

**202. Τῷ μοναχῷ κύρ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ γεγονότι πατριάρχῃ τῷ
Ξιφιλίνῳ**

post Π 201 et ante 1.1.1064

Cris¹ [B, D, P, S], S 175 [P]; cf. Π 534 et Π 535 [K]

Ἐμὸς ὁ Πλάτων, ἀγιώτατε καὶ σοφώτατε, ἐμός, ὦ γῇ καὶ ἡλίε
(ἵνα τι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιτραγωδήσω τῇ τοῦ λόγου σκηνῇ); Εἰ μὲν γάρ
προσονειδίξεις ὅτι θαμὰ ποτε τῷ ἀνδρὶ προσωμίλουν ἐν τοῖς
διαλόγοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ τε χαρακτήρος τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐθαύμαζον,
5 καὶ τὴν ἐν ταῖς διαλέξεσιν ἐξεθείαζον δύναμιν, τί μὴ καὶ τοῖς
μεγάλοις τοῦτο πατράσιν ἐπιρριπτεῖς ἀφ' ὧν ἐκείνοι τοῖς
Εὐνομίοις καὶ Ἀπολιναρίοις τὰς αἰρέσεις ἀνέτρεψαν, βάλλοντες
ἀκριβείαις συλλογισμῶν; Εἰ δ' ὅτι τοῖς δόγμασιν ἔπομαι, ἢ τοῖς
ἐκείνου νόμοις ἐπιστηρίζομαι, οὐ καλῶς οἶει περὶ ἡμῶν, ἀδελφέ·
10 ἐγὼ γάρ πολλὰς μὲν φιλοσόφους βίβλους ἀνέπτυξα, πολλοῖς δὲ
ῥητορικοῖς λόγοις ὠμίλησα, καὶ οὔτε με τὰ Πλάτωνος ἔλαθεν (οὐ
γὰρ ἂν ἀρνηθεῖν), οὔτε τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους παρείδον φιλοσοφίαν,
οἶδα δὲ καὶ ὅσα Χαλδαῖοι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι πεπερσεβέυκασι (ναὶ νῇ

1 ἐμός ὁ Πλάτων: cf. e.g. Π 201,31–32 τῆς τε Πλατωνικῆς πλατάνου et infra
ll. 18 et 192 etc. cf. etiam Greg. Naz. Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ στηλιτευτικός α' = Or.
4,71 ὃ φησιν ὁ σὸς "Ὁμηρος || 1–2 ὦ – ἐπιτραγωδήσω: cf. Greg. Naz. Epist.
5,5 καὶ ἄηρ καὶ ἀρετὴ, τραγωδήσω γάρ τι μικρόν cum Dem. Περί στεφάνου =
Or. 18,127 ὥσπερ ἐν τραγωδίᾳ βοῶντα «ὦ γῇ καὶ ἡλίε καὶ ἀρετῇ», et Π
112,95–96, Π 128,1, Π 146,157–158, Π 157,8, Π 284,25–26, et Π 285,17
10–11 ἐγὼ – ὠμίλησα: cf. Π 387,7–8 πολλοῖς μὲν λόγοις σοφοῖς ὠμίλησα,
καὶ πολλὰ βιβλία ἀνελεξάμην

ep. 202 P 230v–231v, D 264r–267v, B 145r–146v (inc. mut.); cf. duo excerpta
Κλεάνθης ... ἀπόδειξιν (ll. 36–37) et τὸ συλλογίζεσθαι ... εὑρεσις (ll. 105–106)
in K 60r = Π 534 (Can 20) et Π 535 (Can 21); tit. P S: om. K τῷ μοναχῷ κύρ
Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Ξιφιλίνῳ τῷ γενομένῳ πατριάρχῃ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως D
«Michaelis Pselli ad Ioannem Xiphilinum epistola» Cris¹ || 3 τῷ –
προσωμίλουν D: προσωμίλουν τῷ ἀνδρὶ P S Cris¹ || 5 διαλέξεσιν D (cf. Psel.
Τίς ὁ παράδεισος, τί τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ξύλον καὶ τί τὸ ξύλον τῆς γνώσεως; =
Theol. Π 9,42 δύναμιν διαλέξεως et iuncturam Proclianam διαλεκτικῇ
δύναμιν): ἀποδείξουσιν (an recte?) P S Cris¹ | ἐξεθείαζον D: ἐθείαζον P S Cris¹
12 ἂν P S Cris¹: om. D || 13 ναὶ P S: καὶ D Cris¹

τὴν τιμίαν σου κεφαλὴν!)· περὶ γάρ τοι τῶν ἀπορρήτων βίβλων τί
 δεῖ καὶ λέγειν; ἀλλὰ πάντα πρὸς τὴν θεόληπτον ἡμῶν συγκρίνας 15
 γραφὴν, τὴν καθαρὰν τε καὶ στίλβουσαν καὶ τῷ ὄντι δόκιμον,
 ὑπόχαλκα καὶ κιβδηλείας εὖρον μεστά.

