

## PSELLOS' COMMENTARY ON THE JESUS PRAYER

FREDERICK LAURITZEN<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** The commentary on the Jesus Prayer published by Sinkiewicz in 1987 is a genuine work by Psellos. It is ascribed to him in a number of manuscripts and is not eccentric in relation to his interests. Indeed, he wrote a commentary on the 'Kyrie Eleison'. Moreover, the theological points in the commentary echo those he described in Poem 4 Westerkink. The commentary contains a previously unidentified verse which contains eleventh century expressions. Psellos' commentary was used by Markos Eugenikos when he wrote his own commentary on the same prayer which was published in the *Philocalia*. Psellos' commentary was transmitted in a number of manuscripts preserved today on Mt. Athos also under his name.

**Keywords:** hesychasm, Jesus Prayer, Michael Psellos, Markos Eugenikos, Athos.

When the Russian Navy landed on Athos in 1913, their aim was to evict those monks from Panteleimos Monastery, who were accused of interpreting the Jesus Prayer incorrectly. Indeed they thought that the prayer's reference to the name of Jesus was actually a statement of his presence in the name itself.<sup>2</sup> Such military action demonstrates how important the interpretation of this prayer is for the Orthodox tradition. The Constantinopolitan Platonist Michael Psellos (1018-1081?) was the first person to write a commentary on this prayer as will be argued in this paper. Sinkiewicz, the editor of the three versions of the Commentary to the Jesus Prayer (CJP),<sup>3</sup> denied the authorship, and more recently Dunaev<sup>4</sup> thought it was older than the eleventh century. The burden of proof lies on those who deny Psellos' authorship, since a number of manuscripts attribute the work to Psellos (and no one else).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Historian, Scuola Grande di San Marco, Venice, Italy.*  
*Email: frederick.lauritzen@scuolagrandesanmarco.it*

<sup>2</sup> H. Alfeyev *La gloria del Nome. L'opera dello schimonaco Ilarion e la controversia atonita sul Nome di Dio all'inizio del XX secolo.* (Bose: Qiqajon, 2002); The Germanos V ecumenical patriarch wrote a letter and condemned the theory as 'pantheism' on the 5<sup>th</sup> April 1913.

<sup>3</sup> R. Sinkiewicz, *An early byzantine commentary on the Jesus Prayer: introduction and edition,* *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987): 208-220.

<sup>4</sup> A. G. Dunaev, *Византийские догматические толкования на Иисусову молитву, богословские труды* 41 (2007): 8–19.

There are numerous manuscripts which transmit the three versions of the CJP.<sup>5</sup>

CJP 1

- CJP1.1 A Paris BNF Grecs 1302 fols 211v-212r (xiii saec) [no Psellos] [diktyon 50911]  
 CJP1.2 B Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Gt. 384 fol. 52r (xiv-xv saec) [no Psellos] [Diktyon 44832]  
 CJP1.3 C Patmos Μονή τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου 378, fols. 111v-112v (xvi saec) [diktyon 54622]  
 CJP1.4 D Vat. Gr. 1744, fols. Iiir-v (xv saec) [diktyon 68373]  
 CJP1.5 E Cambridge, Trinity College 1408 (O.8.33) fols. 250r-251r (xvi saec) [Psellos] [diktyon 12022]  
 CJP1.6 Ankara Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος 77, fols. 239r-240r (xviii saec) [no Psellos] [diktyon 753]

CJP 2

- CJP2.1 G Oxford Bodleianus Baroccianus Graecus 15, fols. 391v-392v (1105 AD) [no Psellos] [diktyon 47301]  
 CJP2.2 H Oxford Bodleianus Baroccianus Graecus 146, fols 406v (1451 AD) [no psellos] [diktyon 47433]  
 CJP2.3 I El Ecorial Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo gr Ψ.II.20 (De Andrés 455) fol. 85v (xiii saec) [diktyon 15226]  
 CJP2.4 J Vatican City BAV Reginensis Gr. 57, pp. 51-52 (AD 1358/9) [diktyon 66227]  
 CJP2.5 K Vatican City BAV Palatinus Gr. 361, fols. 204v-206r (xv saec) [no psellos] [diktyon 66093]  
 CJP2.6 L Venice, Marciana, gr. Z. 26 (coll 340) fol 302v (xiii saec) [diktyon 69497]  
 CJP2.7 M Berlin Deutsche Staatbibliothek Philipps 1503 (gr. 99) fol. 52r-v (xv saec) [diktyon 9404]  
 CJP2.8 N Milan, Ambrosiana M 15 sup. (gr.506) fols 103v-104r (xiv saec) [diktyon 42980]  
 CJP2.9 O Florence, Bibliotheca Medicea Laurentiana Plut. 55.10, fols. 100v-101r (xv saec) [no Psellos] [diktyon 16331]

---

<sup>5</sup> The references here will indicate if Psellos is mentioned or not. Moreover the [diktyon] number is added in order to consult the online database pinakes.

- CJP2.10 P Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Vossianus gr. Q.54 fols 462r-463r (xv-xvi saec) [diktyon 38161]  
 CJP2.11 Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Philipps 1491 (gr. 87) fols 40v-41r (xiii saec) [diktyon 9392]  
 CJP2.12 Meteora Μονή Μεταμορφώσεως 577, fols 113v-114r (xiv saec) [diktyon 41987]

CJP 3

- CJP3.1 Q Vatican City, BAV Palatinus gr. 328, fols 157r-158v (xiv-xv saec) [diktyon 66060]  
 CJP3.2 R Vatican City BAV Barberinianus gr. 291, fol 151r-v (xiv saec) [no Psellos] [diktyon 64837]  
 CJP3.3 S Vatican city BAV Vat. gr. 1119 fol 161r-v (xv saec) [Psellos] [diktyon 67750]  
 CJP3.4 T Vatican City BAV Vat. Gr. 1150 fols 129v-130v (saec xvi) [Psellos] [diktyon 67781]  
 CJP3.5 U Venice Marciana gr. VII.39 (coll. 1385) fol. 189r (xvi saec) [diktyon 70556]  
 CJP3.6 V Athens Βιβλιοθηκη τῆς βουλῆς 83, fols 184v-185r (xvi saec) [Psellos] [diktyon 1179]  
 CJP3.7 W Athens Μορφωτικὸ Ἴδρυμα Ἐθνικῆς Τραπεζῆς sine numero fol 42v (xv saec) [Psellos]  
 CJP3.8 Athos Ἰβήρων 382 (Lambros 4502) fol. 691r (xv saec) [Psellos] [diktyon 23979]  
 CJP3.9 Lesbos Πρωτὸν Γυμνάσιον Μυτιλήνης Selymbria 4, fol. 29v (xiv saec) [Psellos?] [diktyon 45141]  
 CJP3.10 Athos Μεγίστης Λαύρας K41 (1328) fol 199r (xviii saec) [Psellos] [diktyon 28349]  
 CJP3.11 Athos Μεγίστης Λαύρας K128 (1415) fol. 163r-192r(?) (xviii saec) [diktyon 28437]  
 CJP3.12 Athos Μεγίστης Λαύρας K3 (1290) fol. 22r-v (xv Saec.) [diktyon 28311]  
 CJP3.13 Athos Μεγίστης Λαύρας Λ135 (1626) fol. 451r-452r (xv saec.) [diktyon 28647]  
 CJP3.14 Rome Biblioteca Casanatense 1908 (olim G.II.1) (xiii-xiv saec) [diktyon 56099]

Eight manuscripts attribute this work to Psellos<sup>6</sup>, while the others do not assign any author. It is striking that all the manuscripts which transmit the Commentary of the Jesus Prayer also transmit other works by Psellos.<sup>7</sup> For the sake of argument, one may leave aside the manuscript attribution (since they are generally rather unstable and even unreliable) and focus on the content to see if the commentaries could have been written by Psellos.

