

# A Letter of Michael Psellos to Constantine the Nephew of Michael Cerularios

*Kenneth Snipes*

IN AN ARTICLE listing the unpublished letters of Michael Psellos, Jean Darrouzès noted that a small group of six letters attributed to Psellos is found in three manuscripts: *Athos, Μονή Μεγίστης Λαύρας* 1721 (M 30) fols. 86–98; *Bucharest, Academia Republicii Socialiste Romania* 737 (587) fols. 214–49; and *Cambridge, Trinity College* 1485 (0.10.33) fols. 192–203<sup>v</sup>.<sup>1</sup> In addition to the three manuscripts known to Darrouzès, these six letters are found also in *Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Supplément grec* 1334 fols. 108–23<sup>v</sup>.<sup>2</sup> Three of the six (the first, fourth, and sixth) were correctly identified by Darrouzès as letters already published by Sathas or Kurtz-Drexl.<sup>3</sup> Darrouzès, followed by Paul Canart in a later, more comprehensive list of the unpublished letters of Psellos,<sup>4</sup> believed that the other three letters (the second, third, and fifth) had not yet been published. In the case of the third and fifth letters, however, both scholars have been misled by slight differences between the word order of their *incipits* and the *incipits* of letters 1 and 84 in the large collection of Psellos' letters edited by Sathas.<sup>5</sup> The fifth letter, for example, begins *Ἐγὼ δὲ ᾧμην, ἱερὰ καὶ τριπόθητε κεφαλή*, rather than *Ἐγὼ μὲν, ᾧ ἱερὰ καὶ τριπόθητε κεφαλή* as in the version in *Parisinus gr.* 1182 fol. 207<sup>v</sup>, published by Sathas.<sup>6</sup> This would leave as unpublished only the second letter,

<sup>1</sup> J. Darrouzès, “Notes d'épistolographie et d'histoire des textes. Les lettres inédites de Michel Psellos,” *REByz* 12 (1954) 177–80.

<sup>2</sup> C. Astruc and M.-L. Concasty, *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue des manuscrits grecs III Le Supplément grec* iii (Paris 1960) 654–57.

<sup>3</sup> Letter 1, *Inc. Καὶ ποταπὸς παπᾶς ὁ παπᾶς ὁ ἐμός*, ed. E. Kurtz and F. Drexl, *Michaelis Pselli Scripta minora* I (Milan 1936: hereafter ‘KURTZ-DREXL’) 65–68; letter 4, *Inc. Εἰ δέ μοι νόμος ἔκειτο*; and letter 6, *Inc. Ἀπορῶ παντάπασι γενναιότατε καὶ θαυμασιώτατε ἄνθρωπε*, ed. K. SATHAS, *Μεσαιωνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη* V (Venice 1876: hereafter ‘Sathas’) 318–21, 316–18 (nos. 83 and 82).

<sup>4</sup> P. Canart, “Nouveaux inédits de Michel Psellos,” *REByz* 25 (1967) 59–60, letters 5, 8, and 26.

<sup>5</sup> Sathas 219–22, 321–24.

<sup>6</sup> The third letter begins *Αὐθέντα μου καὶ ἀδελφέ*, instead of *Αὐθέντα μου καὶ ἀνεψιέ* as in Sathas, letter 1.

beginning *Οἶδα ὅτι ἐρᾶς ἐπιστολῶν ἐμῶν*, addressed to Constantine, the nephew of the Patriarch Michael Cerularios.<sup>7</sup> In fact this letter has also been published, but its two early editions are so nearly inaccessible and the witnesses to its text so peculiar that it warrants special study.

In three of the four manuscripts, *Lavra*, *Bucharest*, and *Paris*, the six letters of Psellos are included among a large group of letters, primarily by later, post-Byzantine writers—Maximos Margounios, Cyril Lucar, Theophilos Korydaleus, etc.—but also including letters by earlier writers such as Julian the Apostate, St Basil, Libanios, and Psellos. All these letters appear in the same order in the three manuscripts under the title *Ἐπιστολαὶ Ἑλλήνων μεταγενεστέρων καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἠκμασάντων*, and follow a treatise on letter-writing by Theophilos Korydaleus,<sup>8</sup> *Περὶ ἐπιστολικῶν τύπων*. The *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus was published as early as 1625, by the printer William Stansby (“Ex Officina G. S. Typographi”) in London,<sup>9</sup> and appeared in three other early editions which are today very rare: Moschopolis, 1744;<sup>10</sup> Halle, 1768;<sup>11</sup> and Venice, 1786.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> G. Weiss, “Forschungen zu den noch nicht edierten Schriften des Michael Psellos,” *Byzantina* 4 (1972) 30 n.69, correctly states that two of the three letters of Psellos to Constantine cited as unpublished by Darrouzès have been published, but repeats the opinion of Darrouzès and Canart that the second letter is unpublished. L. G. Westerink, “Some Unpublished Letters of Blemmydes,” *Byzantoslavica* 12 (1951) 44 n.3, also says there is one unpublished letter of Psellos in *Trinity College* 1485.

<sup>8</sup> The life and writings of Theophilos Korydaleus have been studied carefully by C. Tsourkas, *Les débuts de l'enseignement philosophique et de la libre pensée dans les Balkans. La vie et l'oeuvre de Théophile Corydalée (1570–1646)*<sup>2</sup> (Thessaloniki 1967) and “Les années d'études de Théophile Corydalée au Collège grec de Rome (1604–1608),” *Balkan Studies* 8 (1967) 115–22. Tsourkas is summarized by G. P. Henderson, *The Revival of Greek Thought 1620–1830* (Albany 1970) 12–19.

<sup>9</sup> E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-septième siècle* I (Paris 1894) 194–200. The *editio princeps* of the *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus is discussed by R. J. Roberts, “The Greek Press at Constantinople in 1627 and its Antecedents,” *The Library. Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* SER. V 22 (1967) 16–17, 40–41.

<sup>10</sup> E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique du dix-huitième siècle* I (Paris 1918) 322–23, “rarissime et précieuse édition.” The Greek *ἐν Μοσχόπολει* refers not to Moscow (as stated incorrectly by Henderson [*supra* n.8] 16), but to Moschopolis, present-day Voskopojë in Albania, a nearly deserted town about twenty miles northwest of Korçë. Cf. I. Martinianos, *Ἡ Μοσχόπολις 1330–1930* (Thessaloniki 1957). Moschopolis was a thriving Greek town with an estimated population of 50,000 in the eighteenth century. It was famous for its Greek schools and was known as the New Athens of the Turcocrata or as the New Mistra. The second edition of Korydaleus' *Epistolarion* was one of about fifteen books published between 1731–1744 by the press founded by the monk Gregorios Konstantinides. Cf. F. R. Walton, “The Greek Book, 1476–1825,” *Dixième Congrès international des bibliophiles* (Athens 1977) 41.

<sup>11</sup> Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique 18ème siècle* II (Paris 1928) 93.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 463–64.