Ἐμὸς ὁ Πλάτων; οὐ γάρ οἶδα πῶς ἐνέγκω τὴν τοῦ λόγου
 βαρύτητα. Οὐ πάλοι μὲν τὸν θεῖον σταυρόν, νῦν δὲ καὶ τὸν
 πνευματικὸν ζυγὸν προτετίμηκα; Δέδοικα μὴ μᾶλλον σός, ἵνα σε 20
 τῷ ῥήματί σου διώξω, ὃς οὐδεμίαν ἐκείνου δόξαν ἀνήρηκας, ἐγὼ
 δὲ μικροῦ δεῖν ἀπάσας, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ πᾶσαι φαῦλαι· οἱ γὰρ περὶ
 δικαιοσύνης λόγοι καὶ περὶ ἀθανασίας ψυχῶν, ἀρχαὶ καὶ τοῖς
 ἡμετέροις τῶν ὁμοίων δογμάτων ἐγένοντο. Οὐ τοίνυν ὥσπερ τινὸς

14 τῶν – βίβλων: cf. Greg. Naz. Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ στηλιτευτικός β' = Or. 5,3
 ἐκ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς βίβλων καὶ ἀπορρήτων. cf. Psel. Κατηγορία τοῦ
 ἀρχιερέως = Or. for. 1,1137 ἢ τοῦ Ἡλίου βίβλος ἀπόρρητος et Ἐγκώμιον εἰς
 τὸν Μεταφραστὴν ... = Or. hag. 7,170 αἱ μὲν ἀπόρρητοι βίβλοι || 17 ὑπό-
 χαλκα – μεστά: Greg. Naz. Ἀπολογητικός = Or. 2,10 μηδαμοῦ κιβδηλὸν
 ἡχεῖν ἢ ὑπόχαλκον. cf. Psel. Κατηγορία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως = Or. for. 1,643–644
 τὰ τε διαυγὴ τῶν δοξασμάτων καὶ τὰ κιβδηλα καὶ ὑπόχαλκα διεκρίνετο
 19–20 τὸν² – ζυγόν: Mt. 11,29–30 ἄρατε τὸν ζυγὸν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ... ὁ γὰρ
 ζυγός μου χρηστός καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν. cf. Psel. Βίος καὶ
 πολιτεία ... Αὐξεντίου ... = Or. hag. 1c,648–649 et Ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Ἀϊσματος ...
 πρὸς τὸν ... Μονομάχον = Poem. 2,858, Εἰς τὸ 'καὶ ἡμῖν μὲν βοιωθήσεται ...'
 = Theol. I 99,93–95 et II 111,170 et II 251,38, et infra l. 181–182 || 20–21 ἵνα –
 διώξω: cf. infra l. 81 ἵνα προσείπω σε κατὰ σέ || 22–24 ἐπεὶ – ἐγένοντο: cf.
 Psel. e.g. Εἰς τὸ 'οὐσία πρᾶγμα αὐθύπαρχτον' = Phil. min. I 7,53–54 οὐ γὰρ
 πᾶσα Ἑλληνὶς δόξα διαβέβληται πρὸς ἡμῶν, τινὲς δὲ καὶ συνεργοὶ τοῦ
 ἡμετέρου τυγχάνουσι δόγματος et Περὶ ψυχῆς = Phil. min. II 11 (22,2–4) ἰδοὺ
 σοὶ καὶ τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς παρατίθημι Ἑλληνικὰ δόγματα, ὧν ἔνια καὶ τοῖς
 ἡμετέροις λογίοις συνάδει, ἀλλὰ πλέον παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῦ ποτίμου τὸ ἀλμυρόν
 24–25 ὥσπερ – ὀφθαλμίας: cf. Plat. Φαῖδρος 255d4–6 οἷον ἀπ' ἄλλου
 ὀφθαλμίας ἀπολελυκώς. cf. Synes. Cyren. Epist. 7,2–3 δεινὴν τινα καὶ πέρα
 δεινῆς ὀφθαλμιά παλαιαῖς et Psel. Εἰς τὸ 'ἐν ἔτι μοι λῦσον ...' = Theol. I
 55,88–89 ἂν μὲν γὰρ τις ὀφθαλμιά προσπαλαίση δεινῇ

14 βίβλων D: βιβλίων P S Cris¹ || 15 δεῖ καὶ P S Cris¹: χρῆ D || 19 νῦν D: νυνὶ P
 S Cris¹

25 ὀφθαλμίας ἐκείθεν ἔσπασα, ἀλλὰ τὸ διαυγάζον ἴσως ἀγαπήσας τοῦ νάματος, τὴν ἄλμην ἀπεκλυσάμην.

