

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON JOHN MAUPOUS

Abstract: This article revisits the biography of John Mauropous and offers new dates for the composition of the collection of his literary works, the Feast of the Three Hierarchs, the resignation from the see of Euchaita and the date of his death; it also offers new insights into his surname, his place of birth, his occupation, and the historical contexts for some of his homilies and hymns.

These biographical notes grew organically out of two papers I recently wrote, one on the correspondence of Mauropous and Psellos and the other on the early history of the Petra monastery.¹ As I was working on these two papers, I came to realize that I could not explain my arguments without extensive recourse to the biography of John Mauropous. The problem with his biography, just as with that of most Byzantines, is that we have little to build on and that the little we have may have been clear to his contemporaries, but not necessarily to us.² In the case of Mauropous, things are even worse because our main source of information, Mauropous' collection of literary works in Vat. gr. 676,³ presents a highly idealized self-portrait. Mauropous put together his collection shortly before leaving Euchaita for good (see Note 6 below) and states in the "Preface to the whole book" (poem 1) that he selected the best of his poetry and prose. But it is more than just a selection: poem 99

¹ M.D. LAUXTERMANN, *The Intertwined Lives of Michael Psellos and John Mauropous*, in M. JEFFREYS–M.D. LAUXTERMANN (eds), *The Letters of Psellos: Cultural Networks and Historical Realities*, Oxford, 2017, pp. 89-127. M.D. LAUXTERMANN–G.M. PAOLETTI, *Three Verse Inscriptions in the Refectory of the Petra Monastery*, in S. RONCHEY–F. MONTICINI (eds), *Bisanzio nello spazio e nel tempo: Costantinopoli, la Siria*, Rome, 2019, pp. 85-95 and 116.

² Apart from the omnipresent Psellos (see n. 11, n. 20, n. 21 and n. 62) and a liturgical office written by Mauropous' nephew Theodore (see n. 12), the best source is Mauropous himself, who in his poems, letters and orations offers many snippets of autobiographical information. The poems, letters and orations can be found in *Iohannis Euchaitorum metropolitanae quae in codice vaticano graeco 676 supersunt*. IOHANNES BOLLIG descripsit, PAULUS DE LAGARDE edidit, Göttingen, 1882. The letters have been republished and translated by A. KARPOZILOS, *The Letters of Ioannes Mauropous Metropolitan of Euchaita*, Thessaloniki, 1990. For an English translation of the poems, see F. BERNARD–C. LIVANOS, *The Poems of Christopher of Mytilene and John Mauropous*, Cambridge, Ma., 2018. For a partial edition of the poems, with an excellent commentary, see U. MONDINI, *Il Canzoniere di Giovanni Mauropode. Nuova edizione critica e commento delle poesie di contenuto ecfrastico*, Tesi di dottorato di ricerca, Milan, 2020. In the following, references to Mauropous' poems and orations are to the Bollig–Lagarde edition, and references to his letters are to the Karpozilos edition.

³ See D. BIANCONI, «Piccolo assaggio di abbondante fragranza»: *Giovanni Mauropode e il Vat. gr. 676*, in *JÖB*, 61 (2011), pp. 89-103.

strongly suggests that he also polished his writings for publication.⁴ Moreover, as amply demonstrated by Bernard, Mauropous arranged his poems in such a manner that they highlight certain aspects of his life, while leaving out many things that would contradict the self-image that emerges from Vat. gr. 676.⁵

Although much progress has been made in the past twenty years, the chronological framework for the life and works of John Mauropous remain three publications by the great Mauropodian scholar, Apostolos Karpozilos: the PhD thesis he completed in the late 1970s and published in 1982;⁶ the introduction to his 1990 edition of Mauropous' letters;⁷ and the elegant reply in 1994 to a not entirely convincing attempt by Kazhdan to alter received wisdom and rewrite Mauropous' biography.⁸ In a sense, what follows should be seen as footnotes to Karpozilos' fundamental work.

(1) *Names*. Mauropous does not call himself Mauropous. The title page of Vat. gr. 676 offers two book epigrams: in the first, Mauropous tells us that he is called John, that he is a deacon and that he is the nephew of the bishop of Klaudioupolis; in the second, he identifies himself as John metropolitan of Euchaita and synkellos.⁹ The first epigram clearly predates his appointment to the see of Euchaita; the second enumerates the titles he held when he put together his selected writings. The reason why he mentions his uncle, and not his father, in the first epigram, is because it was customary for bishops to fund the studies of their nephews.¹⁰ It is

⁴ Vat. gr. 676 transmits the *Homily on the Three Hierarchs* (no. 178) in a version that is more elaborate and stylistically refined than that of all the other mss.: according to R. ANASTASI, *Su Giovanni d'Euchaita*, in *Sicilorum Gymnasium*, 29 (1976), pp. 24-27, this version is a reworking of the original text by the author himself.

