod incaute voviste non facias. Inpia est promissio quae se[elere adimpletur.*
Ildefonsus: Isidore and the *De Viris Illustribus*

Ildefonsus’ text on Isidore is noticeably shorter than Braulio’s *Renotatio*, leaving out much about Isidore’s personality, for example. The reader is not told about Isidore’s charity, his fight against heresy, and his knowledge of antiquity. All that Ildefonsus repeated was that Isidore was a superb orator and a man with intelligence and propriety. The smaller quantity of general information about Isidore in Ildefonsus’ account is reflected in a reduction in the number of Isidore’s texts to ten. The ten texts on Ildefonsus’ list of works attributed to Isidore are not in chronological order (if, indeed, Braulio’s list is chronological in its organization), contain almost no descriptions of the texts’ contents, and do not include all of the dedications of the books. For example, Ildefonsus does not mention that the *[De] Origine[m] Officiorum* (*De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*) was dedicated to Isidore’s brother Fulgentius, Bishop of Astigi (modern Écija). The works that Ildefonsus does not mention are: *De Numeris, De Nominibus Legis et Evangelorum, De Haeresibus, Chronicon, De Viris Illustribus, Monastica Regula*, and the *De Origine Gothorum, et Regno Suevorum et etiam Vandalorum Historia*. Ildefonsus appears to have left the historical writings and origins stories out of Isidore’s body of work. Upon reading Ildefonsus’ account of Isidore’s works one is provided with a different image of Isidore in which he did not write on history or origins, on spirituality and mysticism, or on monasticism. So, the Isidore of Ildefonsus did not continue the *Chronicles* of Eusebius-Jerome, did not claim that Swinthila was the king of totius Spaniae or declare Spain to be the ‘ornament of the world’ (ornamentum orbis), nor is this Isidore the grand architect of consensus and unity through historical discourse and representation that recent studies have emphasised.30

The cutting of Isidore’s *DVI* from the lists of his texts in Ildefonsus’ continuation of the *DVI* tradition deserves special attention because it suggests that the text as a whole was a response to Isidore's *DVI* and Braulio’s addendum. As the recent editor of the *DVI* has pointed out, Ildefonsus’ principal concern in writing the *DVI* was, in contrast to Isidore, to praise the *sedes regia*, Toledo, but also to insert into the historical record the key role of the Toledan monastery of Agali, from which a number of its bishops were raised.31 Ildefonsus, who was the last bishop of Toledo to be raised

---

30 All quotes from and references to Isidore’s *De Origine Gothorum* are from the edition in *Las Historias de los Godos*, ed. by Rodríguez Alonso, or, when appropriate or necessary, *Historia Gothorum Vandalorum Sueborum*, ed. by Mommsen, pp. 267-303.

31 Codoñer, ‘Los *De viris illustribus* de la Hispania visigótica’. 
through Agali, not only re-wrote the *DVI* in favor of Toledo and Agali, his praise for Isidore was somewhat backhanded. In the preface to the work, he acknowledges that Isidore wrote a *DVI*, but says that he did not do it well, which Ildefonsus intends to remedy.\footnote{Ildefonsus Toletani Episcopi, ed. by Urquiola and Codoñer Merino, p. 110.}

Instead of writing from the second century forward, as Isidore had done, Ildefonsus’ *DVI* includes only thirteen entries, starting with the Bishop of Toledo, Asturias (late fourth century). The next entry is on Montanus (d. c. 530s), the Bishop of Toledo that oversaw II Toledo in 527. Ildefonsus rapidly moves forward, with the fourth entry, to Aurasius, Bishop of Toledo from 603 to 615. In between Montanus and Aurasius, Ildefonsus mentions no bishops, not even Eufemius of Toledo (d. c. 590s), who presided over III Toledo, the council at which the Visigoths were converted to Catholicism in 589.\footnote{Ildefonsus’ exclusion of Eufemius, the Bishop of Toledo at III Toledo, may seem strange: if Ildefonsus was trying to build the legitimacy of Toledo as the primary Catholic see of the kingdom, why would he not include Eufemius? One might reasonably believe that Toledo’s bishop and signatory to the council at which the kingdom converted to Catholicism would be a necessary person to include in such a version of the narrative. However, since Gundemar’s decretal had, in 610, defamed Eufemius for his ‘mistakenly’ recognizing Toledo as in Carpetania, not Carthaginensis, Ildefonsus had to be silent on Eufemius. For more on Gundemar’s decretal and the problem of Eufemius’ signature see Chapter 4.3 of Kelly, ‘Writing History, Narrating Fulfillment’.}

Instead of writing from the second century forward, as Isidore had done, Ildefonsus’ *DVI* includes only thirteen entries, starting with the Bishop of Toledo, Asturias (late fourth century). The next entry is on Montanus (d. c. 530s), the Bishop of Toledo that oversaw II Toledo in 527. Ildefonsus rapidly moves forward, with the fourth entry, to Aurasius, Bishop of Toledo from 603 to 615. In between Montanus and Aurasius, Ildefonsus mentions no bishops, not even Eufemius of Toledo (d. c. 590s), who presided over III Toledo, the council at which the Visigoths were converted to Catholicism in 589. Instead, he includes Donatus (fifth century), the North African monk that had come to Spain with dozens of monks and books. In this entry, he says that Donatus was the first to bring a monastic rule to Hispania, which likely was not true. Ildefonsus may have included this ‘fact’ because Agali used Donatus’ rule (in privileging the authority of the Toledan monastery of Agali, Ildefonsus also ignored Isidore’s *Monastic Rule*).\footnote{Ildef., *DVI* 3. Donatus was a North African monk who brought the rule to Spain with him and who built the monastery of Servitanum. Ildefonsus claims that this was the first rule in Spain, a claim that Roger Collins says should be believed (Collins, *Early Medieval Spain*, p. 81). In contrast, Andy Fear maintains that there were earlier rules in Spain (*Visigothic Fathers*, p. 112). For discussion of the Visigothic monastic rules see Allies, ‘The Monastic Rules of Visigothic Iberia’, pp. 30-31.}

Ildefonsus’ leap from Montanus to Aurasius allowed him to completely ignore III Toledo, and hence Leander of Seville.

In Isidore’s *DVI*, the chapter on Pope Gregory I is followed by one about Leander, a leading figure in the conversion of the Visigothic monarchy. This literary construction placed Seville as the bishopric through which Hispania became Catholic, legitimising its spiritual primacy within the kingdom. It may be significant in this regard that Isidore mentions none of the bishops
of Toledo. Ildefonsus, on the other hand, glosses over the conversion and its key figures – even Eufemius of Toledo – and charts an alternative story of ecclesiastical primacy. The lack of detail was so evident here that later scribes felt the need to add their own entries about the figures of this period, especially Gregory I.\textsuperscript{36} Ildefonsus left Leander out of the narrative, instead focusing on the bishops who had occupied the bishopric of Toledo since the conversion, while the two bishops who were chronologically more distant provided the appearance of historical depth. Ildefonsus’ DVI thus generated a Toledo-centred ecclesiastical history for late antique Hispania.\textsuperscript{37} Ildefonsus thus sought to reshape the legacy of Seville, and of Isidore in particular. Ildefonsus’ historical representation of Isidore reveals that there were at least two distinct historiographies of Isidore concurrent in the Hispania of the mid-seventh century.

The Next Generation: Historical Representations of Isidore

In addition to the first-generation historical representations, other texts were written about Isidore over succeeding decades in Visigothic Hispania: the \textit{Vita Fructuosi}, Epitaphion beati Leandri, Isidori et Florentinae and the \textit{Chronica Regum Visigothorum}. These reflect the divergent representations which have been identified in the historiography of the first-generation. The first post-Visigothic historical representation of Isidore is the eighth-century \textit{Continuatio Hispana} (also known as the \textit{Chronicle of 754}). This text demonstrates the merging of the original historiographical traditions.

The \textit{Vita Sancti Fructuosi} was written by an anonymous disciple of Fructuosus, Bishop of Braga, after his master’s death in 665.\textsuperscript{38} The oldest extant manuscript is the tenth-century MS 10.007 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid (formerly, MS Toletanus 10.25). In the \textit{Life of St. Fructuosus}, together with the opening laudatory remarks for the eponymous saint, Isidore is praised for his divine love, brilliance, eloquent speech, personal charm, the reintroduction, it is said, of Roman education, as well as his productivity, in a description that is very similar to that of Braulio.\textsuperscript{39} Fructuosus himself

\textsuperscript{36} See Codoñer Merino, \textit{De Viris Illustribus}.

\textsuperscript{37} On Ildefonsus’ DVI empowering Toledo see Galán Sánchez, ‘El De viris illustribus de Ildefonso de Toledo’, and Wood, ‘Playing the Fame Game’.

\textsuperscript{38} For a critical edition see Diaz y Diaz (ed.), \textit{La Vida de San Fructuoso de Braga}.

\textsuperscript{39} \ldots\ Isidorum, reverentissimam se elicet virum Spalensem episcopum, atque beatissimum Fructuosum, ab infantia immaculatum et iustum. Ille autem oris nitore clarens, insignis industriae, sophistae artis indeptus praemians, dogmata reciprocat Romanorum.
had been associated with Isidore’s network, specifically with Braulio, and seems to have held similarly to anti-Toledan sentiments.

The short, metrical epitaph of twelve lines to the blessed Leander, Isidore and Florentina (Epitaphion beati Leandri, Isidori et Florentinae) is presented as the transcription of an inscription that was made at the time of the death of Isidore in 636. The possibility that this represents an authentic inscription from the 630s is slim.\(^4^0\) A few puzzling questions come to mind when one reads the text. First, there is no reference to the other brother, Fulgentius, who died several years before Isidore. This absence implies that the person who wrote the epitaph was did not know this fact, or chose to ignore some rather basic information about the family. Second, the person who transcribed or copied the inscription either did not understand the Spanish aera dating system, or did not know when Isidore had died. This is evident from the date of death assigned to Isidore as era DCLXXXIII (Spanish era year 683), the year 645 AD. Jose Vives has argued that this mistake was not the result of ignorance of the Spanish aera system, or Isidore’s date of death, simply a mistake by a later hand, the scribe of the eighth-century manuscript Paris, Lat. 8093, who ‘confundió la primera I con una X’.\(^4^1\) If Vives is correct, the transcription reflects an authentic contemporary inscription, now preserved in an eighth- or ninth-century transcription.\(^4^2\) Although it is possible that the epitaph/inscription could be a later invention, there does appear to have been a tradition in seventh-century Seville of inscribing or writing epitaphs to recently deceased bishops. This can be seen in the case of the Obitus Beati Isidori examined earlier in this chapter and the epitaph to Isidore’s immediate successor, Bishop Honoratius, in the Epitaphium Honorati episc. Hispanensis. In this context, the Epitaphion beati Leandri, Isidori et Florentinae is simply part of an ongoing tradition of episcopal commemoration in Seville.\(^4^3\) Whether created in the mid-630s or later, within Spain or outside, the fact that the Epitaphion has been falsely attributed to both Braulio and to Ildefonsus is a good example of the confused nature of early accounts of Isidore.\(^4^4\)

\(^4^0\) For the most recent edition see Martín, ‘El Epitaphium Leandri’.
\(^4^1\) ICERV, ed. by Vives, num. 272, p. 81.
\(^4^2\) On the manuscript tradition see De Rossi, Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae, II, pp. 296-97, ICERV, ed. by Vives, pp. 80-81.
\(^4^3\) Index Scriptorum Latinorum, ed. by Díaz y Díaz, no. 372, p. 98, and ICERV, ed. by Vives, no. 273, pp. 81-82, and 90, n. 287.
\(^4^4\) See Ledesma, El De Itinere Deserti, p. 68, and Index Scriptorum, ed. by Díaz y Díaz, no. 226, and no. 380. Finally, preserved only in the same manuscript that contains the Epitaphium Leandri, Isidori et Florentinae, MS Paris BN lat. 8093, there is an anonymous text, perhaps from
Chronica Regum Visigothorum

The *Chronica Regum Visigothorum* (CRV) is a basic, non-descriptive list (*laterculus*) of the Visigothic kings from Athanaric in 362 to Ervig in 680. It was originally composed in the late seventh century in Hispania. Appended to the entry on Sisebut is a short note saying that he was king in the time of Isidore, *sisebudi temporibus fuit isidorus episcopus*. Not much can be gleaned from this reference since in it there is no detail about Isidore other than the fact that he was bishop. Furthermore, the reference to Isidore was very likely not from the original CRV. The oldest extant manuscript of the CRV is the eighth-century MS Vat. Reg. Lat. 1024. Of the twelve extant manuscripts of the CRV, only two contain the reference to Isidore: the tenth-century MS Paris 1557, and the eleventh-century MS Casinas n. 1. Since the latter manuscript is built on the former, there is only one manuscript family with this entry on Isidore, and it is a late one, from the tenth century.

In addition to being the only manuscript tradition of the CRV to mention Isidore, there are other anomalies in MS Paris 1557. First, there is no mention in any of the other copies of the CRV of any figures other than Visigothic kings. The scribe of this manuscript added Isidore to the reign of Sisebut, but also Gregory I and the Byzantine Emperor Maurice (539-602) to the reign of Liugivild (*leuuigildus*). The other relevant anomaly is that in the MS Paris 1557 family, the CRV is not collected together with the laws of the Visigoths, but rather, between a conciliar decree and letters of Gregory I. It seems, therefore, that these additions were meant to clarify, for the reader, the historical context of the life and times of Gregory I, not to discuss Isidore.

Thus, the entry on Isidore in the CRV appears to reveal little about the developing historical representation of Isidore in later seventh century Hispania. However, there are indications that some抄isten were drawing an

the seventh century, titled *confessio beati Isidori dicta* (*Index Scriptorum*, ed. by Díaz y Díaz, no. 307). In the ninth century, the anonymous *Ildemundus abbetis* and *versus de S. Johanne* were added to the manuscript, and in the eleventh century a life of Isidore was also included in this dynamic manuscript (*Index Scriptorum*, ed. by Díaz y Díaz, no. 370 and 377).

45 For the edition of the *Chronica Regum Visigothorum* (CRV) see the *Laterculus regum Visigothorum*, in *Chronica Minora.*, ed. by Mommsen, pp. 461-68.

46 This spelling reflects the general manuscript tradition, but also perhaps contemporary disregard for Liuvigild’s attempt to Romanize (Byzantinize) his name into Leogivild. The evidence suggests that various mints in the kingdom purposely ignored royal instructions to write the king’s name as ‘Leo-’. On the coins and their relation to the names see Grierson and Blackburn, *Medieval European Coinage*, pp. 49-54.
association between Maurice, Gregory and Isidore in this period. Braulio was the only early medieval author to associate Isidore and Maurice in the same passage, and there is an early manuscript tradition of John of Bical’s (d. c. 621) Chronicle, which continues the text to 602 with supplementary discussions of Gregory I and Maurice alone. The Maurice-Isidore-Gregory association may therefore reach back into the seventh century if MS Paris 1557 is built on this textual tradition. This supposition receives further support from the claim by the author of the Chronicle of 754 that a continuation of John of Bical’s Chronicle until the year 680 was a source. This continuation itself was likely a continuation of the earlier extension to 602, which, as noted above, focused on Maurice and Gregory I. The Isidore reference in the CRV reinforces the impression that divergent historiographical traditions about Isidore were developing in the second half of the seventh century, one of which drew a close association between Isidore, Gregory I and Maurice.

**Continuatio Hispana, or, Chronicle of 754**

The Chronicle of 754 was written several decades after Arab-Berber armies had overthrown the Visigothic kingdom and established a Muslim state in much of Iberia. It is thus removed from the politics of the Visigothic kingdom, which shaped the earliest accounts of Isidore’s life and works. The Chronicle of 754 mentions Isidore together with, but only after praising, his potential rival, the Bishop of Toledo, Helladius (d. 633). All that is said of Isidore is that he was an illustrious teacher and staunch defender of the faith against heresy. Despite the brevity of this notice, this is the first time that the two great, contemporary bishops of Seville and Toledo, respectively, were included in the same discussion. In bringing Seville and Toledo together in this way, the anonymous chronicler synthesised the historiographical traditions, presenting, what might be said to be, a

47 See the chapter by Jamie Wood earlier in this volume for more on the important role that writers from Visigothic Spain played in the early transmission of the works of Gregory I and in the cultivation of his memory.

48 See Díaz y Díaz, ‘La transmisión textual del Bicalarense’.

49 Juan de Bical Obispo de Gerona, ed. by Campos, p. 100.

50 For an edition of the Chronicle of 754 see López Pereira, Crónica mozárabe de 754, Chronica Minora, ed. by Mommsen, pp. 334-60. For extended discussion of the Chronicle of 754 see Christys, Christians in Al-Andalus, pp. 28-51 (esp. pp. 33-35).

51 Chron. 754, 16.
neutral discourse, or a non-dialectical, or non-historical, one. However, this would be an unfair critique, since the chronicler was indeed speaking within a dialectics of power, but it was not the one colored by competition between Christians in Visigothic Hispania; rather, it was one that promoted Christianity within an Islamic polity in Al-Andalus. The chronicler, writing in Toledo or in the southeast of the Iberian Peninsula, was also concerned with the memory of Isidore, but his aim was to deploy the memory of Isidore (and Helladius) as historical evidence for the achievements of Christianity in Hispania: Isidore was now part of a ‘unity’ narrative, one which sought to see Christians in pre-Islamic Iberia as one community united under their Catholic king.

Conclusion

In summary, the historiography of Isidore emerged from his near contemporaries in Hispania as part of struggles between various networks of power over the politics of historical memory and history-writing. The participants in these debates over the historical representation of Isidore were all Christian, the hegemonic religion in early medieval Hispania. Although our knowledge of life in the Iberian Peninsula of the eighth century is limited, it is evident that Christians living there, after the defeat of the Visigothic monarchy in Toledo, lived under less stable conditions; their religion was no longer an obvious marker of power and status, but put them at a potential disadvantage. It is no surprise then that from the mid-700s the history of Isidore began to be written differently. The anonymous author of the *Chronicle of 754* sought to promote Christianity and all of its illustrious figures in the peninsula. The aim of the text was to encourage an image of longstanding Christian, specifically Catholic, unity in the peninsula, and so merge the historiographical traditions, and indeed the history, into a narrative of consensus. The Franks especially, but others too, later found a desire to use Isidore’s vision of what might be achieved when the church and monarchy were intimately tied to one another.52 These two developments severed the historiography of Isidore from the historical conditions in which his memory was originally competed over. This created a displaced or re-territorialized concept of Isidore and his relation to specific pasts.

52 The first hagiographies of Isidore are from after the Visigothic kingdom’s demise in the first half of the eighth century. On the hagiographical tradition of Isidore see Guance, ‘*Dormavit Beatus Isidorus*’, Martín, ‘El corpus hagiográfico latino’.  

---
and historical narratives. The story of the wider medieval reception of Isidore, not to mention the theory of history, are, however, subjects for other chapters in this volume.
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6 Isidorian Texts in Seventh-Century Ireland

Marina Smyth

When working in the 1980s on elucidating the cosmological views current in Ireland during the seventh century, I came to question the prevailing assumption that Isidorian works such as the Etymologiae and De natura rerum were available in Ireland already ca. 650. It had become clear to me that whereas Hiberno-Latin texts of the third quarter of the seventh century shared much technical terminology with those two Isidorian treatises, the Irish authors did not understand the meaning of these words.1 Hiberno-Latin texts assigned to the mid-years of the seventh century had been adduced as evidence for early borrowings from Isidore of Seville (d. 636).2 Variations on statements such as ‘… We can now be almost completely confident that the writings of Isidore were known in Ireland in the 650s. In the case of the Etymologies, it is at least possible that that work reached Ireland before the middle of the seventh century’3 were commonplace in the field. This conviction led to the assignation of Hiberno-Latin texts to specific periods of the seventh century. Thus, for example, Aidan Breen concluded from his demonstration that the Commentarius in Epistolas Catholicas Scotti Anonymi was not influenced by the Etymologiae – contrary to previous belief4 – that ‘since the text, however, emanated from that very scholastic environment to which the works of Isidore were first introduced in Ireland, a date of 660 seems highly unlikely. In all probability, the text predates 650’.5 Luned Mair Davies gave a very clear and concise account of the state of the question in the mid-nineties in her paper on Isidorian texts and the Canones Hibernenses,6 but readers may not think to seek this information in the study of a text generally dated to c. AD 700 or later.

1 Smyth, ‘Isidore of Seville’, pp. 72-82, and more specifically pp. 82-91; Understanding, especially pp. 114-123.
4 McNally, Commentarius, pp. 1-50.
An early transmission of Isidore’s works to a remote island lying to the west of northern continental Europe was explained by the high level of classical culture and stability in the Visigothic kingdom at that time, combined with maritime routes from northern Spain to Ireland. Jonathan Wooding has pointed out: ‘The presence, or non-presence, of trade routes is not in itself proof of the likelihood of the transmission of texts’, and he feels that the ‘pre-eminence of Spanish learning in the sixth and seventh centuries was sufficient that its influence was dominant’. Aldhelm of Malmesbury (d. 709) is generally accepted as the first witness to the knowledge of Isidore in Anglo-Saxon England, specifically to De natura rerum. This is consistent with my understanding of the situation in Ireland: I agree with Hillgarth that ‘it can be said that Isidore is omnipresent in the Irish writings of the late seventh, eighth and ninth centuries’, but I believe one should be very cautious for anything before the late seventh century... and this applies to more than Isidorian texts relating to cosmology.

In this contribution, I investigate the recent research in two areas and determine its implication for knowledge of Isidore’s works in seventh-century Ireland: first, the dating of texts originating from Ireland, and second, the extensive studies on manuscript transmission associated with the ongoing (and now almost completed) project of providing new editions for the works of Isidore. I now present my findings on some further aspects of the transmission of Isidorian works to Ireland from the middle of the seventh century.

Changes in the Dating of Texts Written in Ireland

The dating of early Hiberno-Latin texts adduced to show that the works of Isidore were available in Ireland already by AD 650 has been modified

---

10 For a convenient list of editions available c. 2008, see M. A. Andrés Sanz, J. Elfassi & J. C. Martín, L’Édition critique, pp. 253-254. We can now add for the Etymologies: Book III: De mathematica (with French transl.; 2009), Book VI: De las Sagradas Escrituras (with Spanish transl.; 2012), Book VII: Dieu, les anges, les saints (with French transl.; 2012), Book XI: De homine et portentis (with Italian transl.; 2010), Book XIV: De terra (with French transl.; 2011), Book XVI: De las piedras y de los metales (with Spanish transl.; 2011), Book XVIII: De bello et ludis (with Spanish transl.; 2007), Book XX: De penu et instrumentis domesticie et rusticis (with French transl.; 2010), all in the collection Auteurs latins du moyen âge (Paris, Les Belles Lettres).
by recent scholarship. When preparing this paper, I was surprised to find that in his 1985 edition of Isidore's *De ortu et obitu patrum*, Chaparro Gómez questioned the credibility of what seemed like perhaps the only solid ground in the study of the spread of Isidore's works to Ireland by the mid-seventh century. Referring to the explicit mention of Isidore in the text of Marc Adriaen's edition of Lathcen MacBaith's *Egloga de Moralibus in Iob*, Chaparro Gómez commented: *si damos credibilidad al testimonio de Lathcen.*

I had previously accepted that in the beginning of his much abbreviated version of the *Moralia* of Gregory the Great, Lathcen made explicit reference to Isidore and to his *De ortu et obitu patrum*: under the heading *Dicta Isidori in libro de uita et exitu prophetarum*, there is a close paraphrase of the short section in Isidore's work giving information on Job's origins and the duration of his life. The death of Lathcen of Clonfertmuloe is recorded in the *Annals of Ulster* for the year 661, and the comment in his *Egloga* seemed to make it secure that Isidore's *De ortu et obitu* was known in Ireland around the middle of the seventh century. Chaparro Gómez, on the other hand, points out that despite the mutual contamination of the various recensions, not all manuscripts of the *Egloga* contain this very section attributed to Isidore. Since the earliest manuscripts of the Irish text are from the eighth century, the section may have been inserted any time before that. I also note that even though Ildefonsus of Toledo refers to Isidore's *De ortu et obitu patrum* as *librum de ortu et obitu prophetarum*, in early manuscripts of that work, the title normally mentions the life and death of *sanctorum*, not *prophetarum*.

Chaparro Gómez identified three main versions for *De ortu et obitu patrum*, the first being the only one composed by Isidore himself at the end of the sixth century, and remaining in Spain. Another version was created soon thereafter, probably in Spain, adding material from the *Breuiarium apostolorum* and Chapter 80. This is the text that would have been transmitted to Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England, and also across the Pyrenees. It did not contain the eight sections concerning Old-Testament

11 Not to be confused with the similar *De ortu et obitu patriarcharum* (Carracedo Fraga, 1996), probably composed in the late eighth century by an Irish author in Bavaria, or maybe in Salzburg.
16 Chaparro Gómez, *De ortu*, pp. 92-93.
17 PL 83:154 (Caput LXXI.140-142); Chaparro Gómez, *De ortu*, pp. 215-216.
18 Chaparro Gómez, *De ortu*, pp. 92-93.
figures which were added later in some of the manuscripts: 46 = PL86: Micheas; 47 = PL87: Naum; 48 = PL88: Abacuc; 51 = PL91: Zacharias; 54 = PL94: Achias; 55 = PL95: Iaddo; 56 = PL96: Azarias and 57 = PL 97: Zacharias.

The third type is later, with numerous and varied accretions.

In her 2012 contribution on Lathcen in Te.Tra. 4, Lucia Castaldi thoroughly reviewed and completely revised the stemma created by Adriaen, thereby showing that he had unfortunately produced a misleading edition in that it presents the text of one of the inflated Carolingian versions. She concludes quite simply and emphatically: ‘Lathcen non conosce e non cita Isidoro’. The trump card for early seventh-century transmission of Isidore’s work to Ireland is gone.

Bischoff mentioned the anonymous Versus cuiusdam Scotti de alphabeto in his 1961 paper on the early spread of Isidore’s works throughout Europe, in this case specifically the Etymologiae. Manitus had assigned this riddle poem to mid-seventh-century Ireland, and his dating had been accepted by most scholars. This early dating hinged on Manitus’ belief that the explanatio of the riddles in the poem was composed by the same anonymous author as the verses, though it had been preserved separately, and only in a single manuscript dated to the end of the ninth or to the early tenth century (Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale 75 (55), since destroyed by fire). In addition, Manitus argued that the statement in the explanatio: KARTAGO est metropolis affricae could only be made before or soon after the Muslim conquest, so that, in his view, it must have been made during the first

19 Chaparro Gómez, De ortu, p. 20.
20 The 1969 Adriaen edition of the Egloga says that Job lived for 228 (CCXXVIII) years, whereas the 1985 edition of Isidore’s work follows Arévalo (and the Septuagint) in reading fuerunt omnes dies uiae eius ducenti quadraginta octo anni, though the apparatus indicates that manuscripts read septuaginta instead of quadraginta (pp. 137-139). This suggests that the number was not spelled out in the manuscript available to the author of this addition to the Egloga and that the L for fifty may have been missing in CCLXXVIII, or unclear in CCXLVIII (and therefore confused with X). The St Gall manuscript of De ortu et obitu patrum (St. Gallen BA 240, s. IX) clearly reads ccxlviii. Checking this small point in other manuscripts might shed light on the text available to the interpolator of Lathcen’s work.
21 ‘Lathcen neither knows nor cites Isidore’, Castaldi, Lathcen, Egloga, p. 387. See Anspach, ‘Das Fortleben’, pp. 337-38, where he suggests that a scribe might have inserted a marginal note into his copy of the text. Anspach was mistaken when arguing that Isidore himself was the author of the Egloga, but his instinct was correct as regards the possibility of an interpolation!
22 Edition by Fr. Glorie in CCSL 133A: 726-741, with a listing of earlier editions on p. 727; CPL # 1562; Kenney # 103; Lapidge & Sharpe # 731 (among the works ascribed to Irish peregrini to the continent).
half of the seventh century. (A puzzling statement since it was only at the
de end of the seventh century that Carthage was destroyed in the course of
the Muslim expansion. It follows that insisting on historical currency for
the statement that Carthage was a major African city would merely imply
that the *explanatio* was composed before the end of the seventh century.)
Manitius added that frequent use of the *Etymologiae* in the *Versus* pushed
the date of composition forward to the middle of that century. In 1976,
Bischoff pointed out that this description of Carthage need not reflect the
historical situation when the *explanatio* was written and that the riddle
poem, composed presumably by an Irishman on the continent, fits in well
with an early Carolingian cultural environment.25 This observation is now
generally accepted and these verses are no longer cited as evidence for early
familiarity with the *Etymologiae* in Ireland.