Ἀλλὰ τοῦτον μὲν σου τὸν ἀκροβολισμόν ἐνέγκοιμι ἂν μετριώτερον. Τὸ δὲ «ἂν ἐμοὶ πείθῃ», καὶ τοὺς «Χρυσίππους», καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς «συλλογισμούς», καὶ τὰς «οὐκ οὔσας γραμμάς», καὶ τὰλλα

25–26 τὸ – ἀπεκλυσάμην: cf. Greg. Naz. Εἰς τοὺς λόγους, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐξισωτὴν Ἰουλιανόν = Or. 19,1 μέχρις ἂν τοῖς ποτίμοις τῶν λόγων τοὺς ἄλμυρους ἀποκλύσωμαι cum Plat. Φαῖδρος 243d4–5 ἐπιθυμῶ ποτίμῳ λόγῳ οἷον ἄλμυράν ἀκοὴν ἀποκλύσασθαι et Psel. Κατηγορία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως = Or. for. 1,21–22, Βίος καὶ πολιτεία ... Αὐξεντίου ... = Or. hag. 1c,69–71, Ὀνειδίζει τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀμελοῦντας = Or. min. 24,108–110, Ἀλληγορία τοῦ ‘οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ ...’ = Phil. min. I 42,12–13, Περὶ τῆς χρυστῆς ἀλύσεως = Phil. min. I 46,12–13, Λόγος ἀλληγορῶν τὴν τοῦ Διὸς γένεσιν ... = Phil. min. I 47,10–12, Περὶ ψυχῆς = Phil. min. II 11 (22,2–4), Ἐκ τοῦ Εἰς τὰ φῶτα δευτέρου λόγου, εἰς τὸ ‘οἶδα καὶ πῦρ...’ = Theol. I 70,194–195, et Π 13a,1–3 δύο τὰς φιλοσοφίας ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγος ἐπίσταται, οὐρανὸν μερισάμενος καὶ γῆν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κάτωθεν ἀναβλύζει θολερῶ τινι καὶ ἄλμυρῷ ρεύματι, ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν ἐπιχειρεῖται ποτίμῳ τῷ ρείθρῳ et Π 507,15–20 συγκρίνων δὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ θεοπαράδοτα τῷ ὄντι λόγια παρὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἀπειροκαλίαν, τὰ μὲν ἀπεικάζω πηγῇ καθαρᾷ καὶ διειδεστάτῃ, κάτωθεν ἀναβλυζούσῃ καὶ τὴν διψῶσαν ψυχὴν ἡρέμα ἐμφορούσῃ τοῦ νάματος, τὰ δὲ ὕδατι ἐξομοίῳ θολερῶ καὶ ἀπότη καὶ ἄλμυρῷ, σφοδρῶς ῥέοντι καὶ τὸν νοῦν κατασύροντι. cf. etiam Π 13b,1–4, Π 97,19, et Duffy 2001 || 28 ἂν – πείθῃ: Greg. Naz. Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ στηλιτευτικὸς β’ = Or. 5,11 et Περὶ δόγματος καὶ καταστάσεως ἐπισκόπων = Or. 20,12 εἴ τι ... ἐμοὶ πείθῃ et Εἰς ἑαυτὸν = Or. 36,7 ἂν ἐμοὶ πείθῃ. cf. infra I. 80–81 εἴ τι οὖν ἐμοὶ πείθῃ, ἵνα προσείπω σε κατὰ σέ μέχρι τούτου | Χρυσίππους: Greg. Naz. Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ στηλιτευτικὸς α’ = Or. 4,43 ταῦτα Πλάτωνες ... καὶ Χρυσίπποι. cf. etiam infra II. 96–97 Πλάτωνα δὲ οὕς λέγεις καὶ Χρυσίππους et 192 ἐμὸς ὁ Πλάτων, ἀδελφέ, καὶ ὁ Χρυσίππος 29 συλλογισμῶν καὶ τῶν γραμμῶν. cf. infra I. 66 | τὰς – γραμμάς: Greg. Naz. Εἰς Ἡρώνα τὸν φιλόσοφον = Or. 25,6 οὐδὲ γραμμαῖς τινες οὐδαμοῦ κείμεναι. cf. etiam Greg. Naz. Λόγος θεολογικὸς δεύτερος, περὶ θεολογίας = Or. 28,25 ποῖος Εὐκλείδης ἐμιμήσατο ταῦτα, γραμμαῖς ἐμφιλοσοφῶν ταῖς οὐκ οὔσαις, καὶ κάμων ἐν ταῖς ἀποδείξεσι; cf. etiam Sext. Emp. Πρὸς λογικοὺς 3,29 et 30 (et etiam 9,376) οὐκ ἔσται ἡ γραμμὴ ... οὐκ ἄρα ἔστι γραμμὴ. cf. etiam Π 201,46 οἷον τὸ ἐκ τῶν γραμμῶν μέγεθος (εἴ που μέμνησαι) et infra II. 59–68 γραμμῶν δὲ μνησθεῖς, ὧ πάντων ὑπεριδὼν σύ, τί κάκείναις προσετρίψω τὸ ἀνυπόστατον; ὁ γὰρ πρῶτος περὶ τούτων εἰπὼν «τὰς οὐδαμοῦ κειμένας», προστέθεικε φιλοσόφως ἄγαν καὶ ὑψηλῶς: «ἄλλο δὲ τὸ μὴ εἶναι καὶ ἄλλο τὸ