⁵ See F. BERNARD, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry, 1025-1081*, Oxford 2014, pp. 128-144 and 195-207. See also LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (asin n. 1), pp. 91-99.

⁶ A. KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή στη μελέτη τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ Ἰωάννη Μαυρόποδος*, Ioannina, 1982, pp. 23-50.

⁷ KARPOZILOS, *The Letters* (asin n. 2), pp. 9-27.

⁸ A. KARPOZILOS, *The Biography of Ioannes Mauropous Again*, in *Ἑλληνικά*, 44 (1994), pp. 51-60. This is a reply to A. KAZHDAN, *Some Problems in the Biography of John Mauropous*, in *JÖB*, 43 (1993), pp. 87-111; see also idem, *Some Problems in the Biography of John Mauropous. II*, in *Byz*, 65 (1995), pp. 362-387.

⁹ For the texts, see LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (asin n. 1), pp. 92-93.

¹⁰ For this avuncular system, see J. ROSKILLY, *Λογιώτατοι ποιμένες: Les évêques et leur autorité dans la société byzantine des xi^e-xii^e siècles*, Thèse, Sorbonne, Paris, 2017, pp. 51-54 and 82-83.

Mauropous' way of presenting himself as a well-educated individual with a connection to the church, not only because of his ordination as a deacon, but also because of his family ties.¹¹

Psellos does not use the name 'Mauropous' either; nor does Mauropous' own nephew Theodore in the *akolouthia* (liturgical office) he wrote in honour of his saintly uncle.¹² For them he is simply John metropolitan of Euchaita. There may be an oblique allusion to the family name in Theodore's *kanon*, ode 7, strophe 2: Ὠραῖοι πόδες καὶ θεῖοι * οἱ σοί, παμμάκαρ, ἐδέιχθησαν· * τῆ γὰρ πόλει τῆ σῆ * ἀγαθὰ τε καὶ εἰρήνην ἐκήρυξας, "Beautiful and divine, O blessed one, were your feet, for you brought tidings of good things and peace to your city". Though this is an obvious reference to St Paul (*Rom.* 10:15), the emphatic use of οἱ σοί may indicate that, in contrast to what Mauropous' surname would seem to suggest, *his* feet were "beautiful and divine".

The name 'Mauropous' is only found in combination with the word μοναχός. For example, many of his *kanones* bear the following title: ποίημα Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ τὸ ἐπίκλην Μαυρόποδος (more about this in Note 9).¹³ Or take the title of the *Life of St Baras* (the mythical founder of the Petra monastery): Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ καὶ ἀρχιδιακόνου (...) τοῦ Μαυροπόδου.¹⁴ The name also occurs in a long poem on the guardian angel incorrectly ascribed to Mauropous: τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ τοῦ Μαυρόποδος.¹⁵ Given the great number of monastic authors called John,

¹¹ In his *Encomium for John of Euchaita* (ed. G.T. DENNIS, *Michaelis Pselli Orationes Panegyricae*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, 1994, no. 17, pp. 143-174; transl. R. ANASTASI, *Encomio per Giovanni, Püssimo Metropolita di Euchaita e Protosincello*, Padova, 1968, pp. 45-67), Psellos mentions the same bishop of Klaudioupolis and a missionary to the Bulgars as the two uncles who took care of Mauropous' education: pp. 145-146, lines 56-77 and p. 147, lines 95-119.

¹² Entitled: *Ἀκολουθία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις πατέρα ἡμῶν Ἰωάννην μητροπολίτην τῶν Εὐχαΐτων γεγονυῖα παρὰ Θεοδώρου κοιτωνίτου καὶ βασιλικοῦ νοταρίου τοῦ ἀνεψιοῦ αὐτοῦ*. Edited twice: S. EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπους μητροπολίτης Εὐχαΐτων*, in G. PAPAMICHAIL, *Ἐναίσιμα ἐπὶ τῆ τριακοστῆ πέμπτῃ ἐπετηρίδι τῆς ἐπιστημονικῆς δράσεως τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Χρυσοστόμου Παπαδοπούλου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀθηνῶν καὶ πάσης Ἑλλάδος*, Athens, 1931, pp. 428-437, and S.G. MERCATI, *Ufficio di Giovanni Mauropode Euchaita composto dal nipote Teodoro*, in *Mémorial L. Petit*, Bucharest, 1948, pp. 350-360, repr. in idem, *Collectanea Byzantina*, Bari, 1970, vol. I, pp. 517-528.