Until the much-awaited 1992 edition of the *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum*
(CCSL 133D), this grammatical treatise was commonly cited as evidence
for extensive use of Isidore’s works in seventh-century Ireland (*De natura
rerum*, *Differentiae*, *Etymologiae*, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*). One example
among others: *De natura rerum* iii.1-4 is the source in the discussion of *feriae*,
as shown by the parallel passages presented by Hillgarth.26 However, in his
introduction to the edition, Bischoff assigned the text to the continent in the
early eighth century, and suggested it originated from Bobbio since it makes
use of texts known to have been available there at that time. He concluded
that, contrary to earlier assumptions,27 one ‘cannot use the *Ad Cuimnanum*
for information on sources available in Ireland’: ‘Angesichts dieser Bindung
an das Columban-Kloster sind aus den Literatur-Kenntnissen des “Anon.”
keine Rückschlüsse auf der Bücherbesitz in Irland möglich’.28

Toward the end of the twentieth century, developments in the study of
computistics related to early medieval Ireland seemed to provide another
avenue for demonstrating that the works of Isidore were available very early
in Ireland. It was argued that the collection of early computistical materials
in the manuscript *Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 309* (saec. XI) – the Sir-
mond manuscript – could be dated to 658,29 and thus provided evidence for

27 Hillgarth, ‘Visigothic Spain and Early Christian, Ireland’ p. 187, notes 102 & 103, citing
28 ‘In view of this connection with the Columban monastery, no inferences may be drawn from
the knowledge of literature displayed by “Anon.” about books available in Ireland’, Bischoff &
familiarity at least with Isidore’s *Etymologiae* at that time.\(^{30}\) I questioned this in my 1987 paper, because such bookish collecting of data seemed at odds with the approach to scientific knowledge I encountered in *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae*\(^ {31}\) and *Liber de ordine creaturarum*,\(^ {32}\) both from the third quarter of the seventh century, and in which I could find no evidence for the use of the *Etymologiae*. It seemed more likely that the short text containing the dating clause AD 658 was another of the earlier compositions included in the collection.\(^ {33}\) In 2010, Immo Warntjes published his analysis of what he identified as a new manuscript in the ‘Sirmond group’ of similar, but not identical, collections of computistical texts known in Ireland which would have been available to Bede. David Ganz had brought the manuscript *Bremen, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MSC 0046* – originating from St. Gall, c. AD 900 – to the attention of Daibhí Ó Cróinín, who in turn encouraged Warntjes to go and examine it in Bremen. In addition to items found in other manuscripts in the Sirmond group, the Bremen compilation contains a previously unknown *Prologue* for a Victorian Easter Table, and this text can be dated unambiguously to AD 699. Warntjes points out: ‘This is only the second post mid-seventh century and pre-Bedan dating clause to be found in any manuscript of the Sirmond group’, and he concludes: ‘If both the Oxford and the Bremen dating clauses [AD 658 and AD 699, respectively] are taken as indicative of the compilation of Sirmond material, then this suggests at least two stages, almost fifty years apart, in the same region, namely, southern Ireland’.\(^ {34}\) At present, there is no way of knowing precisely which texts would have been included in any one of such putative stages in the collecting of these computistical materials. It follows that one cannot assume that texts included in *Bodley 309* demonstrate the use of Isidorian texts already in AD 658.

\(^{30}\) Charles W. Jones published a numbered list of the contents of *Bodley 309* on pp. 106-108 of his 1943 edition of Bede’s works on time. This list, as presented by Ó Cróinín (‘Bede’s Irish Computus’, pp. 202-203) is also available in Graff, ‘The Recension’, pp. 137-138. Merely scanning through the list makes it obvious that Isidore was known by the time the compilation was made: *Sententiae Sancti Augustini et Isidori in laude compoti* is Item 3 (fols. 62v-64v) in that list and Item 35 (fols. 105v-106r) consists of excerpts from Isidore’s *Etymologiae*. In this connection, see footnote 55 on pp. XXVIII-XXIX of Warntjes, *The Munich Computus*, on the need to clarify terminology and to separate out Carolingian items in *Bodley 309*.

\(^{31}\) PL 35:2149-2200; for an edition of both the long and the short versions, see MacGinty’s Ph.D. thesis.

\(^{32}\) Díaz y Díaz published an edition and Spanish translation in 1972; Smyth provided an English translation in 2011.


\(^{34}\) Warntjes, ‘A Newly Discovered Prologue’, p. 275.
In 1982, Ó Cróinín announced that in fols. 77v-107v of the manuscript Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier, MS 5413-22, s. IX-X, he had discovered an Irish computistical treatise which he assigned to the circle of Cummian, author of the AD 632 Paschal Letter, if not to Cummian himself.\textsuperscript{35} He gave this computus the name \textit{De ratione computandi} and provided an edition based on the two known manuscripts.\textsuperscript{36} Isidore is frequently cited by name in this treatise, with selections from both the \textit{Etymologiae} and \textit{De natura rerum}. Warntjes recently carried out a very careful analysis of the content of \textit{De ratione computandi} in relation to the two other known Irish computistical text books from the post-Isidorian and pre-Bedan period, roughly to be dated to AD 650-750\textsuperscript{37}: the Munich Computus securely dated to AD 719\textsuperscript{38} and the recently discovered Computus Einsidlensis.\textsuperscript{39} He eventually concluded that the Computus Einsidlensis was composed sometime in the period 699-719,\textsuperscript{40} and that \textit{De ratione computandi} must have been written between 719 and 727. All these computi quote Isidore’s \textit{Etymologiae} extensively, thereby only establishing familiarity with this work in Ireland at the very end of the seventh century and thereafter.

Bruno Krusch, Bartholomew Mac Carthy and Eduard Schwartz already saw that a dating clause of AD 689, occurring twice in the Munich Computus in the context of materials associated with the Victorian reckoning for the date of Easter, points to the existence of an Irish computus from AD 689 advocating the Victorian system.\textsuperscript{41} Because of its association with Victorian reckoning, this now lost computus probably originated from east Munster where that system was observed – as opposed to the 84-year system observed in the northern parts of the island – and material from this Victorian computus was incorporated into the Munich Computus.\textsuperscript{42} It should be noted that there is a reference to ‘Isidore’ in Section 63 of the Munich Computus, one of the sections taken from the Victorian AD 689 computus: ‘Isidorus ait:

\textsuperscript{35} Ó Cróinín, ‘A Seventh-Century Irish Computus’.
\textsuperscript{37} Warntjes, ‘The Munich Computus’, pp. CXCII-CCL.
\textsuperscript{38} Warntjes, ‘The Munich Computus’, pp. LVII-LXI.
\textsuperscript{39} Warntjes, ‘A Newly Discovered Irish Computus’.
\textsuperscript{40} With the newly discovered evidence that Victorian reckoning was still current in southern Ireland in 699 (Warntjes, ‘A Newly Discovered Prologue’, p. 278), Warntjes refined his earlier estimate of 689-719 for the composition of the Computus Einsidlensis (The Munich Computus, p. CC).
\textsuperscript{41} Warntjes, ‘The Munich Computus’, pp. LVII-LVIII.
\textsuperscript{42} Warntjes, ‘The Munich Computus’, pp. LVIII, LXXII, CXXIV-CXXVI; see his recent ‘Victorian vs Dionysius’ for a clear account of the situation in seventh-century Ireland regarding the dating of Easter.
Quicumque ante XV luna pascha celebrari iubet, transgreditur mandatum’ – ‘Isidore says: Whosoever approves of Easter being celebrated before luna 15 violates the commandment’. This statement is consistent with Isidore’s view that those who celebrate Easter on luna 14 are heretical, as expressed in De ecclesiasticis officiis I.xxxii (xxxi).\(^43\) and Etymologiae VIII.61,\(^44\) so that it could be a paraphrase, but it does not occur as such in the edited works of Isidore of Seville. De ratione computandi 98.21-22 follows the Munich Computus in making this same attribution.\(^45\) This putative borrowing from the lost AD 689 Irish computus suggests that at least the name of Isidore of Seville was well-known in Ireland by AD 689, and probably also his works relating to the Easter question, though one cannot rule out the possibility that the reference was simply to an Irishman named Isidore.

The Manuscript Transmission of Isidorian Texts

Recent studies of the extant manuscripts of Isidore’s works show that:

1. Some of Isidore’s works either remained in Spain or had very limited circulation until the eighth century, as already noted by Hillgarth.\(^46\) These include: De haeresibus (only one manuscript, Spain, saec. VII), De fide catholica contra Iudaeos, Regula monachorum, De uiris illustribus, Historia Gothorum.

2. Most of Isidore’s works circulated in two versions, if not more. De ecclesiasticis officiis and the Sententiae are exceptional in this regard.\(^47\)

3. There is very little seventh century manuscript evidence for Isidore’s works, but it is increasingly clear that Lindsay’s edition of the Etymologiae as well as the texts of the Arévalo edition in PL 83 are not reliable representations of Isidore’s works as they were transmitted in this early period.

In 1991, James P. Carley and Ann Dooley published their discovery on the flyleaves of the codex Longleat House, Marquess of Bath, NMR 10589, of a late-seventh or very-early-eighth century fragment of the Etymologies which was almost certainly written in Ireland. The fragment contains text from

\(^{43}\) Lawson, De ecclesiasticis officiis, pp. 37-38.

\(^{44}\) Lindsay, Etymologiarum siue Originum libri, p. 314.

\(^{45}\) Walsh & Ó Cróinín, ‘Cummian’s Letter’, p. 204.

\(^{46}\) Hillgarth, ‘Ireland and Spain’, pp. 5-6.

Book VI: 16 and Book VII: 1 and deals with computistical matters, including a copy of Isidore’s 95-year Easter table. The inclusion of Spanish era dating (in addition to anno mundi dating) points towards an original text dating from AD 655 which was written in Spain, but there is no way of knowing the number of intermediate copies. This newly discovered fragment is consistent with the interest in Isidore’s views on computistical matters which we observed among Irish scholars at the end of the seventh century. The leaves forming the fragment probably originated from a ‘volume measuring a little in excess of 315 x 240 mm.’ (p. 137), though ‘it is impossible to determine whether or not this fragment was originally part of a complete copy of the *Etymologiae*.48

Until the discovery of the Longleat fragments, the fragments of Book XI in *Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1399a.1* (CLA VII.995) were the only known seventh-century manuscript evidence for the *Etymologiae*, as jumps out immediately from the table drawn up by Baudoin Van den Abeele to show the number for each century of both fragments and manuscripts containing the entire text of the *Etymologiae*.49 The fragments were preserved as part of the binding of Manuscripts 150 and 267 in the St Gall Stiftsbibliothek. Dold, who first reported on these fragments in 1940, believed they were part of a substantial codex and estimated that the folios would have measured some 277 x 165 mm. Lowe estimated the written area to have measured ca. 170 x ca. 145 mm. (CLA VII.995). If Book XI was indeed part of a full text of the *Etymologiae* in the codex, the manuscript contained a text of the twenty-book ‘long version’. The division into twenty books originated from Braulio’s editing, but we have no way of knowing how he divided the content within and between the books.50 Moreover, the codex might have contained only half of this version of the *Etymologiae*, that is, Books XI-XX, since the long text could be transmitted in two separate codices. There is general agreement that the text in these fragments was written in an Irish hand – called cursive minuscule by Lowe, and cursive half-uncial

49 Dold, ‘Irische Isidorfragmente’; Van den Abeele, ‘La tradition manuscrite’, p. 199. Van den Abeele derived his information from the manuscript list drawn up by Fernández Catón in 1966, itself a published version of the *Anspach Nachlass*. Note: Catón lists some 1,000 manuscripts (including fragments) and this high number recurs frequently thereafter in the secondary literature, but Van den Abeele points out that this information needs to be carefully double-checked. He sees only some 500 serious contenders from the eighth to the sixteenth century for relaying the text of the *Etymologiae* (La tradition manuscrite, p. 198).
50 Reydellet, La diffusion des *Origines*, pp. 396-398.
by Brown⁵⁷ – towards the middle of the seventh century, but the question remains whether it originated in Ireland itself or in an Irish-influenced centre on the continent. When commenting on the 1955 revised version of Dold’s announcement,⁵² Hillgarth said that the fragments were ‘probably’ written in Ireland itself.⁵³ Lowe, on the other hand, opted for a continental Irish centre, probably Bobbio. Bischoff, in a 1960 private communication to Hillgarth,⁵⁴ noted that the script in the St Gall fragments is close to that of codex Usserianus Primus (Dublin, Trinity College 55), which Lowe and Bischoff dated to the beginning of the seventh century, as well as to the script on the Springmount wax tablets (Dublin, National Museum, S.A. 1914:2; CLA Supplement 1684) first published in 1920 by Armstrong and Macalister,⁵⁵ and dated by Bischoff to the seventh century.⁵⁶ In his study of the Irish elements in Insular script, Brown assigns the St Gall fragments to a scribe writing in Ireland in the middle of the seventh century.⁵⁷ It is worth noting here that both the Longleat fragmentary text and the text in the seventh-century fragments in St Gall may be related to the version of the *Etymologiae* in the manuscript Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F.74.⁵⁸

In my 1987 study on the lack of evidence until the late seventh century for cosmological information drawn from Isidore’s works, I pointed out that while the St Gall fragment was probably written in Ireland, ‘all this really proves is that the beginning of Book XI: *De Homine et Portentis* (Of man and unnatural births; edited by Gasti in 2010) was almost certainly read and copied in Ireland by the middle of the seventh century’.⁵⁹ It is well known that sections of the *Etymologiae*, sometimes corresponding to one or more of the *libri* in the long recension of that work, were transmitted separately. Books I (grammar), I-III (liberal arts), IV (medicine), the *Chronicon* and the legal matter in Book V, and the sections on heresy in Book VIII, are usually mentioned in this connection. In addition, Books I-XX were often copied in two separate codices, with the break after Book X, so that the two main parts could circulate independently. It should be noted, however,

---

52 Dold & Duft, ‘Die älteste irische Handschriften-Reliquie’.
that when Díaz y Díaz, in his 1982 introduction to the Latin/Spanish text of the *Etymologiae* based on Lindsay’s edition, talks about sections of the *Etymologiae* that commonly circulated separately, he does not mention Book XI among them.\(^{60}\) The anatomical lists in the *lorica/prayer Suffragare Trinitatis Unitas*\(^{61}\) composed by Lathcen of Clonfertmloé (d. 661), and in the exorcism *Collectio super hominem qui habet Diabolum*\(^{62}\) in the Antiphonary of Bangor – a late-seventh-century collection of liturgical texts – argue for the presence in Ireland of Book XI or of glossaries derived from that text at the time the lists were composed. It is, however, also likely that detailed terminology associated with parts of the body was drawn from lists of words intended to increase familiarity with the Latin language.\(^{63}\) I have shown elsewhere that such lists would explain the often bizarre use of cosmological terms in the *Hisperica Famina*.\(^{64}\) After all, Isidore himself used glossaries when writing: those of Placidus and Nonius Marcellus, for instance.\(^{65}\) Referring to the ‘detailed anatomical enumerations’ in the two Irish texts, Patrick Sims-Williams observed: ‘Many similarities in wording and order result from the subject-matter; nevertheless they are sufficient to show that the exorcism probably derives from the same glossary-steeped milieu in seventh-century Ireland as Laidcenn’s *lorica*.\(^{66}\)

As Herren noted, *Etymologiae XI.1* (or glossaries compiled from it) do not account for some 35 of the 120+ of the terms in the extensive anatomical list in the *lorica*, so there must have been other sources. He created a very useful table of corresponding terms in the *lorica* and in the *Etymologiae* as found in the Lindsay edition.\(^{67}\) Patrick Sims-Williams made a similar table showing the anatomical terminology common to *Etymologiae XI.1*, the Bangor exorcism and the Lathcen *lorica*.\(^{68}\) Only two ninth-century manuscripts of *Differentiae II* (Paris, BN lat. 12236 and BN lat 12237) omit the lengthy section on the parts of the human body (CCSL 111A: 125\(^*\) and 127\(^*\))\(^{69}\) so that it is almost certain that this section, which is heavily dependent on Lactantius’ *De opificio Dei*, was included in the early version(s) of the text that travelled

---

61 Herren, The *Hisperica famina* II, pp. 74-89.
64 Smyth, ‘Understanding’, pp. 118-123.
69 Andrés, ‘Adicion o supresion?’, pp. 81-82.
to Ireland. If the much more limited (less than 30 items) and superficial list of the parts of the body in the Bangor exorcism is not simply drawn from memory or from some elementary word-list, it could well have been derived from section XVII of Isidore's *Differentiae II* (CCSL 111A: 34-48; PL 83: 69-98) since only two items cannot be accounted for in that way.

In manuscripts, *Differentiae II* with incipit *Inter Deum* is sometimes called simply *Differentiae*, or *Liber differentiarum* or *Differentiae spirituales*, and the recent editor believes it was composed c. 600 and no later than 610. It circulated at first independently from what is now known as *Differentiae I*, and was consistently attributed to Isidore in the numerous extant early manuscript witnesses. Maria Adelaida Andrés was aware of 26 manuscripts dated from the eighth to the tenth century. In the *Liber de ordine creaturarum* (DOC) composed in Ireland between 655 and c. 680, all references to Isidore's *Differentiae* are in fact to Book II of the *Differentiae*. In particular, DOC VIII: Concerning the devil and the nature of demons relies heavily (though not exclusively) on Sections XIV-XV of *Differentiae II* (CCSL 111A: 28-32; PL 83: 76-77). Comparing *De ordine creaturarum* VIII.16 and *Differentiae II*.14.42 (CCSL 111A: 29) we note that there is no reference to the rationality of demons in *De ordine creaturarum*. Since this detail is also lacking in a number of manuscripts of Isidore’s text, it should be possible to narrow down the type of manuscript available in Ireland when *De ordine creaturarum* was composed.

Two fragments of a codex containing *Differentiae II* are now in Milan, *Bibliotheca Ambrosiana*, *D. 23 sup*, and were formerly used as fly-leaves to the Bobbio Orosius (*Milan, Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, D. 23 sup*). They are probably from the same quire and encompass sections XXXVII.146-XL.167; PL 83:93-97 (that is, XXXV.146-XLI.167; CCSL 111A: 94-110). The script is ‘Irish majuscule, saec. VIII’ and the fragments originated ‘probably from

70 Andrés-Sanz, *Liber differentiarum* [II].
71 Andrés, ‘Adicion o supresion?’, p. 80; *Liber differentiarum* [II], p. 26*.
74 Díaz y Díaz, *Liber de ordine creaturarum*.
75 Smyth, ‘The Date and Origin’.
76 Díaz y Díaz, ‘Isidoriana I’, pp. 157-159. Compare, for example, DOC VI.10 with Diff. II.12.32 (CCSL 111A: 23-24); DOC VIII with Diff. II.14-15; DOC XV.2 seems to refer to Diff. II.14.41 (CCSL 111A: 28); DOC XV. 8 seems to cite Diff. II.11.31 (CCSL 111A: 23) and Diff. II.30.101-2 ; DOC XV. 9 refers to Diff. II.28.100-102 (CCSL 111A: 63-65), DOC XV.10 refers to Diff. II.28.105-108 (CCSL 111A: 66-69).
78 Page 313* of CCSL 111A contains a convenient table for converting chapter numbers in the new edition to the PL 83 chapter numbers.
Ireland’ according to Lowe (CLA II, 329), and are even ‘charakteristisch echt irisch’ according to Bischoff, not only on account of the script but because of the thick vellum on which the text is written. These fragments would thus confirm that Differentiae II was available in Ireland by the eighth century. This tells us nothing, however, about the availability of Differentiae I in Ireland at that time, since the manuscript evidence points to the late eighth century for the first occurrences of both texts in the same manuscript (Paris, BN lat. 2994A and Montpellier, EM 306) – and even then, they are not placed next to one another as parts of the same treatise. We cannot therefore infer from the influence of Differentiae II on DOC, a text written in Ireland sometime between 655 and c. 680, that Differentiae I was available in Ireland at that time – whether in its probably original Inter caelum form organized by subject matter or in the alphabetized form with incipit Inter aptum. It is possible that Differentiae I reached Ireland independently, but I am not aware of any evidence for an early arrival.

Another Isidorian text was used by the anonymous author of De or- dine creaturarum: the De ecclesiasticis officiis. Díaz y Díaz had noticed that the four-fold division of souls described in the Moralia of Gregory the Great (CCSL 143B: 1304-06) did not explain the full scheme of the fate of individuals after death as presented in the Hiberno-Latin treatise. De ordine creaturarum XIV.6 states: ‘The Lord himself does not deny that some sins shall be forgiven in the world to come, when he says: “He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost shall never have forgiveness, neither in this world nor in the world to come, but shall be guilty of everlasting sin” [Mark 3:29 with ‘neither in this world nor in the world to come’ added from Matt 12:32]. This implies that there are some sins which, though not forgiven in this world, can nonetheless be wiped out by fire in the judgment to come. Were this not the case, the Lord would never have made this distinction’. Díaz y Díaz suggested two possible sources: Gregory’s Dialogues IV.40-41 or Isidore’s De ecclesiasticis officiis I.xvi.12 – but was hesitant to accept

80 Andrés-Sanz, ‘Adicion o supresion?’, pp. 80 & 84; ‘Relación y transmisión’, p. 256.
81 The two early stages in the organization of Differentiae I were clarified by Carmen Codoñer, ‘Historia del texto’.
82 Smyth, ‘The Seventh-Century Hiberno-Latin Treatise’, p. 203; Díaz y Díaz, Liber de ordine creaturarum, pp. 188 & 190: ‘Quasdam culpas in futuro remitti dominus ipse non digneat, cum dicit: qui blasphemaverit in spiritum sanctum non habet remissionem neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro sed reus erit aeterni delicti; ex quo intellegitur quaedam esse peccata quae, etsi in hoc saeculo non remittuntur, in futuro tamen iudicio per ignem deleri possunt: si enim ita non esset, hanc distinctionem dominus nequaquam posuisset’.
either one since this would be the only time the source was used by the Irish author and there was no evidence that these texts were available in Ireland at that time. However, since the anonymous Irish author endorsed the idea that really bad people are eternally damned and really good people enter eternal blessedness immediately at death, and the others must wait till the last judgment to have their ultimate destiny determined, he does not allow for any kind of intermediary stage of cleansing punishment, that is, for what came to be called Purgatory. By the time Pope Gregory I wrote Book IV of the Dialogues, he was advocating the notion of that very type of cleansing process taking place before the last judgment, so that it is most unlikely that the Irish author had read Dialogues IV.41.3, for instance. As for De ecclesiasticis officiis I.12, it is much more vague as to the time or location of the purgatorial fire and even includes a citation from Matt 12:32: ‘For when the Lord says: “whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or the age to come” [Matt 12:32], he makes clear that for some their sins will be forgiven there and cleansed by some purgatorial fire’ (my translation). Recent studies on the Canones Hibernenses (for which the earliest extant manuscripts are from the middle of the eighth century and from the continent) posit an Irish proto-version from between AD 669 (arrival in England of Theodore of Canterbury – the latest source) and AD 700. The 2011 edition by Roy Flechner and the tables created by Davies of Isidorian borrowings in the two recensions Hib.A and Hib.B of the Canones Hibernenses indicate that the proto-version of that text – compiled in Ireland and from which the two recensions appear to have derived independently – must have made numerous borrowings from Isidore’s De ecclesiasticis officiis, especially in matters relating to church hierarchy and liturgy. It therefore seems safe to assume that De ecclesiasticis officiis was available in Ireland by the end of the third quarter of the seventh century. There is strong evidence, however, that this was not the complete text since a letter of uncertain date from one Colman to his colleague Feredach (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier, Ms. 5649-67) states that ‘our manuscripts’ – presumably manuscripts available in Ireland – contain

84 ‘Nam et cum dominus dicit: Qui peccauerit in spiritum sanctum non remittetur ei neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro, demonstrat quibusdam illuc dimittenda peccata et quodam purgatorio igne purganda’ (CCSL 113:22-23). My translation is closer to the Latin than that of Knoebel, ‘Isidore of Seville’, p. 44.
85 I thank Roy Flechner for graciously sending me a copy of his very nice thesis.
87 Flechner, The Hibernensis, pp. 43*, 63-64* & 68*.
two serious gaps. Christopher Lawson has identified a group of manuscripts of *De ecclesiasticis officiis* which ‘suffer two considerable lacunae which were caused in the subarchetype by the loss of bifolia’. Were Colman and Lawson noticing the same gaps?

It is well-known that already during the lifetime of Isidore, his friend Braulio was complaining of the circulation of faulty, incomplete copies of the *Etymologiae*. Braulio himself had no qualms reorganizing the text Isidore finally sent him. It is likely that Isidore originally composed only the content of the first ten books (possibly even without Book IV), and that this spread rapidly, with or without his consent. After Braulio divided the longer text Isidore sent him later into twenty books, that version also underwent numerous types of alterations in different environments. It follows that regarding the *Etymologiae* even more so than for other works by Isidore, the following questions should be investigated as much as possible for any medieval citation to that text: Which version was being used? How much of the text was available to the author using it? Did Isidore write it?

The late seventh-century *Commentary on Genesis* in *Clm 17739* refers many times to Isidore, or to several of his works: *Sententiae, De natura rerum, Etymologiae,* and perhaps *Allegoriae.* When Adomnán wrote his *De locis sanctis* in AD 680–690, he had access to both a version of the *Etymologiae* and the long version of *De natura rerum.* The two recensions of the *Canones Hibernenses* contain citations from other works by Isidore: *Etymologiae, Sententiae, Quaestiones in uetus testamentum,* and the *Chronica.* While a number of these citations would have been added later and on the continent, it now seems likely that at least the *Sententiae* and some version(s) of the *Etymologiae* were used in the proto-version since they were available in Ireland during the late seventh-century, as we have just seen. We have also seen above that computistical material from that period presents Isidore as one of the authorities on the subject, citing from the *Etymologiae* and *De natura rerum.*

There is no doubt that several works of Isidore, including at least one version of the *Etymologiae,* were available in Ireland in the later part of the seventh century – whether transmitted directly from Spain, or part of wider patterns of insular cross-cultural connections during the late seventh and

---

early eighth century.\textsuperscript{93} While investigating which recension is involved – or even which manuscript – remains a conjectural process even for this later period, certainty about even the availability of an Isidorian text, let alone a complete text as written by Isidore, is elusive for the earlier period. In general, I hope this study shows that given the alterations to the original text made already in the medieval period and of which later scholars may not have been aware, we should not take anything for granted, so that conclusions based on earlier editions need to be revisited.
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Isidore of Seville in Anglo-Saxon England

The Synonyma as a Source of Felix's Vita S. Guthlac

Claudia Di Sciacca

Recent scholarship has demonstrated that Isidore was, together with Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory, one of the four major patristic authorities for the Anglo-Saxons, and his Etymologiae, De natura rerum, Synonyma, and De ecclesiasticis officiis belonged to the 'small core of staple patristic texts' housed in a typical Anglo-Saxon library. Isidore undoubtedly proved an influential source for a variety of fields of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, ranging from grammar to computus, from history to homiletics and hagiography, from exegesis to charters.

This chapter focuses on the Synonyma and investigates, in particular, their role as a source for one of the founding and most popular Anglo-Saxon hagiographies, the Vita Sancti Guthlaci (henceforth VSG), authored by the elusive Felix in the first half of the eighth century. The Synonyma have not been enlisted among the rich network of source texts underlying Felix's work until very recently. The case study in this chapter will hopefully contribute valuable insights into the early dissemination of the Synonyma in Anglo-Saxon England and enhance our understanding of the subtle 'source-layering' which can be considered Felix's most distinctive compositional technique.

1 My sincere thanks to Prof. P. Lendinara for her comments on an earlier draft of this paper and to Ms. M. Cinninger for her bibliographical help. I also gratefully acknowledge the generous support of the US-Italy Fulbright Commission and the Medieval Institute of the University of Notre Dame, where most of the research for this essay has been conducted.


4 Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi.

5 BHL, no. 3723; Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac, ed. and trans. by Colgrave. On the tenuous evidence concerning Felix's life, see below, pp. 140-141.


7 Downey, 'Interextuality', pp. 25-66.
The Synonyma

Generally grouped with Isidore’s minor and juvenile works, the Synonyma enjoyed an ‘immense’ popularity and were the third most copied work by Isidore after the Etymologiae and the Sententiae. Alternatively classified as a grammatical, ascetic, and dogmatic text, the Synonyma resist any clear-cut categorisation. They consist of two books, one decidedly different from the other as to theme, tone, and sources employed. The first contains an effusive and pathetic lamentation (lamentum paenitentiae) expressed by a sinful man overwhelmed by guilt and despairing of redemption, while in the second book Reason draws a very detailed norma uivendi for the penitent, consisting of pragmatic prescriptions and precepts to pursue a virtuous lifestyle and resist temptations. The penitential lament and hortatory consolation are distinctively combined with a most idiosyncratic style, the so-called stilus ysydorianus, a rhymed, rhythmical prose making pervasive use of synonymical variation and paraphrase, which was to become one of the four major kinds of Latin Kunstprosa in the Middle Ages. It was this characteristic blend of eloquium and uotum, to put it in Isidore’s own words, that secured the Synonyma an exceptionally vast and enduring popularity throughout the Middle Ages in the Latin West, firstly as a spiritual primer and, secondarily, as a grammatical handbook.

The editor of the recent critical edition of the Synonyma has identified two recensions, Λ and Φ, which apparently stemmed from the independent revision of two parallel versions of a primitive text carried out by Isidore himself. Contaminations of the two recensions started as early as the first half of the eighth century and are so numerous and extensive that they represent the most distinctive and recurrent feature of the manuscript tradition of the Synonyma. As has been shown, both recensions circulated

11 Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi, p. 5.
in Anglo-Saxon England, itself a symptom of the variety and complexity of the Anglo-Saxon reception of this Isidorian text.  