28 ἂν P S Cris¹: ἦν D

180 Οὕτως ἐγώ, φίλτατε, τοῖς ὄρεσι διαιτῶ καὶ ταῖς πόλεσι τῷ
 ἐμῷ θεῷ καὶ δεσπότη ἐπόμενος, δι' ὃν καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου ἡράμην
 ζυγόν, καὶ τουτὶ τὸ τρύχινον πεφόρηκα ἔσθημα, ὃς πολλάκις μὲν
 ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, σπανίως δὲ προσήει τοῖς ὄρεσι. Καὶ οἱ περὶ Γρηγό-
 185 ῤιον δὲ τὸν πάνυ (ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὸς οἶσθα) ἀπὸ τῶν πληθουσῶν
 ἀγορῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ζωὴν μετετάξαντο· εἰ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία
 τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ἡμῶν ἐστι, ποῖον ἔνδον ὄρος οὐκ ἀπολέλειπται;
 ἐσχάτη γὰρ αὕτη σφαῖρα συμπάντων μὲν ὁρῶν, συμπάσης δὲ
 ἀναβάσεως.

Σὺ δὲ μὴ ἀπορήσης τί ποτε πεπονθῶς οὕτω τοσάδε καὶ τοιάδε
 190 παρεφθεγξάμην· τὸ γὰρ με κινήσαν ἐπὶ τοὺς λόγους πολυτελεῖς
 μοι τὰς ἀφορμὰς τῆς κινήσεως δέδωκεν.

Ἐμὸς ὁ Πλάτων, ἀδελφέ, καὶ ὁ Χρῦσιππος; Ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ᾧ
 συνεσταύρωμαι, τίνος; δι' ὃν ὅσον ὡς ἐν συμβόλῳ τὴν ὑλικὴν
 ἀπέκερσα περιττότητα, δι' ὃν ἀφ' ἑτέρας πρὸς ἑτέραν μετεθέμην

181–182 τὸν – ζυγόν: Mt. 11,29 ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. cf. Psel. Βίος
 καὶ πολιτεία ... Αὐξεντίου ... = Or. hag. 1c,648–649 et Ἑρμηνεία τοῦ
 Ἀϊσματος ... πρὸς τὸν ... Μονομάχον = Poem. 2,858, Εἰς τὸ 'καὶ ἡμῖν μὲν
 βρωθήσεται ...' = Theol. I 99,93–95 et Π 111,170 et Π 251,38, et supra ll.
 19–20 || 182 τουτὶ – ἔσθημα: Greg. Naz. Εἰς ἑαυτὸν = Or. 36,6 τὸ ἔσθημα
 τοῦτο τὸ τρύχινον || 184–185 πληθουσῶν ἀγορῶν: iunctura saepissime
 laudata; cf. Xen. Κύρου Ἀνάβασις 1,8,1 et 2,1,7 cum e.g. Greg. Naz. Πρὸς
 Ἀρειανούς, καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν = Or. 33,6. cf. Psel. Ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
 μητέρα 702–703, Κατηγορία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως = Or. for. 1,2318–2319 et Βίος καὶ
 πολιτεία ... Αὐξεντίου ... = Or. hag. 1a,723 et 1c,576, et Π 179,19 et Π
 251,39–40 || 183–185 οἱ – μετετάξαντο: fontem non inveni || 185–186 ἡ –
 ἐστι: Luc. 17,21 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν || 190 παρε-
 φθεγξάμην: vox ex Ael. Arist. Περὶ τοῦ παραφθέγματος (373,37, 377,30,
 383,8, 388,18, 389,32)? || 192 ἐμὸς – Χρῦσιππος: Greg. Naz. Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ
 στηλιτευτικὸς α' = Or. 4,43 ταῦτα Πλάτωνες ... καὶ Χρῦσιπποι. cf. etiam
 supra ll. 28 Χρῦσιππους et 96–97 Πλάτωνα δὲ οὐς λέγεις καὶ Χρῦσιππους
 192–193 Χριστὸς – συνεσταύρωμαι: Gal. 2,19 Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι. cf.
 Psel. Ἑρμηνεία τοῦ Ἀϊσματος ... πρὸς τὸν ... Μονομάχον = Poem. 2,1061