¹³ See EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπους* (as in n. 12), 406, n. 3, and E. FOLLIERI, *Giovanni Mauropode metropolita di Eucaita: Otto canoni paraclitici a N.S. Gesù Cristo*, in *Archivio Italiano per la Storia della Pietà*, 5 (1968), p. 22, n. 1.

¹⁴ A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη*, 2 vols, Constantinople, 1884, vol. II, p. 38. For the question of authorship, see the end of the biographical note 9 below.

¹⁵ Laur. 9.18, fol. 2-4 and margins of fol. 5-12 (copied by a 14th-c. hand). The poem is still unedited: inc. Τὴν τοῦ συνειδότος μὲν ἄκραν αἰσχύνην, 456 vv. The reason why it is

the addition of the name ‘Mauropous’ serves to distinguish him from all his namesakes.

The above-mentioned titles present his name in the genitive: Μαυρόποδος and Μαυροπόδου,¹⁶ deriving from *Μαυρόπους and Μαυροπόδης/Μαυρόποδος respectively. The first of these names, Μαυρόπους, is not attested. However, we do find attestations for the names Μαυροπόδης and, less commonly, Μαυρόποδος in the *Prosopography of the Byzantine World* (PBW) and in the *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* (PLP).¹⁷ The metrical seal of Samuel Mauropodes (present at the Synod of 1166) is particularly interesting because it shows that the name Μαυρόπους, though not attested as such, may occasionally have been used as a more elevated variant form: Τὸν Μαυρόπουν σκέποις με λεύιτην, θύτα.¹⁸ In other words, Mauropous’ real surname is likely to have been Mauropodes (or perhaps Mauropodos), with ‘Mauropous’ as a learned variant form.

(2) *Date of Birth.* John Mauropous is generally believed to have been born in or shortly after c. 1000. This dating is based on three testimonies of Psellos. In his *Encomium for John of Euchaita* he tells us that “as a youth” (πρωθήβης) he studied with Mauropous.¹⁹ If Mauropous was indeed Psellos’ teacher (see Note 4 below), it logically follows that he must have been older than his pupil, who was born in 1018. In the *Funeral Oration for Leichoudes*, Psellos mentions that when he met Xiphilinos and Mauropous, he had not yet reached puberty while they were already young adults; furthermore, while they had already embarked upon their rhetorical

attributed to Mauropous is that he is the author of a *kanon* on the same topic, which is one of the few hymns by his hand to be still in use in the liturgy: see *Ωρολόγιον τὸ Μέγα*, Rome, 1876, pp. 329-334.

¹⁶ The genitive form Μαυροπόδη is also attested: see A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Τεροσολυμικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. III, St. Petersburg, 1897, p. 145: ἐξ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Μαυροπόδι (sic).

¹⁷ *PBW* Michael 229 and Samuel 20107 [accessible at <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk>]. PLP 17475-17479.

¹⁸ See *PBW* Samuel 20107. For Μαυρόπουν instead of Μαυρόποδα, see the accusative form ποῦν instead of πόδα (see D. HOLTON et al., *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*, Cambridge, 2019, p. 423 and 425), and compounds in -πους: ἄπουν, δίπουν, πολύπουν, ἄγαθόπουν, etc.

¹⁹ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (asin n. 11), pp. 150-151, lines 203-214.

studies, he was still in the early stages of his education.²⁰ In the *Chronography*, he repeats this information, saying that he had two good friends, Xiphilinos and Mauropous, who although older, shared his passion for philosophy.²¹ If Psellos rightly states that he was “much younger than they were” (ἐγὼ δὲ παρὰ πολὺ ἐκείνων νεώτερος), a date in or shortly after the year 1000 seems indeed a reasonable assumption. But seeing that the same Psellos in his *Funeral Oration for Xiphilinos* tells us that he was only slightly younger than the patriarch and that when they first met, he had down on his cheeks, whereas Xiphilinos had already grown a full beard,²² it would seem that the age difference between the two was between five and ten years. And the same may be true for Mauropous because both the *Funeral Oration for Leichoudes* and the *Chronography* put him in the same age group as Xiphilinos. In that case, his date of birth may in fact have been somewhere around the year 1010. It all depends on how one interprets these terribly vague and contradictory statements by Psellos. Our safest guess is therefore a date between c. 1000 and 1010.