Isidore and the Synonyma in Anglo-Saxon England

Knowledge of Isidore’s texts in Anglo-Saxon England was both early and plentiful. The first testimonies can be dated to the renowned Canterbury school of Archbishop Theodore (d. 690) and Abbot Hadrian (d. 709 or 710), and to the ‘first Englishman of letters’, Aldhelm (c. 640?-709 or 710), himself a student of Theodore and Hadrian and eventually abbot of Malmesbury and bishop of Sherborne. From the evidence afforded by the two major witnesses to the syllabus of the Canterbury school, namely the Canterbury Biblical Commentaries and the Leiden family of glosses, as well as by Aldhelm’s corpus, it can be inferred that by the beginning of the eighth century at least the Etymologiae, De natura rerum, Synonyma, De ecclesiasticis officiis, De ortu et obitu patrum, De differentiis verborum, and the dubious Liber numerorum were known to the Anglo-Saxons. In particular, the literary and manuscript evidence shows that the De natura rerum, the Etymologiae, and the Synonyma were the first Isidorian works that reached Anglo-Saxon England and the most abundantly attested in Anglo-Saxon centres, both insular and continental.

Anglo-Saxon England was particularly receptive to the Synonyma. Anglo-Saxon libraries, whether in England or on the continent, were well stocked with copies of the Synonyma: no fewer than eight manuscript witnesses were written or circulating in pre-Norman times and another six codices are associated with Anglo-Saxon foundations on the continent. Also, another copy of the Synonyma is recorded in the list of books sent by Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester (d. 984), to the monastery of Medeshamstede c. 970.

14 Di Sciacca, Finding the Right Words, pp. 68-76; Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi, pp. cx-cxiii.
15 Biblical Commentaries, ed. by Bischoff and Lapidge; Archbishop Theodore, ed. by Lapidge.
18 Di Sciacca, Finding the Right Words, pp. 55-76.
As mentioned above, both recensions of the *Synonyma* are attested in Anglo-Saxon England. Indeed, the earliest witnesses of both Λ and Φ are either of definite Anglo-Saxon origin or have strong Anglo-Saxon connections. Two Southumbrian codices of the first half of the eighth century, St Petersburg, Russian National Library, Q. v. I. 15,21 and Würzburg, Universitätssbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 79,22 first attest to the Λ recension, while one of the earliest witnesses of the Φ recension is Fulda, Domschatz, Bonifatianus 2,23 an eighth-century continental manuscript with ‘insular symptoms’24 and links to Boniface (c. 675-754),25 the renowned Anglo-Saxon missionary and, together with Aldhelm and Felix, one of the earliest named readers of the *Synonyma* in pre-Conquest England.26 Furthermore, source-studies of both the Old English and the Anglo-Latin corpus have shown the variety of uses the Anglo-Saxons made of the *Synonyma*, ranging from the homiletic to the devotional and the didactic, and it can be concluded that the *Synonyma* were ‘the Isidorian text most abundantly attested in pre-Conquest England after the Etymologiae’.27

It has been argued that the Anglo-Saxon reception of the *Synonyma* was idiosyncratic in that, while most of Isidore’s other works would have reached both South- and Northumbrian England chiefly thanks to Irish transmission,28 the *Synonyma* would have arrived in Southumbria via France and their influence would have been concentrated in south-west...
Mercia and Wessex. In fact, manuscript evidence indicates two major routes of transmission of the Synonyma, an insular and a French one, the former pertaining to recension Λ and the latter to recension Φ, respectively. However, the insular and continental paths of dissemination can hardly be kept discrete. If Λ has got an unquestionably insular trademark – six out of the nine Λ-witnesses collated by Elfassi originated either in Anglo-Saxon England or on an insular centre on the continent, and the Λ-text of the Synonyma was likely the one first known in both England and Ireland – the evidence concerning its actual route from Visigothic Spain to Anglo-Saxon England is inconclusive. In particular, although the manuscript evidence suggests that recension Λ reached England directly from Spain, a dissemination across the English Channel via France cannot be excluded.

In sum, the transmission of the two recensions of the Synonyma as envisaged by their modern editor as well as the frequency of contaminations and interpolations between Λ and Φ suggests that the dissemination of the Isidorian text to the British Isles was probably the result of more than one route or one group of mediators, as the scope of the cultural contacts and exchanges that linked Spain, France, Anglo-Saxon England, Ireland, Italy, and Germany was wider and more complex than it has often been acknowledged.

Although the Synonyma seem to have been less influential than other Isidorian texts in Ireland, still it should be reminded that they feature among the sources of the CollectioCanonum Hibernensis (c. 725). Also, the most distinctive product of seventh-century Irish Latinity, the HispericaFamina, betrays the stylistic influence of the Synonyma, as well as of the contemporary Spanish Reimprosa more generally.

Furthermore, the diffusion of the Synonyma within Irish circles is indirectly attested by two miscellaneous continental manuscripts, Munich,
Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6433,\(^{37}\) and St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908.\(^{38}\) The former is a codex written at Freising in the second half of the eighth century and is the only surviving witness of the *Florilegium frisingense*, a veritable compendium of distinctively Irish exegetical, theological, and homiletic literature which draws extensively on both authentic and pseudepigraphical Isidorian texts, including the *Synonyma*.\(^{39}\) The *Florilegium frisingense* is anonymous but was possibly compiled by the scribe of the Munich manuscript, namely the Northumbrian-trained Anglo-Saxon scribe Peregrinus,\(^{40}\) a circumstance which, incidentally, would challenge the argument that the early circulation of the *Synonyma* in Anglo-Saxon England was confined to Southumbria. Also, the *Frisingense* is immediately followed in the manuscript by the second book of the *Synonyma* and by the *Liber scintillarum*,\(^{41}\) one of the most popular biblical and patristic florilegia of the early Middle Ages, especially widespread in Anglo-Saxon England,\(^{42}\) and also heavily indebted to the Isidorian text.\(^{43}\) In sum, both the textual and codicological evidence suggests that the Munich miscellany was put together in a milieu thoroughly au fait with and appreciative of the *Synonyma*. The fact that the *Frisingense* was composed in an insular foundation on the continent is a welcome reminder that ‘continental’ and ‘insular’ should not necessarily be read as mutually exclusive terms, since insular agents of transmission were active also on the continent, and insular foundations on the continent, such as Bobbio, were undoubtedly centres where Isidore’s texts were well known and zealously copied from very early on. The St Gall codex 908 is another case in point: written ‘in a centre of insular cultural influence’, probably in the Milan area or Bobbio, it contains three excerpts from the *Synonyma* and one from Isidore’s *Sententiae* alongside the only


\(^{38}\) Ms. h: *Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma*, ed. by Elfassi, pp. xlix-xl; Di Sciacca, *Finding the Right Words*, pp. 35 and 64.

\(^{39}\) *Florilegium frisingense*, ed. by Lehner, pp. 1-39; see also pp. xv, xxxv, and 137-138; *Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma*, ed. by Elfassi, p. xxxviii.

\(^{40}\) O’Byrne, ‘Peregrinus of Freising’.

\(^{41}\) *Defensor Liber scintillarum*, ed. by Rochais. The traditional attribution of the *Liber scintillarum* to the monk Defensor of Ligugé about 700 has recently been challenged in favour of a later dating (s. viii) and an origin in Germany, possibly in the Trier or Würzburg area: Elfassi, ‘Defensor de Ligugé; *Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma*, ed. by Elfassi, pp. cxii-cxiii; Elfassi, ‘Les Synonyma d’Isidore de Séville dans l’oeuvre de Raban Maur’, p. 249, n. 9.


copy of the Commentary on the Creation and Fall – the fourth item in Bischoff’s (in)famous catalogue of Hiberno-Latin Biblical commentaries and itself indebted to Isidorian sources – as well as a number of texts of apocryphal content which were distinctively popular with the Irish.44

The Synonyma as a Hagiographic Source

Both manuscript- and source-studies have shown that throughout the Middle Ages the Synonyma were increasingly perceived as a moral treatise. In particular, it has been argued that they proved especially popular with authors of moral florilegia, prayers, and devotional texts, homilies and hagiographies, as well as canonical collections.45 As regards hagiographic literature in particular, the Synonyma have been identified as a source (albeit often an indirect one) of at least eight continental saints’ lives up to the beginning of the thirteenth century,46 and they are associated with hagiographic texts in no fewer than five manuscripts collated for the modern critical edition of the Synonyma.47

Of these five codices, one, that is Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 15817,48 is particularly relevant, because here the Synonyma follow the earliest (if incomplete) surviving copy of the Vita S. Cuthberti, written by an anonymous monk (or perhaps, monks) of the Lindisfarne community c. 699-705.49 This manuscript has been dated to Archbishop Aldaram of Salzburg’s period of office (821-836), but it probably derives from an early exemplar in insular script, whose distinctively Northumbrian spellings were largely preserved by the conservative, if often careless, scribe of the Munich manuscript.50 Another hint supporting the insular origin of this manuscript is the fact that the copy of the Synonyma it contains belongs to the Λ recension, which, as has been mentioned above, had a predominantly insular circulation. Also, although the circumstances of the arrival of the anonymous Vita S. Cuthberti

44 Wright, ‘Apocryphal Lore and Insular Tradition’, pp. 124-127 and 144-145, quotation at 125
47 The five manuscripts in question are Elfassi’s S, U, V, X, and b: Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi, pp. xli-xlvi.
49 BHL, no. 2019; Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, pp. 60-139.
in Salzburg by the early ninth century are still obscure, a possible context for it and perhaps also for the association of the Anglo-Saxon hermit-saint’s life with the *Synonyma* might be provided by Virgilius, the erudite Irish bishop of Salzburg in the second half of the eighth century (d. 784). During Virgilius’s episcopate at least two popular Isidorian pseudo-epigrapha, the *Liber de numeris* and *De ortu et obitu patriarcharum*, were compiled. Another text that can be associated with Virgilius’s entourage is the question-and-answer dialogue *Prebiarum de multorium exemplaribus*, which draws on at least three of Isidore’s texts, the *Etymologiae*, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, and *Sententiae*, and on the pseudepigraphical *Liber de numeris*.\(^5\)

To my knowledge the only Anglo-Saxon saint’s life where the *Synonyma* have been drawn on is the *VSG* and, thereby, the two derivative Old English prose texts, the so-called Vespasian Life and Vercelli Homily xxiii. The following pages will analyse the borrowing from the *Synonyma* in the *VSG*, identify the possible antecedent consulted by Felix, and map out the context in which such a borrowing could have taken place.

**Felix and the *Vita S. Guthlac***

A generation younger than the Northumbrian Cuthbert, Guthlac is the second earliest and most popular Anglo-Saxon hermit saint. The *VSG* provides a comprehensive account of Guthlac’s life, from his youth as a successful warlord of aristocratic descent, to his conversion and tonsure at the monastery of Repton, Derbyshire,\(^5\) and, finally, to his withdrawal to Crowland, a small island (in fact, a promontory linked to the mainland by a gravel ridge), haunted by demons on the fenland marking the border between the Mercian and East Anglian kingdoms, where he spent the last fifteen years of his life as an anchorite.\(^5\) Guthlac soon attracted attention from the most prominent ranks of society: his visitors included Hædda, bishop of Lichfield (d. 716–727), who ordained Guthlac as priest, and Æthelbald (716–757), future king of the Mercians. His rapidly growing

---

\(^5\) Di Sciacca, *Finding the Right Words*, pp. 41 and 43.
\(^5\) Biddle & Kjolbye-Biddle, ‘Repton’.
popularity and saintly reputation was commemorated and reinforced by
the highly-literary Latin *uita* by Felix.\footnote{54}

Over time, a vernacular tradition developed and lasted throughout the
Anglo-Saxon period and beyond the Norman Conquest.\footnote{55} Though Guthlac
– somewhat surprisingly – found no place in the two major Anglo-Saxon
*sanctoralia*, those of Bede and of Ælfric, respectively,\footnote{56} he is one of the few
native saints to be added to the originally continental collection of the
so-called Corpus-Cotton Legendary, the major hagiographic collection
circulating in late Anglo-Saxon England and the chief source of Ælfric's
*sanctorale*.\footnote{57} But more importantly, Guthlac is the Anglo-Saxon saint most
celebrated in Old English and the only one commemorated in vernacular
poetry. There are five major pre-Conquest vernacular texts on St Guthlac:

1. Anonymous, Old English Martyrology (prose; s. ix\textsuperscript{2}; *The Old English
Martyrology*, ed. and trans. by Rauer, pp. 80-81 and 252)
2. Anonymous, *Vespasian Life* (prose; s. ix\textsuperscript{ex}-x\textsuperscript{in}; *Das angelsächsische Pros-Leben*, ed. by Gonser, pp. 100-173)
3. Anonymous, *Vercelli Homily xxiii* (prose; before c. 975; *The Vercelli
Homilies*, ed. by Scragg, pp. 383-392; corresponds to Felix’s *VSG*, chpts.
xxviii-xxxiv)
by Roberts, pp. 83-107; corresponds to Felix’s *VSG*, chpts. xxviii-xxxii)
ed. by Roberts, pp. 108-124; corresponds to Felix’s *VSG*, chpt. l)

While the relationship between the vernacular texts and the Latin life
is not always unequivocal (especially in the case of the entry in the Old
English Martyrology and the poem *Guthlac A*),\footnote{58} the *VSG* represents the

\footnote{54} The *VSG* is attested in thirteen manuscripts in total, of which nine were written or owned
\footnote{55} *Felix’s Life of Saint Guthlac*, ed. by Colgrave, pp. 7-15; Roberts, ‘An Inventory’; *The Guthlac Poems*,
\footnote{56} Bede’s knowledge of Mercia has been defined as ‘patchy’: Roberts, *Guthlac of Crowland*, p. 7.
As to Ælfric, his reliance on Bede as a favoured source for Anglo-Saxon saints is probably the
reason behind his omission of Guthlac: see Di Sciacca, “concupita, quaesita, ac petita solitudinis
secretas”, pp. 174-175.
\footnote{57} Lapidge, ‘Ælfric’s *Sanctorale*’; Jackson and Lapidge, ‘The Contents’; *Three Eleventh-Century
Anglo-Latin Saints’ Lives*, ed. by Love, pp. xviii-xxxiii; Zettel, ‘Ælfric’s Hagiographic Sources’;
Zettel, ‘Saints’ Lives in Old English’.
\footnote{58} Roberts, ‘An Inventory’, pp. 201 and 203-204; *The Guthlac Poems*, ed. by Roberts, pp. 19-29;
Roberts, *Guthlac A*; Roberts, ‘Hagiography and Literature’, pp. 77-80 and 82-84; Roberts, ‘Guthlac,
cornerstone of this vast and enduring hagiographic tradition. Unfortunately, we are in the dark as to the exact circumstances of its composition. Felix’s dedication of the VSG to Ælfwald, king of the East Angles (c. 713-749), and his use of Bede’s prose *Vita S. Cuthberti* (c. 721) as a source provide a fairly definite chronological range for the text. Otherwise, the details of Felix’s life and schooling and of the place where he composed the VSG are unknown. Even his nationality is uncertain and he may not even have been Anglo-Saxon, although he must have spent at least a substantial portion of his life in England, presumably in East Anglia, since in the prologue to the VSG, Felix addresses the East Anglian King Ælfwald as *dominus meus* and later on refers to King Aldwulf without mentioning that he was king of the East Angles. Ælfwald is an equally elusive figure. According to the VSG (chpts. xlviii and l), Ælfwald’s sister, Ecgburh, an abbess, was in touch with Guthlac, and this family connection with the saint may have been at the origin of Ælfwald’s commission to Felix. More relevant for the purposes of this study, however, is that the king can be counted in among Boniface’s correspondents, since Ælfwald addressed a letter to the missionary in the late 740s promising prayers from the seven monasteries in his kingdom.

It is possible that Felix was a monk at one of these seven East Anglian foundations. Otherwise, the only evidence concerning Felix and his environs is that provided by the VSG itself. In spite of its heavy debt to previous saints’ lives and the author’s frequent concessions to hagiographic topoi, the VSG reveals a closeness to the events related and the characters portrayed.


62 Felix’s *Life of Saint Guthlac*, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, pp. 16 and 60.


Hence the impulse to connect Felix with the very same foundations to which Guthlac himself had been attached. In fact, the VSG mentions only one monastery, namely Repton, the double house in Derbyshire where Guthlac received his (Petrine) tonsure and from where he set off for the fens after two years of monastic training. What is more, Repton was associated with the Mercian royal house and Æthelbald (d. 757), king of Mercia in Felix's lifetime and a devotee of St Guthlac, was buried there. From the account of Guthlac's eremitic life in Crowland, however, it is clear that the saint must have relied on the logistic support of a neighbouring foundation, which is never named by Felix. According to Meaney, the most likely candidate for the role of Guthlac's base was Medeshamstede (Peterborough today), a monastery only about seven miles south of Crowland and one of the most influential and thriving foundations in the area at the time.

Why Felix should have kept quiet about Medeshamstede's putative role as Guthlac's logistic base is a matter of speculation, as is the question of whether Felix himself could have been a member of either Repton or Medeshamstede. What seems certain is that he cannot have been a monk of Crowland, since it is unlikely that the local abbey predates the tenth-century Benedictine reform movement. Thus, all that can be concluded at this stage is that Felix must have been active in a Southumbrian, presumably East Anglian, centre endowed with a library of remarkable size. Indeed, the wide range of sources and their subtle integration and layering as well as the ornate, flamboyant Latin displayed by Felix reveal that he was a well-read, sophisticated author who must have benefited from a high standard of Latin training and access to a well-stocked library. In particular, Felix seems to have been thoroughly conversant with and heavily influenced by Aldhelm, who, notably, is also the earliest literary witness to the circulation of the Synonyma in Anglo-Saxon England.

67 Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, pp. 6-7, 15-16, 19, 40, 131, 139, 176, and 188; Keynes, Æthelbald; Kelly, 'Ceolred (d. 757)'; Roberts, 'Hagiography and Literature', p. 76. Æthelbald's interaction with Guthlac is the subject of much of the so-called Guthlac Roll: Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, pp. 12-14; Roberts, 'An Inventory', p. 208.
68 Meaney, 'Felix's Life of Guthlac: History or Hagiography?', pp. 78-79.
69 Ibidem.
70 Roberts, 'Hagiography and Literature', pp. 70-71; Roberts, Guthlac, St', p. 227.
71 Meaney, 'Felix's Life of Guthlac: History or Hagiography?', p. 75.
The Synonyma as a Source of the Vita S. Guthlaci

The borrowing from the Synonyma occurs in one of the central chapters of the VSG, that is in a section of the life which recounts the early stages of Guthlac’s anachoresis and his strenuous fights with the evil spirits infesting the barrow he had chosen as his hermitage. In particular, the chapter in question tells how two devils in human form suddenly materialise in front of Guthlac while the saint is meditating and deceptively try to tempt him to fast to excess by admonishing him about the examples set by the illustrious hermits of the past – Christ himself, Moses, Elijah, and the Egyptian monks – who had all excelled in their abstinence. The quote from the Synonyma is embedded within the lengthy address by the two demons and reads:

Quanto enim in hoc saeculo frangeris, tanto in perpetuum solidaris: et quanto in praesenti adfligeris, tanto in futuro gaudebis.

(‘For insofar as you are broken down in this world, you shall be made whole and firm in eternity; and to the degree that you are afflicted in this present life, so much shall you rejoice in the future’.)

The principle that the more one suffers in this life the more one will rejoice in eternity can be considered a commonplace tenet of Christian ethics. However, a comparison with the Synonyma (i. 28) shows a verbatim debt to Isidore, in that Felix’s phrasing and wording are basically identical with the source-text:

Quanto enim in hoc saeculo frangimur, tanto in perpetuum solidamur; quanto in praesenti adfligimur, tanto in futuro gaudebimus.

(‘For insofar as we are broken down in this world, we shall be made whole and firm in the eternal world; to the degree that we are afflicted in this present life, so much shall we rejoice in the future’.)

74 On the psychological or physical nature of such demonic apparitions, see Meaney, ‘Felix’s Life of St Guthlac: Hagiography and/or Truth’, pp. 36-40; Vos, ‘Demons Without and Within’; Almond, The Devil, pp. 111-117 and 206-216.
76 Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi, p. 23; my translation.
The only notable discrepancy is that, while in the *Synonyma* the verbs are in the first person plural, in the *VSG* they are in the second person singular, which can be explained by the dialogical context of Felix’s text.  

The quote from the *Synonyma* is a brief extract from a longer passage uttered by Reason and devoted to the principle of inverse proportion ruling the destiny in the afterlife (*Synonyma* i. 27-30). In view of the concision of the borrowing, on the one hand, and of the frequency with which the *Synonyma* were abstracted and epitomised throughout the Middle Ages, on the other, it could be expected that Felix had known the Isidorian sentence second-hand and picked it from a *florilegium* or a devotional collection. Indeed, the sentence in question occurs in the *Liber scintillarum* (chpt. i. 29):  

Quantum enim in hoc saeculo frangimur, tantum in perpetuo solidamur. Quantum hic in presente adfligimur, tantum in futuro gaudebimus.

(‘For insofar as we are broken down in this world, we shall be made whole and firm in the eternal world; to the degree that we are afflicted here in the present, so much shall we rejoice in the future.’)  

This passage from the *Liber scintillarum* has been classified as Felix’s direct source in the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* database, while more recently Bremmer has argued that it is not possible to determine whether the *VSG* draws directly on Isidore or on Defensor’s excerpt. What is certain, however, is that Felix and Defensor ultimately relied on two different recensions of the *Synonyma*, at least as far as the quote in question is concerned. This sentence features in both Λ and Φ, but while the *VSG* shares four distinctive readings with the Λ recension, namely *quant* (x2) and *tant* (x2), Defensor’s text as we know it from Rochais’ edition features the corresponding Φ-readings, namely *quantum* and *tantum*; also,
Defensor adds the adverb *hic* in the phrase *hic in presente* which is not recorded in any of the witnesses collated by Elfassi.  

This circumstance is consistent with the general picture of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript tradition of the *Synonyma*, according to which the Λ recension was the first to reach Anglo-Saxon England and had the widest circulation there. Felix predictably knew this text of the *Synonyma*, while the compiler of a continental *florilegium* such as the *Liber scintillarum*, whether from Ligugé or not, presumably drew on the predominantly continental Φ recension.

Now, at least two Southumbrian witnesses of the Λ recension are contemporary with the *VSG*, namely the St Petersburg and Würzburg manuscripts. In particular, Felix’s text seems to be closer to the latter codex, in that both read *futuro* while the corresponding reading in the St Petersburg manuscript is *futurum*.  

The St Petersburg manuscript has been traced to a south-west English scriptorium, but it was eventually moved to the insular foundation of Corbie by the middle of the eighth century; indeed part of the contents, including the final part of the *Synonyma*, were added at Corbie. In addition to its early date and Southumbrian origin, the St Petersburg *Synonyma* are especially relevant to us for their links with two Anglo-Saxon *literati* that, together with Felix, are the earliest named readers of the *Synonyma* in England, namely Aldhelm and Boniface, and whose writings, especially Aldhelm’s, were current in the milieu where the *VSG* originated. Indeed, in the St Petersburg codex the *Synonyma* are bracketed by an acrostic poem on St John, *Iohannis celsi rimans mysteria caeli*, which has been attributed, albeit not universally, to Boniface, and by Aldhelm’s *Enigmata*. What is more, it has been argued – again not unanimously – that one of the hands at work on the codex was that of Boniface himself, whose handwriting has apparently been detected in the two texts preceding the *Synonyma*, namely

---

81 Isidori Hispalensis *Synonyma*, ed. by Elfassi, p. 23. Indeed, according to Elfassi, the *Liber scintillarum* relies on a contaminated Φ-text of the *Synonyma* similar to the text transmitted by an early ninth-century south German manuscript, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6330 (Elfassi’s ms. m): Elfassi, ‘Defensor de Ligugé’, pp. 246-248; Isidori Hispalensis *Synonyma*, ed. by Elfassi, pp. li-lii.

82 See above, n. 41.

83 Isidori Hispalensis *Synonyma*, ed. by Elfassi, p. 23.


86 Di Sciacca, *Finding the Right Words*, pp. 69 and 72.
a copy of the Athanasian creed (Quicumque vult) and the St John poem.\textsuperscript{87} If the St Petersburg manuscript really is a Bonifatian autograph, then it must be dated before 718, when Boniface set off for the continent. Boniface could even have played a role in the arrival of the codex itself on the continent because the St Petersburg manuscript could have been part of an exchange of gifts between Boniface and Grimo, abbot of Corbie (741-751).\textsuperscript{88}

There is also a Bonifatian dimension to the Würzburg Synonyma. The bishopric of Würzburg was established by Boniface in 741 or 742 and the Synonyma seems to have been ‘besonders [beliebt] in Würzburg’.\textsuperscript{89} At least five manuscripts of the Isidorian text dating up to the first half of the ninth century are associated with Würzburg and the codex M. p. th. f. 79 is the earliest of them.\textsuperscript{90} Dating to the first half, possibly the first quarter, of the eighth century, this manuscript has been traced to a Mercian or southwestern centre with Frankish cultural contacts, probably Worcester, on the basis of both the palaeographical evidence and the dialectal features of a number of Old English drypoint glosses roughly contemporary with the production of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{91} The codex reached the Rhine-Main area by the end of the eighth century or beginning of the ninth and finally arrived at Würzburg, likely via Mainz, Boniface’s see, by the mid-ninth century.\textsuperscript{92}

Once in Germany, a number of drypoint glosses in an east Frankish dialect were entered in a hybrid minuscule which has been dated to the early ninth century and classified as ‘nachbonifatianisch’ and ‘deutsch insular’.\textsuperscript{93}

It would be tempting to speculate that Felix consulted one of these two manuscripts, especially the Würzburg one with which it shares the reading futuro. However, if the dating of the two codices is consistent with this hypothesis, their putative places of origin (a southwestern English scriptorium for the St Petersburg codex, and a Mercian or southwestern centre, possibly Worcester, for the Würzburg one), do not correspond with the proposed East Anglian place of composition for Felix’s VSG. Here Felix

\textsuperscript{87} Di Sciacca, Finding the Right Words, pp. 72 and 244-245, nn. 429 and 431.
\textsuperscript{89} Bischoff and Hofmann, Libri Sancti Kyliani, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{92} Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi, p. xlv.
\textsuperscript{93} Thurn, Die Handschriften, III.1, p. 66; Di Sciacca, Finding the Right Words, p. 72; Hussey, ‘Transmarinis litteris’, p. 158; Isidori Hispalensis Synonyma, ed. by Elfassi, p. xlv.
must have had access to at least one copy of the Λ-text of the *Synonyma* (whether in its entirety or in excerpts); in particular, this copy probably contained a text closer to the one preserved in the Würzburg codex. As mentioned above, Felix’s putative East Anglian mother-house must have been provided with an extensive library, where hagiographic sources as well as Aldhelm’s works must have featured prominently. The final part of this chapter will attempt to sketch out the contents of such a library and the original milieu of the *VSG*.

### The Literary Milieu of the *Vita S. Guthlaci*

*Quellenforschung* on the *VSG* has shown that Felix relied on an ingrained knowledge of scripture as well as on an extensive hagiographic library ranging from the lives of the two archetypal Desert Fathers, Antony and Paul the Hermit, to the two most influential hagiographies of the western Middle Ages, Sulpicius’s *Vita Martini* and Gregory the Great’s *Vita Benedicti*, to the lives of two of the earliest insular saints, Fursey and, especially, Cuthbert.94 Indeed Bede’s prose *Vita S. Cuthberti* is the saint’s life to which Felix is most indebted, so much so that ‘it is difficult to imagine that Felix was not in some way attempting to create an East Anglian counterpart to Cuthbert’.95 Finally, Felix was familiar with Virgil and the *VSG* is frequently scattered with Virgilian echoes,96 as is the case with the chapter in which the borrowing from the *Synonyma* occurs.

Guthlac’s vision of the two devils and their long address to the saint on the spiritual benefits of extreme fasting where the quote from the *Synonyma* is embedded do not have an exact antecedent. In general, the whole passage could be described as Antonian, in that, although Antony himself does not experience an equivalent vision, in a long speech recorded in Evagrius’s Latin version of the *Vita Antonii* (chpt. xvi),97 the saint warns his disciples against the devil’s mischievous attempt to lure monks to ascetic excesses.