The letters that follow the *Epistolarion* are given by Korydaleus as models, illustrating the various principles of good letter-writing discussed in his treatise.<sup>13</sup> All six letters of Psellos, including the one thought to be unpublished, are published in two of the four printed editions of the *Epistolarion*, the first (1625) on pp.111–13, and the fourth (1786) on pp.170–72. The second and third editions of the *Epistolarion* contain only the first in this group of six letters by Psellos, the *ἐπιστολή κατηγορικὴ κατὰ τοῦ ἰδίου παπᾶ*.<sup>14</sup>

All four manuscripts that contain the group of six letters of Psellos date from the seventeenth or eighteenth century. The three manuscripts which also contain the *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus obviously cannot be earlier than the beginning of the seventeenth century, when he was active. Two of these, *Bucharest 737* (587) and *Paris, Supplément grec 1334*, date from the eighteenth century. *Bucharest 737* (587)<sup>15</sup> belonged to George Ioannou of Ampelakia, Professor at the Greek Academy in Bucharest from 1794 to 1797.<sup>16</sup> A note on f.126<sup>v</sup> of *Paris, Supplément grec 1334*, *Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον καὶ Ἰσαὰκ πόνος*, records the name of the scribe, and another note in the upper margin of f.1 records the former provenance of the manuscript, *ἀφιέρωμα τοῦ ἁγίου τάφου*.<sup>17</sup> A close comparison of the first edition of the *Epistolarion* with the manuscripts in Bucharest and Paris reveals that both were copied from this printed edition of 1625, and consequently have no independent value for establishing the text of the six Psellos letters.<sup>18</sup> The scribe of the Paris

<sup>13</sup> H. Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften, 9. Griechische Briefsteller," *RhM* n.s. 53 (1909) 288–89, says that the *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus is essentially a paraphrase of a similar treatise, *Ἐπιστολικὸς χαρακτήρος σύνοψις*, in *Barberini gr.* 71 fols. 46<sup>v</sup>–61<sup>v</sup>. *Barberini gr.* 71, a manuscript of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, does not contain the collection of illustrative letters. Cf. V. Capocci, *Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana. Codices Barberiniani graeci I* (Vatican City 1958) 78–79.

<sup>14</sup> Moschopolis edition p.66, Halle edition p.65.

<sup>15</sup> C. Litzica, *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești din Biblioteca Academiei Române* (Bucharest 1909) 486–89.

<sup>16</sup> A. Camariano-Cioran, *Les Académies princières de Bucarest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs* (Thessaloniki 1974) 463–64.

<sup>17</sup> Astruc and Concasty (*supra* n.2) 654–57. *Supplément grec 1334*, acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale on 11 January 1913, was formerly ms 18 in the small collection of the monastery Mar Ibrahim (K. Koikylides, *Κατάλοιπα χειρογράφων Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς βιβλιοθήκης* [Jerusalem 1899] 121) before passing into the collection of the Greek Patriarchate in Jerusalem. This manuscript is described as part of the collection of the Holy Sepulchre by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη V* (St Petersburg 1915) 438–39, although it had already entered the Bibliothèque Nationale by the time Papadopoulos-Kerameus' catalogue was published.

<sup>18</sup> This is true for the other illustrative letters as well. L. Canfora, "Altri manoscritti Giuliani," *AntCl* 37 (1968) 634–36, unaware that the text of the letter of Julian to St Basil included in *Lavra 1721* (M 30) and *Bucharest 737* (587) was simply copied from the

manuscript slavishly reproduces every line of division found in the *editio princeps* between the various letters, and produces his own crude, colored version of the ornamental decoration.<sup>19</sup> The Lavra manuscript, which has remained inaccessible to me, follows exactly the contents of the Bucharest and Paris manuscripts, and it too is almost certainly a copy of the first edition of the *Epistolarion*.<sup>20</sup> The *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus became a standard textbook for students at the Patriarchal Academy in Istanbul and in the Greek Academies in Roumania, and it continued to be copied and re-copied because of the scarcity and difficulty of obtaining copies of the printed editions.<sup>21</sup> The Library of the Academy in Bucharest contains a dozen or more manuscript copies of Korydaleus' *Epistolarion*,<sup>22</sup> but according to the printed catalogues only *Bucharest 737* (587) has reproduced the collection of illustrative letters.

The presence of the group of six letters of Psellos in the Trinity College, Cambridge, manuscript is more problematic. This manuscript does not include the *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus or any of the other illustrative letters. There are a number of significant

---

*Epistolarion* of Korydaleus, lists these two manuscripts as part of the manuscript tradition of Julian overlooked by J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite des lettres de l'empereur Julien* (Brussels 1898).

<sup>19</sup> M.-L. Concasty (*supra* n.2) 657 incorrectly postulated that *Supplément grec* 1334 was copied from the Venice edition (1786) of the *Epistolarion*, but did not verify this hypothesis, stating that the *Epistolarion* was "pratiquement introuvable." Darrouzès, *REByz* 20 (1962) 228, reviewing the catalogue of Astruc and Concasty, pointed out that the Institut français d'études byzantines in Paris possesses two editions (1744 and 1786) of the *Epistolarion*. The Institut, in fact, has three editions, including the very rare second edition, Moschopolis 1744. Using a photocopy of the first edition from the Bodleian Library, Oxford, I was able to compare all four editions of the *Epistolarion* in the library of the Institut in Paris. *Supplément grec* 1334 differs from the *editio princeps* only in the addition of elaborate and fanciful colored initials at the beginning of each section of the *Epistolarion* and at the beginning of each of the letters.

<sup>20</sup> Spyridon of the Lavra and S. Eustratiades, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Lavra on Mount Athos* (Harvard Theological Studies 12: Cambridge 1925) 307–08. Spyridon published in the sixth letter (Sathas, no. 82) of the group of Psellos letters in *Lavra 1721* (*M* 30), "Ἐπιστολαὶ παρηγορητικαί," *Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς* 8 (1924) 279–81. Spyridon's text follows closely the version of the letter in the 1625 edition of the *Epistolarion* on pp.121–23, with only a few obvious copying or printing errors.

<sup>21</sup> Camariano-Cioran (*supra* n.16) 172–74 discusses the study of epistolography in these academies and the copying of Korydaleus' manual by professors and students. Tsourkas, *Débuts* (*supra* n.8) 101–02, says that no other Greek author enjoyed such a "succès de tirage" in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but adds that "personne n'a été oublié aussi rapidement. . . ."

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Litzica (*supra* n.15) and N. Camariano, *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești din Biblioteca Academiei Române II* (Bucharest 1940).

textual variants in the six Psellos letters in this manuscript, and it is not so evidently copied from, or based upon, one of the printed editions. Most of the manuscript, a miscellaneous collection of primarily Byzantine texts copied at various times on several different sizes of paper,<sup>23</sup> was copied by the English scholar Patrick Young (Patricius Junius, 1584–1652).<sup>24</sup> However, the folios near the end of the manuscript which contain the letters of Psellos are not in Young's ordinary hand but were written by another scribe, perhaps a friend or student of Young.<sup>25</sup> Many of Young's manuscripts, including many of his own transcriptions, passed into the collection of Dr Thomas Gale (1635/6–1702), whose son Roger Gale presented the manuscripts to Trinity College in 1738.<sup>26</sup> Bernard's great catalogue of manuscripts in England and Ireland, published in 1697, includes the manuscripts in Gale's collection, and lists the manuscript that contains the six letters of Psellos as manuscripts nos. 5895 through 5904, assigning a different number to each group of texts which make up the manuscript that is now *Trinity College 1485* (0.10.33).<sup>27</sup>

Among the miscellaneous collection of Greek texts in *Trinity College 1485* are several works copied by or for Patrick Young from manuscripts in Oxford, including nine orations of Himerios from *Barocci 131* in the Bodleian Library. It is possible that the six letters of Psellos on folios 192–203<sup>v</sup> of the Trinity College manuscript may originally have been included in this famous manuscript which contains a great many works of Psellos, including a group of letters.<sup>28</sup> According to a report in 1654 by Thomas Barlow, Librarian of the Bodleian Library, against the practice of

<sup>23</sup> M. R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge* III (Cambridge 1902) 520–21.

<sup>24</sup> J. Kemke, *Patricius Junius (Patrick Young) Bibliothekar der Könige Jacob I. und Carl I. von England. Mitteilungen aus seinem Briefwechsel* (Leipzig 1898).