The earliest manuscript containing the text is dated to 1105 (CJP2.1).<sup>8</sup> Therefore the ante quem date is 1105. The latest chronological indication within the text is the sixth ecumenical council and its final condemnations, giving us the terminus post quem of 681. Therefore, the date of composition of the CJP is between 681 and 1105. The editor of the texts, Sinkiewicz believed that the author could not be Psellos and claimed the authorship was either of the seventh or of the eleventh century.<sup>9</sup> Dunaev proposes seventh or eighth centuries.<sup>10</sup>

The content and aims of the commentaries suit the eleventh century. The text reveals the desire to connect the practice of personal monastic prayer with the decisions established by the church during the councils, an attitude similar to that held by Niketas Stethatos who in 1035 edited his master's monastic texts, those of Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022), and proposed that they fitted within ecclesiastical tradition.<sup>11</sup> Psellos' interest in monasticism is not limited to his becoming a monk in 1054<sup>12</sup>, as one may see in his use of neoplatonic thought to understand the nature of the uncreated light of Mt Tabor.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the first important surviving corpus of synod decrees since the end of iconoclasm are those composed by patriarch Alexios Studites (1025-1043).<sup>14</sup> Thus the interest in prayer and synods points to an eleventh century composition.

---

<sup>6</sup> CJP1.5; CJP1.6; CJP3.3, CJP3.4, CJP3.6, CJP3.7, CJP3.8, CJP3.10

<sup>7</sup> Insight based on the list of manuscripts in the *Iter Psellianum* by Paul Moore.

<sup>8</sup> Based on the Paschal tables. CJP2.1 G Oxford Bodleianus Baroccianus Graecus 15, fols. 391v-392v (1105 AD) [no Psellos] [diktyon 47301] K. Lake, S. Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, vol. 2 Boston 1934, N. 61 p. 12. Plate 111.

<sup>9</sup> Sinkiewicz 209

<sup>10</sup> Dunaev 8

<sup>11</sup> F. Lauritzen *Areopagitica in Stethatos: a chronology of an interest*, *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 72 (2013): 162-177

<sup>12</sup> M. Jeffreys, Michael Psellos and the monastery, in M. Jeffreys, M. Lauxtermann, *The Letters of Psellos*, (Oxford 2017), 42-59.

<sup>13</sup> F. Lauritzen, Psellos the Hesychast: A Neoplatonic Reading of the Transfiguration on Mt Tabor, *BSI* 70 (2012): 167-180.

<sup>14</sup> F. Lauritzen, Synod decrees of the Eleventh Century in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105.1 (2012): 101-116.

The Commentary on the Jesus Prayer is also remarkable since it focuses mainly on Christology. This also confirms an eleventh century composition since the topic had not been discussed directly at a council since 681. One should remember the effort of patriarch Alexios Studites (1025-1043) in persecuting the Christology of the Syro Jacobites on numerous occasions.<sup>15</sup> Even Patriarch John Xiphilinos (1064-1075) called a synod against the Syro Jacobites. These attacks were based on the Syro Jacobite refusal to accept the decisions of the council of Chalcedon (451) one of the synods referred to in the commentary to the Jesus Prayer. Moreover, the separation of the Catholic and Orthodox churches in 1054 was also on a Christological question (filioque).<sup>16</sup> This was a dispute over the wording of the creed agreed at the council of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381). These synods also referred to in the Commentary to the Jesus prayer. Psellos also wrote poem 4 Westerink summarizing the decisions of the ecumenical councils including those mentioned in the CJP. The poem was dedicated to Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055). It is striking that the focus of the CJP should be on identifying the correct Christology in connection with the councils. Psellos had already spent much time identifying the correct Chalcedonian Christology in his paraphrase of the Canon of Cosmas the Melodist as well as in an essay on the same subject.<sup>17</sup> The eleventh century poet Christopher Mitylenaios describes the Transfiguration in Christological terms.<sup>18</sup> Therefore there is no reason to exclude an eleventh century date, since the concerns expressed in the commentary are present in the eleventh century and specifically in Psellos' writings.

If one focuses on the text itself, one sees concrete and direct evidence for an attribution to Psellos. In the introduction to the CJP one sees that the author believes that there are forms of knowledge which are not rational and which need to be addressed without mediation of reason. The CJP claims that the constant repetition of such a prayer was not simply irrational:

*Τὸ Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. Ἀμήν, οὐχ ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν ἀσυλλογίστως καὶ ἀνεξετάστως παρεδόθη ἡμῖν καθ' ἑκάστην ὥραν λέγεσθαι.* (Psell. Praec. Ad Jesum. 1.1-3 Lauritzen)

*The "Lord, Jesus Christ, our God, have mercy on us. Amen" has not just been traditionally recited every hour, without reason or examination.*

---

<sup>15</sup> F. Lauritzen, The synods of Alexios Studites (1025-1043). In: Christian Gastgeber [u. a.]: The Patriarchate of Constantinople in Context and Comparison (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 41, VÖAW, Wien 2017), 17-24.

<sup>16</sup> There are essays by Psellos condemning the filioque in Psell. Theol. 1.20-22 Gautier.

<sup>17</sup> F. Lauritzen Paraphrasis as interpretation Psellos and a canon of Cosmas the melodist (poem 24 westerink) in Byzantina 33 (2014): 61-74.

<sup>18</sup> Christopher Mitylainaios Poem 25 De Groote.