---

96 *Felix’s Life of Saint Guthlac*, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, p. 17.  
only to throw them into despair.\textsuperscript{98} The Antonian resonances are corroborated at the end of the relevant chapter of the VSG, when Guthlac dispels his demonic antagonists who ultimately vanish like smoke from his presence into thin air.\textsuperscript{99} As Downey has demonstrated, this sentence represents ‘a particularly complex moment of source-layering,’\textsuperscript{100} because it conflates a phrase possibly from Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid} (XII, 591-592),\textsuperscript{101} but more likely from Bede’s prose \textit{Vita S. Cuthberti} where it describes the saint’s dispelling of a false devilish fire,\textsuperscript{102} with a biblical echo of Psalm lxvii. 2-3.\textsuperscript{103} Notably, the same psalm is chanted by Antony in a similar context of demonic harassment and it is probably through the \textit{Vita Antonii} that the scriptural quote filtered into Felix’s text, where it is in turn echoed three more times, always to describe Guthlac’s chasing away of devilish tormenters.\textsuperscript{104}

The sophisticated integration of sources and multiple criss-crossing of intertextual and intratextual borrowings has been shown to be the most characteristic of Felix’s compositional techniques.\textsuperscript{105} Indeed, in view of this practice, I would suggest that the above-quoted \textit{fumus}-simile might provide a further link, albeit an indirect one, between the VSG and the \textit{Synonyma}, particularly with the most popular and elaborated-on passage from the Isidorian text, namely the \textit{ubi sunt}.\textsuperscript{106} The \textit{ubi sunt} passage of the \textit{Synonyma}

\textsuperscript{98} Similar admonitions are also found in classics of medieval monastic literature: \textit{Felix’s Life of Saint Guthlac}, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, p. 184.
\textsuperscript{100} Downey, ‘Intertextuality’, pp. 63-65, quotation at p. 63.
\textsuperscript{101} The sentence in question likens panicking townspeople to bees smoked out of their hive: ‘Voluit ater odor tectis, tum murmure caeco / Intus saxa sonant, vacuas ut fumus ad auras’ (a terrible reek rolls through their house, and then the rocks resound within with their blind buzzing, and smoke goes into the empty air); translation by Downey, ‘Intertextuality’, p. 63, n. 230.
\textsuperscript{103} ‘Exurget Deus et dissipentur inimici eius et fugiant qui odierunt eum a facie eius; sicut deficit fumus deficiant’ (‘let God rise up, and let his enemies be scattered, and let those who hate him flee from his face; let them fade away just as smoke fades away’); Downey, ‘Intertextuality’, pp. 38-39, translation at p. 38, n. 123.
\textsuperscript{105} Downey, ‘Intertextuality’, pp. 25-66.
\textsuperscript{106} Isidore’s \textit{Synonyma} represent the major source for the \textit{ubi sunt} topos in the western Middle Ages: Gilson, \textit{Les idées et les lettres}, pp. 14-15 and 33. As concerns Anglo-Saxon England in
itself does not mention any smoke – the two concluding similes read ‘quasi umbra transierunt, uelut somnium euanuerunt’ (‘they passed away as if they were a shadow, they vanished like a dream’)\textsuperscript{107} –, but no fewer than six Anglo-Saxon \textit{ubi sunt} passages, four in Latin, namely Aldhelm’s \textit{Epistola ad Acircium}, Boniface’s Epistles ix and lxxiii, and the anonymous sermon \textit{In nomine Domini} in ms. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 190, and two in Old English, namely the anonymous homilies Napier xlix and Irvine vii, feature a smoke-simile and they are all demonstrably derivative of the \textit{Synonyma}.\textsuperscript{108}

As has been shown, the ultimate source for the \textit{fumus}-simile itself in these Anglo-Saxon \textit{ubi sunt} passages is biblical, that is Wisdom V. 13-15. In particular, in Aldhelm’s and Boniface’s \textit{ubi sunt} passages, this scriptural echo was spontaneously triggered by and conflated with the \textit{Synonyma}, a text which itself often echoes the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{109} Given Felix’s scriptural know-how and familiarity with Aldhelm’s corpus, on the one hand, and his distinctive multi-layering of sources, on the other, it is possible that his image of the devil vanishing like smoke might betray, besides Virgilian or Bedan antecedents, also an echo of the Aldhelmian elaboration of the \textit{fumus}-simile in the \textit{Epistola ad Acircium}.

As to Boniface, although no firm evidence exists concerning Felix’s knowledge and use of his writings, Boniface exchanged letters with at least two royal personages mentioned in the \textit{VSG} who were contemporaries of Felix himself, namely the very dedicatee of the \textit{uita}, the East Anglian king Ælfwald, and the Mercian king Æthelbald. The former was probably a subject king to the latter, and indeed Æthelbald features prominently in the \textit{VSG} as a pious devotee of the saint, who frequently visited Guthlac for counsel and encouragement during his youth as an exile and who generously enriched Guthlac’s shrine after he had finally ascended to the throne.\textsuperscript{110}

Notably, Æthelbald is the addressee of one of the two above-mentioned epistles by Boniface featuring the \textit{ubi sunt} motif and the concluding particular, Cross demonstrated that the Isidorian text is ‘quite the favourite individual source’ for the \textit{ubi sunt} passages in Old English prose and poetry: Cross, “Ubisunt” Passages in Old English, p. 25; Di Sciacca, ‘Il topos dell’\textit{ubi sunt}’; Di Sciacca, ‘The \textit{ubi sunt} Motif’; Di Sciacca, \textit{Finding the Right Words}, pp. 105-159.

\textsuperscript{107} My translation.
Here the Mercian king is depicted in far less flattering terms than in the VSG, as Boniface sternly reprimands Æthelbald for his depraved mores and violations of church privileges and property. With its emphasis on the transience of any worldly grandeur, the *ubi sunt* paragraph perfectly fits Boniface’s admonition to the king to amend his wicked ways. Indeed, this letter can be considered as a veritable manifesto of church reform. It was authored by Boniface but nominally signed by seven other Anglo-Saxon bishops. Given the public dimension of the epistle, it is reasonable to suppose that such a well-read contemporary as Felix, possibly even in personal contact with the king targeted by Boniface, was aware of it and its flamboyant *ubi sunt* passage featuring the *fumus*-simile. Also, stylistic parallels seem to link the Bonifatian *ubi sunt* paragraph and the VSG, in that like the latter, the former is of ‘derivative, repetitious and innately formulaic nature’. Like Boniface’s, Felix’s own style and compositional techniques also employ a complex network of intertextual and intratextual resonances, and such a network could well have included Boniface’s Epistle lxxiii and its *fumus*-simile.

Finally, a further connection between Boniface’s Epistle lxxiii and Felix’s VSG can be identified in the negative portrayal both authors give of Ceolred, king of the Mercians (709–716), predecessor and distant cousin of Æthelbald. According to Felix, Ceolred had cast Æthelbald into exile and persecuted him further. Indeed, shortly before Guthlac’s death, Felix has the saint prophesise to Æthelbald the death of wicked Ceolred and Æthelbald’s long-awaited accession to the Mercian throne. Boniface does not touch upon the dynastic controversy implied in Felix’s account, but fully agrees with the latter’s depiction of Ceolred as a dissolute king who ultimately died raving mad at a banquet (only, unlike Felix, Boniface uses Ceolred as a cautionary example for the equally depraved Æthelbald).

Notably, Boniface had already chastised Ceolred decades earlier, when, recounting the otherworldly vision of the monk of Much Wenlock within his epistle to Eadburg (717–719), he had depicted the soul of the evil king falling prey to a host of demons. This very vision too could provide a further connection between Boniface and the VSG, especially the episode of Guthlac’s

112 Orchard, ‘Old Sources, New Resources’, p. 36.
113 Kelly, ‘Ceolred (d. 716)’.
descensus ad inferos, when at the height of a demonic assault, the saint is carried by a host of devils to the gates of hell and there he is made to witness the torments inflicted on the damned souls and threatened to be cast down into the hellish abyss, but is eventually rescued due to his faithfulness and the intercession of St Bartholomew.116 Although to my knowledge no specific debt of the VSG to Boniface's account of the Wenlock vision has been pinpointed, it is nevertheless significant that Guthlac's descensus ad inferos has been associated with other early Anglo-Saxon visions, including those of Dryhthelm117 and Fursey,118 as making up 'a visionary tradition in early Anglo-Saxon ascetic circles in which the Latin and literary and the vernacular and oral intermingled'.119

In sum, although the evidence concerning Felix’s knowledge of Boniface’s texts remains largely circumstantial, I think there is a strong possibility that they too circulated in Felix’s circle, where – it must be remembered – the works of Boniface’s great model, Aldhelm, proved so influential. Not unlike Aldhelm, Boniface, one of the earliest Anglo-Saxon admirers of the Synonyma and an enthusiastic propagator of the Isidorian text in the Anglo-Saxon missions on the continent, could have endorsed a broader appreciation of the Synonyma.

Conclusion

Analysis of the Synonyma excerpt in the VSG contributes interesting data as to the circulation of this Isidorian text in Anglo-Saxon England, in that it confirms that by the mid-eighth century the Synonyma were already widely disseminated in Southumbrian England. In particular, the text circulating at this stage seems to have been that of the A-recension. The St Petersburg and the Würzburg manuscripts of the Synonyma are the earliest witnesses

116 VSG, chpts. xxxi-xxxiii: Felix’s Life of Saint Guthlac, ed. and trans. by Colgrave, pp. 100-109. On Guthlac’s descensus ad inferos, see the recent study by Giliberto, ‘The Descensus ad inferos’.
117 Bede, Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum, V. 12: Bede’s Ecclesiastical History, ed. and trans. by Colgrave and Mynors, pp. 488-499. See also Giliberto, ‘The Descensus ad inferos’, pp. 245-254. On the influence of a seventh-century Spanish text, the Prognosticon by Julian of Toledo, on the depiction of the otherworld in the visions of the monk of Much Wenlock and Drythhelm, see Kabir, Paradise, Death and Doomsday, pp. 77-140; Di Sciacca, Finding the Right Words, pp. 177-179.
of this recension and Felix also seems to have consulted a Λ-text, indeed a version of the text which was apparently close to the Würzburg Synonyma. The locales to which Felix and the Würzburg manuscript have been traced, an East Anglian foundation and a southwestern centre, possibly Worcester, respectively, do not seem to be compatible and the circumstances of both Felix’s life and the itinerary followed by the Würzburg Synonyma from its original scriptorium to the continent are just too hazy to posit a definite association between them. It is therefore safer to suggest that Felix must have had access to another Λ-copy of the Synonyma, possibly related to the Würzburg codex, thereby virtually expanding our estimates of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript tradition of the Synonyma. Alternatively, it could be speculated that what Felix consulted was an excerpt or a florilegium, based on a Λ-text or even on the Würzburg Synonyma.

Previous scholarship has pointed out that the Synonyma proved especially popular with Anglo-Saxon anonymous homilists, and that in pre-Conquest England the Isidorian work contributed to the definition of a specifically Anglo-Saxon stock of eschatological, penitential, and devotional motifs. As an eschatological and devotional source, the Synonyma were often associated with that corpus of texts, mostly of eastern origin and Irish-transmitted, which shaped Anglo-Saxon cosmology and vision literature as well as spirituality and devotion.120

Within the wide pre-Conquest readership of the Synonyma, there are at least two distinctive intellectual environments from the early Anglo-Saxon period where the Synonyma were particularly appreciated, namely Aldhelm’s entourage and, in turn, that of Aldhelm’s great epigone, Boniface. Not only did Aldhelm and Boniface demonstrably draw on the Isidorian text in their own writings, but Boniface and his fellow missionaries also actively promoted the diffusion of the Synonyma in the area of the Anglo-Saxon missions on the continent.121

The evidence from the VSG both confirms and augments this picture. Through Felix’s work we can glimpse a milieu that, besides holding Aldhelm in high esteem and demonstrating an extensive scriptural and hagiographic proficiency, nurtured an interest in eremitic values and had a detailed knowledge of some of the key hagiographies concerning the founders of eastern monasticism, namely Antony and Paul the Hermit, as well as

Guthlac’s own ‘predecessor’ as native Anglo-Saxon hermit-saint, namely Cuthbert. Thus, the VSG affords precious evidence as to the association of the Synonyma with hagiographies specifically devoted to hermit-saints, which confirms the ascetic component of the Isidorian text and helps to illustrate and explain its fortune as a classic of monastic spirituality in the western Middle Ages. More specifically, analysis of the VSG brings into sharper focus the literary corpus to which the Synonyma probably belonged in pre-Norman England and to sketch out a more detailed picture of the Anglo-Saxon library to which they virtually belonged.
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8 Hispania et Italia

Paul the Deacon, Isidore, and the Lombards

Christopher Heath

The jurist and philologist Friedrich Lindenbrog’s (1573-1648) edition of Diversarum gentium historiae antiquae tres – published in 1640 and dedicated to Johann Friedrich (1579-1634), the Archbishop (administrator) of Bremen and Bishop of Lübeck – associated three authors who provided histories of the origins and migrations of peoples.1 Lindenbrog collated three authors in this work: first, the De Regnorum ac temporum successionibus of Jordanes (better known as the Historia Romana);2 three items of Isidore of Seville;3 and a De Gestis Longobardorum, better known as the Historia Langobardorum of Paul the Deacon.4

It is not entirely surprising that Lindenbrog should collect these writers and their works in one volume. His note to the readers emphasises the connections between the origins of the ‘Germans’ and the relevance of the works of Jordanes, Isidore and Paul as materials for the early histories of their peoples.5 At the same time, Isidore of Seville and Paul the Deacon embody authors who not only delineate the origins of the gens upon which they write but also, through their works, assist in shaping the ethnic constructions that we term Visigoth and Lombard. As they composed their histories, we see the processes that have been termed ethnogenesis begin to crystallise so that both social (peoples, power) and spatial zones (geography) coalesce. Where previously in the late sixth-century both Visigothic and Lombard kings had endeavoured to perpetuate political, socio-economic and cultural hegemony over populations of Hispano- and Italo-Romans by the enforcement of legal separation, both kingdoms began to mould

1 Lindenbrog, Diversarum gentium, p. 8.
3 Isidore’s De Gothis, Wandalis et Suevis (i.e. Historia Gothorum), De Origine Gothorum and the Chronicon Regnum Wisigothorum.
4 Waitz (ed.), MGH SrL; Foulke (trans.), History of the Lombards; and, Capo, Paolo Diacono.
5 Lindenbrog, Diversarum gentium, p. 10 In tanta vetorum scriptorum, quies gestas maiorum nostrorum litteris tradiderunt, raritate omnino necessum est, eos pro bonis ut habeamus... (‘In many of the oldest writings which set down the deeds of our ancestors in books, it is rarely always necessary, that we have them for the good things...’).
a territorial identity which encompassed, commanded and acquired the loyalties, or at least aimed to do so, of all the inhabitants under their rule.\textsuperscript{6}

How the situation on the ground affected the context and content of the narratives of both Isidore and Paul the Deacon has been the subject of considerable recent interest and debate. Whilst the influence of Gregory of Tours, for instance, on Paul’s \textit{Historia Langobardorum} (hereafter \textit{HL}) has been acknowledged, and the inspiration provided by both the examples of Jordanes and Bede in prompting Paul to compose a general work of history on the Lombards has been identified, the influence of Isidore at significant junctures in Paul’s work and thought have not been sufficiently addressed. Isidore generally and his \textit{Etymologiae sive Origines} specifically had a profound impact on the cultural and intellectual developments of the late eighth- and early ninth-centuries that we know as the Carolingian ‘Renaissance’. As Laistner pointed out in 1957:

The \textit{Etymologiae} far surpassed (in demand) any other of his [i.e. Isidore’s] books in popularity; for this encyclopaedia was a \textit{sine-qua-non} in every monastic library of any pretensions. Its use by a long list of writers from the seventh to the tenth century is easily demonstrable, it appears constantly in medieval library catalogues, and the number of extant manuscripts is exceedingly great.\textsuperscript{7}

Isidore’s influence is evident in three of Paul’s important works. First, in his earliest historical compilation-composition, the \textit{Historia Romana}, composed at some point in the 760s at the bequest, we are told, of Adelperga of Benevento, daughter of Desiderius (757-74) the last Lombard king;\textsuperscript{8} secondly, the \textit{Homiliarium} completed in the 780s upon the direction of

\textsuperscript{6} These processes are complex and multi-faceted. So far as law and the application of process is concerned the concept of individuality rather than territoriality of law persists. See King, ‘The alleged territoriality’; and, King, ‘King Chindasvind’. For the Lombards, see Everett, \textit{Literacy in Lombard Italy}, pp. 163-197.


Charlemagne; and thirdly, his best known and last work, the *Historia Langobardorum*, written in the 790s – the last decade of Paul's life. The use of Isidore in the first two works is not extensive. Often overlooked and under-rated in the canon of Paul's writings, the *Historia Romana* is a work of three distinct sections. The opening ten books are an amended version of the *Breviarium ab Urbe Condita* composed by Eutropius (c. 320-c. 390). The next six books attached to this Eutropian core are Paul's own work with extensive use of Orosius, Jerome and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* to name but three. As one would expect from a work of political history of Rome and the Roman empire up to the time of Justinian (527-65), the Goths are dealt with as an important but incidental element within the orbit of the general narrative. Crivellucci identified six occasions within the extension that appeared to have some Isidorian influence. Whilst Paul was not averse, in common with most early medieval writers, to reproduce lengthy passages verbatim from sources, only one short passage on the death of Transamund, the treatment of the catholic bishops of North Africa, and the career of Fulgentius are close enough to suggest direct use of Isidore. Thus the *Chronica maiora* has:

[390] *Transamundum Wandalorum rex catholicas ecclesias claudit et cxx episcopos exilio Sardiniam mittit*
[391] *Fulgentius quoque in confessione fidei et scientia floruit*

Transamund king of the Vandals shut the catholic churches and sent 120 bishops into exile in Sardinia.

Fulgentius also flourished in the confession of faith and knowledge.

---

10 Opinion varies as to the year of Paul's death. The best options would place it at some point between 796 and 799.
11 Bird, *Eutropius*.
12 Crivellucci (ed.), *Pauli Diaconi*, pp. xxxvi-xlili, and pp. xxxviii-xxxix where Crivellucci lists a total of 46 sources.
13 These are: *HR XIV 19,4-6; XV 1, 4-5; XV 6, 7-15; XVI 3 & 4, 8-18, 1-2; & XVI 7, 6-16*. In order these deal with: the return of Genseric to Africa; events in Constantinople; the division of the Goths under Alaric and Fritigern; the exile of the North African bishops to Sardinia; and, the career of Fulgentius and Transamund's death.
And Paul’s *Historia Romana* has:


[XVI 4] *Inter hac tempestas beatus Fulgentius in confessione fidei et scientia floruit.*

At that time, Transamund who was the brother of Huneric succeeded to the Kingdom of the Vandals in Africa, following the perfidy of his brother and father, Genseric, closing the catholic churches, he sent 120 bishops into exile in Sardinia.

During this time blessed Fulgentius flourished in the confession of faith and knowledge.

Within the orbit of the *Historia Romana*, Isidore is not a source that Paul draws upon frequently. Whilst the section above suggests a close use of that particular passage for details of events in Vandal Africa, the remaining five passages do not lead us to conclude that there is any particular pattern in Paul’s use of Isidore. A similar scenario is presented by Paul’s compilation, the *Homiliarium*. A compilation in four parts, the *Homiliarium* uses sermons and homilies from primarily western Patristic fathers. Out of a possible 244 items, Isidore’s presence is restricted to two sermons in the *Pars Hiemalis*. This in itself is a little more surprising, given the influence of Isidore upon the court intellectuals at the heart of the Carolingian renaissance. The relative modest footprint of Isidore in these two works need not, however, lead us to the conclusion that Isidore remained a minor influence on Paul globally. For it is in the third work, the *HL*, that there is a closer convergence of aims and interests between the two – in particular, the creation of a

---

15 Crivellucci (ed.), *Pauli Diaconi*, p. 226.
16 The sermons are items xvi: ‘Isidori natalis domini dies ea de causa a patribus votivae’ from the *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* and item xxxi ‘Isidori – in natale sancti Iohannis evangelistae’ from the *De ortu et obitu patrum*. For the sermons and context see: Grégoire, *Les Homéliaires Liturgique Médiévaux*, pp. 425-486; Wiegand, *Das Homiliarium*, pp. 23 & 26; and, Smetana, ‘Ælfric’, pp. 166-7 which has the most accessible list of items.
17 See Laura Carlson, Adoption, Adaptation, & Authority: The Use of Isidore in the *Opus Caroli* in this volume.
18 This is demonstrated in this volume by: Melissa Markauskas, Rylands MS Latin 12: A Carolingian example of Isidore’s reception into the Patristic Canon.
narrative that depicts the maintenance of strong and effective orthodox kingship of their respective peoples.

The creation of a unified and orthodox Visigothic Iberian kingdom was both difficult and uncertain. In similar circumstances but with different results, the intersection between the social, political, and religious identities of the Lombards also raised questions for Lombard rulers and those they ruled. This was neither straightforward nor un-problematic for Paul or his people. Despite the themes of the Historia Langobardorum, where Iberia and the Visigoths remain peripheral to the main thrust of the narrative, Isidore of Seville has an impact upon two important sections in the work. In the first place, as we shall see, Isidore has significant influence upon the ethnographic and historico-geographic material with which Paul commenced book I of the HL; and, secondly, his excursus on the Italian provinces in book II of the HL provides particular evidence for Paul’s knowledge and use of Isidorian materials. This chapter seeks to analyse the etymological and ethnographic responses of Paul’s works and how these were formulated and crafted with an eye on the Laus Spaniae which introduces Isidore’s Historia Gothorum. Isidore’s image of a Gothic past based on the providential migrations of peoples provided a template for Paul’s comments on the origins of the Lombards. Once settled in Italy, Paul could use an Isidorian approach to deal with the difficult (for him) pagan origins and history of his own, now catholic, gens. In both respects Isidore’s works provided Paul with both answers and solutions. But before we can analyse these elements, we must consider Isidore’s responses to the origins of the Visigoths and how these dovetail with modern perceptions of the situation on the ground.

**Origines Gentium: Identities, Texts and Ethnicities**

Identity and ethnicity and what might be termed the construction of identities through texts are as Pohl has demonstrated an uncertain business.¹⁹ The trajectory in ethno-political terms of the successor ‘states’ of the western Roman empire and the often opaque processes that produced the Visigothic and Lombard kingdoms have generated considerable scholarly debate.²⁰ Identity is at the core of these processes, which of course matters

---

²⁰ Some of this debate has been uncharitable at best. The literature is extensive, but for a good introduction to the issues see Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity* which includes papers from
as ‘the interface between the individual and a given society where social codes, cultural languages and political integration are in flux or are being negotiated’. book IX of Isidore’s *Etymologiae sive Origines* provides definitions of languages and nations. Isidore tells us:

*Gens est multitudo ab uno principio orta, sive ab alia natione secundum propriam collectionem distincta ut Graeciae, Asiae.*

A nation is a number of people sharing a single origin or distinguished from another nation in accordance with its own grouping, as the nations of Greece or of Asia Minor.

The writer of history is not exempt from these processes or influences and will influence and be influenced by the contextual situation on the ground. In broad terms, the historian marks the point of contact as narrator/composer/compiler with his motive(s), audience(s) and inspirations. Isidore’s *Historia Gothorum* embodies these difficulties. One might characterise Isidore’s temporal and spatial experience as being at the sharp end of both the creation and consolidation of a unified and orthodox Visigothic kingdom. As Lung has pointed out Isidore’s works of history are written from a Toledan point of view, which flows from ‘le centre de l’espace politique’.

Yet Isidore himself embodies a somewhat paradoxical position. In terms of ethnicity, in the first place, it is more than likely that both Isidore and his family were Hispano-Romans. Secondly, as a writer, Isidore looks back to Classical Antiquity but at the same time develops an independent response to his world which does not depend upon nostalgia for the Roman Empire. Finally, he acts as an intermediary between clerical and secular culture. How he negotiates these conflicting paradigms is exemplified by critics of the ‘ethnogenesis model’ and a reasoned response from Walter Pohl who is termed a ‘prominent spokesman for the Traditionskern model’.

22 Reta, Casquero & Diaz-y-Diaz (eds.), *San Isidoro de Sevilla*, p. 742; Barney, Lewis, Beach & Berghof (eds. & trans.), *Etymologies*, p. 192; and Henderson, *The Medieval World*, pp. 121-140.
the approach that he adopts in the structural composition of the *Historia Gothorum.*\(^{25}\)

The *Historia Gothorum* details the history of the Goths from their bellicose interventions into the ancient Mediterranean basin up until the rule of Swinthila (621-31). Here the Visigoths form the principal narrational spine of the work but, whilst Isidore must have been aware of the heterogeneous landscape of ethnicities in *Hispania*, his work concentrates on the Visigoths as the principal *leitmotiv*; using the Vandals and the Sueves as useful and illustrative contrasts to emphasise Visigothic success.\(^{26}\) A key feature of his approach is to provide an introductory section, now known as the *Laus Spaniae* and to conclude with a complementary *Laus Gothorum*. In this way the reader is aware from the commencement that the *Historia Gothorum* is designed to prove the appropriate and providential rule of the Visigoths in *Hispania.*\(^{27}\) Isidore is selective in how he presents the origins of the Visigoths and their subsequent adventures. In his discussion of their origins he observes:

*Gothorum antiquissimorum esse gentem certem est: quorum Originum quidam de Magog Iafeth filio suspicantur a simulitudine ultimae syllabae; et magis de Ezechiela propheta id colligentes. Retro autem eruditi eos magis Getas quam Gog et Magog appellare consueverunt.*

It is certain that the Gothic people are very ancient. Some suspect that they originated from Magog, son of Japheth on the basis of the similarity of the last syllable, or they conclude the same from the prophet Ezekiel. But in the past learned men were in the habit of calling them ‘*Getae*’ rather than Gog or Magog.\(^{28}\)

---

25 Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville*, p. 6 where Isidore is described as ‘le dernier philologue de l’Antiquité.’

26 Merrills, *History and Geography*, pp. 195-196. Merrills notes that Isidore did not subscribe to the belief in a homogenous Hispano-Roman entity identifying *Gallaeci, Asturi* and *Cantabri* separately within the *Origines*.

27 Merrills suggests that this approach is in distinct contrast to Jordanes and Paul the Deacon. Whilst not as explicit Paul the Deacon does provide one small pointer to his own similar agenda i.e. *Pari etiam modo et Winnilorum, hoc est Langobardorum gens, quae postea in Italia feliciter regnavit.* (HL I.1) (‘In similar fashion, also, the people of the Winnili, that is, of Langobards, which afterwards ruled happily in Italy...’) Capo, *Paolo Diacono*, p. 4; and, Merrills, *History and Geography*, p. 36. See also, Linehan, *History and Historians*, p. 14.

Later within the *recapitulatio* that concludes the Gothic part of the history, Isidore returns to the same issue but whilst, once again, we are told that the Goths originated from Magog, a new element is introduced. On this occasion, he remarks that ‘they have a common origin with the Scythians. That is why they are not much different in name with one letter changed and one removed. *Getae* becomes *Scythae*’.\(^29\) So far as origins are concerned Isidore depends upon a combination of biblical exegesis and etymological sleight of hand.\(^30\) The fusion of Isidore’s political and religious concerns prompts, as Wood has suggested, a ‘re-write of significant proportions of the history of the Goths’, which seeks to reinforce the ‘Catholic identity of the Visigothic *gens*’.\(^31\) His treatment of the emperor Valens (364-78) is a case in point. Isidore attributes the blame for Visigothic Arianism to the emperor who had ‘sent heretical priests’ (*haereticis sacerdotibus*) in the first place.\(^32\) It was he tells us:

\[
Ut in tamen preaclarum gentem virus pestiferum semine pernicioso trans\-fudit sicque errorem, quem recens credulitas ebit, tenuit dieque servavit.
\]

‘With this pernicious seed [that] he infused a deadly poison into this excellent people, who held and maintained for a long time the error which they had trustingly accepted’.\(^33\)

Subsequently, Isidore attempts to minimise the impact of the Visigothic sack of Rome in 410. In describing this, he details the despoiling of St Peter’s Sanctuary and recounts how Alaric directed that the items taken should be returned *dicens cum Romanis gessisse bellum, non cum apostolis* (saying that he was waging war against the Romans, not against the Apostles).\(^34\)

Detailed analyses elsewhere have identified Isidore’s cumulative message that the Goths have been re-fashioned by their contact with the Roman

---

\(^29\) ‘*Gothi de Magog Iafeth filio ori cum Scythia una probantur origine sati, unde nec longe a vocabulo discrepant. Demotata enim ac detracta littera Getae quasi Scythae sunt nuncupati*’ Mommsen (ed.), *MGH Auctorum Antiquissimorum*, p. 293; and, Wolf, *Conquerors*, p. 107.

\(^30\) See Torreiro, ‘*El Concepto*’, p. 57; ‘*Acogiéndose a la leyenda de Gog y Magog utilizada ya en su día por San Ambrosio como símbolo de las invasiones, el obispo de Sevilla la transformará en un instrumento apologético de los godos*’ (‘*Already in the days of St Ambrosius the legend of Gog and Magog had been used as a symbol of the invasions, the bishop of Seville transformed it into an apologetical instrument of the (Visi-)Goths*’)

\(^31\) Wood, ‘*Heretical catholics*’, pp. 18-20 and pp. 23-4.

\(^32\) Mommsen (ed.), *MGH Auctorum Antiquissimorum*, p. 270; and, Wolf, *Conquerors*, p. 83.

\(^33\) Mommsen (ed.), *MGH Auctorum Antiquissimorum*, p. 270; and, Wolf, *Conquerors*, p. 83.

\(^34\) Mommsen (ed.), *MGH Auctorum Antiquissimorum*, p. 274; and, Wolf, *Conquerors*, p. 87.
and Christian world. Isidore has created an interpretation of Visigothic origins and identity based on an impulse to deal with the new realities on the ground in seventh-century *Hispania*. Isidore's agenda shaped history into a 'picture of the operation of God's will' and his example affected Paul's responses to the origins of his own people, which, as we shall see in what follows, were selective and moulded by Isidore's interpretations.

‘These things are worthy of laughter’

Unlike the *Historia Gothorum*, which survives in both short and long redactions that most commentators associate with respectively earlier and later recensions, one cannot identify with ease the process of gestation of the *Historia Langobardorum*. So far as the earliest period of Lombard history is concerned Paul's problems were somewhat similar to Isidore. So far as books I and II were concerned, in particular, Paul was distant in both spatial and temporal terms from his subject matter. One has the impression that paradoxically, due to this distance and the extensive citation of classical authors in the first two books, Paul's sources were rather 'thin' and to compensate, he employs digression and oral witness in the narrative. Thus we find, for instance, notices on whirlpools and Amazons. Isidore's influence in book I, which will be discussed here, however, affects the core origin story provided by Paul and his understanding of its significance.