<sup>25</sup> A specimen of Young's Greek handwriting is given by G. P. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collection* IV (London 1921) pl. 124(g). The unidentified hand that copied the six letters of Psellos begins on f.142 and continues through f.203<sup>v</sup>. This section of the manuscript contains corrections by Young on many folios, but not on those that contain the Psellos letters.

<sup>26</sup> James (*supra* n.23) v–xiii. The third volume of James's catalogue is entirely devoted to the manuscripts given to Trinity College by Gale. Cf. also P. Gaskell and R. Robson, *The Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Short History* (Cambridge 1971) 26.

<sup>27</sup> E. Bernard, *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* II (Oxford 1697) 187 no. 5904, "Michaelis Pselli Epistolae ad diversos."

<sup>28</sup> N. G. Wilson, "A Byzantine Miscellany: MS. Barocci 131 Described," *JOB* 27 (1978) 157–79, gives a complete description of the contents and foliation of the manuscript, indicating the places where folios have apparently been lost. The orations of Himerios in

lending books from the Bodleian, "lending of books makes them lyable to many casualties . . . they may be spoyl'd in the carriage, as by sad experience we find, for above 60 or 100 leaves of a Greek MS. (*Μυριοβιβλος*, num. 131) lent out of Archiva Pembrochiana to Mr. Pat. Younge were irrecoverably defaced."<sup>29</sup>

Although none of these six letters is found today among the letters of Psellos that have survived in *Barocci* 131, five of the six are found in at least one manuscript other than the four late manuscripts that contain the entire group of six letters. Only the letter to Constantine, the nephew of Michael Cerularios, edited below, the second in the group, is found in no other manuscripts. Four of the six, letters two through five, are addressed to Constantine, and form a small group within the larger group of six letters. The letter preceding the four to Constantine, the *ἐπιστολή κατηγορική κατὰ τοῦ ἰδίου παπᾶ*, is found also in *Vaticanus gr.* 672, on folios 249<sup>v</sup>–51.<sup>30</sup> The letter that follows those to Constantine was written to the deposed and blinded emperor Romanos Diogenes in the summer of 1072,<sup>31</sup> and is found in three other manuscripts: *Parisinus gr.* 1182 f.207;<sup>32</sup> *Vaticanus gr.* 712 fols. 61–62;<sup>33</sup> and *Laurentianus gr.* 57–40 fols. 1–2.<sup>34</sup> Three of the four letters to Constantine are also included in *Parisinus gr.* 1182; letters four and five appear in sequence on folios 207–08, and the third letter is at the top of folio 189.<sup>35</sup>

*Parisinus gr.* 1182 (thirteenth century) belongs to a group of important manuscripts that contain large collections of the many diverse writings attributed to the polymath Psellos.<sup>36</sup> The manu-

---

*Trinity College* 1485, copied from *Barocci* 131 according to a note on f.129 (*Ex. MS. Barocci* 131), are not by the hand that copied the letters of Psellos.

<sup>29</sup> W. D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, Oxford (Oxford 1868) 83.

<sup>30</sup> R. Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani graeci* III: *Codices* 604–866 (Vatican City 1950) 124.

<sup>31</sup> G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. Hussey (Oxford 1968) 345, remarks that "Psellus surpassed himself on this occasion by sending the blinded emperor a letter in which he addressed him—his own victim—as a fortunate martyr whom God had deprived of his eyes because He had found him worthy of a higher light."

<sup>32</sup> H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale I* (Paris 1886) 250.

<sup>33</sup> R. Devreesse (*supra* n.30) 201–02.

<sup>34</sup> A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae* II (Florence 1768) 399.

<sup>35</sup> H. Omont (*supra* n.32) does not specify which letters of Psellos appear in *Parisinus gr.* 1182, but states only that *epistolae variae cciv* are found on fols. 189–238.

<sup>36</sup> Other manuscripts which are primarily collections of the works of Psellos include *Barocci* 131, *Vaticanus gr.* 672, *Barberini gr.* 240, and *Laurentianus* 57–40.

script is in very poor condition and is notoriously difficult to transcribe. The scribe wrote in a small, cramped script, and the folios bristle with abbreviations and compendia.<sup>37</sup> As Serruys has shown in his ingenious attempt to reconstruct the original order of the folios in this manuscript,<sup>38</sup> many folios and entire quires have disappeared, or have been incorrectly replaced after having fallen out. The present pagination of the manuscript is seriously at variance with the earliest indications of the correct order of the quires. Many texts are interrupted or made senseless by the incorrect order of the folios. The resulting chaos is further compounded by a number of folios on which the text has been copied from an earlier exemplar whose folios had also been incorrectly arranged.<sup>39</sup> It is important to note carefully the chaotic state of *Parisinus gr.* 1182, because the text of the other three letters addressed to Constantine in the Trinity College manuscript agrees more closely with this manuscript than with the version of these letters published by Korydaleus. The absence of the first letter to Constantine in *Parisinus gr.* 1182 is all the more puzzling since the other three letters in the group appear to be derived directly from *Parisinus gr.* 1182, or to share with it a common archetype.

In the present state of the manuscript, the letters of Psellos collected in *Parisinus gr.* 1182 begin at the top of f.189 with the second letter of the group of four letters to Constantine, *i.e.*, the third letter of the group of six letters found in the Trinity College manuscript and in the *Epistolarion* of Korydaleus and its apographs. The top edge of f.189 is badly damaged, and an obviously much later hand has added a title, *Ἐπιστολαὶ διάφοροι πρὸς διάφορους*, at the top of the frayed folio, spacing the words and even individual letters to fit the contours of the various tears and gaps. The bottom of the page has an early quire mark *ΜΔ'* and the folio number *ρπθ*, indicating that folio 189 is the first folio of a quire.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Although the size of the script and its arrangement on the folios vary throughout the manuscript, giving a superficial appearance that the manuscript is the work of several scribes writing in a similar script, a closer analysis of the script suggests the work of a single scribe, perhaps written at many different times and later joined together to form a collection of the works of Psellos.

<sup>38</sup> D. Serruys, "Note sur le manuscrit de Psellos: Parisinus 1182," *BZ* 21 (1912) 441–47.

<sup>39</sup> L. G. Westerink, "Proclus, Procopius, Psellus," *Mnemosyne* SER. III 10 (1941–42) 277, shows that a section of Psellos' *Accusatio Cerularii* in *Parisinus gr.* 1182 which has perplexed scholars was copied from an exemplar in which a double leaf had fallen from the middle of a quaternion and had been inserted incorrectly at the end of the quaternion. This sort of copying error is obviously very difficult to detect.