180 διαιτῶ P D S Cris¹: διαιτῶμαι B || 181 καὶ² P B S Cris¹: om. D
 183 προσήει P D S Cris¹: προσήειν B || 184 τῶν P D S Cris¹: om. B
 185 ἀγγελικὴν P B S Cris¹: πολιτικὴν D || 186 ἀπολέλειπται P D S Cris¹:
 ἐπιλέλειπται B || 187 ἐσχάτη D B: ἐσχάτη μὲν P S Cris¹ || 189 ἀπορήσης P D S
 Cris¹: ἀπορήσ B | οὕτω P D S Cris¹: ἐγὼ B || 190 πολυτελεῖς D B Cris¹:
 πολυπετεῖς P S e quo falsum LBG lemma || 193 ὡς – συμβόλῳ D: ἐν
 συμβόλοις P B S Cris¹ || 194 μετεθέμην D: μετετέθην P B S Cris¹

ζωήν; Οὐ μὴν εἰ καθαρῶς εἰμι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοὺς σοφωτέρους τῶν 195
 λόγων ἀρνήσομαι, καὶ τὴν γνώσιν τῶν ὄντων, ὅσα τε νοητὰ καὶ
 ὅσα αἰσθητὰ πέφυκεν, ἀποδύσομαι· ἀλλ' ἐντεύξομαι μὲν θεῷ δι'
 εὐχῆς ὅποσα δυνήσομαι, καὶ ἀρπασθήσομαι εἴ γε δοθείη μοι·
 καταβάς δὲ ἐκεῖθεν διὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως πολυκίνητον ἐπὶ τοὺς
 λειμῶνας βαδιοῦμαι τῶν λόγων, καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ «εἶπε γέρων» 200
 ὥσπερ ἄνθος ὠραῖον κερῶ, νῦν δὲ ἄλλο τι τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀπανθί-
 σας τῇ ψυχῇ συλλέξω.

Αὐθις δὲ μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ συλλογιόμην, καὶ φυσικοῖς
 ὁμιλήσω δόγμασι, καὶ τοὺς λόγους τῶν γιγνομένων ζητήσω, καὶ
 τὸν νοῦν πολυπραγμονήσω καὶ τὸ ἐπέκεινα τούτου, ἵσως δέ τι καὶ 205
 περὶ σχημάτων ζητήσω. Σὺ μὲν οἶε ὥσπερ τὸ πρὶν ἐποιοῦμεν,

198 καὶ ἀρπασθήσομαι: cf. II Cor. 12,2 οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ... ἀρπαγέντα ... ἕως
 τρίτου οὐρανοῦ cum Psel. Εἰς τὸ 'εἶδον ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ ...' = Theol. I 27
 et supra l. 158–159 || 199–200 ἐπὶ – λόγων: cf. II 50,10 τῷ τοῦ λόγου λειμῶνι,
 II 167,51 ὥσπερ ἐν λειμῶνι ταῖς ἐμαῖς διαναπαύῃ ἐπιστολαῖς, et II 459,31.32
 τὰ ἐμὰ γράμματα, ὥσπερ κῆποι τινες ἢ λειμῶνες. cf. etiam Liban. Πρὸς τοὺς
 Ἀντιοχείας ὑπὲρ τῶν ῥητόρων = Or. 31,18,10 τὸν λειμῶνα τῶν λόγων
 200 εἶπε γέρων: iunctura ex Apophth. patrum (e.g. collectio systematica 1,30,
 1,32, etc.). cf. infra l. 229 || 204–205 καὶ² – τούτου: cf. Psel. Περὶ θεολογίας
 καὶ διακρίσεως δογμάτων Ἑλληνικῶν = Phil. min. II 35 (120,5–7) τὸ δὲ
 λεχθὲν περὶ τοῦ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ νοῦ, ὅτι κατὰ μὲν νόησιν πολλὰ λέγεται,
 θεωρεῖται δὲ ἀνοησίᾳ κρείττονι νοήσεως, γνησιώτατον τοῖς ἡμετέροις ἐστὶ
 δόγμασι cum Porph. Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ 25 (15,1–2); cf. etiam Psel.
 Ἐξήγησις τῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν ῥητῶν = Phil. min. II 38 (145,11–22) et II
 124,28–29