The story of how the Langobards acquired their name is a well-known narrative that has attracted the attention of scholars such as Stefano Gasparri, Stefano Cingolani, and Walter Pohl, who have considered the importance and presentation of the Lombard origin myth. It was clearly important to Paul to recount the story notwithstanding the pagan ambience of the subject, but the composition of the origin story was one of the most acute examples of his difficulties when composing the *HL*. Classical authors

---

36 Linehan, *History and Historians*, pp. 14 & 17. XIXth-century Spanish historians ‘traced back the origins of constitutional progress ... to German forests. Liberty was nourished in the shady woods and Visigothic kings were restrained from lapsing into tyranny by the spirit of indipendencia y libertad displayed by their sylvan subjects.’
38 For Whirlpools and Amazons see respectively Waitz (ed.), *MGH SrL*, pp. 51 & 55; and, Foulke, *History of the Lombards*, pp. 10 & 28.
were silent as to Lombard origins and confined their brief and infrequent remarks to observations relating to the Lombards’ fierceness in battle and their limitation in number. These textual remarks place the Winnili (who subsequently become the Langobardi) in the region of the upper Elbe around the first-century C.E. rather than the island of ‘Scadinavia’ from which Paul suggested his people first originated. Paul relied upon later material. The story of the origins of the Lombard name survives in three sources: first, the earliest extant source is the Chronicle of Fredegar – composed at some point before c. 660 probably in Burgundy; secondly, the Origo gentis Langobardorum, also composed in the mid seventh-century provides a short summary of Lombard history from its origins up to the rule of Perctarit (672-88); and, finally, Paul’s HL. None of these three narratives are entirely the same – and whilst Paul knew and referred to the OGL his version remains distinctive. In his narrative, Paul’s Winnili leave Scadinavia and arrive in Scoringa where the Wandali demand tribute. Battle is prepared when the Winnili decline to pay. The Winnili and Wandali seek divine assistance of Godan and Frea respectively. Frea advises Gambara to ensure that the Winnili women fashion their hair into beards and stand with their men in the east. Upon seeing them at sun-rise Godan says:

Qui sunt isti longibarbi?
Who are these long-beards?

Frea then invites Godan to give the now-named Longobardi victory over the Wandali.

Apart from the clearly pagan atmosphere of the story, two features stand out. In the first place, it is remarkable that Paul should mention the story at all given the presence and importance of Godan and Frea in the text. Why, one wonders, did he bother to include the story at all? Everett suggested that Paul felt ‘compelled’ to include it ‘for fear of disappointing his readers’. It

41 See Foulke’s note on this: Foulke, History of the Langobards, p. 3.
43 Bracciotti, Origo gentis Langobardorum.
44 Gambara was the mother of the Winnili leaders Ibor and Aio. See Gasparri, La cultura tradizionale.
45 Waitz (ed.), MGH Srl, pp. 52-3; and, Foulke, History of the Langobards, pp. 16-17.
46 Everett, Literacy, p. 94.
is, of course, impossible to demonstrate that this was true – although any cursory analysis of the *HL* would certainly suggest that Paul enjoyed any opportunity to tell a good story and could exhibit a rather ‘gossipy’ tone. Secondly, Paul’s presentation of the passage is illuminating. At the start of the chapter he indicated:

*Refert hoc loco antiquitas ridiculam fabulam: quod accedentes Wandali ad Godan...*

At this point the men of old tell a silly story about the Vandals coming to Godan...⁴⁷ Subsequently he concludes the chapter with this observation:

*Haec risui digna sunt et pro nihilo habenda. Victoria enim non potestati est attributa hominum, sed de caelo potius ministratur.*

These things are worthy of laughter and are to be held of no account. For victory is due not to the power of men, but it is furnished from heaven.⁴⁸

The passage is thus framed between two markers that distance Paul as author from the material presented but also prepare the reader for his own opinion based upon Isidorian material. This continues in the next chapter where Paul informs us:

*Certum tamen est, Langobardos ab intractae ferro barbae longitudine, cum primis Winnili dicti fuerint Ita postmodum appellatos. Nam iuxta illorum linguam lang longam, bart barbam significat*  
It is certain, however, that the Langobards were afterwards so-called on account of the length of their beards untouched by the knife, whereas at first they had been called *Winnili*; for according to their language *lang* means long and *bart* beard.⁴⁹

This is clearly an echo of the entry in Isidore's *Etymologiae* where he says *Langobardes vulgo fertur nominatos prolixa barba et numquam tonsa* (‘It is commonly said that the Lombards are named Langobardi from their widely spreading never cut beard’).⁵⁰

---

⁴⁷ Waitz (ed.), *MGH SrL*, p. 52; and, Foulke, *History of the Lombards*, p. 16.  
Here then we see that Paul has used Isidore’s etymological definition to emphasise his own point that the origin story of the Lombards should be discounted. There are at the same time less obvious impulses at work which have been affected by Isidore’s work. Due to its circulation and importance, he was not able to disregard the tale entirely. Instead, following Isidore’s lead where Isidore has managed and manipulated the origins of the Goths, Paul attempted to re-formulate the presentation to mitigate the pagan details of his material. One generation later, the anonymously written *HL Codex Gothani* excluded the origin story of the Lombards entirely and draw a veil of silence over the whole mythic episode, preferring to simply ascribe the name to the length of beards of the *Winnili*.\(^1\) With his second book, the narrative follows the Lombards from the north to Italy and it is here, subsequently, that we can also discern Isidorian influence on the structure and composition of the material.

‘Touching briefly upon other provinces of Italy’

Whilst the first book moves the story of the Lombards forward from the north to the Elbe and on to Pannonia and finally Italy, book II deals with the period from the use of the Lombards as unruly allies by Narses in the Gothic wars in 552 up to the murder of the Lombard king, Cleph (572-4) in 574. The structure of the book can be divided as the following slightly simplified schedule shows in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Simplified Structure of Book II of the <em>Historia Langobardorum</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A¹</td>
<td>The Victory of Narses and the Advent of the Lombards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interlude: Gaul in 561, Pope Benedict I &amp; Paul of Aquileia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B¹</td>
<td>The death of Narses &amp; Alboin and the Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interlude: Venantius Fortunatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Alboin, Venetia and the Italian Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A²</td>
<td>The Undoing of Alboin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B²</td>
<td>Cleph and the Lombard Dukes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book II has a complex set of interlocking narrative threads that associate, on the one hand, Narses and the misfortunes of Byzantine Italy with, on the

---

\(^1\) Waitz (ed.), *MGH SrL*, pp. 7-12; Berto, *Testi Storici*, p. 5 (of the text) for further references.
other hand, Alboin and the good fortune of the Lombards. If one sets aside the narrative interludes in the structural arrangement, one may discern that the geographical section knits the separate parts of the book together and acts as a chiastic pivot. Standing at this point in the book, the reader is encouraged to associate the Lombard arrival in Italy with providential rule over the entire peninsula and associated islands. Paul’s descriptions are not as hyperbolic as the highly accomplished Laus Spaniae but nonetheless we are told of the ‘very rich cities of Capua, Neapolis and Salernus’ (opulentissimae urbes); of the very fertile plain of Capua’ (uberrima); that Emilia is ‘adorned with wealthy cities’ (Haec locupletibus urbibus decoratur); and Ravenna is the ‘most noble of cities’ (nobilissima urbs). Where one might expect rhetorical flourish or even a riposte to Isidore’s classical allusions on Italy in the Laus Spaniae, these are not deployed. Instead, Paul’s depiction of each of the provinces and his emplacement of it between an account of Alboin’s capture of most of Venetia and his entry into Mediolanum mirrors for the Lombards – the marriage of Iberia and the Visigoths – thus, we understand that it is the Lombards who are the ruler-heirs of the Romans in Italy, as Paul points out at the very start of the book.

In terms of content book II of the HL has the greatest accumulation of Isidorian material. A significant cluster of references is contained within a section of the book which introduces the provinces of Italy. Debate amongst scholars in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries concentrated on the sources of Paul’s excursus, the origins of errors in the text, and the correlations between and across extant manuscript copies. Isidore’s influence upon both the formulation and creation of the excursus has attracted rather less attention. There are two features here that merit closer scrutiny: first, the use and knowledge of the Etymologiae; and, secondly, the impact of Isidore upon Paul’s structural arrangement of the book.

52 The closest the Lombard kingdom came to making this a reality was with the capture of the Exarchate of Ravenna in 751.
53 Foulke, History of the Lombards, p. 73; and, Waitz (ed.), MGH SrL, p. 82.
54 Foulke, History of the Lombards, p. 73; and, Waitz (ed.), MGH SrL, p. 82.
56 Foulke, History of the Lombards, p. 75; and, Waitz (ed.), MGH SrL, p. 83.
57 Merrills, History and Geography, pp. 35-46.
58 See Jacobi, Die Quellen; Waitz (ed.), MGH SrL, pp. 25-26; Schmidt, Zur Geschichte; and Mommsen, ‘Die Quellen’.
59 Waitz insisted that the additions in what he termed the Catalogus Provinciarum Italiæ were drawn mostly from Isidore – see Waitz (ed.), MGH SrL, pp. 188-189. For context, see Foulke, History of the Lombards, p. 383.
Paul’s excursus on the Italian provinces occupies the central third of book II. In eleven chapters he describes eighteen provinces commencing with *Venetia* and *Histria* in chapter 14 and concluding with the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica in chapter 22. There is much of interest in these chapters, not least Paul’s extensive use and re-use of classical authorities.\(^6^0\) It is particularly noteworthy that we see Paul both updating and adapting material from the *Etymologiae* in his text. His notices in this section follow a pattern. He commences with the etymological foundations of the provincial name, discusses particular features of that area (e.g. lakes, mountains), and lists the important cities. In chapter 16, for instance, Paul describes *Tuscia* and Umbria. We are told:

_Sexta provincia Tuscia est, quae a ture, quod populus illius superstitione in sacrificiis deorum suorum incendere solebant, sic appellate est._

The sixth province is Tuscia which is thus called from *tus* which its people were wont to burn superstitiously in the sacrifices to their Gods.\(^6^1\)

And

_Umbria autem dicta est, quod imbribus superfuerit, cum aquosa clades olum populos devastaret_

... and it is called Umbria because it remained above the furious rains when long ago a watery scourge devastated the nations.\(^6^2\)

Both these passages reveal a connection to Isidore for their etymological foundations. Their example could be replicated with further instances in the geographical section.\(^6^3\) Whilst this use of Isidore is significant, Paul’s adaptation of this structural segment into his historical narrative is of fundamental importance in appreciating Paul’s agenda in this part of the *HL*. Although Paul does not explicitly follow the Isidorian arrangement of the *Laus Spaniae* and *Laus Gothorum* to open and close the narrative, his

---

\(^6^0\) For geography in Carolingian Europe see Lozovsky, ‘Roman Geography’, pp. 325-364. Classical authorities used include Pliny, Pomponius Mela and the *Geographia Ravennatis*.

\(^6^1\) Waitz (ed.), *MGH SRL*, p. 82; and, Foulke, *History of the Lombards*, p. 72.

\(^6^2\) Waitz (ed.), *MGH SRL*, p. 82; and, Foulke, *History of the Lombards*, p. 73.

\(^6^3\) For Isidore’s comments see Barney et al., *Etymologies*, p. 196 (Tuscia IX.2.86) and p. 251 (Umbria XIV.4.20); and, Reta & Casquero, *San Isidoro de Sevilla*, p. 184. Further influence may be detected in *HL* II.14, II.17, II.18, II.20 and II.22, II.23 and II.24, which describe how the Galatians and the etymology of Italy are also influenced by Isidore’s *Etymologies*. 
delineation of the Italian provinces allows him to promote Lombard kings as the heirs of the Byzantine Empire in the Italian peninsula.

The construction of textual identities and the adaptation, adoption, and manipulation of texts is neither straightforward nor simple. Although the focus of Isidore and Paul the Deacon varied, their aims were similar in respect of the creation and progress of their chosen gentes. Paul as an ‘assiduous user of sources’ was able to bring Isidore to the foreground in the HL on two crucial occasions. As we have noted, Paul provides two readings of the origin story of the Lombards. In the first, he presents a detailed tradition redolent of a northern pagan ambience; but, in the second, familiar to his clerical and intellectual audiences, he not only discounts the story but uses the authority of Isidore to provide a straightforward etymological response. This turn to Isidore, as authority, is illustrative of his use of materials from the Etymologiae in book II of the HL where Isidore is the basis for his comments – but also, at this point, as a rhetorical template for the description of the Italian provinces. Having associated the Lombards with all of Italy, Paul was subsequently free to develop his themes in the remaining four books of the HL.

Although, as we have seen, it is possible to identify the imprint of Isidore’s influence in a number of respects in his HR and HL, Paul does not make explicit reference to the authority of Isidore. Similarly, even though one might be tempted to see Paul’s excursus on the Italian provinces as a riposte to Isidore’s Laus Spaniae, one cannot be certain that Paul knew or consulted Isidore’s Historia Gothorum and consequently formulated this digression. Instead, it is possible to indicate that Isidore was one of many authorities that Paul used to enhance his work. In this respect, Isidore’s authority allowed Paul to approach and resolve the difficult and uncertain history of the Lombards and to provide his own providential account of his own history and gens.
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Rylands MS Latin 12

A Carolingian Example of Isidore's Reception into the Patristic Canon

Melissa Markauskas

Introduction

Rylands MS Latin 12 is a homiliary – a collection of readings set for specific occasions during the liturgical calendar – of medium size (295 x 210 mm). It includes some minimally decorated initials, but otherwise is a quite workman-like, practical copy. It was very likely written at the scriptorium at Luxeuil Abbey, which was originally founded in the late sixth century by the Irish monk Columbanus but refounded in the Carolingian period under the Benedictine rule. This is the period in which the core of the manuscript was written. It remained at Luxeuil until at least the eighteenth century, after which it moved from the continent to London, and ultimately to Manchester.

Setting aside the later addition of the first quire, Rylands MS Latin 12 is arranged liturgically and encompasses the entire year, albeit limited to particular saints’ festivals within the calendar. The texts excerpted are for the most part what we would term “Patristic”, with Bede appearing as the latest identifiable author. Many, but not all, of the manuscript’s choices of readings correspond to the so-called Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary. One

1 Abbreviations:
PD (I & II) = Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, in Grégoire, Homélaires Liturgiques Médiévaux.
PDT = Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, Homiliae de Tempore, PL 95, 1159A-1457B.
PDS = Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, Homiliae de Sanctis, PL 95, 1457C-1565C.
Rylands = Rylands MS Lat 12. See Appendix 1 for full manuscript description.

2 Victor Perrin (d.1740), sub-prior of Luxeuil, wrote a description of the manuscript on paper that has since been bound into the manuscript. He discusses as evidence of the MS’s Luxeuil origins an inscription copied onto f. 10r: “Luxouio et BRIXIAE . G. IVL. / FIRMAR . IVS . V. S . L . M”. See also Salmon, Le Lectionnaire du Luxeuil, xliv, who lists this Rylands MS among four definitely copied at Luxeuil.

3 Dated on paleographical grounds in: Jones, ‘Dom Victor Perrin’, who concluded that the second to eighteenth quires dated from the early ninth century, produced as a single piece of work.

4 James and Taylor, A Descriptive Catalogue, 11*-12*.

5 See Appendix 1 for full details of the manuscript’s contents.
particularly noteworthy variation for the purposes of this volume is the curious inclusion of a high number of excerpts of Isidore of Seville’s *De Ortu et obitu patrum* (hereafter *DOOP*), a text that was written between 598 and 615 and gives brief accounts of the lives and deaths of a number of figures from the Bible.\(^6\) Isidore combined scriptural material with biblical commentaries and a small number of histories and chronicles to create a sacred chronology focused on the Old Testament.\(^7\) Although by no means one of Isidore’s major works, the *DOOP* did circulate relatively widely, often in combination with other Isidorian works, and was excerpted as a source by compilers of biographical catalogues elsewhere in the early medieval West.\(^8\)

This chapter sheds light on Isidore’s reception in the Carolingian period, using this manuscript to consider how and why Isidore would have been redeployed in this liturgical context. It examines the relationship between the Isidorian material and the other texts with which it was copied in Rylands MS Latin 12 and contextualises the manuscript and the use made of Isidore by reference to Carolingian homiliary production more generally. Discussions of the Carolingian use of Isidore typically focus on his influence on Carolingian historiography.\(^9\) This chapter is instead concerned with Isidore far from the exploits of kings, where he was re-used in a solidly liturgical, monastic context.

**Carolingian Homiliaries**

Homiliaries as a book-type predate the Carolingian period, but gained wider prominence and production as a highlighted element of Carolingian ecclesiastical reform.\(^10\) In his 802 *De Examinandis Ecclesiasticis*, Charlemagne listed homilies for all feast days among the minimum required knowledge for all priests.\(^11\) The 813 reform councils of Rheims and Tours make specific reference to the duty to preach ‘the sermons and homilies of the Holy Fathers’.\(^12\) The statutes of Riculf, of Hincmar of Rheims, and of another

---

\(^6\) For introduction to the text and further discussion of its key characteristics see: Inglebert, ‘Renommée et sainteté’, esp. 985-988; the best modern edition is: Chaparro Gómez, *Isidoro de Sevilla. De ortu et obitu patrum*.

\(^7\) Inglebert, ‘Renommée et sainteté’, 977-988.

\(^8\) Dolbeau, ‘Nouvelles recherches’.

\(^9\) E.g. McKitterick, *History and Memory*, 49, 54-55, 238-239, 246-247; see also Christopher Heath’s chapter in this volume on Isidore’s influence on Paul the Deacon’s historical works.

\(^10\) Grégoire, *Homéliaires*, 1-422.

\(^11\) *De Examinandis Ecclesiasticis*, MGH Cap. I, c. 4, 10, p. 358.
anonymous author recommend that individual copies of Gregory the Great’s Homiliae in evangelia be available for every priest, while the statutes of Haito of Basle demand an unspecified homiliary that encompassed each Sunday and feast day throughout the year. Carolingian imperial and conciliar legislation clearly promoted homiliaries as a necessary part of the Carolingian sacerdotal library. However, this promotion has tended to be narrowly interpreted in light of its potential effect on popular preaching, leading scholars to privilege both the pastoral uses of homiliaries and the contemporary composition of homily texts. This focus ignores the fact that Carolingian copies of Patristic homiliaries far outnumber the so-called ‘Carolingian’ composed homiliaries. Furthermore, it also overlooks that Charlemagne’s one commission for a ‘state’ homiliary, that given to Paul the Deacon, emphasised a correction and revision of the Night Office drawn from the fathers of the Church, an obviously monastic rather than pastoral use.

As noted in the brief overview of its travels offered above, Rylands MS Latin 12 belongs squarely to a monastic context as it spent the first nine centuries of its existence at Luxeuil Abbey. Its correspondences to the content/arrangement of the so-called Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary also link the manuscript to a monastic context.

Rylands MS Latin 12

Rylands MS Latin 12 has itself been seldom studied, with James’s catalogue entry from the 1920s providing only an incomplete identification of the

13 Haito of Basle, MGH Cap. I, c.6, p. 366.
14 Gatch, Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England, 34, considers Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary to be too exegetical in content for popular preaching, and therefore unlikely to be implied the legislation discussed above.
16 Charlemagne is claimed to have read the work himself before giving his approval and arranging distribution. His prefatory letter is printed at PL 95, col. 1159.
17 McKitterick, Charlemagne, 316, links Paul’s homiliary with the Carolingian production of a “corrected” Old and New Testament.
18 For the most recent work on Paul the Deacon’s homiliary, including up-to-date bibliography see: McKitterick, ‘Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 334’, including reference to Paul’s use of Isidore at pp. 188-190.
manuscript’s contents. My own investigation began by providing firm identification for all Patristic extracts in the manuscript. Thus, I will begin with a brief analysis of the manuscript’s construction, decoration, and arrangement to offer a more comprehensive contextualisation of the Isidorian material within the manuscript. I will then outline the overall parallels between the Rylands MS and Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary before turning to the Isidorian material, which appears to be unusual among the family of ‘Paul the Deacon’-type homiliaries so far identified.

Rylands MS Latin 12 binds together three main sections that show clear signs of separate production. Its core is the final seventeen quires, which are preceded by an additional six leaves of paper and a medieval first quire. The paper leaves contain an eighteenth-century description of the second and third sections by Dom Victor Perrin (d. 1740), the sub prior of Luxeuil Abbey. He indicates that the homiliary began with Fulgentius of Ruspe (f.1r) in his day, so it is certain that the first quire was part of the manuscript at least by this time. A hand very similar to his has written ‘homiliae sanctorum patrum’ at the top of f.1r, suggesting that Perrin viewed the second and third sections as a whole. However, as the second section contains no Isidorian material, my discussion will focus mainly on the third and largest section.

Quires two through eighteen contain what is described on f.10v, as a ‘Liber de Nataliciis Sanctorum’. Though it does not contain the entire liturgical cycle, the material for the saints’ feasts found there is arranged according to the liturgical calendar. The main cycle (ff.10v-96r) progresses from St Stephen on the seventh Kalends of January (Dec 26) to St Thomas the Apostle on the twelfth Kalends of January (Dec 21), followed by three readings that are given for the martyrs (ff.96r4-106v3). Next comes a further cycle of recapitulatio, alternative readings, which are also arranged liturgically from St Agnes to St Thomas the Apostle (ff. 106v4-132r4). The collection concludes with an incomplete copy of Serapion’s De Octo Principalibus Vitiis taken from John Cassian (ff.132r5-143v).

19 James and Taylor, A Descriptive Catalogue, 11*-12*.
20 See Appendix 1.
21 See Appendix 1, Rylands i.1. James and Taylor, Catalogue, 33-36, gives a partial transcription of Perrin’s account.
22 Rylands III.1-39. I will discuss the significance of the particular saints venerated below.
23 Rylands III.40-42.
24 Rylands III.43-60.
25 Rylands III.61. It is difficult to assess the relation to the rest of the collection. The Serapion text is written by the manuscript’s main scribe. Jones, ‘Victor Perrin’, 179. It completes the second
The third section of the homiliary is a working copy with minimal decoration. The text in the third section of the homiliary appears in consistent one-column blocks with an average of twenty-nine lines per page. Fifty-three of the sixty-one items begin with rubricated titles, while the other changes of text are indicated with a dot of rubrication in the first letter of the next text or a marginal note. Sometimes there is no indication at all. The textual format for titled items over the first calendrical cycle is usually consistent, with rubric headings listing in order the calendar date, the festal occasion, the gospel from which the homily pericope comes (not always rubricated), the pericope itself (never rubricated), and finally the attributed author. The homily text itself begins with a minimally decorated initial in red and brown-black, the colours of the main text and the rubrication. These initials vary in detail, with few as fine as the initial on f.10v, beginning the first homily. In the remaining items, those described as ‘for martyrs’ and the recapitulatia, the titles omit the calendar date, and more frequently omit the gospel, the pericope, and the author. As a hint towards the manuscript’s overall tendencies towards the Isidorian material, which will be discussed later, it is worth noting here that most of the excerpts that omit such details are those taken from the DOOP.

The table of homilies of f.10r lists thirty capitula, listing the saint’s or saints’ names only and eight numerals for De plurimorum recapitulationibus sanctorum. This table matches the first thirty ‘titled’ items in the following folios, though it subsumes several paired items under one capitulum. The main hand of f.10v has not filled in attributions for the eight recapitulatia. A further hand has indicated the presence of relevant recapitulatia in the margin beside the foot of related readings in the first cycle. The table of homilies and the recapitulatia marginal notes suggest two methods by half of quire XVII and continues over the whole of quire XVIII, but the text remains incomplete. As a further curiosity, the final four lines of the recapitulatio for St Thomas at the head of f. 132r have been crossed out.

26 Rylands III.3-4, ff. 16v10, 17v9.
27 Rylands III.27, f. 69r15.
28 Not Rylands III.10, 18, 24, 25, 28, 32.
29 Rylands III.26 gives the occasion before the date.
30 Not Rylands III.10, 18, 32.
31 Not Rylands III.10, 18.
32 Not Rylands III.39.
34 For example, beside f. 64v11, there are two marginal notes (one certainly a "re-copy" of the other) indicating an alternative reading for James, the brother of John the Evangelist.
which the following texts were used, emphasising that quires II-XVIII alone enjoyed use as a complete work in its early life.

Rylands MS Latin 12 and the So-called Paul the Deacon’s Homily

Despite their use and production being advocated by Carolingian ecclesiastical reforms, Carolingian homiliaries have been relatively little studied and their serious examination has only begun in recent years. It is still true, as McKitterick noted in the 1970s, in reference to Grégoire’s *Les Homéliaires du Moyen Âge* and the homiliaries printed in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*, that studies of the homiliaries themselves remain at the level of catalogue entries, sacrificing much of the richness of manuscript variance.35 Barré’s *Les Homéliaires Carolingiens de l’École d’Auxerre* and Grégoire’s more recent *Homéliaires Liturgiques Médiévaux* are invaluable comparisons of most known homiliary collections, but they are by necessity selective rather than exhaustive in their use of manuscripts.36

Barre and Grégoire offer indices for the extracts chosen in many Merovingian and Carolingian homiliary collections which pre-date Rylands MS Latin 12.37 The Rylands MS contains none of the Auxerrois ‘Carolingian’-composed homilies, and parallels between the patristic sources reproduced in the Auxerrois homiliaries are few. Among the earlier homiliaries investigated by Grégoire, only Paul the Deacon’s *Homily* offers significant parallels with *Rylands MS Latin 12* sharing almost thirty of its sixty-eight homiletic items.38 The homiliary of Agimond has the next most concordances: a mere four. The Roman homiliary known as that of Alan of Farfa offers only two.39 There are no parallels between Rylands MS Latin 12 and the two seventh-century Luxeuil lectionnaires considered by Grégoire.40 Grégoire also noted that while homiliary collections before the Carolingian reforms show substantial overlap amongst themselves in terms of their text selections, the collection he termed that of Paul the Deacon showed

---

35 McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, 103.
38 Excluding antiphons.
39 Grégoire, *Homéliaires*, Agimond II.85, p. 363 (Rylands III.20), II.113, p. 370 (Rylands III.21); II.20, p.376 (Rylands III.23); III.34, p.380 (Rylands III.38); Alan of Farfa, 88a, p.184 (Rylands III.8); 80, p. 181 (Rylands III.8).
almost total divergence, suggesting a significant difference in liturgical practice following the Carolingian reforms. Rylands MS Latin 12 confirms this trend.

There has not yet been a critical study investigating the manuscript tradition of Paul the Deacon's *Homiliary*. Thus, it is impossible to comment on whether the copyist of Rylands MS Latin 12 had access to any particular copy. The homiliary appears in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*, reprinting a 1539 Cologne version that includes a homily cycle ‘de tempore’ of 202 items followed by another ‘de sanctis’ of 96 items. Migne’s version is obviously interpolated as it includes the later ninth-century homiliaries of Haimo and Heirc of Auxerre. The un-interpolated version proposed by Wiegand in the late nineteenth century remains authoritative, with a trimmer 244 items, 110 items in the winter section, and ninety-nine in the summer section, which also included a further thirty-five ‘generic’ items to be used commonly for saints’ feasts. The most recent account of the homiliary, by Grégoire, does not substantially alter Wiegand’s list aside from more recent textual identifications and some altered capitula.

Despite the substantial differences between the versions edited by Migne and Wiegand, twenty-four of the Rylands extracts correspond to the same-titled extracts in both versions, with a slightly greater number of odd items

41 Wiegand, *Homiliarum*, 69-78, 83-96. For more recent if briefer comments, see also: McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, 33-36; Fassler, ‘Sermons, Sacrementaries, and Early Sources for the Office in the Latin West’.

42 Szarmach, ‘Vercelli’, 77. Cf. The English manuscript tradition only is considered in Smetana, ‘Paul the Deacon’s Patristic Anthology’. Zachary Guiliano is currently involved in a project to index known examples of ‘Paul the Deacon’ type homiliaries at the University of Cambridge. This will allow for a better understanding of the relative uniqueness of particular extract selections amongst this corpus. At an early stage of research, Guiliano indicated in personal correspondence that Isidorian material is rare among such homiliaries.


44 PL 95, cols. 1159-1565. On Migne’s 1539 source, see: Smetana, ‘Paul the Deacon’s Patristic Anthology’, 87-88.


46 Grégoire, *Homéliaires*, 423-477. It is unclear from where these differences arise. Though his edition considers two additional manuscripts, Grégoire states that he has taken his capitula from Munich Clm 4533 (winter) and Clm 4534 (summer), which are manuscripts his study shares with Wiegand’s edition. Grégoire, *Homéliaires*, 427. Further explanation of this difference is another line of enquiry frustrated by the lack of a concordance between Paul the Deacon manuscripts. On their choice of manuscripts, see Wiegand, *Homiliarum*, 5-12; Grégoire, *Homéliaires*, 425-426.

47 Rylands II.1, 5, 6, III.1, 5, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 55, 56. See also Appendix 2.
matching in the Wiegand edition compared to Migne’s. As Rylands MS Latin 12 focuses on saints’ feasts, it is not surprising that most (though not all) of the concordances are found in Migne’s ‘de sanctis’ cycle or the saints commonly found in Wiegand. In Victor Perrin’s eighteenth-century description of the manuscript, he suggested that Luxeuil had presumably once had another codex covering the festivals related to Jesus Christ and the mysteries, as these are entirely omitted by Rylands MS Latin 12.