The term used is *ἀσυλλογίστως*. What it means is that even without reason it is possible to reach the divine with such a prayer. Psellos writes to his friend patriarch John Xiphilinos (1064-1075) “having first rid yourself of syllogisms, climb up to immediate knowledge (*ἀσυλλογίστους γνώσεις*)”.<sup>19</sup> The same concept is expressed more clearly in the funerary speech dedicated to the same person:

*Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἔρωτι τοῦ ἀπράγμονος βίου τρωθεὶς καὶ ἤδη τῇ ἡσυχῶ ζωῇ καθοσιωθεὶς, αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ δρόμον περὶ τὰ καλὰ καὶ πέρας ἐτίθετο· τί γὰρ ἂν ἐρασμιώτερον γένοιτο, εἴ τις ψυχὴ φύσεως ἀποστᾶσα καὶ σώματος ὅσον ἕξεστιν, καὶ τῶν ἐνοχλοῦντων παθῶν κατισχύσασα, εἶτα δὴ στραφεῖσα πρὸς ἑαυτήν, ὄλον τὸν ψυχικὸν καθορῶν διάκοσμον, πάλιν τε πρὸς τὸ θεϊότερον ἀνανεύσασα τὴν νοερὰν θεωροίῃ ζωὴν καὶ ἀσυλλογίστως ἔχει τὰ κρείττονα, εἴτ' ἐκεῖθεν πᾶσαν ὑπερβᾶσα δύναμιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκροτάτου σταίῃ τῆς οἰκείας ζωῆς, καὶ τὸ ἐνοειδὲς προβαλλομένη τῆς φύσεως, αὐτῶ δὴ τῶ ἐνὶ συναφθείῃ, πνεῦμα καὶ νοῦς γενομένη καὶ θεὸς ἀντικρυς; (Psell. Or. Fun. 3.21-31 Polemis)*

*For wounded by the desire of a calm life and elevated to a quiet life, he considered it both the path and aim for what is beautiful. What could be sweeter than a soul which is separated from nature and body as much as possible, which controls the troubling passions, and which heads once more towards what is more divine in order to contemplate the intellectual life and which holds what is better without thinking, which then surpasses every power and energy in order to stay on the highest plane of its own life, and which projects the one-ness of nature, in order to connect to the one, and which becomes spirit and intellect even before God.*

Here one sees Psellos using the term *ἀσυλλογίστως* to refer precisely to the approach to what is superior to rational knowledge. Since Xiphilinos became a monk ca 1054 and then patriarch (1064-1075), such a topic would interest him specifically. Moreover, Psellos concludes his famous essay on the Chaldean Oracles<sup>20</sup> stating that the neoplatonists admired these oracular utterings since they provided unreasoned statements:

<sup>19</sup> καὶ τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς γυμνασθεὶς τὰ πρῶτα, οὕτως ἐπὶ τὰς ἀσυλλογίστους γνώσεις ἀνάβηθι· (Psell. Ep. 202.85-87 [Ad Xiphilinum] Papiouannou). See also Ὁ δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν ὑποκειμένων μὴ προσιέμενος ἐν μὲν συλλογισμοῖς ἀναρεῖ τὸ συμπέρασμα, ἐν δὲ τοῖς φυσικοῖς λόγοις ἀθετεῖ τὴν ὀλότητα· τούτων δὲ τῶν δυοῖν ἀνηρημένων, οὔτε τὸ πᾶν ὄλον, καὶ τέλος ἡμῖν οὐδαμοῦ ὀδοιποροῦσιν οὐδὲ συμπέρασμα. ὀρᾶς οἷον τὸ ἄγαν καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸ μὴ ἑαυτοῦς εἰδέναι, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ ἐπεστράφθαι καὶ μὴ συλλογίζεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀσυλλογίστως καὶ χωρὶς λεπτύνσεως τεχνικῆς τοὺς ὄχθους καταπίνειν τῶν ὑποθέσεων; (Psell. Ep. 202.72-79 [ad Xiphilinum] Papiouannou).

<sup>20</sup> Psell. Phil. Min. 2.38 O'Meara.

*Τούτων δὲ τῶν δογμάτων τὰ πλείω καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Πλάτων ἐδέξαντο, οἱ δὲ περὶ Πλωτῖνον καὶ Ἰάμβλιχον Πορφύριον τε καὶ Πρόκλον πᾶσι κατηκολούθησαν καὶ ὡς θείας φωνᾶς ἀσυλλογίστως ταῦτα ἐδέξαντο. (Psell. Phil. Min. 2.38.148.17-19 O'Meara)*

*Aristotle and Plato accepted most of these beliefs, the disciples of Plotinus and Iamblichus, Porphyry and Proclus followed them all and accepted them irrationally as divine voices.*

This realm of irrational knowledge, or knowledge above argument is also discussed in Psellos' allegorical reading of the Greek alphabet.<sup>21</sup> Each letter represents a different stage. Once he reaches the letter M he points out that logic is irrelevant.<sup>22</sup> The question of what is not investigated (ἀνεξετάστως) also seems to concern him. Indeed CJP1 wishes to justify the validity of a prayer which does not seem researched. It is rather a striking coincidence that the only text in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* which combines the terms ἀσυλλόγιστος and ἀνεξετάστος concerns a synod decree of patriarch John Xiphilinos (1064-1075) mentioned by Nikephoros Botaniates.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, CJP indicates the prayer was recited repeatedly<sup>24</sup>, as Psellos also says in his theological essay dedicated to the continuous (αὐτομάτως) repetition of the "Kyrie Eleison".<sup>25</sup> Thus Psellos indicates that a short prayer repeated continuously would somehow give direct access to the divine.

Sinkiewicz claims that this sort of text would not fit with Psellos' intellectual interests.<sup>26</sup> Leaving aside the fact Psellos also wrote an essay on the continuous repetition of the Kyrie Eleison, one may object the following text by Psellos' favourite neoplatonic philosopher:

*πάντα γὰρ εὔχεται πλὴν τοῦ πρώτου, φησὶν ὁ μέγας Θεόδωρος. τελειότης δὲ ἀρχομένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν κοινοτέρων ἀγαθῶν, λήγουσα δὲ εἰς τὴν θεϊαν ἔνωσιν καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν συνεθίζουσα τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον φῶς. (Procl. in Timaeum 1.213.2-6 Diehl in E. Diehl, Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria, Leipzig 1903-1906.*

<sup>21</sup> Psell. Phil. Min. 1.36 Duffy

<sup>22</sup> Psell. Phil. Min. 1.36.335-361 Duffy

<sup>23</sup> Synod decree of Xiphilinos (1063-1075) confirmed by Nicephoros III Botaniates (1079-1081): Prochiron Auctum 2.20.16-17 Zepos in P. Zepos, Prochiron Auctum (Athens 1931); Novella Alexios I Comnenos (1084) 24.11-14 Zepos in J. Zepos and P. Zepos, Νεαραι καὶ Χρυσόβουλλα τῶν μετὰ τὸν Ἰουστινιανὸν Βυζαντινῶν Αυτοκρατόρων (Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1962).

<sup>24</sup> Καθ'ἐκάστην ὥραν λέγεσθαι (Psell, Prec. Jesus. 1.3-4 Lauritzen)

<sup>25</sup> Psell. Theol. 1.13.17 Gautier.

<sup>26</sup> Sinkiewicz 211.