195 καθαρῶς P B S Cris¹: καθαρός D | σοφωτέρους P D S Cris¹: σοφοὺς B
 196–197 ὅσα – πέφυκεν P B S Cris¹: ὅσα πέφυκε νοητὰ, καὶ ὅσα πέφυκε
 αἰσθητὰ D || 197 μὲν P B S Cris¹: om. D | θεῷ P D S: τῷ θεῷ B Cris¹
 197–198 δι' – ὅποσα P D S Cris¹: ὅποσα δι' εὐχῆς B || 201 ἡμετέρων D B
 Cris¹: ὑμετέρων P S || 201–202 ἀπανθίσας P B S Cris¹: ἀπανθήσας D
 203 μεταβάς: [ca. 7 litt.] B || 204 γιγνομένων P D S Cris¹: γινομένων B
 205 τι D Malt³, 431 Cris¹: om. P S || 206 σχημάτων D Malt³, 431: σχήματος P S
 Cris¹ || 204–206 καὶ² – ζητήσω P D S Cris¹: om. B

ταύτης τῆς καταβάσεως, ἀφ' ἧς θάττον πρὸς τὰς ὑπερτέρας νοήσεις ἀφίσταμαι.

Ἀλλὰ μὴ οὔ, ἀδελφὲ φίλτατε (φίλτατος γὰρ εἶ, εἰ καὶ μετὰ Πλάτωνος ἡμᾶς ἠρίθμησας ἀποστήσας Χριστοῦ), ὅτι πρὸς ἀπέχθειάν σοι ταῦτα γέγραπται παρ' ἡμῶν. Οὐ, μὰ τὸν ἐμόν τε καὶ σὸν Ἰησοῦν! Ἄλλ' ἀθρόον πληγείς τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ῥήματι, οὐκ εἶχον ὅπως διαβαστάσω τὸ ἄχθος. Διὰ ταῦτα γοῦν εὐθύς ἐπὶ ταύτην ἐλήλυθα τὴν γραφήν, ἀπολογούμενος πρὸς τὴν ὕβριν, καὶ ἀποδεικνύς ὡς οἶόν τε, ὅτι πᾶσαν Ἑλληνικὴν σοφίαν, ὅσην ὁ πάλαι χρόνος ἐπρέσβευε (συναριθμεῖ ταύτη καὶ τὰ Χαλδαίων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ εἴ τις ἐτέρα γνώσις ἀπόρρητος), ἐλάττονα ζύμπαντα τοῦ «εἶπε γέρων» λελόγισμαι.

Ἐπὶ τούτῳ, βάλλω σοι πόρρω μετάνοιαν, τὸ σύνηθες τοῦτο τῆς ὑμετέρας παιδαγωγίας, καὶ συγγνώμην αἰτῶ, ὅτι μὴ κατέσχον τοὺς λογισμούς, μηδὲ τὴν γλῶτταν ἐπέσχον, τὸ μετὰ Πλάτωνος ἀριθμεῖσθαι χωρισμὸν τῶν ἰσοθέων ἀνδρῶν ὑμῶν ἡγησάμενος.

πάντα ταῦτα κοσμεῖ τὸ ὄμμα ἐκεῖνο, καὶ ἀφαιρεῖ τὴν λήμην, καὶ διεγείρει κατὰ βραχὺ προσεθίζοντα τοῖς ὁράμασιν, ὥστε θαρσῆσαι ποτε καὶ πρεσβύτερον θέαμα, καὶ μὴ ταχὺ σκαρδαμύξαι πρὸς ἥλιον ἀτενίσαντα. cf. etiam 6,4 cum Π 64,23–24, Π 167,30–33, Π 200,69–75, et Π 201,30–34
225 ὅσην – ἐπρέσβευε: Synes. Cyren. Δίων 1,2 καὶ ἀστρονομίας εὖ ἤκοντα, ὅποσην ὁ τότε χρόνος ἐπρέσβευεν || 227 εἶπε γέρων: cf. supra l. 202