As noted earlier, the homilies of quires II-XVII follow two cycles of a calendar of saints. This calendar is more expansive than the one employed by any of the reconstructed editions of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary, but it shares substantial parallels with that calendar. In comparison with Wiegand’s edition, the Rylands MS celebrates almost all the saints’ feasts that appear in Paul’s homiliary, with only three feasts absent, that of St Cyprian and two additional Marian feasts, her purification and birth. As noted above, Grégoire’s edition expands some of Wiegand’s capitula. His edition includes St Martin ‘or another confessor’, where Wiegand has only ‘saint’ or ‘confessor’ and St Felicitas ‘or another female saint’. Migne also omits Cyprian and shares with Rylands Latin 12 five additional feasts not included in Wiegand’s edition, with feasts for St Felicitas, Mary Magdalene and Luke the Evangelist appearing in Migne alone. In addition to these common feasts, the Rylands MS also includes feasts for the apostle Simon Zelotes and Judas, St Agatha of Sicily, the exaltatio of the holy Cross, St Germanus of Paris, St Medardus of Noyons, St Martin of Tours, St Denis and the martyr saints Crispin and Crispinan. Item III.7 in the Rylands MS, for St Agatha, is a text that appears in Migne and Wiegand’s editions, where it is set simply for a virgin. It would be impossible to say whether the template for Paul the Deacon’s original homiliary, which was a state project and sponsored by the Carolingians, was intended to be as freely adapted as it has been in Rylands MS Latin 12. However, the homilies incorporated a

48 Rylands III.4, 6, 13, 37, 50, 52.
49 Rylands II.12, III. 2, 8, 48.
50 Wiegand, Homiliarum.
51 These are: St Stephan, John the Evangelist, Holy Innocents, St Agnes, the apostles Philip and James, son of Alpheaus, John the Baptist (the birth and the beheading), the apostles Peter and Paul (together and separately), St Lawrence, the archangel Michael, the apostle Matthew, the apostle Andrew and the assumption of the Virgin.
52 Wiegand, Homiliarum, 73.
54 Feasts for the apostle James, son of Zebedee, the apostle Thomas, St Bartholomew, the annunciation of Mary, and the inventio of the holy cross.
55 Rylands III.7.
range of material on saints, martyrs, virgins and confessors and therefore do offer scope for selective and creative adaptation.

The copyist also included material that cannot be matched to any of the published Paul the Deacon templates, and several of the new inclusions substitute different material for feasts explicitly named in Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliary*. Between Wiegand and Migne’s frameworks, there are a possible eight items listed as suitable for the veneration of the Holy Innocents. However, Rylands MS Latin 12 has a ninth reading at item III.5, a portion of Jerome’s *Commentarii in evangelium Matthaei*. Disparities such as this may explain why the present first quire was added to the original homiliary manuscript as many of the additions in the first quire correspond to ‘missing’ Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliary* entries (see appendices for details).

Items in the Rylands MS that cannot be matched to either edition of Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliary* include extracts from Augustine’s *In Iohannis evangeliwm tractatus* and his sermons, Jerome’s *Commentarii in evangeliwm Matthaei* and his *De Viris Illustribus*, Gregory of Tours’ *Liber in gloria martyrum*, Rufinus’ Latin translations of Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*. The most frequent new addition, however, is Isidore’s *DOOP*.

Before moving on to a discussion of how often and in what ways Isidore’s text was used in this manuscript, it is worth noting that almost all of the above texts have also all been excerpted in one or other of the editions of Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliary*, and this includes Isidore’s *DOOP*. This may suggest that when the copyist inserted different readings, he or she chose to turn to the texts that Paul the Deacon had already vetted as suitable for extraction when compiling his homiliary. However, more importantly, it implies that whomever compiled the texts copied in Rylands MS Latin 12 had access not only to some sort of exemplar of Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliary*, but also access to some of the full texts from which he took his ‘homilies’.

**Isidore in Rylands Latin MS 12**

Rylands MS Latin 12 includes ten excerpts from Isidore’s *DOOP*. The manuscript only makes use of his account of a number of New Testament figures.

---

56 On the contents of Carolingian libraries, see McKitterick, *Carolingians and the Written Word*, 166-196. For homiliaries in particular, see Deleeuw, ‘Gregory the Great’s “Homilies on the Gospels”,’ 860-865. Cf. McKitterick, ‘Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 334’, 201: ‘The Homiliary [of Paul the Deacon] itself witnesses to the transmission and circulation of knowledge of particular patristic authors and their works within the Carolingian world.’
There are three excerpts in the main cycle of the readings: those for John the Evangelist, James the Lesser and Philip. They are all included following a longer text from an earlier patristic author: coincidentally the same in each case, Augustine’s *In iohannis evangelium tractatus*.

The main cycle includes the only extract for which I have located a parallel in any of the homiliary types listed by Barré or Grégoire. This is item four in the Rylands’ manuscript’s third section (*DOOP*, 72) which is item 31 in the Wiegand framework (as printed by Gregoire) and does not appear at all in Migne’s version. This short paragraph of bibliographical material about John the Evangelist is the only extract from Isidore’s *DOOP* listed by Barré or Grégoire. It is one of only two correspondences between Rylands MS Latin 12 and the so-called homiliary of Alan of Farfa (Gregoire, 145-148). It is also repeated in the homiliary of Eginon (Gregoire, 198), considered to be quite closely related to the previous homiliary type.

In general, Isidore is poorly represented among Merovingian and Carolingian homiliaries. The Alan of Farfa homiliary contains extracts from Isidore’s *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (Gregoire, 155-56), *De fide catholica contra Iudaeos* (Gregoire, 157-8, 171) and the *Sententiae* (Gregoire, 180). These are six extracts in a work that totals over one hundred and fifty items. These six exactly are repeated in the quite closely related homiliary of Eginon. (Gregoire, 198, 204, 206, 210, 216). The homiliary of St Peter of the Vatican repeats four from this group (Gregoire, 233-34, 241, 244), and those of Ottobeuren and of Agimond repeat just one of these same readings, albeit different ones (Gregoire, 338, 379). Gregoire’s account of Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliary* also includes one further Isidorian excerpt, although this is a different extract from *De ecclesiasticis officiis* than that which is found in the other homiliary types, which are far more closely related to one another (Gregoire, 433). This makes for only two Isidorian extracts among several hundred entries. The ten extracts from Isidore in Rylands MS Latin 12, just under one-sixth of the total number of entries in the manuscript’s original homiliary core, mean that it is unusually rich in its use of Isidore.

In the *recapitulationes*, a secondary cycle of readings in the Rylands manuscript, Isidore is better represented, with seven excerpts: under John the Baptist, St Paul, James the Greater, Jude, Simon the Zealot, Andrew and Thomas. Five of these appear as texts in their own right rather than simply following on from another author. This second cycle covers roughly nineteen percent of the original homiliary core, some forty-nine sides of parchment. The Isidorian material in the *recapitulationes*, seven out of eighteen texts, makes up only around seven percent of this already comparatively smaller section. In part, this is surely because Isidore’s text comprises short, pithy
chapters on each biblical figure, but it is also part of a broader trend where the Isidorian material seems to be judged worthy of inclusion in this collection, but is treated as of secondary importance to other authors.

A comparison with Gregory the Great, another author with substantial numbers of extracts in this manuscript, illustrates this point. As noted above, Gregory the Great’s homilies themselves were sometimes considered to be the only homiliary collection that a Carolingian cleric needed. Gregory’s homilies are substantial texts in their own right in contrast with the brief biographical entries that made up Isidore’s *DOOP*. Covering over thirty percent of the original homiliary core, there are more lines from Gregory in Rylands MS Latin 12 than any other author. However, this manuscript has exactly the same number of extracts from Gregory as from Isidore, ten each, with only Jerome having a greater number with ten extracts from his commentary on Matthew and a single extract from his *De Viris Illustribus*.

The use made of Isidorian material in this manuscript is comparable to a few other authors in this collection. For example, short extracts from Gregory of Tours’ *Liber in gloria martyrum* and Rufinus’ Latin translation of Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* are included in the main cycle only after a longer text. However, although their use is similar, the compiler of this manuscript reached for Isidore’s text far more frequently than Gregory of Tours or Rufinus, who are only represented by three items each. Thus, while Isidore may be second-string, his text is definitely preferred to others on that lower level.

The extracts from Isidore are also visually relegated to a second level, below the more typical Patristic authors such as Gregory the Great, Augustine, or Jerome. Entries in the main cycle typically begin with a rubricated line listing the date, the saint and the particular gospel from which that day’s reading is taken. This is followed by a gospel pericope and a further rubric listing the patristic author’s name. Despite the frequent recourse to the *DOOP*, Isidore’s name does not appear within Rylands MS Latin 12.

The Isidorian extracts, along with those of Gregory of Tours and of Rufinus, are often barely distinguishable from the text that precedes them. A squiggle mid-line is sometimes present to mark the break in texts, but at other times, no indication is given at all. Isidore’s entries among the recapitulationes are clearly distinguished from the preceding text by a rubricated title, but these titles only indicate the saint that the extract concerns. Even among the recapitulationes, ‘Patristic’ authors like Augustine or Bede are named in a rubric. One exception to this is the extract from Jerome’s *De Viris Illustribus*. While Jerome is otherwise usually named in the rubric, here his text seems to be treated similarly to Isidore and the other ‘second-string’
texts. Perhaps this can be explained by the encyclopedic nature of this particular text, in contrast with the more obviously exegetical content of the commentary on Matthew from which all other Jerome extracts in this manuscript derive.

The fact that Isidore’s name is not associated with the extracts from the *DOOP* is striking. Carolingian texts do not always explicitly signal their Patristic contents, but this manuscript does indicate a Patristic author in most cases. The *DOOP* therefore does not seem to be classified as the work of a church father. This suggests that Isidore was not considered to lie within the top bracket of past authorities for Carolingian copyists, although the material that he had included in the *DOOP* was judged to be useful by the manuscript’s compiler.57

### Isidore’s *De ortu et obitu patrum* in the Carolingian Period

This chapter concludes with some brief comments about how this manuscript fits into the broader Carolingian reception of Isidore, and in particular, the *DOOP*. A homiliary is a text with a liturgical context, so the focus in this manuscript on readings that expound on the gospel verse for a particular saint’s day – the longer texts like those of Gregory the Great, Augustine, and Jerome – makes obvious sense. However, we can also see value placed on more explanatory material about the saint’s life and death, which is exactly the sort of material Isidore’s *DOOP* provides. This might help to explain the attractiveness of his text in this Carolingian milieu.

Another text roughly contemporary with this manuscript makes significant use of Isidore’s *DOOP*: the universal chronicle of the ninth century historian Bishop Freculf of Lisieux.58 Written in the second quarter of the ninth century and dedicated to Charles the Bald, Charlemagne’s grandson, its twelve books cover all history from creation to the author’s own day. Yet, while Freculf sometimes takes Isidore’s details as the starting point for further elaboration on the lives of Biblical figures, Rylands MS Latin 12 adheres strictly to Isidore’s text. Freculf also does not reference Isidore’s name explicitly when he makes use of *DOOP* even when he quotes from it.

57 Here we might draw a comparison with Laura Carlson’s chapter elsewhere in this volume, which demonstrates the frequent use the *Opus Carolii* made of Isidore’s writings, although with more frequent attribution. In contrast, Christopher Heath’s chapter on Paul the Deacon’s historical writings suggests unacknowledged borrowing from Isidore.

rather than paraphrasing, although he does name other authorities such as Jerome. An examination of Freculf's chronicle shows us that, as with the Rylands manuscript, Freculf used Isidore as a source of data rather than as an authority.

Finally, coming back to the manuscript itself, Rylands Latin MS 12 shows significant medieval wear, including the re-writing of several passages in fresh ink where the original script had worn away. Occasionally, the rubrication has been copied over in blue, perhaps to remedy fading. Far more frequently, the main text itself appears to have been re-copied by tracing over the original lettering in a darker ink. This is particularly visible over ff. 86v-88v, with another interesting example at f. 111r2 where the descender of quin can be just barely discerned from beneath a later scribe's cum. The leaf 11r-12v also shows one of several stitching repairs in the manuscript.

On f. 103r, the same portion of original text is copied once over the original text space and again, in a different hand, in a marginal note. Re-copyings like this complicate the identification of the manuscript’s hands. In the only palaeographic study of the manuscript, Jones suggested that quires II-XVIII are the work of a single ninth-century scribe, except for f. 10r and f. 21v, which are a table of homily capitula and the conclusion of the homily for St Agnes and beginning of the homily for St Agatha, respectively. The different hand on f. 21v might be explained by a later scribe engaged in re-copying, particularly as this is the only folio on which a homily begins that involves absolutely no rubrication. The main hand on f. 10r may also be a later addition, a table of capitula composed on what had initially been a blank fly-leaf.

These indications suggest that the MS enjoyed use by readers concerned with the preservation of the text over a substantial period of time. This shows that this manuscript experienced significant use in the monastery. It was not a copy set aside for special occasions or display; it was clearly being used, and, given the broader context and purpose of homiliaries in this period, it seems a safe assumption that this use involved reading aloud to a monastic community. Thus, curiously, Isidore’s encyclopedic text seems to have found a place in the Carolingian liturgy. His name might not have been considered worthy of rememberance, but Isidore’s words were apparently exactly what the unknown Carolingian compiler at Luxeuil and subsequent users were looking for.

59 For example, Rylands III.45, f. 109v; Rylands III.58, f. 131v11.
60 Another example can be found at f.56. The Rylands MS shares these stitching repairs with the other Luxeuil manuscripts discussed by Jones, ‘Victor Perrin’, 178.
Appendix 1  Full Manuscript Description of Rylands MS Latin 12

Listed for each item is the encompassing folio(s), the quire number,\(^{62}\) the hand, and a suggestion for the hand's date.\(^{63}\)

For items in the two medieval sections (II & III), incipits and excipts are also provided as well as the item's identified original source and parallels between the MS and the various editions of Paul the Deacon's *Homiliary* where these exist.

Bold text in the following indicates rubrication in the manuscript.

**Homiliary**

Vellum, 295 x 210mm, ff. vi + 143.
Collation. \(I^4+(+5), II^8-V8, VI^6, VII^8-XVIII^8\).
Luxeuil. s.viii\(^{ex}-ix\).

**Section I**

1. fols. i-r-vi; i; Victor Perrin.
Victor Perrin, description of Rylands ms. Latin 12 headed *Quatrieme Manuscrit*.

**Section II**

1. fols. i-r-5v15; I; A, s.ix. Title in red uncials gone, except... *Secundum Lucam*. In illo tempore dixit Ihesus discipulis suis. Sint lumbi uestri precincti ... Dominicus sermo quem debemus ... atque utiliter habeamus. **EXPLICIT OMELIA B. FULGENTII EP. DE CONFESSORIBUS.**

*PD* II.108, p. 474. (Legendus in S. Martini vel Alterius Confessoribus)
*PDS*.84, col. 1551C. (De Confessoribus)

2. fol. 5v16-23; I; B, s.xi?. Ecce karissimi dies illa uidicit ... possideatis regna calorum. (Antiphons with neumes)

3. fol. 5v24-25; I; B. Ecce mater nostra iherusalem cum magro affectu clamat ad nos et dicit prius quam hostium. (Antiphons with neumes)

---


\(^{63}\) Following Jones, ‘Dom Victor Perrin’, 179.
4. fol. 5v26-28; I; C, s. xii? Ecce mater nostra ierusalem cum magro affectu clamat ad nos et dicit uenit filii mei dilictissimi uenite ad me ut uideatis. (Antiphons with neumes)

5. fols. 6r-6v3; I, D, s.x? SERMÓN S. SEUERIANI IN NATALI INNOCENTUM. Zelus quo tendit ... sed muneris est diuini.
   Petrus Chrysologus, *Sermones*, s. 152, lines 3-89, *PL* 52, cols.604C-607A.
   *PD* I.34, p. 436. (In Natale Innocentem)
   *PDT*, cols. 1174-1175. (In Festo Sanctorum Innocentium)

6. fols. 6v32-7v30; I, D (6v), E, s.xi? DEDICATUR NOUUS ab infantibus sermo ... victoria per interitum comparatur.
   *PD* I.35, p. 436. (De Eisdem Innocentum)
   *PDT*, as above.

7. fol. 7v31-32; I; E. Secundum Ioh. In illo tempore dixit Ihesus discipulis suis ... Sic deus dilexit mundum ... sed habeat uitam et nam [sic], et rt.
   John 3:16

8. fol. 8r1-6; I; F, s.xi? YMNUΣ DE SANCTIS INNOCENTIBUS. Saluete flores martyrum ... inpune christus tollitur. (Antiphons with neumes)

9. fol. 8r7-10; I; G, s.xi. Exultent omnes sincera mente fideles ... simeonem duxit ad dulam uenite. (Antiphons with neumes)

10. fol. 8r11-18; I; H (no date given). Te lucis auctor ... ab ... seris. (Antiphons with neumes, ink rubbed off)

11. fols. 8r19-8v15; I (no date given). Sec. Ioh. Sic deus dilexit mundum...
   Ergo quantum in medico est sanare ... homines magis tenebras quam lucem.
12. fols. 8v16-9r10; I; I. FERIA. III. SEC. IOH. ... Amen amen dico uobis qui non intrat. De inluminato [sic] illo qui natus est caecus ... uel inflama-
tione contemnunt.

   Augustine, In Iohannis evangelium tractus, tract 45, par. 1, line 1 - par.
   2, line 25, CCSL 36, pp. 388-389.

   PDT:151, In Feria Tertia Pentecostes, col. 1341B.

13. fols. 9r11-9v5; I; I; Sec. IOH. Nemo potest uenire ad me nisi pater qui misit me, traxerit eum. Magna gratiae commendatio... noli credere hoc est noli me tangere.

   Augustine, In Iohannis evangelium tractus, tract 26, par. 2, line
   4 - par. 3, line 13, CCSL 36, pp. 260-261.

14. fols. 9v6-38; I; I. Sec. Luc. Convocatis Ihesus xiieim aposolis... Concessa primum potestate signorum ... sed potestatem dedisse in qua scirent sibi ista deberi.

   Bede, In Lucae euangelium expositio, lib. 3, cap. 9, line 1104-1133,

Section III

i. fol. 10r; II; J, s.ix. Table of Contents, listing the first 30 homilies and numerals for a further 8 recapitulationibus sanctorum

1. fols. 10v-12v2; II; K, s.ix. Incipit liber de Natali/ciis sanctorum, VII. Kal.
   Ian. Natale Sancti Ste/phani diaconi et martyrис Euang. Sec. Matth. ... Dicebat Ihesus turbis Iudaeorum. Ecce ego mitto ... Dicta S. Hieronimi
   presbiteri. Hoc quod ante dixeramus ... christi ora conspicient.

   Jerome, Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei, lib. 4, lines 267-369,
   CCSL 77 (eds. D. Hurst & M. Adriaen, Turnhout, Brepols, 1969),
   pp. 218-222.

   PD I.30, p. 435. (Beati Martyri Stephani)

   PDT:29, col. 1169B. (De Sancto Stephano)

   Euang. Sec. Ioh. Dixit ihesus petro sequere me... Dicta Sancti Agustini
   Episcopi. Non parua quaestio est, cur apostolo petro ... meum terminare
   sermonem.

   Augustine, In Iohannis evangelium tractatus, tract. 124, CCSL 36,
   pp. 680-688.
PDT 35, col. 1174A. (De Sancto Joanne Apostolo Et Evangelista)

3. fols. 16v10-17r8; II; K. Iohannes vero apostolus et evangelista domini post peractum ... in hac et idolum dianae fuit ab apostolo paulo destructum
Gregory of Tours, Liber in gloria martyrum, cap. 29. MGH SS rer. Merov. 1, 2, (Krusch, 1885), p. 505.

4. fols. 17r9-17v13; II; K. Iohannes apostolus et evangelista filius zebedie frater iacobi virgo ... puluus ebulliat quieuit autem apud epesum.
Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 72, PL 83, cols. 151A-152A.
PD I.31, p. 436. (In Natale Sancti Iohannis Euangelistae)

Jerome, Commentarii in euangelium Mattheaei, lib. 1, lines 158-219, CCSL 77, pp. 14-16

Gregory the Great, Homiliae in evangelia, lib. 1, hom. 11, CCSL 141 (ed. R. Etaix, Turnhout, Brepols, 1999), pp. 73-79.
PD II.123, p. 476. (In Natale Virginum)

7. fols. 21v6-25v27; III; L (21v only), K. Non. Feb. Nat. Agathe Virg. Euang. Sec. Matt. Simile est regnum caelorum decem ... Dicta Gregorii papae. (not red) Saepe uos fratres karissimi ammoneo praua opera ... diem neque horam
Gregory the Great, Homiliae in evangelia, lib. 1 hom. 12, CCSL 141, pp. 80-88.
PD II.122, p. 476. (In Natale Virginum)
PDS.95, col. 1566C. (De Virginibus)

*PDS* 14, col. 1475B. (In Annuntiatione Beatae Mariae)

*Euang. Sec. Ioh.* Non turbetur cor uestrum... *Omelia eiusdem. Dicta b. Agustini Ep.* Hic praedicat apostolús de passione suá. Ne mortem tamquam homines tимерent ... nostro largiente reddamus ... in nomine meo hoc faciam.  
Augustine, *In Iohannis evangilium tractatus*, tract. 67, par. 1, line 5-par. 4, line 7 (end), *CCSL* 36, pp. 495-497.  
No matches, but *PDS* 15, col. 1475C. (Augustine, *In Iohannis ...*, tract. 67-68; In Festo Philippi Et Iacobi.)

10. fols. 35v5-36v25; V; K. Relatio Egesippi in hystoria ecclesiastica de Iacobi iusti passione. ‘Suscepit’, inquit, ‘ecclesiam cum apostolis frater [sic] ... rursus sceleratas iniecerint manus.  

11. fols. 36v25-37r5; V; K. Iacobus alfei episcopus hierosolymorum primus cognomento iustus... hierosolya credatur esse diruta.  
Isidore of Seville, *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum*, cap. 77, *PL* 83, cols. 153A-153B.

12. fols. 37r5-10; V; K. Philippus a bethsaida ciuitate ... suis ibidem requiescit.  
Isidore of Seville, *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum*, cap. 73, *PL* 83, cols. 152B.

Jerome, *Commentarii in evangilium Matthæi*, lib. 1, lines 1769-1845, *CCSL* 77, pp. 73-76.  
*PD* II.110, p. 474 (In Vigilia in Unius Martyris)


   Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in evangelia*, lib. 1, hom. 9, *CCL* 141, pp. 58-64.

   *PD* II, 104, p. 473. (In Natale Unius Sacerdotis)

   *PDS*.85, col. 1551C. (De Confessoribus)


   *PD* II.40, p. 460. (In Vigilia Sancti Ioannis Baptistae)

   *PDS*.19, col. 1476B. (In Vigilia Beati Ioannis Baptistae)


   *PD* II.44, p. 461. (In Natale Sancti Ioannis Baptistae)

   *PDS*.22, col. 1476C. (In Nativitate Sancti Ioannis Baptistae)

18. fols. 53r-53v18; VII; K. De eadem festuuitate (sermo) b. Maximi Ep. Festuuitatem praesentis diei ... testis fidelissimus reuelauit.

   Maximus of Turin, In nativitate sancti Joannis Baptistae III, *PL* 57, cols. 389B-390C.

   *PD* II.43, p. 461. (As above.)

   *PDS*.21, col. 1467C. (As above.)

prandissent hoc est quando [sic] tertio dominus post resurrectionem manifestauit... ut pro omnibus pateretur eius [sic] est factus.


*PD II.54*, p. 462. (In Natale S. Pauli)

*PDS*.7, col. 1461C. (In Conversione Sancti Pauli)

22. fols. 57r26-59r12; VIII; K. III. Id. Iul. Translatio corporis S. Martini Ep. Euang. Sec. Luc. Sint lumbi vestri precinti... *Omelia eiusdem lectionis b. Gregorii papae.* Sancti euangelii fratres karissimi aperta uobis est lectio ... semper timeatur.


*PD II.109*, p. 474. (De Confessoribus)

*PDS*.88, col. 1555C. (De Confessoribus)


*PD II.101*, p. 472. (In Natale Unius Apostolis)

*PDS*.72, cols. 1537B-C. (De Apostolis)


27. fol. 69r15-29; IX; K. Bartholomaeum apostolum apud Indiam ... virtutibus ac benefitiis manifestat. Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, cap. 33, MGH SS rer. Merov. 1, 2, pp. 509-510.

29. fols. 71v6-16; IX; K. In urbe autem toronica est ecclesia sanctae mariae virginis et s. ioh. baptistae nomine consecrata ... curricolo finirentur.  


31. fols. 72v8-73r13; X, K. Item quomodo potest nasci cum sit senex... nisi quia eius membra erunt ut unus ascendit audi discipulum eius inquit nostra conversatio in caelis est.
   No matches, but cf. *PDS* II.16, cols. 1475C-1475D. (Augustine, In Ioh. &c, tract 11, cap. 3ff.; In Festo Inventionis Sanctae Crucis)

32. fols. 73r14-74v5; X; K. *De serpentis exaltatione Hieronimus*. Sicut exaltatus est serpens in heremo ita exaltari oportet filius hominis iohannes apostolus dixit qui prae omnibus ... caelestia habe(bi)mus et mirabilia quae oculus non vidit nec auris auidivit nec in cor hominis ascendit quae praeparauit deus his qui diligunt eum.
   Unidentified

   Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*, tract. 80, par. 2, line 4-par. 3, line 30 (end), *CCSL* 36, pp. 528-529.


35. fols. 77v16-83v11; X-XI; K. VII. Id. Oct. Nat. S. Dionisii. Euang. Sec. Luc. Si quis venit ad me et non odit patrem... Dicta Gregorii Papae. Si consideremus, frat. kar, quae et quanta ... remedia contulit ... saecula saeculorum amen.


*PDS*.75, De Uno Martyre, col. 1543B.


*PDS*.80, De Martyribus, col. 1550D.


Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*, tract. 87-91 (fragments), *CCL 36*, pp. 541-555.

*PD* II.103, col. 473. (In Natale Unius Apostolis)

cf. *PDS*.71, col. 1537B. (De Apostolis; tract. 87-88)


*PD* II.98, p. 472. (In Natale Sancti Andreae)

*PDS*.2, col. 1457D. (In Die Sancti Andreae)

Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*, tract. 80, par. 1, line 2 - tract. 83, par. 1, l. 30 (fragments), *CCSL* 36, pp. 527-535.


40. fols. 96r4-102r9; XIII; K. De Plurimis martyribus. Euang. Sec. Matt. Si quis uult est... Dicta Gregorii. Quia dominus ac redemptor ... aeternum regnum citius adepturi sumus per eum qui ... saecula saeculorum amen.


*PD* II.118, p. 475. (*Festivitate Martyrum*) *PDS*.77, col. 1543C. (De Uno Martyre)

41. fols. 102r9-104r9; XIII-XIV; K. De plurimis martyribus. Euang. Sec. Matt. Uidens autem ihesus turbas ascendit in mortem... Dicta Hieronimi presb. Dominus ad montana conscendit ... opere compleure.


42. fols. 104r9-106v3; XIV; K. De plurimis martyribus. Euang. Sec. Matt. Dicta S. Gregorii. Sancti evangelii fr. kar. brevis est lectio ... carnalia desideria in menta trucidamus, ipso adiuvante ... sancta sanctorum amen.


Ps.-Ambrose, *PL* 17, s. 48, cols. 701-705; Maximus of Turin, *PL* 57, s. 56, cols. 643-648.

44. fols. 109r4-109v13; XIV; K. Recapitulatio Iohannes Bapista. Iohannes Baptistae filius Zacharie ex tribu Leui ... greco sermone Augustan vocauit. Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 66, PL 83, cols. 147B-148B.


PD II.45, p. 461. (In Vigilia Sancti Petri)
PDS.23, col. 1476D. (In Vigilia Apostolorum Petri Et Pauli)

46. fols. 111v11-114v8; XV; K. Item de eadem festiuitate sermo Maximi. Gloriosissimos christianae fidei principes ... ibi regni sui principes collocaret. Maximus of Turin, Homilies, hom. 68, In natali beatissimorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum I, PL 57, cols. 391-396B.

PD II.47, p. 461. (De Natali Beatissimorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli) PDS.32, col. 1484C. (In Comemoratione Sancti Pauli)

47. fols. 114v9-115v6; XV; K. Cuius supra de eadem festiuitate. Apostolici natalis gaudio ... effusione devoti sanguinis consecrarunt. Maximus of Turin, Homilies, hom. 69, De eodem natali sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli II, PL 57, cols. 397A-398B.


48. fols. 115v6-119r7; XV; K. Item de eadem die. Euang. Sec. Matt. Venit ihesus in partes cesariae phillipi... Omelia Bedae presb. respondens simon petrus dixit: tu es christus filius dei uiui... Notet autem dilectio vestra... accipiemus coronam uitae ... saecula saeculorum amen. Bede, Homiliarum evangelii libri ii, lib. 1, hom. 20, l. 47-226, CCSL 122, pp. 145-146.

PDS.11, cols. 1465D-1470B. (In Cathedra Sancti Petri)
49. fols. 119r8-119v12; XV; K. Simon petrus filius iohannis frater andreae ortus bethsaida... urbis veneratione celebratur.

50. fols. 119v13-120r17; XV-XVI; K. Item sermo b. Agustini de Nat. S. Pauli. Amen inquit dico uobis quod uos qui secuti estis me ... hic dicimus cum suis discipulis iudicaturum Iesum ... regenerata per fidem.
   PD II.55, p. 463. (In Natale S. Pauli)

51. fols. 120r17-120v24; XVI; K. Paulus qui ante saulus. Apostolus gentium aduocatus iudaorum a christo de caelo uocatus in terram prostratus ... septimo tertio ab urbe roma miliario contra orientalem plagam
   Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 69, PL 83, cols. 150A-150B.