<sup>40</sup> Originally the quires (quaternions) of *Parisinus gr.* 1182 were signed simply by groups

It would be tempting to postulate that the missing letter to Constantine was originally on a folio now lost which preceded the new quire. This hypothesis would be strengthened by the late title added along the top edge of the folio, a title obviously not written by the scribe who copied the letters but by some later scribe or owner of the manuscript who wanted to mark the beginning of the section containing letters by Psellos. The top line of the text on f.189 begins after a discreet indentation with the title of the first letter in the present collection, *τοῦ Ψελλοῦ ἐπιστολὴ πρώτη πρὸς τὸν πρωτοπρόεδρον κὺρ Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν Δρουγκάριον*. This letter was not originally the first in this collection of Psellos' letters. Its title has misled some later binder to place this quire at the head of the section that contains the letters of Psellos. The letter is in reality only the first letter in a group of five letters addressed to Constantine, the Great Drungarios, all dealing with the subject of Constantine's remarriage (Sathas, nos. 1, 83–86). Although addressed to Constantine, the letter edited below does not discuss his remarriage and does not properly belong with the other five letters to Constantine in *Parisinus gr.* 1182. It is impossible to say whether this letter, now missing from *Parisinus gr.* 1182, has perhaps fallen out at some time from the manuscript or had already become detached from the exemplar from which *Parisinus gr.* 1182 was copied. Folios are definitely missing from the section of the manuscript which contains the collection of Psellos' letters.<sup>41</sup>

Where the scribe of *Trinity College* 1485 and Theophilos Korydaleus found the missing first letter of Psellos to Constantine in their group of six letters remains an intriguing mystery. The other letters to Constantine in the Trinity College manuscript consistently follow the versions in *Parisinus gr.* 1182. In the second letter to Constantine, for example, the word *γλωτται* is omitted in the text printed by Korydaleus (p.113.16 of the London edition, after *μόνον*). The missing word appears in both the Trinity College manuscript (f.195<sup>v</sup>.11) and in *Parisinus gr.* 1182 (f.189.3). A puz-

---

of one hundred, one of the very few examples of this method of numeration. An early hand, perhaps contemporary but not the hand of the scribe, has noted this numeration in a large script in brown ink on fols. 291<sup>v</sup>, 67<sup>v</sup>, and 247<sup>v</sup>. For example, on f.291<sup>v</sup> of the present manuscript, *ἕως ὧδε φύλλων ἑκατοντάς πρώτη*. The quires are marked by four different sets of numbers, making it possible to detect the successive stages of the manuscript and to follow the progressive decomposition and rearrangement of its folios and contents.

<sup>41</sup> For example, the thirty-fourth quaternion, fols. 236–38, consists now of only three folios. Since the final text is mutilated, we can presume that the quire originally contained eight folios, of which five are lacking today.



zling series of lacunae in another of the letters (f.196<sup>v</sup>.7–8) of the Trinity College manuscript can be explained tentatively by comparison with the parallel passage in *Parisinus gr.* 1182 (f.189.24). The Paris manuscript is not damaged at this point, but the words which the scribe of the Trinity manuscript, or the scribe of his exemplar, could not decipher are very difficult to interpret in the Paris manuscript. Many other similar omissions, additions, and variant readings shared by the Trinity College manuscript and *Parisinus gr.* 1182 show that the two are in some way related. This is in striking contrast with the variant readings in the version printed by Korydaleus and copied by the scribes of *Bucharest* 737 (587), *Paris, Supplément grec* 1334, and *Athos, Lavra* 1721 (*M* 30). The variant readings in the printed editions are not so distinctive as to eliminate the possibility that the Korydaleus group derives ultimately from a corrupted text of the archetype of the Trinity College manuscript and *Parisinus gr.* 1182.

The text of Psellos' letter to Constantine, the nephew of Michael Cerularios, edited below is based primarily on the Trinity College manuscript. Although this manuscript and the text published by Korydaleus both date from the seventeenth century, the Trinity College manuscript appears to be an independent and somewhat superior witness to the text of this letter. The text of the six letters of Psellos in the Trinity College manuscript has been corrected in several places by what appear to be both the hand of the original scribe and that of a later corrector. Two small corrections in the letter edited below have been made by the original scribe on f.194<sup>v</sup>.5: the incorrect *μέν* before the infinitive *ἴστασθαι* has been corrected by the addition of *ἡ* above the word, and *αι* has been added above the line to correct *ἐλαύνεσθε*. These corrections are minor and could easily have been made conjecturally without reference to another manuscript. But corrections on f.202 recto and verso in the final letter of the group have been made from a collation of the manuscript with the *editio princeps* of Korydaleus' *Epistolarion*: f.202<sup>r</sup>.4, *διὰ τί* has been added (*διατί ed. pr.*, p.121.22); line 19, *κυρίῳ* has been crossed out and *Θεῷ* added (*ed. pr.* p.122.4); line 21, *δέ* inserted above the line (*ed. pr.* p.122.6). The earliest recorded owner of the Trinity College manuscript, Dr Thomas Gale, appears to have known the edition of the Psellos letters by Korydaleus and may possibly have owned a copy of the *editio princeps*. Folio 205 of *Trinity College* 1485 contains a list of *Libri graeci inediti* belonging to Gale, dated *Junii* 2.1686 (crossed out at the top of the folio). Three works of Psellos are listed: *Pselli*

*didascalìa multiplex; Eiusdem moralium quaestionum solutiones compendiosae; and Eiusdem aenigmata in Psychogoniam Platonis tractatus/ et περὶ χρυσοποιῆας.* The six letters of Psellos are not listed, and presumably Gale knew that they had been published with Korydaleus' *Epistolarion* in 1625.<sup>42</sup>

Since no manuscript of the Byzantine period has survived of the letter of Psellos to Constantine edited below, I have thought it particularly important to record all readings from the Trinity College manuscript in the *apparatus criticus*. It is impossible to estimate the number of intermediate copies which separate the manuscript from Psellos' original, but the text in this manuscript is remarkably accurate in comparison with the edition of Korydaleus. The variant readings found in the latter are almost always elementary errors of orthography, word division, improper accentuation (especially of enclitics), itacisms, or careless printing errors. These errors have been silently corrected and are not usually recorded in the *apparatus criticus*. The Bucharest and Paris manuscripts, eighteenth-century copies of Korydaleus' *Epistolarion*, have no independent value for the reconstruction of the text. The Bucharest manuscript is a remarkably accurate transcription of the *editio princeps* of the *Epistolarion*, departing only once from Korydaleus' text: the scribe recognized that the reference near the end of the letter to Constantine's youngest child as τὸν πατρίκιον refers to the dignity *patricius* and does not signify that the child was named Patrikios as in the version published by Korydaleus. The Paris manuscript faithfully reproduces all the errors of the *editio princeps*, the scribe adding a few jejune-interlinear and marginal notes: the emperor Romanos Diogenes, for example, referred to by Psellos simply as ὁ βασιλεύς, is incorrectly identified (f.112.7) as ὁ Ἀλέξ(ι)ος. The readings of both these apographs are accordingly excluded from the *apparatus criticus*.

<sup>42</sup> The corrections in the letters of Psellos in *Trinity College* 1485 made by a comparison with the *editio princeps* could obviously have been made after the manuscript entered the college library. The library has a beautifully bound copy of the 1625 edition (\*Grylls. 32. 84) with the initials TG on both covers. The book was a bequest from James Duport (1606–1679), elected Fellow of Trinity College in 1627. See J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* I.2 (Cambridge 1924) 76. The volume bears the inscription "Ex dono clarissimi viri, clarissimi et mei amici, m<sup>ri</sup> Sethi Ketlewell." Seth Ketlewell was a Fellow of Trinity College during 1627–36 (Venn 11). The initials TG are not easily explained. Thomas Gale himself was not admitted to the college until May 23, 1655, but the book might conceivably have belonged to him at some time.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ, Κωνσταντίνω

1 Οἶδα ὅτι ἐράς ἐπιστολῶν ἐμῶν καὶ συχνῶν καὶ καλῶν,  
ὧ τέκνον σοφίας ἐπήρατον· καὶ πῶς γὰρ οὐ μέλλεις, ὕφ'  
ὦν ἐτρέφης πρὸς παιδευσιν καὶ ἅ τῶν ἄλλων προέκρινας;  
ἐγὼ δὲ ἔοικα μὴ δύνασθαι νῦν ἐμπλήσαι σου τὴν ψυχὴν  
5 τοῦ ἐραστοῦ τούτου δὴ πράγματος καὶ παραμυθῆσασθαι  
σου τὸν ἔρωτα· πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι μοι καὶ ἡ χεὶρ, ὡσπερ δὴ  
οἱ τοὺς πίνακας γράφοντες, ἀργότερα πῶς ἐγεγόνει τῷ  
χρόνῳ πρὸς τὰς τῶν λόγων μορφάς, ἔπειτα δὴ καὶ τὸ  
γόνιμον ἐκείνο καὶ εὐτονον τῆς ψυχῆς ἀμβλύτερον μὲν  
10 ἴσως οὐκ ἐγεγόνει – τί γὰρ δεῖ μὴ τάληθῆ λέγειν; – ἀλλ'  
ἐπέσχον τὴν γνώμην ὠδίνουσαν τὰ ἐνταῦθα δεινά.