*Everything prays except the First (principle) says the great Theodore [of Asine].  
Initiation begins from the most common goods ending with divine union. It slowly  
makes the soul used to divine light.*

Indeed, Psellos employs Proclus to define contemplation of the divine energies on Mt Tabor.<sup>27</sup> The essay deals with the contemplation of divine energies of Jesus during the Transfiguration. Psellos explains this event by using Proclus' philosophy. Prayer and contemplation are fundamental parts of neoplatonic thought.<sup>28</sup> Sinkiewicz not only thought that the ideas did not suit Psellos, but also that the language was too humble to be by Psellos. He pointed out that only the word *πέλει* revealed something intellectual.<sup>29</sup> Apparently Sinkiewicz did not notice the word was part of an iambic trimetre:

*Τῶν δογμάτων ἄμοιρος οὐδαμῶς πέλει*  
(Psell. Praec. Ad Jesum 1.4-5 Lauritzen)  
*He is not entirely ignorant of dogmas*

This is an unattested verse, and may have been composed for the treatise. Such an interest in theology and correct verse composition is already quite striking. Psellos wrote several poems on religious topics. Moreover, the form *ἄμοιρος* is only attested once in the in the Database of Byzantine Book epigrams and specifically Vat. Gr. 676 fol. 1v which is the dedicatory poem of the manuscript collection of the writings of Mauropous, friend and correspondent of Psellos.<sup>30</sup> This was poem was written after he was appointed metropolitan of Euchaita. It appears also in Mauropous' writings<sup>31</sup> as well as Christophoros Mitylenaios.<sup>32</sup> The word *ἄμοιρος* appears only twice in the entire Palatine Anthology,<sup>33</sup> but rather often in Psellos.<sup>34</sup>

Psellos also studied poems to explain their theological meaning. He was familiar with poetry and interested in its intellectual content. Thus, the quotation would seem suitable for Psellos and it is not merely an attempt to elevate a text

<sup>27</sup> Psell. Theol. 1.11 Gautier.

<sup>28</sup> J. M. Dillon, A. Timotin, Platonic Theories of Prayer, (Leiden 2015).

<sup>29</sup> A surprising claim given that *πέλω* is used in Greek verse composition. It is recommended in the general introduction of A. Sidgwick, F.D. Morice, An introduction to Greek Verse Composition, (London 1893) 38.

<sup>30</sup> M. Lauxtermann, the intertwined lives of Mauropous and Psellos in M. Jeffreys and M. Lauxtermann, the letters of Psellos, (Oxford 2017), 89-127.

<sup>31</sup> Maurop. Ep. 17.41, Poem. 47.14; 90.6; Can. 2.5.100.

<sup>32</sup> Christ. Mytil. Poem 35.1 De Groote.

<sup>33</sup> AP 7.383.5; 13.23.6

<sup>34</sup> Here are some examples of the use of the word *ἄμοιρος* Psell. Chron. 4.7.6 Reinsch; Or. Pan. 2.200, 287 Dennis Or. Hagiogr. 3a137, 3b343, 7.140, Phil. Min 1.36.126, Theol. 1.7.54, 72.61, 75.118, 107.64, 107.106, Poem 9.848, 1314, 21.160, 62.36, 67.141, De Eur. Pisd. 80, Omn. Doct. 97.20, 135.9, 197.4, 197.6, Laud. Crusutu. 451, Ep. 323a7.



by using an unusual word in prose, but familiar from iambic trimeter. Moreover, Psellos' poetry is one of the very first attestations of the purely accentual versification in Greek. Psellos wrote a comparison of the metre of Euripides and George of Pisidia. Thus, Sinkiewicz's objection about level of language is rather surprising. The background of religious learning is signalled by the phrase which ends the introduction. The expression 'fulfilment of the commandments' is a favourite of Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022).<sup>35</sup> Therefore in the introduction one notices the use of poetry, irrational learning, and references to Symeon the New Theologian. In the case of an irrational approach to what is superior one sees a clear echo of Psellos' texts written to and about Xiphilinos. These elements point to an eleventh century composition.

The notion that words reveal concepts is an old debate. However, in late Neoplatonism the idea that words could yield information which was not argued but gave access to a superior reality was important in such texts as Proclus' commentary on the Cratylus of Plato, quoted by Psellos. Thus the idea that each word represents a concept fits in the atmosphere of the eleventh century.

At the centre of the treatise is the idea that the words of Jesus prayer deny certain heresies and therefore are a statement of Orthodoxy. The text distinguishes different types of heretics: 1) those who believe Jesus was a simple man and not son of God 2) those who believe that he was only divine and not complete man 3) those who think that he has one nature, 4) those who confuse the natures. The text reflects generally accepted opinions about the nature of Christ. In the actual body of the text there are seven parts present in the three versions of CJP. Each part discusses one word of the prayer "Κύριε, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς", "Lord, Jesus, Christ, our God, have mercy on us". Each word is connected with a decision of a synod.

Κύριε Synod of 325  
 Ἰησοῦ Synod of 451  
 Χριστέ Synod of 431  
 ὁ θεὸς Synod of 681

The introduction had indicated the four different heresies attacked in the text and associates names to them: 1) Eutyches and Dioscoros, 2) Nestorius, 3) Theodore of Pharan, Honorius of Rome, Sergios and Pyrrhos, Peter the Coward. This group of three heretics is striking. Eutyches and Dioskoros were condemned at Chalcedon (451). Nestorius was condemned at Ephesus (431) and the group of four were condemned at Constantinople III (681). The choice of grouping heretics according to the condemnation at a synod confirms the hypothesis that

---

<sup>35</sup> ἐκπλήρωσις ἐντολῶν (TLG search 8 may 2021. Lemma search 5 words of separation) Symeon N. Theolog. H. 33.78, 33.125, Cap. Theol. 1.90.7, Catech. 9.49, 14.70, 24.57, 25.28. Cap. Alph. 10.1.65, 10.1.67, Or. Ethic. 1.12.34, .1.12.161, 1.12.162, 1.12.494, 9.1.122, 9.1.463, 15.1.155,

Peter the Terrible is Peter the Patriarch of Constantinople (654-666).<sup>36</sup> While Arius is left out in this section of the introduction, he is present in the discussion of the meaning of each word of the prayer. What is left out is also important: The council of Constantinople I (381) Constantinople II (553) and Nicaea II (787). In other words, the discussion of the Holy Ghost, Origenism and Icons are left out and confirms an exclusive interest in Christology. The list of heretics mentioned in the CJP conforms closely with that present in the Constantinople III (681).