52. fols. 120v24-125r9; XV-XVI; K. Recapitulatio Natale Sancto Iacobi. Ome- lia Agustini ep. Hoc est praeeptum meum. Siue dicatur preceptum sive mandatum ex uno verbo graco utrumque ... ad ratione salutis.
   Augustine, In Iohannis evangelium tractatus, tract. 83, par. 2 - tract. 86, par. 3 (end), CCSL 36, pp. 535-543.
   PD II.102, p. 472. (Natale Unius Apostoli)

53. fol. 125v10-16; XVI; K. Iacobus filius zebedei frater iohannis quartus ... sepultusque est in achaia marmarica.
   Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 71, PL 83, col. 151A.

54. fols. 125v16-126r8; XVI; K. In illo autem tempore sine dubio tempus quod sub claudio ... in apostolorum actibus conscripta nosse docet.
   Eusebius of Caesarea, Historia ecclesiastica, trans. Rufinus, lib. 2, cap. 9-10, par. 1, l.6, Corpus Berolinensis, vol. 9,1 + 9,2, pp. 125-127.

55. fols. 126r9-126v12; XVI; K. Recapitulatio S. Iohannis. Sermo Iohannis Ep. Heu me quid agam ... salationis accepit.
   John Chrysostom (?), In Decollatione Beati Joannis Baptistae, PL 95, cols. 1508D-1509C (excerpt).
   PD II.72, p. 466. (In Decollatione S. Joannis Baptistae)
   PDS.50. (As above.)
   PD II.99, p. 472. (In S. Matthaei Apostoli)
   PDS 55, col. 1522B. (In Die Sancti Matthaei)

57. fols. 131v6-10; XVII; K. Recapitulatio S. Iudae Ap. Iudas iacobi frater ... in nerito arminiae urbe.
   Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 78, PL 83, col. 153B.

58. fols. 131v11-20; XVII; K. Recapitulatio S. Symonis Ap. Simon zelotes qui prius dictus est chanaeus ... sortes proprias acceperunt.
   Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 80-81, PL 83, cols. 153C-154A.

   Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 70, PL 83, col. 151A.

60. fols. 131v26-132r4; XVII; K. Recapitulatio S. Thomas Ap. Thomas Christi discipulus didimus ... sepultus est in honore.
   Isidore of Seville, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, cap. 74, PL 83, col. 152B.

61. fols. 132r5-143v; XVII-XVIII; K. Inc. Sermo B. Sarapionis de octo uitiis principalibus. In illo coetu antiquissimorum senum fuit vir nomine sarapion ... qui cum universas cordis.
   Serapion, De Octo Principalibus Vitiis, cap. 1-23 (incomplete), in John Cassian, Conférences, pt. 1.5, PL 49, cols. 609D-640A.
Appendix 2  Parallels Between Rylands MS Latin 12 and Gregoire's and Migne's Editions of Paul the Deacon's *Homiliary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ryl. Lat 12</th>
<th>Gregoire's edition</th>
<th>Migne's edition</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
<td>PD I</td>
<td>PD II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hom. 108</td>
<td>hom. 84</td>
<td>Fulgentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>hom. 34</td>
<td>hom. 38</td>
<td>Severiani/P. Chr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>hom. 35</td>
<td>hom. 39</td>
<td>Chrysostom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>hom. 151</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III</strong></td>
<td>hom. 30</td>
<td>hom. 29</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hom. 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>hom. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isidore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>hom. 123</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>hom. 122</td>
<td>hom. 95</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>hom. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>~hom. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isidore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isidore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>hom. 110</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>hom. 104</td>
<td>hom. 85</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>hom. 40</td>
<td>hom. 19</td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>hom. 44</td>
<td>hom. 22</td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>hom. 43</td>
<td>hom. 21</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>hom. 54</td>
<td>hom. 7</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>hom. 109</td>
<td>hom. 88</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>hom. 101</td>
<td>hom. 72</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>hom. 68</td>
<td>hom. 42</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>~hom. 43 / 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryl. Lat 12</td>
<td>Gregoire’s edition</td>
<td>Migne’s edition</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD I</td>
<td>PD II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>~hom. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>~hom. 100</td>
<td>~hom. 69</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>hom. 112</td>
<td>hom. 75</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>hom. 116</td>
<td>hom. 80</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>hom. 103</td>
<td>~hom. 71</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>hom. 98</td>
<td>hom. 2</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>~hom. 100</td>
<td>~hom. 69</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>hom. 118</td>
<td>hom. 77</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>hom. 124</td>
<td>hom. 34</td>
<td>Gregory I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>hom. 62</td>
<td>hom. 5</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>hom. 45</td>
<td>hom. 23</td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>hom. 47</td>
<td>hom. 32</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>hom. 48</td>
<td>hom. 25</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>hom. 11</td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>hom. 55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>hom. 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isidore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>hom. 72</td>
<td>hom. 50</td>
<td>Chrysostom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>hom. 99</td>
<td>hom. 55</td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serapion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Adoption, Adaptation, & Authority

The Use of Isidore in the Opus Caroli

Laura Carlson

The art historian Ernst Kitzinger once framed the period between the fourth and the ninth centuries as one overwhelmed with talk about images. The eighth century certainly would seem to illustrate his case. The adoption and subsequent abandonment of Iconoclasm by the Byzantine Empire rekindled a long-standing debate about the appropriateness of imagery in Christian worship throughout the Mediterranean world, engaging not only the Byzantines, but also the papacy and the emergent Carolingian Empire. The formal repeal of Iconoclasm at the 787 Second Council of Nicaea produced not one but two Carolingian treatises that explicitly discussed and rejected Byzantine image theory. Both treatises, the earlier, and now lost, Capitulare adversus Synodum and the later Opus Caroli regis Contra Synodum (often referred to as the Libri Carolini), often are contextualized as ‘response’ texts, written specifically to combat the conclusions reached at Nicaea, where the Byzantines revealed a new image-inclusive spiritual policy. That Nicaea was the instigation behind these two texts cannot be denied; however, the presumed centrality of image theory in the Opus Caroli can obscure the broader insight it (and presumably the lost Capitulare) provides on the emergent linguistic philosophy within the Carolingian intellectual world. Yes, the Opus Caroli was written to combat a new Byzantine perspective of the spiritual worth of images, but in doing so it advocated a specifically Carolingian understanding of language, reflective of a growing incorporation of the etymological and linguistic philosophy of classical, late antique, and early medieval writers, specifically Isidore of Seville. The core of the Opus Caroli is not images, but language.

What has often been called the working copy of the Opus Caroli (Vaticanus Latinus 7207) clearly once commanded considerable attention at the Carolingian court. At least four distinct hands worked on the text, resulting in over 3,400 distinct corrections as well as marginal notes in Tironian


2 Unfortunately the Capitulare itself does not survive, available now only partially via the Responsum prepared to it by Pope Hadrian, c. 793. Hadrian, Epistola 2, pp. 6–57.
shorthand. Although this early manuscript lacks a title, preface, or the majority of Book One, a later, more complete, and polished manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 663) attributes the work to Charlemagne (‘The Work of Charles against the Synod’), a textual example of the Frankish king’s spiritual as well as political sphere of influence. The significance of this attribution is rarely commented upon but it should serve to indicate the text’s one-time prominence within the Carolingian intellectual world. The attachment of Charlemagne’s name to the text provided a broader cultural and geopolitical context for the image debate, in which the Carolingians (as a whole) dismissed the cultural, political, and theological legitimacy of Byzantium. Analysing the text is daunting due to its size (four books of 120 chapters); however, its heft provides unparalleled access to a singular attempt at representing Carolingian linguistic and semiotic theory. The text’s predominant author, Theodulf of Orléans, worked largely as a ghost-writer (his name does not appear in any of the extant manuscripts), accorded the responsibility of demonstrating the superiority of Carolingian spiritual ideology to that of the Byzantines. Such an ideology was not an inclusive one. Similarly seen in attitudes towards the pagan Saxons or the Spanish Adoptionists, blanket condemnation and even violence were frequent tools of enforcing Carolingian interpretations of Christianity. Accordingly, this chapter will not examine Theodulf’s (and, by proxy, the Carolingians’) mastery of Byzantine theology, but instead will analyse his explanation of Carolingian image theory in terms of its milieu of the late eighth century Carolingian intellectual world. Theodulf’s denigration of the Greek Patriarchate, the Byzantine imperial court, and overall Greek intellectual society might be usefully understood as a ‘straw man’ argument, in which the Byzantines acted as a foil for the author to present and promote a Carolingian linguistic philosophy nascent within the international community of scholars at Charlemagne’s court. This task

3 Noble, Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians, p. 166.
5 The style of argument within the Opus Caroli is largely an ‘us vs. them’ construction, referring collectively in the first person plural in order to indicate Carolingian policy and referring to the errors of the second Council of Nicaea as those of ‘the Greeks’, such as seen in Book IV, Chapter 11, ‘That uselessly and without care the Greeks attempted to anathematize the catholic church in their synod...’, (‘Quod inutiliter et incaute Gręci ecclesiam catholicam anathematizare conati sint in eorum synodo...’), Theodulf of Orléans, Opus Caroli, p. 332, l. 17.
6 Although the debate regarding the authorship of the Opus Caroli has mostly been put to rest, thanks largely to the work of Ann Freeman, a number of scholars (Freeman included) have considered the potential influence of Alcuin of York.
7 On the Adoptionist Controversy see Cavadini, The Last Christology of the West.
was underpinned by geopolitical resonance as the Carolingians worked to establish themselves politically, militarily, and spiritually as the true successors of Rome.

Prior to an examination of the *Opus Caroli*’s linguistic arguments, it is worth discussing the means by which the text rejects the authority and conclusions of the 787 Council of Nicaea. Early medieval conciliar authority traditionally rested on two intersecting arguments: horizontal and vertical. The vertical approach invoked the historic authority of the Christian church, referencing both the received transmission of scripture and the inspired authority of patristic authors. In contrast, the horizontal appeal rested in current ecclesiastical authority, traditionally the pentarchy of ancient patriarchates (Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome) and decisions made within ecumenical councils.8 The *Opus Caroli* relies heavily on the vertical argument, condemning the council of 787 for wilfully departing from received patristic and Bible authority.9 Numerous chapters of the work allude to the prohibition of image worship based on these precedents (e.g. Book I, chapters 12, 14, and 26). Interestingly, however, the *Opus Caroli* lacks any invocation to horizontal arguments, that is, appeals to current ecclesiastical authority, such as the Pope or recent church councils. Thomas Noble has surmised the prominent absence of this form of argument might be rooted in Pope Hadrian’s refusal to side with the Carolingians against the 787 Council, rendering them unable to invoke current ecclesiastical authority. The Carolingians may also have taken an even more extreme approach: rejecting the 787 Council’s status as a valid ecumenical council outright, claiming that it was neither catholic nor universal (as they pointedly noted they had not been invited).10 By stripping the 787 Council of its status as ecumenical, the Carolingians simultaneously removed its ‘horizontal’ authority, that is, any ability to dictate or define appropriate Christian practice.

Theodulf’s vertical arguments also may be linked to the broader circumstances of the dissemination of the Acts of the 787 Council to the Carolingian court. Ironically, the Carolingians’ condemnation rested on a poorly translated copy of the Byzantine Council. Papal representatives who attended Nicaea in 787 provided the papal archives with a copy of the conciliar acts in Greek, to be later translated into Latin. Although the name

of the scribe given this task has been lost to history, the effects of his poor translation attempt endure. The Greek Acts reveal the Byzantines’ careful demarcation in vocabulary between worship (\textit{latreia}, a term applicable exclusively to the worship of God) and reverence (\textit{prokynesis}, a widely used term related to the action of “bowing down”) when referring to images, advocating the latter as an appropriate Christian attitude toward religious imagery. The distinction between ‘worship’ and ‘reverence’, so carefully demarcated in the Greek, was removed from the Latin translation. Both \textit{prokynesis} and \textit{latreia} were translated indiscriminately as either \textit{adorare} or \textit{osculauri}, denuding the Acts’ original and purposeful vocabulary choices. The reasons behind the poor translation can never be known or why the Carolingians, when receiving this Latin version, accepted the text as a genuine reflection of Byzantine image policy. Regardless, it was this Latin text on which the Carolingians (i.e. Theodulf) based the predominant arguments of the \textit{Opus Caroli}.\footnote{Freeman, “An Introduction”, p. 1.} But, as mentioned above, Theodulf’s arguments should not be judged on the basis of their adequacy in representing the Byzantine position, as the Carolingians were rarely interested in expressing their enemies’ views correctly.\footnote{Freeman, “An Introduction”, p. 33.} Instead, we should focus on how Theodulf constructs these linguistic arguments in light of the wider context of the Carolingian intellectual world. Within this context, Theodulf’s heavy incorporation of Isidore of Seville comments not only upon Isidore’s increasing influence within the Carolingian literate world, but also speaks to a nascent consideration of linguistic philosophy among the intellectual elite, one that indicated a developing formal relationship between the study of language and Christian doctrine throughout the early medieval Mediterranean.

\textbf{Isidore of Seville and the ‘Spanish’ Presence at the Carolingian Court}

Study of the Latin language, both from a grammatical and philosophical perspective, reached new heights in the Carolingian court during the late eighth century. As Peter of Pisa and Alcuin of York turned to writing new technical grammars, they embraced an emergent sense of the higher purpose of linguistic study, in which the traditional disciplines of the \textit{trivium} (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) could be applied to biblical study.\footnote{Alcuin \textit{De Dialectica}; Peter of Pisa, \textit{Ars}.} These
writers, in addition to later ninth century intellectuals such as Hrabanus Maurus and John Scottus Eriugena have often been cited as the turning point for the development of early medieval grammatical discourse: the years after them are marked with vocational grammars increasingly absorbing other disciplines, especially dialectic, mythology, theology, and biblical exegesis. Yet these developments stemmed from a markedly increased recognition of the spiritual ramifications of etymological and linguistic theory, rooted largely in the works of Isidore of Seville.

Isidore’s most influential text, the *Etymologiae*, not only provided an ‘encyclopaedic’ approach to knowledge (discussing everything from geography to military tactics), but was also a means of understanding knowledge itself via a Christianization of the secular liberal arts. This work is one of the largest distinguishable influences on Theodulf’s arguments in the *Opus Caroli*. Although neither Isidore nor the *Etymologiae* is mentioned by name in the text, Ann Freeman’s work revealed over seventy direct references to phrasing and vocabulary from the *Etymologiae* within the *Opus Caroli*, a number almost commensurate to biblical or exegetical references in the text. What these references reveal is that Isidore was a model for both Theodulf’s content and methodology on language in the *Opus Caroli*. Theodulf appropriated a range of topics from the *Etymologiae*, more than half of his references to Isidore relate specifically to the topics of language, largely from the first two books of the *Etymologiae*, those related to the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic). The similarities between the dialectical and syllogistic reasoning in the *Opus Caroli* and these sections of the *Etymologiae* are striking, suggesting Theodulf’s familiarity with the text. Simultaneously, these books provided Theodulf with extensive authoritative reasoning advocating the importance of language over images, using inherited linguistic philosophy adopted from classical and late antique writers such as Aristotle, Augustine, and Boethius. An epistemological explanation of language, as defined by the *Etymologiae*, underpinned Theodulf’s arguments against the Greeks.

Theodulf’s awareness and subscription to Isidore of Seville extends beyond the *Opus Caroli*, going so far as to append Isidore’s *Chronicon* to

---

14 Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse*, p. 207.
15 This number is somewhat arbitrary as it is unable to properly assess Theodulf’s awareness of other writers/texts via Isidore’s *Etymologiae*; however, it does provide a useful comparison of Isidore’s explicit presence in comparison to other works. Theodulf, *Opus Caroli*, p. 604.
16 At least half of the references to the *Etymologiae* within the Opus Caroli stem from Books I and II. *Opus Caroli*, pp. 604-5.
his biblical manuscripts. Theodulf’s preference for Isidore as a Christian authority has also been suggested to stem from Theodulf’s perception of their shared Iberian origins. Theodulf’s sympathies for his fellow countrymen is marked in other examples of his work: a reference to Prudentius as ‘noster et ipse parent’ suggests a Spanish origin as well as a reference in a poem to Charlemagne, ‘Annuit is mihi qui sum inmensis casibus exul’. Although Theodulf believed (albeit erroneously) he shared a Visigothic heritage with Isidore as well as a well-developed antipathy for the Greek world, no specific allusion to Isidore’s distrust for the Byzantines can be found in the Opus Caroli. Interestingly, despite his prominence Isidore is never cited explicitly by name; that honour is reserved for a precious few patristic and classical authorities (i.e. Aristotle, Apuleius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Boethius, and Gregory the Great). Freeman postulated these writers held such authority within both the eastern and western medieval worlds that invocation of their works commanded unqualified assent. Theodulf’s decision not to include Isidore in these ranks may indicate an assumption that his works were relatively unknown in the Byzantine world. Although access to and appreciation of Isidore’s texts had increased markedly in the Carolingian literate world in recent decades, his work did not convey the same authority as those of Aristotle or Augustine. Though explicit reference to Isidore may be lacking, the pervasiveness of his works in the Opus Caroli indicates their availability in the Carolingian world.

17 This text is included in two extant copies of Theodulf’s biblical manuscripts in addition to De Nominibus Hebraicis by Eucherius, the Clavis Melitonis, and the pseudo-Augustinian Speculum or the Divinis Scripturis. Freeman, ‘Theodulf of Orleans and the Libri Carolini’, p. 695; Koon & Wood, ‘The Chronica Maiora of Isidore of Seville’.
18 ‘Our very parent’, Theodulf of Orléans, Carmen 45, p. 543, l. 16; ‘He gives me, an exile far from home, his approval’, Carmen 23, p. 481, l. 28.
19 Although one might suggest that this belief was in error, Theodulf refers to himself as a Visigoth, while it is believed that Isidore was a Hispano-Roman, writing under Visigothic rule. See Fontaine, ‘Isidore de Sevilla frente a la España Bizantina’.
20 Freeman, ‘An Introduction’, p. 75.
21 Within the Opus Caroli, Theodulf references Isidore’s Etymologiae, De Natura Rerum, Allegoriae Scripturae Sacrae, Chronica, De Ecclesiasticis Officis, De Fide catholica, De Ortu et Obitu Patrum, Differentiarum, Liber Numerorum, Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, and the Sententiae.
Byzantine Error and Isidore’s Theory of Language

The Greek misunderstanding of language, both in its technical form (e.g. grammar) and in its role in Christian theology (e.g. the understanding of the Bible and patristic writing) underpins Theodulf’s wide-sweeping attacks on the Byzantines; a profound error at the root of Greek society. Theodulf embarks on an extended discussion of language: its origin, its ability to communicate God’s law, and its role in human development. Theodulf and Isidore share a common approach to language as a predominantly human, as opposed to a divine, institution. Within the Etymologiae, Isidore refers to words ‘[having been] established by the ancients’ either according to nature or by whim (secundum placitum). This adhered to an emergent form of naturalism in terms of the Christian understanding of language as a human invention. Although other classical philosophical views of naturalism had led to the dismissal of language as a ‘conventional’ institution, in which words and their meanings were subject to change and variation according to culture or time, Isidore’s (and by proxy Theodulf’s) linguistic naturalism gave language a permanence rooted in Christianity. Despite its human origins, God had allowed language to accurately reflect elements of His creation. Such a philosophy was derived from Genesis 2:19, in which God accorded Adam the responsibility of naming all creatures on Earth, and man provided the first linguistic link between word (the signifier) and object (the signified): ‘Now the Lord God had formed out of the ground all the wild animals and all the birds in the sky. He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name.’ God’s approval of Adam’s names for creation instilled a semi-divine nature to language: its human origins had been transformed and elevated to having a fundamental and inseparable tie to reality. Language was thus established as an eternal institution: words and their meanings were fused irrevocably. To change or misappropriate the meaning of a word was to disrespect God’s blessing of human language. Theodulf invokes this link when condemning the Greeks for their idolatrous

22 Arguments against the Greeks based on language can be found as early as Book I, Chapter 1, in which Theodulf attacks Constantine and Irene for claiming to ‘co-reign’ with God. This argument develops into an exposition on language according to the pseudo-Augustinian Categoriae about the three modes of speech. Theodulf of Orleans, Opus Caroli, pp. 106-108.

23 “Non autem omnia nomina a veteribus secundum naturam imposita sunt, sed quaedam, et secundum placitum.” Isidore augments this understanding with the origin of written words in the Hebrew language, which he derives ultimately from the Law transmitted by Moses. Isidore, ed. Lindsay, Etymologiae 1.29.2-4; trans. Barney, Lewis, et al. The Etymologies, p. 39.
mistake in confusing and conflating two different words in reference to the worship of images (adorare and osculari):

And it is clear that “osculum” and “adorationem” are the names of two [different] things. For how can there be unity in the names as much as in sense, when there is such a difference in their meaning? Or why can’t the words be different in sense, when the origins of the words are different when said aloud? For things are not created according to their names, but names are created according to things, nor should it be believed that things are fitted to names, but more often that names are fitted to things, since all living things were brought to the first man by God, so that he might see what he would call these things [as he saw them], the names were chosen; for the same father of the human race (Adam) gave names to the material world created by God. He did not look at material objects [res] that were brought before him in order to apply names themselves which he had created [previously].

God’s permission for man to provide names for all of creation solidified the relationship between a representation of the world (i.e. language) and the world itself. Isidore’s search for etymological origins stemmed from a common patristic belief that Latin contained the fundamental linguistic elements of this original ‘Edenic’ language, Hebrew. This link between language and Edenic purity allowed any sacred language (Hebrew, Greek, or Latin) to link to something beyond itself: to God’s plan for humanity. In Christian epistemology, this allowed for language to remain a vehicle for accurate communication between man and God, expressed most fully in scripture. Idolatry, the worship of images, violated this sacred relationship. Only words, a human invention blessed by God, could adequately express God’s message to humanity. Images, as purely man-made creations, could never hope to rival this connection. To worship images was to worship only

24 Manifestum namque est osculum et adorationem duarum rerum nominà esse. Quomodo ergo erit nominum tanta in sensu unitas, cum rerum in intellectu sit tanta diversitas? Aut cur non possint vocabula differri in sensu, cum possint vocabulorum origines differri in actu? Non enim res sunt conditae propter nominà, sed nominà propter res, nec credendum est, ut res aptentur nominibus, sed nominà potius aptentur rebus, quoniam et protoplasto animantia adducta a Domino fuisse, ut videret, quid vocaret ea, leguntur; rebus enim a Deo conditis idem humili generis pater nominà dedit, non nominibus a se condités res, quibus ipsa nominà ingerit, ad se adductas perspexit. Theodulf of Orléans, Opus Caroli, pp. 544 l. 30-545, l. 5.
25 Amsler, Etymology and Grammatical Discourse, p. 149.
26 See Mary Beagon’s chapter in this volume for additional information on the Christian understanding of Adam’s conferral of names to mankind.
the world: man-made images could not possibly rival the allegorical and multi-layered nature of Scripture. Having been sanctioned by God, the Bible represented the deepest and most perfect expression of God’s law, accessible on an infinite number of symbolic and allegorical layers. In confusing the words of worship (osculari and adorare), the Greeks were forgetting the fundamental link between linguistic ‘symbols’ and an external divinely-ordered reality. To confuse two words particularly in reference to worship was to deny the proper relationship that joined man and God via language.

In the *Opus Caroli*, Theodulf, successor to Isidore’s etymological approach, bases language in an extra-verbal authority (i.e. God), which guarantees the connection between word and reality. Exemplified by the biblical account of Moses receiving God’s law on Mt. Sinai, the proper relationship between man and God is via words, not images. Not via painting, Theodulf argues, but in writing, did humanity receive God’s law. On those tablets were not images but *apices* or letters, which are the ‘signs for things’, a phrase at the heart of Isidore’s *Etymologiae*:

> And thus forty days after the immolation of the lamb and the crossing of the Red Sea “the Lord descending on Mount Sinai” gave the law to Moses not in pictures but writing, and delivered “in written stone” not in images but in the form of letters, which are *signs for things* or the [physical marks] for the words which have been assigned [to them].

The ‘Isidorian’ definition of language Theodulf provides echoes throughout the *Opus Caroli* and roots Theodulf’s justification of Carolingian opposition to the Greeks. Although seemingly minor, Theodulf’s invocation of Isidore’s etymological approach to language marks a significant development in the intellectual Christian world, as Davide del Bello states: ‘[Isidore’s work provided] an etymological account of both the world and language, of the world as language’. Although the theory of etymological inquiry as a means of understanding reality was certainly not unique to Isidore, the

---

28 “Quinquagesimo denique die post agni immolationem et maris rubri transitum Dominus in montem Sinai descendens legem non pictam sed scriptam Moysi dedit, et in tabulis lapideis non imagine sed apices, qui indices rerum sive signa verborum esse perhibentur, tradidit” Theodulf of Orléans, *Opus Caroli*, pp. 304 l.27-305, l. It is noteworthy that Theodulf [and Isidore] use three different words to indicate “signs” or “words”: *apices, indices*, and *signa*. The semantic variation in their meaning has yet to be fully explored. This is taken directly from Isidore’s ‘Litterae autem sunt indices rerum, signa verborum.’ Ed. Lindsay, *Etymologiae* I, 3:1.
29 Del Bello, *Forgotten Paths*, p. 97.
The popularity of his *Etymologiae*, which combined a Christian encyclopaedic knowledge with this theory of etymological inquiry, marked a new Christian linguistic philosophy emergent within early medieval intellectual circles. Theodulf’s incorporation of this philosophy within the *Opus Caroli*, a purposeful representation of Carolingian Christian philosophy, should be understood as a significant turning point in the acceptance and promotion of this approach to language within the early medieval world.

**The Christian Encyclopaedia and the Spiritual Implications of Language**

Isidore’s adherence to a form of linguistic naturalism, that language has some permanent connection to reality, is evident in the philosophy that drives his most popular work, the *Etymologiae*. Isidore’s etymological accounts imply a belief in the worthwhile knowledge that can be gleaned from a word’s meaning or roots. Yet this philosophy was by no means widespread as an integral component of Christian learning. Rather, this text should be contextualized by the developing treatment of classical linguistic philosophy within Christian intellectual circles. A linguistic philosophy advocating naturalism or the benefits of etymological inquiry can be found in numerous classical and late antique writers, such as Plato’s *Cratylus* (fifth century BCE), Aristotle’s *De Interpretatione* (fourth century BCE), Varro’s *De Lingua Latina* (second-first century BCE), and Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* (late first century CE). Yet an inherent relationship between language and existence was not one universally accepted by the early Christian intellectual community. In his *Principia Dialecticae*, Augustine largely dismissed the use of etymological inquiry for the purposes of spiritual study. He refused to acknowledge the validity of the search for the true ‘etymon’, arguing, ‘Discerning the origin of words is like the interpretation of dreams; it is a matter of each man’s ingenuity’. Augustine rejected the use of grammatical science for the purposes of discovering the origins and uses of words and, by association, any fundamental link between language and existence. Although not widely popular in the patristic world, the seventh and eighth centuries reveal a much wider acceptance of etymological inquiry, perhaps

---

30 Varro’s lost work *Disciplinarum libri IX* would also presumably be in this category.
32 Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse*, p. 51.
most prominently demonstrated by the *Etymologiae*’s popularity, but more broadly in the transmission and transcription of other works advocating its use within Christian study. The *Principia Dialectae*, in which Augustine rejected etymological study, was largely unknown or rarely copied during this period. Although Theodulf may have known of it, only one phrase from the *Opus Caroli* has been linked to the text.33 Instead, a popular pseudo-Augustinian text, the *Categoriae Decem* (often known by its alternate title, the *Paraphrasis Themistiana*), was far more influential in determining early medieval understanding of Augustinian etymological theory, a text which ironically supported the philosophical relevance of etymological study, based largely on the linguistic philosophy of Aristotle, who was enormously influential in his posited relationship between language and reality.34

If the seventh and eighth centuries mark a new approach to linguistic philosophy, particularly the ‘naturalism’ suggested by Isidore, this philosophy should be broadly compared with the overall role of linguistic study within Christian education. In addition to the first purpose-written etymological text of the early medieval period, Isidore’s *Etymologiae* also has been considered a benchmark in the development of the medieval Christian encyclopaedia. As Jacques Fontaine has indicated, the formation of a text such as the *Etymologiae* represented more than a random synthesis of divine and worldly knowledge.35 Both Isidore and other early encyclopaedists, such as Cassiodorus with his *Institutiones* (mid-sixth century), derived the structure and philosophy of their work from the classical *episteme*: ‘a way of knowing, conditions of knowing and how these conditions determine the object of knowledge’;36 Isidore’s approach to his subject(s), arranging his material according to the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, evoked the aims of the classical *enkyklios paideia*: to discuss the full range of subjects appropriate for comprehensive knowledge, stimulus for the eventual development of the traditional medieval curriculum.37 In Book I of the *Etymologiae*, this approach to language and knowledge is made purposefully clear: ‘A discipline (disciplina) takes its name from “learning” (discere), when it can also be called “knowledge” (scientia).’38 Especially resonant in this area

---

33 Although the MGH edition includes a reference to the *Principia* in Book I, Chapter II (p. 117) of the *Opus Caroli*, I have found no similarities to the known Augustinian text, based on the edition available in Migne.
34 Freeman ‘An Introduction’, pp. 88–9; Pseudo-Augustine *Categoriae Decem*.
35 Fontaine, ‘Isidore de Séville et la mutation de l’encyclopédisme antique’
were the disciplines of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic), in which the study of language itself could yield knowledge and understanding about the world.\(^{39}\) The theory of the use of secular disciplines such as the *trivium* within a Christian setting should be distinguished from the etymological inquiry and linguistic naturalism also at the heart of Isidore’s work. The acceptance and perceived benefit of the secular disciplines was one suggested in patristic writings, notably by Augustine.