Ἐπεγείρεται γὰρ αἰεὶ μοι κῦμ' ἐπὶ κύματι, καὶ μοι τὸ  
σῶμα ὅλον καταβελὲς ἤδη, κἂν οὐπω βέβλητο. τέως γὰρ  
ἀφόρητόν τί μοι ἐδόκει κακὸν ἢ ἄμετρος ἐνταῦθα πε-  
15 ριαγωγὴ, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἴστασθαι με, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ἐλαύνεσθαι, καὶ  
οὐδὲ διὰ ῥαδίας οὐδὲ διὰ λείας καὶ τετριμμένης, ἀλλὰ νῦν  
μὲν διὰ βαθείας φάραγγος, αὐθις δὲ δι' ὀρέων ὑπερνεφῶν  
αἵματί τε ποταμῶν κεκραμένων καὶ ἐφελκομένων τῷ ῥεύ-  
ματι· ταῦτα δὴ, καὶ τὰ τούτων δεινότερα. νῦν δέ μοι ζύμ-  
20 παντα ταῦτα μέτριά τε καὶ ἀτεχνῶς ἰλαρά, καὶ ἐλάνθανον  
τέως ἐν παραδείσῳ τρυχόμενος· τὰ δέ γε νῦν παρεστῶτα  
πῶς ἂν διηγησαίμην, τριπόθητε ἀδελφέ; εἰοίκαμεν γὰρ  
ἄντικρυς κατακρίτοις καὶ ἀπαγομένοις εἰς θάνατον. περι-  
κάθηντο γὰρ ἡμᾶς κύκλωθεν οἱ πολέμοι πρὸς οὓς ἀφικ-  
25 νούμεθα, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποδειλιασάντων πρὸς τὴν  
ἐπαγωγὴν τοῦ κακοῦ μόνος θαρρεῖ τοῦτο ὁ βασιλεύς· καὶ  
οὐδὲν αὐτῷ πρᾶγμα εἰ καὶ μόνος ἐκείνων ταῖς χιλιάσιν  
ἀντισταίῃ καὶ μυριάσι. τὸ γὰρ γενναῖόν τι πρᾶγμα καὶ τοῖς  
πράγμασι λυσιτελεῖς ἐργάσασθαι μυρίων θανάτων ἀνταλ-  
30 λάττεται. κάμοι βραχὺ τι καθίσταται ἡ ψυχὴ, ἐπειδὴν ὑπὸ  
προπυργίῳ τούτῳ καὶ βαδίζω καὶ ἴσταμαι. ἀλλ' αὐθις  
ταράττομαι πρὸς ἑτέραν δὴ ἀκοήν· καὶ νῆ τὴν ἱεράν σου  
ψυχὴν, εἰ μὴ ὁ καλὸς Ἰασίτης, ὁ πάντα ἐμοὶ ἐράσμιος καὶ  
θαυμάσιος, καθίστα τέως τὰ κυμαίνοντα πράγματα καὶ  
35 τὴν φορὰν τῶν δεινῶν ἐπέιχε καὶ τὴν ἐπάνοδον ἡμῖν ἤτοι-  
μάζετο πόρρωθεν, ὁποῖος δὴ οὗτος τοῖς ἀπόροις πόρους  
προσμηχανώμενος καὶ ἰλαρᾶ γλώττη βραχὺ τι πρᾶγμα  
ἀναχωννύς, αὐτίκα ἂν ἐτεθνήκειν.

Ἀπὸ δὴ τοιαύτης ψυχῆς τί ἂν ἀκούσαις ἠδύ, φιλότατη  
40 ψυχὴ; ἀπερρῦη γὰρ μοι ἄντικρυς εἴ τί μοι δὴ καὶ πρώην

συνείλεκται· καί σοι ἡ καλὴ ἐκείνη γλῶττα, ἥς ἐραστῆς  
 ἐτύγχανες ὦν, καὶ ἀφ' ἧς οὐδὲν πίπτειν χαμάζε ἐβούλου,  
 ἀλλὰ καὶ πίπτον ἴσως χαμόθεν ἀναλαμβάνειν ἡροῦ, κατέ-  
 ψυκται ἄντικρυς, καὶ αὐχμὸν ἀγροικίας περὶκείται. εἰ δέ  
 45 τι καὶ ὠραῖον ἐν ταῖς εἰκόσι – λέγω δὲ οὕτω τοὺς λόγους  
 τούτους—οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἐμὴν χάριν καὶ δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν  
 πρὸς σέ μοι φιλίαν, δι' ἣν δοκεῖ μοι κἂν ἐξ "Αἰδου φωνὴν  
 ἀφείναι χαρίεσσαν, εἰ μὴ τῶν ἐν "Αἰδου τὰ τῆδε καταπολὺ  
 50 σκυθρωπότερα. ἀλλὰ πότε σὲ καὶ τὴν ζύμπασάν σου θεα-  
 σαίμην οἰκίαν, τὸ τιμιώτατόν σοι τῆς πλευρᾶς τμήμα, τὸν  
 μαθητήν, τὸν βεστάρχην, τὸν βέστην, τὸν ἄρτι τῶν σπαρ-  
 γάνων λυθέντα πατρίκιον, τὸν πρῶτον περὶ σὲ κύκλον,  
 τὸν δεύτερον, καὶ εἴ τις τρίτος, καὶ τὸν περὶ τὸν ἵπῶνα,  
 55 καὶ τὸν ἱπῶνα; ἀλλὰ πότε ταῦτα ὑμῖν ἀποκαθιστάμενος  
 φθέγξομαι; νῦν γὰρ ἀπάγομαι, νῦν ἀπελαύνομαι ἔτι καὶ  
 πόρρω Καισαρείας· ἀφ' ἧς ἀνακάμψω καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς  
 βαδιοῦμαι, καὶ τὼ χεῖρέ ποτε ὡς σταδιοδρόμος ἄρῶ.

C = Cambridge, Trinity College 1485 (0.10.33), fols. 194–195<sup>v</sup>, saec. XVII

ed.pr. = editio princeps, Theophilus Korydaleus *Περὶ ἐπιστολικῶν τύπων* (London 1625) 111–13.

Tit.: post Κωνσταντίνῳ add. ἀδελφῶ ed.pr. || 3 ἐτράφης ed.pr.: ἐτράφεις C || 4 δὲ ἔοικα C: δ' ἔοικα ed.pr. || 6 δὴ C: δὲ ed.pr. || 7 post ἐγεγόνει inseruit κρατοῦσα et in marg. scripsit ἴσως prima manu C || 10 μὴ C: μὲ ed.pr. || 13 ὄλον C: ὄσον ed.pr. || καταβελές C: καταβαλές ed.pr. || 15 μὴ ed.pr.: μὲν cum ἡ supra lineam prima manu C || ἐλαύνεσθαι ed.pr.: ἐλαύνεσθε ante corr. cum ai supra lineam prima manu C || 18 κεκραμένων] κεκραμμένων C ed.pr. || 22 διηγησαίμην] διηγησαίμι C: διηγησαίμι ed.pr. || 29 λυσιτελές ed.pr.: λυσιτελής C || 37 προσμηχανώμενος] πρὸς μηχανώμενος C: προσμηχανόμενος ed.pr. || 40 ἀπερρῦη C: ἀπορρῦει ed.pr. || 52 πατρίκιον signo superscripto nomen proprium indicat C: Πατρικίον ed.pr. || 53 ἵπῶνα C: ἵπωνα ed.pr. || 54 ἱπῶνα] ἵπωνον C: ἵπωνον ed.pr. || 55 φθέγξομαι ed.pr.: φθέξομαι C

I know that you are longing for many beautiful letters from me, my charming and accomplished young friend. And how could it be otherwise, since you owe to them your education and have preferred them above all else? But it now seems as though I am unable to provide sufficiently what you desire so much and to satisfy your longing. In the first place, my hand, as is sometimes the case with those who paint pictures, had grown too stiff through the passage of time to paint its word-pictures. And while that creative tension of the soul had not perhaps become more sluggish—why should I not tell the truth?—the terrible situation here held back my teeming thoughts.