*Νεστορίῳ καὶ Εὐτύχεϊ καὶ Διοσκόρῳ ἀνάθεμα  
 Ἀπολιναρίῳ καὶ Σεβήρῳ ἀνάθεμα τοῖς ὁμόφροσιν αὐτῶν ἀνάθεμα  
 Θεοδώρῳ τῷ τῆς Φαράν ἀνάθεμα Σεργίῳ καὶ Ὀνωρίῳ ἀνάθεμα  
 Πύρρῳ καὶ Παύλῳ ἀνάθεμα Κύρῳ καὶ Πέτρῳ ἀνάθεμα  
 Μακαρίῳ καὶ Στεφάνῳ καὶ Πολυχρονίῳ ἀνάθεμα  
 ὅλοις τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς ἀνάθεμα τοῖς κηρύξασι καὶ κηρύττουσι καὶ μέλλουσι  
 διδάσκειν ἐν θέλημα καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας Χριστοῦ  
 τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀνάθεμα. (Const III. 18.798. 17-22)*  
 Anathema to Nestorius and Eutyches  
 Anathema to Apolinarius and Severus. Anathema to those who agree with them  
 Anathema to Theodore of Pharan. Anathema to Sergius and Honorius.  
 Anathema to Pyrrhus and Paul. Anathema to Cyrus and Petros.  
 Anathema to Makarios and Sephanos and Polychronius

The CJP is using the strategy of Constantinople III in combining the condemnations council of Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451) and Constantinople III (681) as if they represented different aspects of the same heresy. This is not an obvious choice since the mention of some of the heretics is quite rare between 681 and 1105. One notable exception is the poem by Psellos on the synods which is the only text which mentions all the persons condemned in CJP1:

	Psellos	CJP1
Arios	4.9	1.19
Nestorios	4.28	1.24
Eutyches	4.39	1.21
Dioskoros	4.39	1.22
Theodore Pharan	4.70	1.29
Honorios of Rome	4.70	1.29
Sergios	4.71	1.30
Pyrrhos	4.71	1.30
Petros the deilos	4.72	1.30

<sup>36</sup> Sinkiewicz 209 thinks it is Peter the Fuller.

If one compares the list of heretics with the anathemas quoted above from 681, it is striking Apolinarios and Severos are missing from CJP1. They are also missing from poem 4 of Psellos. The list present in the Commentary to the Jesus prayer corresponds to that of Poem 4 of Psellos. The shared selection may point to common authorship, but the question is the aim for such a list of heretics. Somehow both Psellos and CJP seem to think they have something in common. The anathemas of 681 are grouped together since it appears these heretics lead to the notion of a single energy of Christ (which is what is being discussed at this council). One may infer that the theology present in the CJP is aimed at showing that not only are the two natures present but mainly the two energies. The Christological question of the natures and their respective energies relates to the matter of contemplation. Such a development was rather usual and well known in Constantinople especially after the publication of the hymns of Symeon the New Theologian in 1035. His monastery in Constantinople of Saint Mamas was acquired by Maria Skleraina, who Psellos knew well and whose funerary commemoration he wrote (poem 17 westerink).

One should point out that Psellos' paraphrase of the canon of Cosmas the Melodist makes the same points concerning Christology. The original text of Cosmas was very brief and Psellos goes out of his way to introduce numerous elements non present in the original text in order to guarantee the orthodoxy of the text and specifically the chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures.

Based on these arguments, the proofs presented here that the CJP is by Psellos are the following

- 1) it is ascribed to Psellos in eight manuscripts
- 2) all the manuscripts which transmit the CJP also contain works by Psellos
- 3) Psellos wrote about the Kyrie Eleison
- 4) Psellos wrote a poem about Synods
- 5) the verses present in CJP 1 contain verbal forms present in Mauropous
- 6) The Christological concern of CJP fits with Psellos' interests in Christology
- 7) the heretics mentioned in CJP also appear in Psell. Poem. 4 Westerink

One should also point out another feature. Markos Eugenikos wrote a commentary on the Jesus Prayer<sup>37</sup> and it is based on the text written by Psellos. His commentary was also included in the Philocalia.<sup>38</sup> Markos Eugenikos' rival at the council of Florence was Bessarion, who later became cardinal of the Catholic Church. Bessarion left his collection of Greek manuscripts to Venice in

---

<sup>37</sup> I. Bulovic, ἡ ἐρμηνεία τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου Μάρκου Ἐφέσου, *Kleronomia* 7 (1975): 345-352.

<sup>38</sup> *Philocalia*, Venice 1782, 1163-1167.

1468. None of his books contain theological works by Psellos and do not contain the Commentary on the Jesus Prayer while at least five manuscripts containing the CJP are present on Mt. Athos. Among these some attribute the work to Psellos. Among athonite hesychasts, the CJP was considered a genuine work of the eleventh century Platonic Constantinopolitan Psellos.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bulovic I., ἡ ἐρμηνεία τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Μάρκου Ἐφέσου, *Kleronomia* 7 (1975): 345-352
- Dillon J. M., Timotin A., *Platonic Theories of Prayer*, (Leiden 2015)
- Dunaev A.G., Византийские догматические толкования на Иисусову молитву, богословские труды 41 (2007): 8–19
- Jeffreys M., Michael Psellos and the monastery, in M. Jeffreys, M. Lauxtermann, the Letters of Psellos, (Oxford 2017), 42-59
- Lake K., Lake S., *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, vol. 2, Boston 1934
- Lauritzen F., Areopagitica in Stethatos: a chronology of an interest, *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 72 (2013): 162-177
- Lauritzen F., Paraphrasis as interpretation Psellos and a canon of Cosmas the melodist (poem 24 westerink) in *Byzantina* 33 (2014): 61-74
- Lauritzen F., Psellos the Hesychast: A Neoplatonic Reading of the Transfiguration on Mt Tabor, *BSI* 70 (2012): 167–180
- Lauritzen F., Synod decrees of the Eleventh Century in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105.1 (2012): 101-116
- Lauritzen F., The synods of Alexios Studites (1025-1043). In: Christian Gastgeber [u. a.]: *The Patriarchate of Constantinople in Context and Comparison (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 41, VÖAW, Wien 2017)*, 17–24
- Lauxtermann M., the intertwined lives of Mauropous and Psellos in M. Jeffreys and M. Lauxtermann, the letters of Psellos, (Oxford 2017), 89-127
- Sidgwick A., Morice F.D., *An introduction to Greek Verse Composition*, (London 1893) 38
- Sinkiewicz R., An early byzantine commentary on the Jesus Prayer: introduction and edition, *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987): 208-220
- Zepos J. and P. Zepos P., *Νεαράι καὶ Χρυσόβουλλα τῶν μετὰ τὸν Ἰουστινιανὸν Βυζαντινῶν Ἀυτοκρατόρων* (Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1962)
- Zepos P., *Prochiron Auctum* (Athens 1931)

### Edition

The present edition is based on that published by Sinkiewicz. The collations are his as is the apparatus with the variants. The apparatus with references to the iambic verse and synods is my own as is the apparatus of testimonia. For Marcus Eugenicus the text is that edited by Bolovic in *Kleronomia* 1975. There were some problems with the line numbers of the original edition of CJP and the references in the apparatus. (notably at CJP1.3-13 Sinkiewicz). A new edition will be needed since Sinkiewicz collated 23 out of the 33 manuscripts he found (70%). The present edition is aimed at inspiring others to collate the remaining ten manuscripts and to look for new witnesses to this commentary.