According to Karpozilos, however, Mauropous must have been born not long after 987, because an anonymous teacher, whom he identifies as Mauropous, tells in a versified petition to the emperor that for all his merits and his advanced age (he is sixty years old), he has not been remunerated as he should have been, and his panegyric celebrating the emperor’s victory over Tornikes (1047) has not received its deserved praise.²³ This poem is found in Athen. gr. 1040 (15th c.), in a small sylloge of eleventh-century poems that follows immediately after Theophylaktos of Ohrid’s *Commentaries on the Gospels*: fol. 288^r an anonymous dedicatory

²⁰ Ed. I. POLEMIS, *Michael Psellus: Orationes Funebres*, vol. I, Berlin, 2014, p. 87, §4.24-27: ἀμφοῖν ἐγὼ τοῖν ἀνδροῖν τούτοιον ἐντετυχήκειν οὕτω ἠβήσας ἐκείνοις ἤδη ἀκμάζουσιν, ἄρτι τῶν ἐγκυκλίων παιδευμάτων ἀψάμενος, ἐκείνοις εἰς τὸν τῆς τέχνης ἀγῶνα ἐμβεβηκόσι.

²¹ Ed. D.R. REINSCH, *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia*, 2 vols, Berlin, 2014, I, p. 192, §VI.192.4-7: λόγος δὲ τῆς συμφυΐας ὁ τῶν μαθημάτων ἐγένετο λόγος· ἀλλ’ ἐκείνω μὲν ἤστην πρεσβυτέρω, ἐγὼ δὲ παρὰ πολὺ ἐκείνων νεώτερος.

²² Ed. POLEMIS, *Orationes Funebres* (asin n. 20) p. 121, §5.41-44: ἡλικίας δὲ οὐ ταῦτ’ οὐκ ἐξ τὸ πολὺ παρηλάττομεν ἀλλ’ ὅποτε ἀλλήλους ἐγνώκεμεν καὶ κρατῆρα φιλίας ἐστήσαμεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἦν θοὺν ἔτι τὸν ἴουλον, ὁ δὲ ὄλαις θριξίν ἐπεπύκαστο. Puberty seemsto have set in quite late for Psellos; in 1034, at the age of 16, he still does not have a beard: οὕτω γενειάσκων: ed. REINSCH, *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia* (asin n. 21) I, p. 53, §IV.4.1.

²³ For the text, see KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (asin n. 6), pp. 71-74; for the date of birth, see *ibidem*, p. 74, and *idem*, *The Letters* (asin n. 2), pp. 10-11.

epigram on the monastic complex of St George of Mangana founded by Constantine IX Monomachos;²⁴ fol. 288^r-289^r poem no. 47 by Mauroπους, anonymous in the manuscript; fol. 289^r-290^v the anonymous versified petition; and fol. 290^v-294^v a monody on Anastasios Lizix (a good friend of Psellos)²⁵ by a certain Basil Kekaumenos.²⁶

The ascription of the versified petition to Mauroπους is incorrect. Firstly, not taking into account obvious scribal errors, which the editor should have corrected,²⁷ there are serious prosodic errors in lines 52 (τὸ long; the first syllable of δῶσαις short), 64 (the first syllable of ἄλλων short) and 88 (ὁ long).²⁸ What is more, lines 59-60 are not in metre, but in prose, a licence that Mauroπους never allowed himself. It is hardly believable that Mauroπους, one of the best Byzantine poets ever, had an off day and made really horrible mistakes when he presented his petition to the emperor. Secondly, if the author of this poem were Mauroπους, he could hardly have maintained that the emperor had overlooked his oration on the revolt of Tornikes. Let me quote Lefort, who has the following to say about the panegyric of the real Mauroπους (*Or.* 186): “le discours de décembre (...) était le triomphe, rhétorique et politique, de Mauroπους (...) il parlait aussi comme principal conseiller de l’empereur, ce qu’il était manifestement en 1047”.²⁹ But if we follow Karpozilos, we have to assume that the “principal conseiller” felt that the emperor had not paid enough attention. How likely is that?