For wave upon wave rises up against me, and my whole body is already covered with wounds, even though I have not yet been hit. Until now, in fact, it seemed intolerable misery to me to wander about here endlessly and not to settle down anywhere, but to be driven on forever, not by an easy road, smooth and well-travelled, but now through a deep ravine, then through cloud-capped mountains, and rivers stained with blood and carried along in their currents. Such was my fate, and even worse than that. Now, however, all this appears trifling to me, thoroughly pleasant even, and without being aware of it, I was fretting all the time in the very midst of Paradise. But how can I describe to you our present predicament, my dearest brother? We are just like condemned men on their way to execution. We were surrounded on every side by the enemy against whom we were marching, and while the others shrink from the approaching danger, the Emperor is the only one to brave it. It means nothing to him if he alone must face their thousands and ten thousands, because to do some brave deed for the good of the country is worth ten thousand deaths to him. My heart is quiet for awhile, when I move and stand in the shelter of such a rampart as he. But I am again alarmed at a fresh rumour; and upon my word, if noble Iasites, my most beloved and admired friend, did not establish order for the present in the confused state of affairs and stem the flood of disaster and prepare my return from afar, expert as he is in handling precarious situations, and cheerfully building up our slender resources, I would have been dead long ago.

From one so disposed, what pleasant thoughts can you expect, dear friend? Everything has slipped from me, whatever I might have gleaned before; and that elegant tongue which you used to admire so much, from which you would not allow a single word to fall to the ground, and if anything did happen to fall, you made a point of picking it up—it has lost all its charm and has withered to barren dullness. If there is any beauty at all in my pictures, as I call these writings of mine, it is not due to my grace and power, but to the friendship I hold for you, which I daresay could make me say charming things even in Hades, assuming that things here are not far more dismal than in Hades! But when shall I see you and your household again, your dear wife, my pupil the *vestarches*, the *vestes*, the *patricius*, just now out of swaddling-clothes, the first circle of your friends, the second, the third if there is one, your stable and kitchen staff? When shall I be reunited with you and speak these words to you? I am still being carried away, still driven on beyond Caesarea; but I shall return from there, and I shall throw up my hands at last, like a runner in the stadium.

The recipient Constantine, the nephew of the Patriarch Michael Cerularios,<sup>43</sup> is well known through a series of letters addressed to

<sup>43</sup> P. Gautier, "La curieuse ascendance de Jean Tzetzés," *REByz* 28 (1970) 212–13 and

him by Michael Psellos.<sup>44</sup> According to information that may be deduced from the rhetorical flourishes of Psellos' funeral oration for Michael Cerularios, Constantine and his brother Nikephoros appear to have been placed in the custody of their illustrious uncle at an early age when their father died.<sup>45</sup> They were sent by the Patriarch to Psellos for instruction,<sup>46</sup> and they later rose to the highest ranks of the imperial administration in Constantinople. The two brothers fell into disgrace briefly in November 1058, when the Patriarch was sent into exile by the Emperor Isaac Comnenos, but they were restored to their former positions by the Emperor after the death of their uncle a few months later. The dying Emperor Constantine X Doukas viewed the potential threat of the brothers with such alarm that he required his wife Eudocia Makrembolitissa, a cousin of Constantine and Nikephoros, to bind herself by oath not to raise any of her relatives to the position of *paradynasteuon* in the event of his death.<sup>47</sup> The historian Nike-

---

216, twice insists that *Κηρουλάριος* (literally, 'a maker or seller of wax candles', according to E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*) was a surname reserved exclusively for the Patriarch Michael Cerularios and was never a patronymic applied to other members of his family. A. P. Každan, *Social'nyi sostav gosподstvujuščego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow 1974), found no evidence for this name in the period 976–1025, but found references to eight members of this family in the later eleventh and twelfth centuries. Since the prosopography compiled by Každan for his study of the social composition of the ruling class in Byzantium in the eleventh and twelfth centuries has unfortunately not been published, it is impossible to know if he actually found any member of the family of Michael Cerularios styled simply 'Cerularios'. The earlier study of Byzantine surnames by H. Moritz, *Die Zunamen bei den byzantinischen Historikern und Chronisten I–II (Programm des K. Humanistischen Gymnasiums in Landshut 1896–97, 1897–98)*, gives no help towards a solution to this problem. In the titles of the letters of Psellos to Constantine and his brother Nikephoros, the two brothers are never called simply Cerularios. I follow Gautier, and the usage of Psellos himself, by referring to Constantine as 'the nephew of Michael Cerularios', rather than simply, and incorrectly, as 'Constantine Cerularios'.

<sup>44</sup> These letters are listed and discussed by Ja. N. Ljubarskij, "Psell v otnošenijach s sovremennikami. Psell i semja Kerulariev," *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 35 (1973) 89–102, and more recently in his book *Michail Psell. Ličnost' i tvorčestvo* (Moscow 1978) 62–69. Ljubarskij also discusses other letters of Psellos, the titles of which are lost, but whose contents suggest that they had been addressed to Constantine.

<sup>45</sup> Sathas IV 351.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 352. The teaching career of Psellos is discussed by W. Wolska-Conus, "Les écoles de Psellos et de Xiphilin sous Constantin IX Monomaque," *Travaux et mémoires* 6 (1976) 223–43.

<sup>47</sup> This document is published by N. Oikonomidès, "Le serment de l'impératrice Eudocie (1067)," *REByz* 21 (1963) 101–28. The position of *παπαδυναστεύων* is discussed by H. G. Beck, "Der byzantinische Ministerpräsident," *BZ* 48 (1955) 310–38, and J. Verpeaux,

phoros Bryennios confirms these suspicions by saying that at one time Constantine aspired to the imperial throne.<sup>48</sup> The ascent of Constantine on the Byzantine *cursus honorum* can be reconstructed to some extent by the titles of letters addressed to him by Psellos.<sup>49</sup> Constantine held at various times the titles and dignities of *logothete tou genikou*,<sup>50</sup> *magister* and *sakellarios*,<sup>51</sup> *proedros*,<sup>52</sup> *protoproedros*,<sup>53</sup> *drungarios*,<sup>54</sup> *great drungarios*,<sup>55</sup> and *sebastos* and *ἐπὶ τῶν κρίσεων*.<sup>56</sup>

Psellos writes that he is on a traumatic and dangerous journey towards Caesarea, and that he intends to return from that city immediately to Constantinople. The letter must date from the spring of 1069 when Psellos accompanied the Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes on the latter's second expedition against the Seljuks in Asia Minor.<sup>57</sup> These two campaigns preceded the disastrous

“Contribution à l'étude de l'administration byzantine: *ὁ μεσάζων*,” *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955) 270–96. The oath of Eudocia uses the expression *τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ διοικεῖν τὸ κοινόν* (78–79).