*1* Τὸ Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐλέησον  
 ἡμᾶς. Ἀμήν, οὐχ ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν ἀσυλλογίστως καὶ  
 ἀνεξετάστως παρεδόθη ἡμῖν καθ' ἐκάστην ὥραν  
 λέγεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ βραχὺς πέφυκεν οὗτος ὁ στίχος, τῶν  
 δογμάτων ἄμοιρος οὐδαμῶς πέλει, ἀλλὰ μετὰ σκέψεως  
 καὶ μελέτης πολλῆς τῇ συνεργείᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος  
 συνετέθη παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εἰς ἀναίρεσιν  
 πασῶν τῶν αἰρέσεων καὶ ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ  
 κυρίου.  
 Ἐκάστη γὰρ λέξις δογμάτων καὶ ἐνταλμάτων  
 κυριακῶν καὶ θεοσεβείας πεπληρωμένη ἐστίν. Οἱ μὲν  
 γὰρ τῶν αἰρετικῶν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι  
 ἔλεγον, καὶ οὐχὶ καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ. Οἱ δὲ θεὸν μόνον, καὶ  
 οὐχὶ καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον, κατὰ φαντασίαν  
 ὑποδύμενον, τὸ ἀνθρώπινον. Οἱ δὲ καὶ θεὸν  
 ὁμολογοῦντες καὶ ἄνθρωπον, οὐ τὰς δύο φύσεις  
 συνιέντες εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ φύσεις δύο,  
 οὕτω καὶ δύο ὑποστάσεις καὶ δύο υἱούς ἔλεγον. Οἱ δὲ  
 συνδραμεῖν εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν τὰς δύο δοξάζοντες καὶ  
 αὐτὰς τὰς φύσεις φρυθῆναι καὶ συγχυθῆναι εἰς ἓν  
 δογματίζοντες, καὶ μίαν φύσιν ἐξηλλαγμένην  
 δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελεσθῆναι τῶν φύσεων ἀπεδείκνυον.  
 Τὰς φύσεις φρυθῆναι καὶ συγχυθῆναι εἰς ἓν  
 δογματίζοντες, καὶ μίαν φύσιν ἐξηλλαγμένην  
 δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελεσθῆναι τῶν φύσεων ἀπεδείκνυον.  
 Ἀλλ' ὁ στίχος οὗτος διὰ μὲν τοῦ Κύριε, ὁ τῆς θείας  
 δηλωτικόν ἐστι φύσεως, τὸν Ἄρειον καὶ τοὺς ὁμόφρονας  
 αὐτοῦ, ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγοντας αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ καὶ  
 υἱὸν θεοῦ, ἀποκηρύττει.  
 Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὁ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐσίαν δηλοῖ,  
 τὸν Εὐτυχέα καὶ Διόσκορον καὶ τοὺς συμμύστας αὐτῶν

**1,3** ὥραν] ABD deest C **5** ἄμοιρος] οὐκ ἄμοιρος B **8** ἐκπλήρωσιν]  
 ἐκπλήρωσιν πασῶν E **16** οὐ] deest CDE **17** συνιέντες] ABD  
 συνάγοντες C **24** δογματίζοντες] AB ἐδογματίζον CDE

**1,26** διὰ... 29 ἀποκηρύττει] Marc. Eugen. Prec ad Jesum 349.12-14  
 Bulovic **30** Διὰ... 33 προσαρμόζοντας] Marc. Eugen. Prec ad Jesum  
 349.14-17 Bulovic

**1,4** τῶν... 5 πέλει] versus iambici **11** Οἱ... 13 θεοῦ] Arius cfr. C Nic  
 (325) **13** Οἱ... 15 ἀνθρώπινον] Eutyches et Dioscorus cfr. C Chalc.  
**15** Οἱ... 18 ἔλεγον] Nestorius cfr. C Eph (431) **18** Οἱ... 25 ἀπεδείκνυον]  
 Monoergitae et Monothelitae cfr. CCP (681) **26** Ἀλλό... 29 ἀποκηρύττει]  
 C Nic (325) | διὰ... 29 ἀποκηρύττει] **30** Διὰ... 33 προσαρμόζοντας] C  
 Chalc.

ἐπιστομίζει, τοὺς θεὸν μόνον οἰομένους τοῦτον καὶ τῇ  
θεότητι τὰ πάθη προσαρμόζοντας.

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Χριστέ, ὃ ἔστι, θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, τὸν  
35 Νεστόριον καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἀποπαύει, τοὺς διηρημένας  
ἀλλήλων τὰς ὑποστάσεις εἶναι δοξάζοντας, καὶ δύο υἱοὺς  
ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μυθολογοῦντας καὶ δύο  
ὑποστάσεις, καὶ μὴ εἶναι Θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν Θεοτόκον  
ἀλλὰ Χριστοτόκον λέγοντας.

40 Διὰ δὲ τοῦ ὁ θεός, Θεόδωρον τὸν τῆς Φαράν  
ἐπίσκοπον, Ὀνώριον Ῥώμης, Σέργιον τε καὶ Πύρρον,  
Πέτρον τὸν δειλὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς  
ἀποτρέπει. Καὶ ληρωδοῦντας ἀποδεικνύει τοὺς σύγχυσι  
τολμῶντας λέγειν καὶ μίαν φύσιν ἐξηλλαγμένην καὶ ἐν  
45 θέλημα καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν, ἀσύγχυτον τὴν θείαν φύσιν  
δηλῶν κἀντεῦθεν καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, καὶ δύο οὐσίας  
ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει συνηνωμένας παρίστησι.

Καὶ οὕτως τὸ περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων  
δόγμα, ἐπάγει τὸ ἡμῶν, ἀδελφικῶς ἀλλήλους τοὺς  
50 πιστοὺς συνάπτει καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης συνδέει, ἐν ᾗ, τῇ  
ἀγάπῃ φημί, τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν ἅπαν ὑπάρχει  
τὸ πλήρωμα.

Οὕτω γοῦν τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν  
περιλαβὼν τὴν συμπλήρωσιν προστίθησιν τὸ ἐλέησον.  
55 Διὰ γὰρ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῆς  
συμπληρώσεως τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐλευσόμεθα.

Εἶτα ἐπάγει τὸ ἡμᾶς, τῆς ἀγάπης ἐχόμενον, καὶ  
τελευταῖον ἐπιφέρει τὸ ἀμήν, ὃ ἔστι, γένοιτο, εὐκτικῶς  
ἐπικυρῶν τὰ εἰρημένα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ βεβαιότητι.