Augustine’s rejection of etymological inquiry in the *Principia Dialecticae* may appear incongruent with his apparent support for the use of the liberal arts in Christian contexts, as argued in his *De Doctrina Christiana*. But although the ideas are related, they should be considered distinct, particularly in terms of changing perspectives on the two within the early medieval Christian intellectual world. Although Augustine rejected etymological inquiry as a philosophical basis for knowledge of existence, he did support the application of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic) as a means of better understanding scripture. Augustine’s *De Doctrina Christiana* advocated a new perspective on the Bible as the epitome of eloquence, in which all modes and methods of speech were most fully realized, ‘The literary-minded should be aware that our Christian authors used all the figures of speech which teachers of grammar call by their Greek names of tropes [...] Those who know about these tropes recognize them in sacred literature and to some extent helps them in understanding it...’\(^{40}\)

In the centuries following Augustine, the acceptance of pagan disciplines such as the *trivium* did not always indicate a similar appropriation of the philosophical implications of etymological inquiry. The growth of early medieval Christian linguistic treatises often evoked Augustine’s approach to the liberal arts within the *De Doctrina Christiana*, as opposed to the * Categoriae Decem*. Study of technical aspects of language (e.g. grammar, tropes, etc.) increased as a focus of monastic pedagogy and intellectual activity, resulting in proto-encyclopaedic texts such as the seventh century Irish text, *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* (St Paul in Carinthia, Stiftsbibliothek, 2/1, ff. 21-42rb), and grammatical collections such as the seventh century Italian *Ars Ambrosiana* and the ninth century *Ars Laureshamensis*.\(^ {41}\)

---

41 Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse*, p. 208.
The emergence of texts incorporating Christian and pagan disciplines, such as Cassiodorus’ *Institutiones* as well as his *Expositio Psalmorum*, supported and supplemented a Christian appropriation of classical disciplines for religious purposes. The increased production of Christian texts advocating the use of the liberal arts may have spurred a renewed interest in the other component to linguistic study: language’s relationship to reality. The increased transmission and translation of classical philosophical texts, such as Boethius’ commentaries on Aristotle in the sixth century, may have fomented a wider examination of linguistic study within the seventh and eighth centuries. The promotion of the liberal arts within the *De Doctrina Christiana* as well as the ‘rediscovery’ of the pro-etymological *Decem Categoriae* (which advocated a largely Aristotelian view of language) may have contributed to the continued transmission of many classical and late antique linguistic philosophical treatises on etymology, such as those by Varro and Quintilian. This perspective led perhaps understandably to the supposition that the technical arts associated with language (e.g. grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) as well as the investigation into the origins of language itself (e.g. etymology) could be viewed as support systems through which one could better understand language (and in correlation, existence and/or God). The prominence of the pseudo-Augustinian *Decem Categoriae*, in addition to the growing acceptance of classical disciplines such as the trivium within Christian intellectual thought indicates a blended approach to the role of language by the time Theodulf was composing the *Opus Caroli* in the late eighth century. His acceptance of the etymological naturalism advocated by Isidore (and more distantly by Aristotle and Boethius) echoes throughout the *Opus Caroli*, as all feature prominently in his arguments against the Greeks. Theodulf also relies heavily upon Cassiodorus’ *Expositio Psalmorum* (c. 540-548), a text allied closely to the etymological program of Isidore. Within the *Opus Caroli*, the *Expositio* is second only to Isidore’s *Etymologiae* in terms of numbers of appearance. As heir to these two traditions, Theodulf’s subscription to the belief that an understanding of the origins or meanings of words could lead to a fuller understanding of the concepts they represented permeates the *Opus Caroli*, providing the groundwork for his attack on the Greeks.

42 See Boethius, *Liber Aristotelis de decem praedicamentis* and *De Interpreptatione vel Periemenias*, ed. Laurentius Minio-Paluello.
45 Freeman ‘An Introduction’, p. 76.
Isidore, and subsequently Theodulf, demonstrate both an acceptance of and application of secular disciplines, but they also subscribe to the more complex philosophy that language itself denoted something fundamental about reality. The popularity of this perspective, to the degree that Theodulf felt confident in expressing it as a part of Carolingian spirituality, must to some extent rest on Isidore’s shoulders. Isidore’s *Etymologiae* might be considered among the first widely influential Christian texts to advocate a joint perspective: a culmination of the appropriation of the secular liberal arts in addition to a heavy emphasis on the fixed relationship between language and reality.

The *Etymologiae*, as a successful bridge to the Christian appropriation of secular disciplines, prompted a new approach to biblical study. During the Carolingian period, we find the increased copying, compilation and transmission of linguistic treatises incorporating secular education as a necessary path for deeper spiritual understanding. In Alcuin’s preface to his *De Grammatica* (late eighth century), the *Disputatio de vera philosophia*, the teacher explains that grammatical study sets the student on the search for true knowledge, God, pure thought, and eternal life.\(^{46}\) Knowledge of language (via grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) was considered essential in understanding scripture; the culmination of not only God’s words but human wisdom.\(^ {47}\) Those without this education were to be considered spiritually suspect. Isidore explicitly stated the new repurposing of Christian grammar in his *De Natura Rerum*, assuming the authority to speak for the proper divine doctrine (*sana sobriaque doctrina*).\(^ {48}\) This newfound responsibility (and the spiritual dangers associated with its lack) encapsulates Theodulf’s argument against the Greeks. In the preface to the work, Theodulf invokes Isidore’s words as the stimulus behind the *Opus Caroli*: ‘Therefore ambition, puffed up by arrogant winds and the most arrogant desire for empty glory, inflamed not only the rulers but also the priests of the eastern regions to such an extent that they disregarded proper and divine doctrine...’.\(^ {49}\) Having established their inability to recognize the importance of words as the appropriate bond between God and man, Theodulf further demonstrates the Bible as the compendium of human wisdom. Theodulf

---

46 ‘*Est equidem facile viam vobis demonstrare sapientiae, si eam tantummodo propter Deum, [propter rerum scientiam], propter puritatem animae, propter veritatem cognoscendam, etiam et propter seipsam diligatis...*’ Alcuin, *De Grammatica*, PL 101: 850B.
47 This is exemplified in the *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum*.
48 See also Andrew Fear’s chapter on Isidore of Seville’s *De Natura Rerum* in this volume. Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse*, p. 134; Isidore, *De Natura Rerum*, PL 83: 963.
49 Theodulf of Orléans, *Opus Caroli*, p. 98 l. 5.
lists how the Greeks have failed to train themselves in language and thus have misunderstood God's law:

[In the Bible] one also will find the brilliance and fluency of eloquence (Isidore *Etym. 1.2.1*), the states and types of arguments (2.4.1 & 2.5.1); there exordiums, by which listeners are rendered benevolent, docile, and attentive (2.7.1); there brief and candid narratives and also long and obscure (2.7.1), which are not related except by the revealed Holy Spirit; there conclusions by which the property of things is shown, arguments in which the souls of the listeners are stirred to carry out what is said (2.7.2); there laws (2.10.1) or maxims (2.11.), there are related [the three registers of speaking]: speaking grandly, speaking humbly, and speaking moderately (2.17.1); there prosopopoeia (2.13.1), ethopoeia (2.14.1), and all types of speech, which were bequeathed by the rhetoricians. One will also find many other types more glorious than these which when he finds them, he will take pleasure in them, which neither the school of grammarians nor that of the rhetoricians was able to grasp.\(^{50}\)

This laundry list of linguistic terminology drew largely on the vocabulary and phrasing of the *Etymologiae* (as shown above in the parentheses).\(^{51}\) Whether Theodulf had a copy of the text in front of him as he worked on the *Opus Caroli* may never be known; however, the ease with which Theodulf incorporates Isidore's discussion of linguistic tropes and figures into his own work demonstrates a high degree of familiarity with the *Etymologiae*.\(^{52}\)

But Theodulf's use of these linguistic terms extends beyond simply listing prosopopoeia and other forms of rhetorical speech. He conspicuously

\(^{50}\) ‘Illic etiam inveniet nitorem et copiam eloquentiae (Isidore, *Etym. 1.2.1*), generas causarum (2.4.1) et status (2.5.1); illic exordia, quibus benevoli, dociles vel adentii auditores fiant; illic narrationes apertas et breves (2.7.1), clausas etiam et longas, quae non nisi Spiritu sancto rerum monstratur; illic conclusiones quibus proprietas rerum monstratur; argumentationes, quibus animi audientium concitantur ad implenda ea, quae dicuntur (2.7.2); illic leges (2.10.1) sive sententiae (2.11.), illic magna granditer, parva summisse, mediocria temperate (2.17.1) promuntur; illic prosopopeian (2.13.1), ethopopeian (2.14.1) et omnes figuras loquitionum, quae a rethoribus traduntur, inveniet et plures illis augustiores quae percepisse se gaudebit, ad quas nec grammaticorum nec rethorum scola pertingere potuit.’ Theodulf of Orléans, *Opus Caroli*, p. 314 ll. 3-30.

\(^{51}\) The MGH edition classifies this entire section as a reference to Isidore; however, given the numerous linguistic or grammatical treatises available during this time, I am not convinced Theodulf is intentionally citing the *Etymologiae*. This could either be a list from memory or a list of terms gleaned from any grammatical treatise.

\(^{52}\) Freeman ‘An Introduction’, p. 78.
demonstrates his ability to use these linguistic forms and dialectical reasoning (in the form of syllogisms) as a means to further contrast Carolingian linguistic mastery to Byzantine ignorance. As Freeman has shown, the *Opus Caroli* is littered with syllogistic phrasing; a classical method re-appropriated to demonstrate a specifically Carolingian Christian truth.\(^{53}\) As the idea of the multiple layers of Scripture gained traction in the late antique and early medieval world, Christian scholars such as Theodulf increasingly had recourse to the classical disciplines – as a means to ‘pull back the curtain’ and reveal the various deeper meanings of the Bible. The Byzantines, by failing to demonstrate an appreciation for semiotic importance, thus had shown themselves to be poor, uneducated Christians. As the earlier *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* argued (a sentiment Isidore and Theodulf clearly shared), ‘the grammarian was an expert Latinist who had mastered the ratio of a foreign language in a formal way and corrects grammatical errors... Without the grammarian, Latin literary and Christian wisdom cannot be attained’.\(^{54}\) As the author implies, the proper Christian is the correct speaker.\(^{55}\) Theodulf argues that the Byzantines prove the truth to this philosophy: their inability to understand the forms and styles of biblical and patristic language has led them into idolatry. Their ignorance of language has produced an ignorance of Christian doctrine.

Syllogistic phrasing illustrates the extent to which the classical trivium had been adopted into a Christian framework. Theodulf did not only employ biblical quotations to show how the Greeks’ idolatry violated God’s law, but also methods of deliberative rhetoric and dialectical syllogisms to illustrate how the Greeks had failed to construct a logical argument to defend their idolatrous ways.\(^{56}\) Theodulf flaunts his (and by proxy the Carolingians’) superiority in these disciplines, consciously invoking ‘the authority of Roman eloquence’ to warn the Greeks of his impending rhetorical attack in subsequent books: ‘and thus it ought to be argued as such, that first we establish our position, and then demolish [our] adversary’s [position],’ a direct quotation from Cicero’s *De Oratore* via Isidore.\(^{57}\) Logic, or better stated,

\(^{53}\) Freeman, ‘An Introduction’, p. 56.


\(^{56}\) Theodulf of Orléans, *Opus Caroli*, p. 323, l. 10.

reason \((\textit{rationalis})\) is at the heart of both Isidore and Theodulf’s examination of language, one which incorporates the disciplines of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic. In his \textit{Differentiae} (\textit{De differentiis verborum}), Isidore attributes an introspective and ontological definition to dialectic, ‘A rational method of discussion which sharpens intelligence and distinguishes truth from error’.\(^{58}\) The essence of \textit{rationalis} was to discover, via language, the true causes of things.\(^{59}\) For Theodulf, the Greeks failed to do this at Nicaea. Theodulf repeatedly upheld the rationality of Christian truth: ‘[For] the Lord God is spirit, and He ought to be adored in spirit and in truth. One should not cling carnally but spiritually to Him. It is right to cleave to him neither carnally nor via the senses, but rather by the rationality of the soul’s intuition’\(^{60}\). For Isidore, and subsequently Theodulf, truth was now defined by a \textit{rationalis} Christianity; what had been traditionally agnostic or at least predominantly secular disciplines became crucial to biblical exegesis and revelation.\(^{61}\)

**Conclusion**

Theodulf’s obvious access to and application of classical deliberative rhetoric counters our understanding of the prevalence and continued copying of rhetorical, grammatical handbooks during the early medieval period. Jacques Fontaine, in his study of Isidore’s language and use of rhetoric, saw in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries a weakening appreciation of the practicality of the linguistic disciplines. Ascribing a profound unoriginality in grammarians from Pseudo-Apuleius to Isidore, Fontaine saw these centuries as representative of the ‘weakening of the agility of the mind’ (‘une sorte d’affaiblissement de l’agilité d’esprit’).\(^{62}\) Fontaine argued that the

---


59 Amsler, \textit{Etymology and Grammatical Discourse}, p. 159.

60 Theodulf of Orleans, \textit{Opus Caroli}, p. 275, l. 15.

61 The theme of \textit{ratio} or the role of reason in spiritual thinking is one found throughout the writings of both Jerome and Augustine (from the Latin perspective) and also within the works of the Cappadocian Fathers. On the ‘rational’ in Augustine’s work, see Conybeare, \textit{The Irrational Augustine}, particularly chapter 5, ‘The Interrogation of Reason’. Gregory of Nyssa’s concept of the individual also plays largely into the role of logic or reason as a fundamental element of humanity. See Turcescu, \textit{Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons}, particularly chapter 2, ‘Philosophical Concepts that Shaped Gregory of Nyssa’s View of the Individual’.

increased prominence on jargon rather than practical applications in these rhetorical handbooks signalled an increasingly elementary understanding of these subjects. Indeed, other linguistic handbooks from the period of Theodulf and Alcuin have been described as ‘dry, technical manuals’, with little to no relevance outside the schoolroom. Yet this does not take into account Theodulf and the *Opus Caroli*. This is not the dry jargon-based academic texts that Fontaine warned us about, but instead a practical synthesis of both Isidore’s encyclopaedic offerings on language, combined with more extensive sources on specific forms of dialectic and logic; each applied to prove the error of the Greeks.

Unfortunately, Theodulf’s *Opus Caroli* was destined never to reach its intended audience. The working manuscript, never fully completed, was shelved by the time of the 794 Synod of Frankfurt, at which Greek idolatry was barely referenced. The text was effectively wiped out of existence, although Hincmar of Rheims attempted to produce a complete, corrected copy of it in the early ninth century. But its significance should not be forgotten. Theodulf’s treatise demonstrates a slow turning point in Christian intellectual circles, augmented by Alcuin in the late eighth century, and reaching full stride by the ninth. Although few would relegate Isidore to simply a ‘transmitter of earlier sources’, an increasingly rare generalization, his specific spiritual and intellectual influence on the later medieval world still demands more investigation, as is demonstrated by a number of other papers in this volume. This examination of the *Opus Caroli* has shown that Isidore was a source for medieval writers on a variety of levels. His *Etymologiae* provided quick access to a number of subjects and earlier writers; however, this cannot have been its sole function. Tying together Aristotelian ideas of the signifier-signified relationship in addition to early patristic formulations on the multiple meanings of Scripture (and language more generally), Isidore fused these concepts to create a more comprehensive philosophy, defined by what Davide Del Bello calls, ‘Christian language as a verbal construction motivated by an extra-verbal reality’.

So fundamental was this formulation that, by the Carolingian period, Theodulf was able to use it to justify the entire Carolingian spiritual policy of opposition to the Greeks. Found in other Carolingian writers, such

---

63 Fontaine, “Isidore de Seville et la culture classique”, p. 634.
64 See also Marina Smith’s chapter in this volume on the selective editing of Isidore’s work for specific purposes.
65 *Capitulare Francofurtense*, p. 165.
as in Hrabanus Maurus’ *De Universo* and John Scottus Eriugena’s universals in his commentary on the *Categoriae Decem* as well as his *Periphyseon* in the ninth century, and of course amplified and expounded in the twelfth century, Isidore was much more than simply a vehicle of transmission for late antique and early medieval intellectual thought.\(^\text{68}\) Isidore’s *Etymologiae* (and his entire corpus generally) provided the groundwork for Christian rational inquiry, but in emphasizing the ‘science’ of linguistic (specifically biblical) semiotics capable of analysis and understanding by the human mind, he also simultaneously cleared a path for a more well-developed sense of biblical *allegoria* in the later medieval period.\(^\text{69}\) By localizing the origin and meaning of language in the *ratio* of the human mind, Isidore, and the etymological tradition he represented, allowed for a dual ‘scientific’ (analysis via a word’s origins) and ‘non-scientific’ (allegory based on human interpretation) examination of the Bible for the rest of the middle Middle Ages.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td><em>Auctorum Antiquissimorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Civitate Dei</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td><em>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</em> (Turnhout: Brepols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etymologies</td>
<td>Isidore of Seville, <em>Etymologies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>Paul the Deacon, <em>Historia Langobardorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>Pliny, <em>Historia Naturalis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Paul the Deacon, <em>Historia Romana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</em> (Hannover: Monumenta ‘Germaniae Historica’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap.</td>
<td><em>Capitularia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conc.</td>
<td><em>Concilia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS rer. Merov.</td>
<td><em>Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS rer. Lang.</td>
<td><em>Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGL</td>
<td><em>Origo gentis Langobardorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTH</td>
<td>Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae 116
De ratione computandi 117-118
Defensor of Ligugé 136, 143-144
descensus ad inferos 149-150
Desiderius, Lombard king 160
dialectic, dialectical 2.4, 107, 212-213, 218-222, 224-226
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 63
Eadburg, abbess 149-150
East Anglia 23, 138, 140-141, 145-146, 148, 151
Ecburgh, abbess 140
Empedocles 62-63
enkyklios paideia 219
Epicurus 21, 83-86, 89
Epitaphion beati Leandri, Isidori et Florentinae 103-104
Ethnogenesis 159, 164
etymology 20-21, 71-72, 221
Eufemius, bishop of Toledo 102-103
Eugenius II, bishop of Toledo 32, 48-49, 97, 100
Eutropius, Breviarium ab Urba Condita 161
face, human, as signifier of soul 58, 61, 67
Felix, Vita S. Guthlaci 8, 22-23, 131-157
Florilegium frisingense 136
Florentina, sister of Isidore 15, 38-41, 103-104
Fontaine, Jacques 9, 13, 21, 41, 75-77, 81, 86, 91, 96, 219-225, 226
fragment(s) 118-120, 122-123, 198, 200
France 7, 134-135
Frankfurt, Synod of 226
Franks, Frankish 7, 9, 107, 145, 210
Frea (Freyr) 168
Freculf of Liseux, Historiae 188-189
Fredegar 79, 168
Freising 136
Friedrich, Johann 159
Fronimian 95
Fructuosus, Bishop of Braga 78, 95, 103
Fulgentius, bishop of Écija 14, 38-40, 101, 104
Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe 161-162, 180, 190, 204
Sermones 190
Fursey 146, 150
Galen 63
Gambara 168
Genseric, Vandal king 161-162
Germany 135-136, 145
glossaries 121
glosses 133, 145
God, as creator 21, 57-58, 60, 62, 66, 71-72, 76, 80-81, 83-85, 91, 167, 215-216
Godan (Woden) 168-169
grammar 16, 24, 82-83, 120, 131, 212-213, 215, 220, 222-225
Gregory, bishop of Nyssa 225
Gregory, bishop of Tours 160, 185, 187, 193, 197-198, 204-205
Liber in gloria martyrum 185, 187, 193, 197-198
Gregory I (‘the Great’), Pope 8, 15, 20, 31-36, 97, 100, 102-103, 105-106, 113, 123-124, 131, 146, 179, 185, 187-188, 204-205, 214
Dialogi 34-36, 41, 49, 51, 123-124
Homiliae in evangelia 179, 193, 195-196, 199-200
Regula Pastoralis 33-35, 47, 52
Vita Benedicti 146
Grino, abbot of Corbie 145
Gundemar, Visigothic king 96-97, 102
Guthlac, St. 8, 22-23, 131-157
Guthlac A 139-140, 143
Guthlac B 139, 143
Hadrian, abbot 133
Hadrian, Pope 211
Hædda, bishop of Lichfield 138
Heaven, human, as signifier of soul 61, 71
Helladius, bishop of Toledo 106-107
hermaphrodites 59
Hicmar, bishop of Rhiems 9, 178-179, 226
Hispana 94, 98, 103
Hesperica famina 121, 135
historiography 93, 103, 107, 178
Hrabanus Maurus 75, 213, 227
De Universo 75, 227
hybrids 65-66, 69-70
Idefonsus, bishop of Toledo 13, 48-49, 51-52, 94-95, 101-104, 113
De viris illustribus 13, 51-52, 94-95, 101-103
Ireland, Irish 7-9, 14, 16, 22, 111-130, 134-138, 151, 177, 220
Isidore, bishop of Seville
Allegoriae 15, 89, 125
Chronica / Chronicon 15, 80, 96, 125, 161
De differentiis urborum / Differentiae 225
De ecclesiastico officii / De origine officiorum 14, 38, 45, 96, 101, 115, 118, 123-125, 131, 133, 138, 162, 186, 214
De fide Catholica contra Iudaeos 38-39, 118, 186
De haeresibus 15, 101, 118
De natura rerum 14, 21-22, 62, 75-92, 111-112, 115, 117, 125, 131, 133, 214, 222
De ortu et obitu patrum 14, 24, 96, 113-114, 133, 162, 178, 181, 185-189, 193-194, 201-203, 214
De uiris illustribus 13, 15, 17, 35-44, 51, 94-97, 101, 118, 185
Historia Gothorum / De origine Gothorum 15, 96-97, 101, 118, 159, 163-165, 167, 173
Laws Gothorum 165, 172-173
Laws Spaniae 8, 23, 163, 165, 171-173
Quaestiones in uetus testamentum 16, 125, 214
Regula monachorum / Monastica Regula 15, 101, 118
Sententiae 11, 15, 18, 44-47, 51, 82-83, 85-86, 96, 98-100, 118, 125, 132, 136-138, 186, 214
Synonyma 8, 14, 22-23, 51, 83, 98, 100, 131-157
stilus ysydorianus 132
Italy 7-8, 33, 39, 135, 163, 165, 170-173
Jacob's sheep 64-68
Jacques Lacan 99
Jerome 15, 33, 39, 45, 49, 64-69, 83, 101, 131, 161, 185, 192-199, 202, 204-205, 214, 225
Commentarii in evangelium Matheaei 185, 192-200, 202
Contra Jovinianum 83
De viris illustribus 39, 185, 187
Laus Spaniae 8, 23, 163, 165, 171-173
Laus Gothorum 165, 172-173
Laus Gothorum 165, 172-173
Liber de ordine creaturarum 16, 116, 122-123
Liber Eliensis 140
Liber scintillarum 136, 143-144
Lithium MacBaith of Clonfertmuloe 113-114, 121
Litho de Moralibus in Job 113-114
Narathagare Trinitatis Unitas 121
Leander, bishop of Seville 8, 12-13, 18, 20, 31-56, 97, 102-104
Lucretius 16-17, 21, 62, 81, 83-89
De Rerum Natura 21, 62, 81, 83-85, 87-88
Luxeuil 155, 177, 179-180, 182, 184, 189-190, 206-207
Magnus Maximus, Roman usurper 78
Mainz 145
Manuscripts
Bremen, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MSC 0046 116
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 190 148
Fulda, Domshatz, Bonifatianus 2 134
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6330 144
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6433 135-136
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1587 137, 152
Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 309 115-116
Rylands MS Latin 12 23-24, 177-207
St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908 135-136
St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 1399a.1 134, 144-145, 150
Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. F. 79 134, 144-146, 150-151
Martianus, bishop of Écija 40, 56, 98
Martianus Capella 26, 83
maternal impressions, theory of 62-70
Maximus, bishop of Saragossa 97
Maximus, bishop of Turin 195, 200-201, 204-205
Medeshamstede 133, 141
mens 58, 64, 68
Mercia 23, 134-135, 138-139, 141, 145, 148-149
Mérida 32, 99
metamorphosis 70
Milan 122, 136, 171
monkeys 60-61, 67
monstrosity 58-62, 70-71
monstrous races 59-62, 70-71
monstrosities, individual 59, 70-71
mules 65-66
Munich 135-137, 144, 152, 183
Munich Computus 117-118
Narses 170
natura creatrix 70
naturae ludibria 60, 70-71
naturalism (linguistic) 215, 218-221
nature 14, 18, 57-60, 64-67, 70-72, 78, 80-81, 84-86, 89, 91, 122, 142, 215
Nicaea, Second Council of 209-211, 225
Obitus Beati Isidori 94-95, 104
Old English Homilies 134, 136, 138-139, 143, 145, 148
Irvine vii 148
Napier xlix 148
Vercelli xxiii 138-139, 143
Old English Martyrology 139-140
Oppian 64-65, 67
Opus Caroli regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini) 24, 209-230
Origo Gentis Langobardorum 168
Orosius 122, 161
Ovid 16-17, 58
Metamorphoses 58
pantheism 57
Paul the Hermit, St. 146, 151-152
Paul the Deacon 23, 159-176, 179, 188
   Homiliarium 177, 179-180, 182-186, 190, 204
   Historia Langobardorum 159-163, 167-168, 170, 173
   Historia Romana 160-162, 173
Perctarit, Lombard king 168
Peregrinus, Northumbrian scribe 136
Peterborough 141
Plato 16, 218
Pliny the Elder 8, 16, 20, 24, 57-74, 172
portents 59, 81, 112, 120
Prebiarum de multorium exemplaribus 138
Priscillian 78-79
prodigies 59, 80-81
Prologue of AD 699 to a Victorian Easter Table 116
Pseudo-Apuleius 225
Pseudo-Aristotle, Problemata 64
Pseudo-Augustine
   Categoriae Decem (Paraphrasis Themistiana) 215, 219, 221
   Speculum (Divinis Scripturis) 214
Pseudo-Cyprian 9
Pseudo-Isidore
   De haeresibus 15
   De ortu et obitu patriarcharum 138
   Liber de numeris 138
   Liber numerorum 133
Purgatory 123-124
Ramon Llull 75, 91
ratio 64-65, 70, 224-225, 227
Ravenna 171
Reccared I, Visigothic king 32-34, 38, 41, 99
Repton 138, 140-141
rhetoric 24, 212-213, 220-226
Sallust 16-17
Sardinia 161-162, 172
Scadinavia, island 168
Scythians 166
Seville 17, 19, 22, 40-41, 52, 93-95, 97-99, 102-104, 106
   Second Council of 40, 97-98
   Third Council of 40, 96
sensus 68
Servius 16
Sirmond 116
Sisebut, Visigothic king 14, 21, 77, 79-81, 105
Soranus 63, 67, 69
soul 58, 60-61, 68-71, 83, 87, 123, 149-150, 223, 225
spiritus 68-69
spontaneous generation 69-70
St. Gall, monastery 116, 119-120, 136
Stoicism 57, 62, 64
Suetonius 16
Sueses 15, 165
Sulpicius Severus 146
   Vita Martini 146
Swinthila, Visigothic king 101, 165
syllogism 224
Taio, bishop of Saragossa 32, 49-50, 53, 100
Sententiarum Libri V 49-50
Theodore, bishop of Canterbury 124, 133
Theodulf, bishop of Orleans 8-9, 209-230
   Opus Caroli 209-230
Thrasamund 161-162
Toledo 11-12, 18-19, 21-22, 33, 50-52, 79, 81, 94,
   96-103, 106-107
   Church councils of 11-12, 18, 50-51, 81, 94,
   97-100, 102
trade routes 112, 135
Transamund, Vandal king see Thrasamund
Trivium 212-213, 219-221, 224
   See also grammar, rhetoric, dialectic
Trogodytae 61
Tuscia 172
Ubi sunt topoi 147-149
Umbria 172
Valens, Roman Emperor 166
Valerius of El Bierzo 48-49
Vandals 15, 161-162, 165, 168-169
Vercelli Homily xxiii 138-139, 143, 183, 207
Versus cuiusdam Scotti de alphabeto 114
Vespasian Life 138-139, 143
Vit arian AD 689 Irish computus (lost) 117-118
Virgil 16-17, 87, 146-148
   Aeneid 147
Virgilus, bishop of Salzburg 138
Visigothic Spain 12, 16, 18-22, 31-56, 79, 85,
   94-110, 112, 134-135, 164
Visions, Anglo-Saxon (of Drythelm; of Fursey;
   of the monk of Much Wenlock) 150
Vita Antonii 23, 146-147, 157
Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium 32, 35-36, 84
Wessex 135
whirlpools 167
Winnili 165, 168-170
Worcester 145, 151
Würzburg 134, 136, 144-146, 150-152, 157