<sup>48</sup> Nicéphore Bryennios, *Histoire*, ed. P. Gautier (CFHB 9: Brussels 1975) 213.3, *πάσαι γὰρ ἦν ὄνειροπολῶν τὴν βασιλείαν*.

<sup>49</sup> The career of Constantine is discussed at some length by Oikonomidès (*supra* n.47) 119–20 and Gautier (*supra* n.43) 212–14.

<sup>50</sup> Psellos addresses two letters *τῷ γενικῷ τῷ ἀνεπιῷ τοῦ πατριάρχου*, Sathas V 363, 441. R. Guillard, “Les logothètes. Etudes sur l'histoire de l'Empire byzantin,” *REByz* 29 (1971) 21, lists Constantine among holders of the title *ὁ λογοθέτης τοῦ γενικοῦ*, or logothete of the public Treasury. This office is discussed by N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris 1972) 313 and *passim*.

<sup>51</sup> Sathas V 277. In this letter, addressed *τῷ μαγίστρῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ σακελλαρίῳ*, Constantine is referred to as *ὁ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως ἀδελφιδουῦς* (7–8). For the title *sakellarios* see I. Ševčenko, “The Inscription of Justin II's Time on the Mevlevihane (Rhesion) Gate at Istanbul,” *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 12 (1970) 6, and Oikonomidès (*supra* n.50) 312.

<sup>52</sup> Kurtz-Drexel II 46. For the honorifique title *proedros* see C. Diehl, “La signification du titre de proèdre à Byzance,” *Mélanges Gustave Schlumberger* I (Paris 1924) 105–17; A. Christophilopoulou, *Ἡ σύγκλητος εἰς τὸ Βυζαντινὸν κράτος* (Athens 1949) 78–84. Oikonomidès (*supra* n.50) 299.

<sup>53</sup> Sathas V 219–22, 467–69.

<sup>54</sup> Nikephoros Bryennios 3.2 (211–13 Gautier), *ὁ δρουγγάριος οὗτος ἦν Κωνσταντίνος, ὁ τοῦ τῆς πατριαρχίας τὸν θρόνον ἰθύναντος πάλαι Μιχαὴλ ἀδελφιδουῦς, ὃς ἐπεκέκλητο Κηρουλάριος*. Cf. R. Guillard, “Le Drongaire et le Grand drongaire de la Veille,” *BZ* 43 (1950) 340–65, reprinted in *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* I (Berlin 1967) 563–87.

<sup>55</sup> Sathas V 318. See also the novel promulgated by Michael VII Doukas in October 1074, in J. and P. Zepos, *Jus graecoromanum* I (Athens 1931) 279–82.

<sup>56</sup> Kurtz-Drexel II 254. For the *ἐπὶ τῶν κρίσεων* see N. Oikonomidès (*supra* n.50) 259.

<sup>57</sup> The campaigns of 1068–1069, in which Romanos attempted to stop further penetration by the Seljuks into Byzantine territory, are described in detail by Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1853) 93–138. Cf. Baron V. Rosen, “Arabskie skazaniya o

defeat of the Byzantine army and the capture of Romanos by the Turkish forces of Alp Arslan at Mantzikert in August 1071, an event often cited as emblematic of Byzantium's rapid and dramatic decline from its reputed acme at the end of the reign of Basil II in 1025. The letter appears to have been written shortly before another which Psellos addressed, according to the contents of the letter, to the *protoasecretis*, the *libellisios*, and the *ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων*.<sup>58</sup> In this letter Psellos informs his three correspondents that he has now arrived in Caesarea and that his hazardous journey over mountains and valleys has finally come to an end: *Διὰ ταῦτα ἐμοὶ μὲν καμπτήρος ἢ τοῦ δρόμου γέγονε ζύντασις. οὕτω γὰρ ἐγὼ καλῶ τὴν Καισαρείαν, ἔνθεν αὐτὸς τὸν δρόμον ἀνέλυσσα*.<sup>59</sup> This repeats almost exactly the letter edited above, with the exception that Psellos has not yet reached Caesarea. This would suggest that the letter to Constantine was written several weeks before the letter addressed to the three high dignitaries.

In Book VII of the *Chronographia* Psellos describes briefly his participation in Romanos' second campaign against the Seljuks.<sup>60</sup> Somewhat uncharacteristically Psellos minimizes his own role in the expedition.<sup>61</sup> This is in keeping with his use of the historical framework of the *Chronographia* as the vehicle for an elaborate *apologia* for his own political career.<sup>62</sup> With a view of the disastrous consequences of Romanos' expeditions, Psellos emphasizes at the beginning of his brief account that he had advised the emperor against undertaking these expeditions without sufficient and

---

poraženin Romana Diogena Alp-Arslanam," *Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologicheskago Obshchestva* 1 (1886) 193–202, and C. Cahen, "La campagne de Manzikert d'après les sources Musulmans," *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 628–42. The Turkish menace, and the attempt of the Byzantines to counter it, is recounted by C. Cahen, "La première pénétration turque en Asie-mineure (seconde moitié du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *Byzantion* 18 (1948) 5–67; V. Gordlevskij, *Gosudarstvo Sel'džukidov Maloj Azii* (Moscow/Leningrad 1941); and S. Zakkar, *The Emirate of Aleppo 1004–1094* (Beirut 1971).

<sup>58</sup> Sathas V 451–55.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.* 455.6–8.

<sup>60</sup> *Chronographia* 7.15–17. Michel Psellos, *Chronographie, ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance* (976–1077), ed. E. Renauld, II (Paris 1928) 159–60.

<sup>61</sup> 7.15.4–5, *κἀγὼ τῆς στρατείας πάρεργον γίνομαι* (II 160 Renauld).

<sup>62</sup> R. Anastasi, *Studi sulla 'Chronographia' di Michele Psello* (Catania 1969), emphasizes this apologetic character of Psellos' history. See my review in *JHS* 94 (1974) 258–59. G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie* III.2 (Frankfurt 1962) 760–830, discusses the *Chronographia* as a work of autobiography. The autobiographical and apologetic character of the *Chronographia* is discussed in a perceptive essay on Psellos as an historian in the recent Russian translation of the *Chronographia* by Ja. N. Ljubarskij, *Michail Psell, Chronografia* (Moscow 1978) 198–263.



careful preparations. Boasting of his great expertise in matters of military tactics, he writes that Romanos insisted that he accompany him on his second attempt to contain the Seljuk menace. Psellos enigmatically declines to elaborate on the reason why Romanos was so insistent that he accompany him on this expedition. He excuses himself from further comment by saying that he is simply summarizing events at the moment, and will write about the expedition at greater length at a later time.<sup>63</sup>

Psellos' portrait of Romanos Diogenes in the *Chronographia*<sup>64</sup> is very different from the almost encomiastic description of the Emperor's courage in battle contained in the letter of Psellos to Constantine. Alluding in the *Chronographia* to Romanos' arrest on charges of plotting against the government of the Empress Eudocia in 1067, Psellos deplors the clemency of the Empress, who spared the life of Romanos and eventually married him, raising him to the imperial throne: "she should have put him to death."<sup>65</sup> Psellos himself later played an important role in the deposition of Romanos, and his eventual blinding and death, after the defeat at Mantzikert. Psellos was no admirer of Romanos, but any uncomplimentary or critical letter written while on campaign in Asia Minor with Romanos could obviously have come very easily into the wrong hands. Psellos, the master Byzantine politician, praises Romanos in the letter written on campaign in 1069, but paints a very different picture of Romanos when he composed the final section of the *Chronographia* sometime in the reign of Michael VII Doukas.<sup>66</sup> The emperor to be glorified at that time was Michael Doukas, and the dark account of Romanos' reign

<sup>63</sup> 7.15.6–11 (II 160 Renault). Psellos and his friend, the Caesar John Doukas, brother of Constantine X, had opposed the marriage of Constantine's widow Eudocia to Romanos Diogenes. Romanos probably insisted that Psellos accompany him on campaign in order to lessen the danger of a rebellion in Constantinople during his absence. The career of the powerful Caesar John Doukas is recounted by B. Leib, "Jean Doukas, césar et moine. Son jeu politique à Byzance de 1067 à 1081," *AnalBoll* 68 (1950) (*Mélanges Peeters* II) 163–80.