60

**1,38** ἁγίαν] ἁγίαν ABD κυρίως C κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς E **42** δειλὸν] ABD  
δειλὸν CE **48** οὕτως] CDE οὕτω B οὕτ' A οὕτως ἀπαρτίζων Sinkiewicz  
**51** τοῦ... 53 δογμάτων] deest E | τῶν... 52 πλήρωμα] ἐν αὐτῇ ἅπαν τὸ  
πλήρωμα ὑπάρχει C **55** Διὰ... 59 βεβαιότητι] desunt E **57** τῆς...  
ἐχόμενον] deest B ἐχόμενον BC ἐχόμενος AE

**1,50** ἐν... 52 πλήρωμα] cf: Rom 13:10

**34** Διὰ... 38 ὑποστάσεις] Marc. Eugen. Prec. ad Jesum 349.17-19 Bulovic

**40** Διὰ... 47 παρίστησι] Marc. Eugen. Prec. ad Jesum 349.19-350.1  
Bulovic

**34** Διὰ... 39 λέγοντας] C Eph (431) **40** Διὰ... 47 παρίστησι] CCP (681)  
Θεόδωρον... Φαράν] Theodorus Pharan (570-638) **41** Ὀνώριον Ῥώμης]  
Honorius Romae (625-638) | Σέργιον] Sergius Constantinopolis (610-  
638) | Πύρρον] Pyrrhus Constantinopolis (638-641) **42** Πέτρον] Petrus  
Constantinopolis (654-666)

2 ἐρμηνεία εἰς τὸ Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν,  
ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. Ἀμήν.

Ἐκάστη λέξις πεπληρωμένη δογματῶν καὶ  
θεοσοφίας ἐστίν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν τῶν αἰρετικῶν ψιλὸν  
ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι ἔλεγον· οἱ δὲ θεὸν μόνον  
κατὰ φαντασίαν ὑποδύμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· οἱ δὲ καὶ  
θεὸν ὁμολογοῦντες καὶ ἄνθρωπον, τὰς δύο φύσεις οὐ  
συνῆγον εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δύο φύσεις,  
οὕτω καὶ δύο ὑποστάσεις καὶ υἱοὺς δύο ἔλεγον· οἱ δὲ  
συνδραμεῖν εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν τὰς δύο φύσεις  
δοξάζοντες, καὶ αὐτὰς τὰς φύσεις φρυθῆναι καὶ  
συνγυθῆναι εἰς ἑαυτὰς ἐδογματίζον, καὶ μίαν φύσιν  
ἐξηλλαγμένην δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελεσθῆναι τῶν  
φύσεων ἀπεφαίνοντο.

Διὰ μὲν τοῦ Κύριε, ὃ τῆς θείας δηλωτικόν ἐστι  
φύσεως, τοὺς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγοντας αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος  
ἀποκηρύττει.

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὃ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐσίαν δηλοῖ,  
τοὺς θεὸν πάλιν μόνον οἰομένους τοῦτον ἐπιστομίζει.

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Χριστέ, τοὺς διηρημένας ἀλλήλων τὰς  
ὑποστάσεις εἶναι δοξάζοντας ἀποπαύει.

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ ὁ θεός, τοὺς τὴν σύγχυσιν τολμῶντας  
λέγειν ἀποτρέπει καὶ ληρωδοῦντας ἀποδεικνύει.  
ἀσύγχυτον τὴν θεϊαν φύσιν δηλῶν κἀντεῦθεν δηλαδὴ

2,1 εἰς τὸ] GLOP τοῦ H τοῦ στίχου τῷ I τοῦ στίχου τοῦ JN τοῦ στίχου τὸ  
K τοῦ στίχου M 2 Ἀμήν] deest GM 5 θεοσοφίας] θεοσεβείας IM  
φιλοσοφίας LP τε καὶ σοφίας O 12 φρυθῆναι] φυραθῆναι JKM  
15 ἀπεφαίνοντο] ἀποφαίνονται G φίνωτὸ H ἀπέφανον I ἀπεφῆναντο J  
ἀπεφένοντο K ἀπεφαίνοντο O 20 πάλιν] deest M | πάλιν μόνον] μόνον  
πάλιν LP | μόνον] deest GHN | οἰομένους] ἰωμένους HK ὄρωμένους N  
| τοῦτον] GM τούτους HIJKLNOP | ἐπιστομίζει] ἀποστομίζει JLP  
22 δοξάζοντας] νομίζοντας JKN 23 τὴν] deest HIJKLMNPO  
24 ἀποτρέπει] ἀποτέρπεται H ἀποτρέπεται IJM | ληρωδοῦντας]  
λοιδοροῦντας HK ληροῦντας M

2,16 Διὰ... 18 ἀποκηρύττει] Marc. Eugen. Prec ad Jesum 349.12-14  
Bulovic 19 Διὰ... 20 ἐπιστομίζει] Marc. Eugen. Prec ad Jesum 349.14-  
17 Bulovic 21 Διὰ... 22 ἀποπαύει] Marc. Eugen. Prec. ad Jesum 349.17-  
19 Bulovic 23 Διὰ... 27 παρίστησιν] Marc. Eugen. Prec. ad Jesum  
349.19-350.1 Bulovic

2,5 οἱ... 6 ἔλεγον] Arius cfr. C Nic (325) 6 οἱ... 7 ἀνθρώπινον·]  
Eutyches et Dioscorus cfr. C Chalc. 7 οἱ... 10 ἔλεγον·] Nestorius cfr C  
Eph (431) 10 οἱ... 15 ἀπεφαίνοντο] Monoergitae et Monothelitae cfr.  
CCP (681)

καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, καὶ δύο οὐσίας ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει  
συνηνωμένως παρίστησιν.

30 Καὶ οὕτως ἀπαρτίζων τὸ περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τῶν  
ὀρθοδόξων δόγμα, ἐπάγει τὸ ἡμῶν, ἀδελφικῶς ἀλλήλοις  
τοὺς πιστοὺς συνάπτων καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης συνδέων, ἐν  
ἧ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν πῶν τὸ πλήρωμα.

35 Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν  
περιλαβὼν τὴν συμπλήρωσιν προστίθησι τὸ ἐλέησον, διὰ  
γὰρ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῆς  
35 συμπληρώσεως τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐλεούμεθα.

Εἶτα πάλιν ἐπήγαγε τὸ ἡμᾶς, τῆς ἀγάπης ἐχόμενος,  
καὶ τελευταῖον ἐπήγαγε τὸ ἀμὴν, ὃ ἔστι, γένοιτο,  
ἐνκτικῶς ἐπικυρῶν τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ ἐπιβεβαιῶν.

40 Οὕτω παντὸς δογματικοῦ τε καὶ ἐνταλματικοῦ  
πεπληρωμένος ἀγαθοῦ, ὁ βραχὺς οὗτος στίχος ὑπὸ τῶν  
θείων πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδοται.