216 καταβάσεως P D S Cris¹: καταστάσεως B || 219 Πλάτωνος D: τοῦ Πλάτωνος P B S Cris¹ | ἠρίθμησας D: ἠρίθμησας P B S Cris¹
222 διαβαστάσω P B S Cris¹: διαβαστάξω D || 223 εὐθύς P B S Cris¹: om. D
224 σοφίαν P D S Cris¹: παιδείαν B || 225 ἐπρέσβευε D: ἐπρέσβευσε P B S Cris¹ || 225–226 τὰ – Αἰγυπτίων D: τὴν Χαλδαίων καὶ τὴν Αἰγυπτίων P S Cris¹ τὰ Χαλδαίων καὶ τὰ Αἰγυπτίων B || 227 εἶπε D B Ana¹ Malt⁴,31: εἶναι P S Cris¹ | λελόγισμαι P B S Cris¹: νενόμισμαι D || 228 ἐπὶ τούτῳ – μετάνοιαν P D S Cris¹: om. B || 229 ἡμετέρας dubitanter prop. Cris¹ (in app. crit.)
228–229 τὸ – παιδαγωγίας P S Cris¹: om. D B || 229–230 ὅτι – τὸ P B S Cris¹: μὴ κατασχεῖν τοὺς λογισμούς δυνηθεῖς μηδὲ ἐπισχεῖν τὴν γλῶσσαν τῷ D || 231 ἀνδρῶν ὑμῶν P D S Cris¹: ὑμῶν ἀνδρῶν B

Summaries

C 1 (= S 175) TO THE MONK IOANNES XIPHILINOS, WHO BECAME PATRIARCH

‘My Plato?’, Psellos asked, dramatically. If Xiphilinos meant that Psellos often read Plato’s dialogues, admiring his thoughts and the power of his arguments, then why did he not make the same accusation to the great fathers whose precise argumentation overturned heresies in the early church? If he meant that Psellos followed Plato’s beliefs or relied on his laws, he was wrong. Psellos read many philosophical books as well as rhetorical speeches, including Plato (of course) and Aristotle. He also knew the Chaldaean and Egyptian philosophers. But in comparison to the pure, authentic Christian gospels, he found them adulterated and false. ‘My Plato?’. The charge was insufferable. He long ago adopted the cross, and recently became a monk. Plato belonged just as much to Xiphilinos, who had not disavowed his doctrines, while Psellos rejected most of them, though some were the basis of similar Christian beliefs. Xiphilinos’ list of charges read like a prelude to persecution. Either he had not understood Psellos’ letter, or it had been addressed to heretics. Xiphilinos showed hostility to Plato and philosophy. When had he heard Psellos identifying with those on his list? Not at court, nor while they discussed tonsure, nor in the monastery. He was accused of still being furiously angry. It would be easier to undergo a violent physical assault than for one dedicated to Christ to be accused of heresy, and thought by a friend (a judge) to have deserted God for Plato. Psellos defended himself against speaking of intangible lines, which were in fact the basis of mathematics and physical theories, so highly regarded by Maximos the Confessor, whose thought they had in common. Rather than taking pride in his lack of education, Xiphilinos should read all Christian and non-Christian literature, which would give a less haughty perspective. Psellos was from his youth a devoted Christian.

He enjoyed ancient philosophy, but superficially. Most of its doctrines he rejected at once, while others he mixed with Christian texts, as did St Basil and St Gregory. He wished he could dispense with argumentation and see God as he was: but otherwise argumentation was a necessary Christian way to approach truth, the solid food recommended by St Paul. Psellos protested that Xiphilinos turned against him some points he conceded out of friendship. He also argued at length against obscure geographical arguments used by Xiphilinos, commenting on their inaccuracy. Psellos used Chaldaean terms in a Christian framework to make a symbolic opposition between the mountain (Xiphilinos the monk) and the city (Psellos), ending by espousing both sides. He had been crucified with Christ, and symbolically renounced matter: but that did not mean abandoning the wisest of writings and knowledge of nature. He would pray to God to be allowed to wander in the fields of science, collect ideas, reason, seek rationales, and inquire into the mind. This was what he had done before, but he now found a door to go beyond the shadowy enquiries of the past. He also used rhetorical techniques of writing, convinced these were pathways to higher knowledge. He finally told Xiphilinos he remained a friend, and did not write because he disliked him but because he was wounded by the words about Plato. Psellos had replied at once, stressing that all ancient philosophy, Greek, Chaldaean, and Egyptian, was less than the words ‘I am a monk’. He apologized for expressing himself so strongly as to be counted with Plato, separating himself from great Christians like Xiphilinos.