<sup>64</sup> 7.10–43 (II 157–72 Renault).

<sup>65</sup> 7.10 (II 157 Renault).

<sup>66</sup> Joan Hussey, "Michael Psellus, the Byzantine Historian," *Speculum* 10 (1934) 82, believes the *Chronographia* may be divided into two sections—from Basil II to the end of the reign of Isaac Comnenos (976–1059), and from Constantine X Doukas to Michael VII Doukas (1059–78). At the instigation of Michael VII, Psellos added the second part of the *Chronographia* to the original history which had ended with the abdication of Isaac Comnenos. Psellos even states (7.11: II 177–78 Renault) that Michael VII himself had supplied the material for the history of his reign. See also the earlier analysis of the *Chronographia* by J. Sykutris, "Zum Geschichtswerk des Psellos," *BZ* 30 (1929–30) 61–67.

would only intensify the brilliance of the achievements of Psellos' pupil, Michael Doukas.

The letter to Constantine confirms the impression given by other Byzantine sources of the chaotic state of affairs in the Byzantine Empire in the years immediately before the Battle of Mantzikert. Psellos speaks in the letter of the "confused state of affairs" in the capital, and credits his friend Iasites with establishing order during his absence on campaign with Romanos. The identity of 'Iasites' is not absolutely clear. Two other letters of Psellos are addressed to 'Iasites', called in one "the very honorable *curopalates*."<sup>67</sup> This was most probably the *curopalates* Constantine Iasites.<sup>68</sup> At the end of 1094 we find a Constantine Iasites, holding the dignity of *curopalates*, present at the Synod of Blachernae.<sup>69</sup> He may also have been one of the followers of the philosopher John Italos mentioned by Anna Comnena in the *Alexiad*.<sup>70</sup> As we learn from a seal of Constantine Iasites, he was at one time *protoproedros* and *ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων*,<sup>71</sup> and he was perhaps the *ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων* among the three high dignitaries to whom Psellos wrote after his arrival in Caesarea.<sup>72</sup>

Psellos' letter to Constantine, like the majority of surviving Byzantine letters, is essentially a letter of friendship. An anonymous

<sup>67</sup> Sathas V 434 (letter 171) and Kurtz-Drexl II 7 (letter 6).

<sup>68</sup> G. Weiss (*supra* n.7) 30 states incorrectly that the Iasites referred to by Psellos in the letter to Constantine was the *vestes* Michael Iasites, mentioned by Cedrenus, *Historiarum compendium*, ed. B. G. Niebuhr (Bonn 1838–39) II 557.23. S. Pétridès, "Le moine Job," *EchO* 15 (1912) 46–48, and K. Amantos, *Ἰασίτης-Διασίτης*, *Ἑλληνικά* 3 (1930) 208–09 (with a supplementary note by V. Laurent, 529–31), list a dozen or so representatives of the family *Ἰασίτης* (later *Διασίτης*), many of whom held important titles and positions. The career of Constantine Iasites is not well documented, but Gautier (*supra* n.43) 217–18 gives a brief summary of what is known. The founder of the convent called *τοῦ Ἰασίτου* in Constantinople may have been the *curopalates* Constantine Iasites. See R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin* I.3<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1969) 255–56.

<sup>69</sup> P. Gautier, "Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Etude prosopographique," *REByz* 29 (1971) 251.

<sup>70</sup> 5.9.2. Anne Comnène, *Alexiade*, ed. B. Leib (Paris 1943) II 37.

<sup>71</sup> Istanbul Archaeological Museum, no. 490. This seal was first published, without illustration or complete transcription, by J. Ebersolt, "Sceaux byzantins du Musée de Constantinople," *RevNum* SER. IV 18 (1914) 393. Ebersolt gave the legend as "Constantin protoproedre *ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων*." An unpublished manuscript of the late Vitalien Laurent in the Institut français d'études byzantines (intended for Laurent's *Corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*) gives a complete transcription, adding the name *Ἰασίτης* from the damaged final line. Three examples survive of another seal of Constantine Iasites, without title: Fogg Art Museum, no. 361; American Numismatic Society, Mabbott Coll., no. 65; Dumbarton Oaks, accession number 55.1.3061.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. *supra* n.58.

letter of the tenth century begins charmingly, "Nature has invented letters as some sort of comfort and consolation for friends who are separated from each other."<sup>73</sup> Psellos, far away on campaign in Asia Minor, writes to his friend and former pupil in the capital. He begins his letter with the ageless apology for not having written sooner. At the end of the letter he sends his greetings to Constantine's wife and his three sons.<sup>74</sup> Although the letter is highly polished and rhetorical, there is a light, playful quality about the end of the letter, which contrasts sharply with Psellos' bleak account of the hardships of life on campaign with the army. Is it possible that Psellos is being facetious throughout the entire letter?<sup>75</sup> The esoteric character of Byzantine literature is most pronounced in the epistolary genre. The writer Psellos and the recipient Constantine were intimates, sharing personal experiences and private jokes. Although we cannot hope to recapture every nuance of meaning in works of such personal intimacy, this glimpse of the great scholar-statesman Psellos brings us a small step closer to a better understanding of the crucial events of the eleventh century.<sup>76</sup>

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL  
December, 1980

<sup>73</sup> Τὸ χρήμα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἢ φύσις ψυχαγωγίαν τινὰ καὶ παραμυθίαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀποῦσι τῶν φίλων ἐμηχανήσατο. This anonymous letter, found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, *Auct. T. 4.4*, is edited and translated by G. Karlsson, *Idéologie et cérémonial dans l'épistolographie byzantine*<sup>2</sup> (Uppsala 1962) 26–29. The Byzantine letter as a token of friendship is discussed by A. R. Littlewood, "An 'Ikon of the Soul': the Byzantine Letter," *Visible Language* 10 (1976) 197–226. For Psellos' letters of friendship see F. Tinnefeld, "Freundschaft in den Briefen des Michael Psellos," *JOB* 22 (1973) 151–68.

<sup>74</sup> The allusion to the three children of Constantine, τὸν μαθητήν, τὸν βεστάρχη, τὸν βέστην, τὸν ἄρτι τῶν σπαργάνων λυθέντα πατρικίον, is puzzling, and it is not possible at present to identify the three children in question. In another letter addressed simply to the ἐπὶ τῶν κρίσεων (a position held by Constantine in 1070), Psellos congratulates him on the occasion of the recent birth of a son: Sathas V 409–12 (letter 157).

<sup>75</sup> Ljubarskij, *Michail Psell* (*supra* n.44) 66–67, gives other examples of this playful, humorous quality in much abbreviated Psellos.

<sup>76</sup> An earlier and much abbreviated version of the first section of this article was read at the Fifth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C., on October 26, 1979. A short summary of that paper appeared as "Theophilus Korydaleus and an 'Unpublished' Letter of Michael Psellos," *Fifth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference. Abstracts of Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1979) 17–18. I am grateful to Paul Gautier, L. G. Westerink, and Nigel Wilson for reading various portions of this article and for making valuable suggestions. A grant from the Research Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill enabled me to consult manuscripts in Cambridge, Oxford, and Paris.