---

**2, 28** τὸν] deest JK | τὸν Χριστὸν] Χριστοῦ KN | τῶν... 29 ὀρθοδόξων]  
τὸ ὀρθόδοξον H ὀρθόδοξον IJKMN **29** ἀλλήλοις] ἀλλήλους G  
**30** συνδέων] συνδέον HK **33** περιλαβὼν] παραλαβὼν H  
**35** συμπληρώσεως] πληρώσεως LP **39** Οὕτω... 41 παραδέδοται] deest  
G

---

**2, 30** διὰ... 31 πλήρωμα] cfr. Rom. 13:10



3 ἔρμηνεία εἰς τὸ Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν,  
ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. Ἀμήν.

Παντὸς δογματικοῦ τε καὶ ἐνταλματικοῦ ἀγαθοῦ  
πεπληρωμένος ὑπάρχων ὁ βραχὺς οὗτος στίχος ὑπὸ τῶν 5  
θειῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν παραδέδοται. ἐκάστη γὰρ λέξις  
πεπληρωμένη δογμάτων καὶ θεοσοφίας ἐστὶ. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ  
τῶν αἰρετικῶν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι  
ἔλεγον· οἱ δὲ θεὸν μόνον κατὰ φαντασίαν ὑποδύμενον  
τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· οἱ δὲ καὶ θεὸν ὁμολογοῦντες καὶ 10  
ἄνθρωπον, τὰς δύο φύσεις οὐ συνῆγον εἰς μίαν  
ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ φύσεις δύο, οὕτω καὶ δύο  
ὑποστάσεις καὶ δύο υἱοὺς ἔλεγον· οἱ δὲ συνδραμεῖν εἰς  
μίαν ὑπόστασιν τὰς δύο φύσεις δοξάζοντες, καὶ αὐτὰς 15  
τὰς φύσεις φυρθῆναι καὶ συγχυθῆναι εἰς ἑαυτὰς  
ἐδογματίζον, καὶ μίαν φύσιν ἐξηλλαγμένην καὶ  
δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελεσθῆναι τῶν φύσεων ἀπεφῆναντο.

Διὰ μὲν τοῦ Κύριε, ὃ τῆς θείας δηλωτικῶν φύσεώς  
ἐστὶ, τοὺς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγοντας αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος  
ἀποκηρύττει. 20

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὃ τῆν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐσίαν δηλοῖ,  
τοὺς θεὸν πάλιν μόνον οἰομένους τούτον ἐπιστομίζει.

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Χριστέ, τοὺς διηρημένας ἀλλήλων τὰς  
ὑποστάσεις εἶναι δοξάζοντας ἀποπαύει.

3,1 ἔρμηνεία] deest V | εἰς τὸ] QSTV τοῦ RU 2 Ἀμήν] deest U  
4 ἀγαθοῦ] ἀγαθῶν ST 6 ἡμῶν] QSTV ἡμῶν RU 7 θεοσοφίας]  
θεοσεβείας ST σοφίας W 13 δύο υἱοὺς] υἱοὺς δύο Q 15 φύσεις] δύο  
φύσεις QR | φυρθῆναι] φυραθῆναι QRV 17 ἀπεφῆναντο] ἀπεφαίνοντο  
QST 18 Διὰ] καὶ διὰ R | δηλωτικῶν... 19 ἐστὶ] φύσεώς ἐστὶ δηλωτικῶν  
R φύσεώς δηλωτικὸν ἐστὶ ST φύσεώς ἐστὶ δηλωτικὸν U  
22 οἰομένους] ἰομένους Q ἰομένους S οἰομένους T οἰομένους T  
τούτον] deest RU τούτους V 24 ὑποστάσεις] φύσεις RU

3,18 Διὰ... 20 ἀποκηρύττει] Marc. Eugen. Prec ad Jesum 349.12-14  
Bulovic 21 Διὰ... 22 ἐπιστομίζει] Marc. Eugen. Prec ad Jesum 349.14-  
17 Bulovic 23 Διὰ... 24 ἀποπαύει] Marc. Eugen. Prec. ad Jesum 349.17-  
19 Bulovic

3,7 Οἱ... 9 ἔλεγον.] Arius cfr. C Nic (325) 9 οἱ... 10 ἀνθρώπινον.]  
Eutyches et Dioscurus cfr C Chalc. 10 οἱ... 13 ἔλεγον.] Nestorius cfr. C  
Eph (431) 13 οἱ... 17 ἀπεφῆναντο] Monoergitae et Monothelitae cfr.  
CCP (681) 18 Διὰ... 20 ἀποκηρύττει] C Nic. (325) 21 Διὰ... 22  
ἐπιστομίζει] C Chalc. 23 Διὰ... 24 ἀποπαύει] C Eph (431)

- 25 *Διὰ δὲ τοῦ ὁ θεὸς, τοὺς σύγχυσιν τολμῶντας λέγειν  
ἀποτρέπει καὶ ληρωδοῦντας ἀποδεικνύει ἀσύγχυτον τὴν  
θεϊαν φύσιν δηλῶν κἀντεῦθεν καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, καὶ  
δύο οὐσίας ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει συνηνωμένας παρίστησι.*
- 30 *Καὶ οὕτως ἀπαρτίζων τὸ περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τῶν  
ὀρθοδόξων δόγμα, ἐπάγει τὸ ἡμῶν, ἀδελφικῶς ἀλλήλοις  
τοὺς πιστοὺς συνάπτων καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης συνδέων, ἐν  
ἧ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν ἅπαν ὑπάρχει τὸ πλήρωμα.*
- 35 *Οὕτω γοῦν καὶ τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν  
περιλαβῶν τὴν συμπλήρωσιν, προστίθησι τὸ ἐλέησον.  
Διὰ γὰρ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῆς  
συμπληρώσεως τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐλεούμεθα.*
- 40 *Εἶτα πάλιν ἐπήγαγε τὸ ἡμᾶς, τῆς ἀγάπης ἐχόμενος,  
καὶ τελευταῖον ἐπήγαγε τὸ ἀμῆν, ὃ ἔστι, γένοιτο,  
εὐκτικῶς ἐπικυρῶν τὰ εἰρημένα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ  
βεβαιότητι.*

3,25 ὁ] deest RUV 26 ληρωδοῦντας] λοιροδοῦντας R λοιρωδοῦντας S  
29 τὸ] deest Q | τῶν] deest RU 30 ὀρθοδόξων] ὀρθόδοξον U  
ἀλλήλοις] ἀλλήλους STV 31 τοὺς πιστοὺς] τοῖς πιστοῖς QRST  
συνδέων] συνδέον U 32 ὑπάρχει] ὑπάρχων Q 34 περιλαβῶν]  
παραλαβῶν RU 37 ἐπήγαγε] ἐπάγει RU 38 ἐπήγαγε] ἐπήνεγκε QST

3,31 διὰ... 32 πλήρωμα] cfr. Rom. 13:10

25 Διὰ... 28 παρίστησι] Marc. Eugen. Prec. ad Jesum 349.19-350.1  
Bulovic

25 Διὰ... 28 παρίστησι] CCP (681)