Date etc.: 1055–64 probably c.1055–6. Xiphilinos may have joined, in his own way, in attacks on Psellos listed in excursus 11. The fullest description of these attacks, [S 139](#), is falsely addressed to Xiphilinos, not Keroularios, in one ms., perhaps because the scribe knew [C 1. C 1](#) seems to have little structure and to contain mixed voices. It replies to criticism from Xiphilinos, behind which may be dimly seen a previous letter of Psellos. Psellos refers by summary and quotation to Xiphilinos’ lost letter, leaving apparent contradictions between it and his reply. It is likely that the structure is taken from the lost letter. The famous phrase ‘Plato is mine’ which begins the letter and recurs like a refrain, reads much better as an indignant, interrogative, repetition of an accusation from his friend than a statement of Psellos’ belief, as is often assumed. Xiphilinos probably referred more than once to ‘your Plato’ (Metzler 2007). The letter should be dated soon after Psellos left Mt Olympos in 1055 and resumed political life in the capital. The *terminus ante quem* is 1064, since there is no sign in the letter that it addresses a patriarch. The reference in the heading does not date the letter, it just identifies the recipient.

Moore 142: ms P, K, D, B. Bezobrazov 1890/2001, 153–60 (partial Russian translation); Zervos 1919, 145 n. 3, 162 n. 1, 217 n. 2; Criscuolo 1973; Tinnefeld 1973, 167; Browning 1975, 11 nn. 39–40; Gouillard 1976, 316 n. 88, 317 n. 93, 323 n. 145; Lemerle 1977, 244; Tatakis 1977, 160 n. 107, 161 n. 112, 170 n. 162, 171 n. 163, 172 n. 173, 178–9 (nn. 209–20),

180 nn. 226–7, 181 n. 237, 183 (nn. 244–51), 187 n. 261, 196 n. 305; Ljubarskij 1978, 49, 53–5; Niarchos 1979, 130–1; Beck 1982, 141–5; Garzya 1985, 478–9; Anastasi 1988a; Maltese 1988a, 30–1; Criscuolo 1990a, 49–57 (edition of text), 61–7 (Italian translation); Ljubarskij 1992, 177–8; Angold 1994, 244–5 nn. 71–7; Angold 1995, 35 n. 41; Duffy 1995, 87 n. 16; Angold 1998, 236 n. 64; Agapitos 1998, 181–2 n. 55; Kaldellis 1999, 15 n. 34, 113 n. 230, 126 n. 263; Chondridou 2002, 211 n. 223; Ierodiakonou 2002a, 158, 159; Tatakis 2003, 130 n. 112, 131 n. 116, 140 nn. 168–9, 142 n. 179, 147 n. 215, 148–9 (nn. 217–33), 151 n. 242, 152–3 (nn. 249–56), 156 n. 267, 164 n. 311; Ljubarskij 2004, 84, 89–91; Walker 2004, 68 n. 44; Grünbart 2005, 72, 214, 220, 221, 323, 325, 352; Sarres 2005, 425 n. 49; Jenkins 2006, 146 n. 42, 147 n. 44; Kaldellis 2007, 201 n. 35, 203 n. 39, 207 n. 58; Metzler 2007, 293–6, 298; Siniosoglou 2011, 77 n. 72, 80 n. 80; Kaldellis 2012, 142–4; O’Meara 2012, 168 n. 36; Papaioannou 2012a, 302 n. 43; Wassiliou-Seibt 2012, 311 n. 17; Papaioannou 2013, 7, 22 n. 59, 109 n. 64, 134, 145; MICHAEL ANGOLD; JOHN DUFFY.

C 2 (= S 207) TO THE PATRIARCH MICHAEL KEROULARIOS

Psellos wrote a long letter to Keroularios in the form of a comparison, beginning with an extravagant and respectful address. He then listed the extreme differences between them, varying the descriptions of both their characters in a disconcerting way from extreme praise to blame, suggesting that the whole is a thinly veiled attack on the patriarch, sometimes turning to open hostility. Keroularios was an incomparable angel going up and down between heaven and earth, forming a link between the beings above and humans below, while Psellos was a man with an earthly body, having no higher powers or ambitions; Keroularios was uniquely immutable, Psellos changeable and striving to improve; Psellos was always reading, studying, and teaching every possible subject, Keroularios’ wisdom came in different ways, without effort, from mystic sources; Keroularios was a proud aristocrat descended from famous forebears, destined for a brilliant career, Psellos was not; Keroularios despised culture and literature, and so had contempt for Psellos, despite his great skills and high fame as a teacher in every corner of the world. Keroularios (Psellos said in mock admiration) had an inflexible nature and dogmatic rigidity basing his beliefs on unknown premises rather than reason and contemplation. Psellos had a philosophical throne of parallel importance, the resources of which Keroularios would need if involved in theology. Psellos believed in equality with his fellow citizens at theoretical and practical levels, Keroularios despised them and was ready to provoke and divide them: he should sheath his sword and quench his fire. Keroularios was the centre of Byzantium’s religious drama, Psellos cowered on the periphery. The two were so