²⁴ Ed. I. SAKKELION–A. SAKKELION, *Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, Athens, 1892, pp. 184-185. This epigram has been attributed to Mauroπους by S.G. MERCATI, *Un testament inédit en faveur de Saint-Georges des Manganes*, in *REB*, 6 (1948), p. 36 (repr. *Collectanea Byzantina* (asin n. 12), I, p. 54). This attribution is unlikely because of the prosodic error in v. 25 (the first syllable of κλήρους measured short); the equally unprosodic δεσποίνῃ in v. 19 might perhaps be defended as a so-called ‘technical term’, but cannot be found in the work of Mauroπους. Delete ῶ in v. 26.

²⁵ *PBW* Anastasios 2101 (=Anastasios Lizix). Mercati (see following footnote) identifies Lizix with a correspondent of Theodore Prodromos, but P. GAUTIER, *Michel Italikos. Lettres et Discours*, Paris, 1972, pp. 50-52, and M.D.J. OP DE COUL, *Théodore Prodrome. Lettres et Discours. Édition, Traduction, Commentaire*, Thèse, Sorbonne, Paris, 2007, vol. II, p. 315, n. 68, rightly disputethis.

²⁶ S.G. MERCATI (ed.), *Versi di Basilio Cecaumeno in morte di Anastasio Lizix*, in *Studi Bizantini* 1 (1925), pp. 149-166 (repr. *Collectanea Byzantina* (asin n. 12), I, pp. 321-342).

²⁷ Read σῶν (not τῶν) in v. 39, ἐπιπρέπει (not ἐπιτρέπει) in v. 48 and προσνέμειν (not προνέμειν) in v. 49. Also emendate χρυσόρρειθρον in v. 51 to χρυσόρειθρον for metrical reasons.

²⁸ For the metrical and prosodic practices of Mauroπους, see F. KÜHN, *Symbolae ad doctrinae Περὶ διχρόνων historiam pertinentes*, Breslau, 1892, pp. 72-81 and 115-137.

²⁹ J. LEFORT, *Rhétorique et politique: trois discours de Jean Mauroπους en 1047*, in *TM*, 6 (1976), p. 302.

And thirdly, in the passage where the anonymous poet complains that all sorts of people, including his own students (vv. 33-43), have been promoted over him, he expressly tells the emperor that he would like to show him what he is worth, namely εἰ πιστὸς εἰμὶ σῶν φύλαξ προσταγμάτων, “whether I am a loyal guardian of your decrees” (v. 39). This clearly refers to the post of *nomophylax* at the School of Law, created in 1047: Mauropous wrote the foundation deed (*Or.* 187) and selected John Xiphilinos, a good friend, as its first incumbent. If Mauropous had authored the poem, we would have to assume that he was first instrumental in the appointment of his friend and then tried to steal his job. That too does not sound very plausible. However, we know that Xiphilinos’ appointment as *nomophylax* met with considerable opposition from the *nomodidaskaloi*, who understandably viewed the institution of this new post as a measure that encroached upon their traditional prerogatives. One such instance of protest came from Ophrydas, a high-ranking judge, who wrote a pamphlet against Xiphilinos: as the text has not come down to us, we can only guess what Ophrydas may have said, but it was apparently offensive enough for Psellos to write a long apology in defense of Xiphilinos, in which he returned the insult with interest.³⁰ As the anonymous author of the versified petition appears to share Ophrydas’ indignation at seeing a much younger lawyer promoted to the post of *nomophylax*, it is reasonable to assume that he was one of those *nomodidaskaloi* who were directly affected by the creation of the School of Law and who retaliated by conducting a smear campaign against Xiphilinos.³¹

(3) *Home*. In his *Chronography*, Psellos tells us that his two best friends, Xiphilinos and Mauropous, “had come from other places (πατρίδων) and

³⁰ For Ophrydas, see *PBW Anonymus* 2010. For Psellos’ text see G.T. DENNIS (ed.), *Michaelis Pselli Orationes Forenses et Acta*, Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1994, pp. 124-142.

³¹ For the controversy, see W. WOLSKA-CONUS, *Les écoles de Psellos et de Xiphilin sous Constantin IX Monomaque*, in *TM*, 6 (1976), pp. 238-240; P. LEMERLE, “Le gouvernement des philosophes”: notes et remarques sur l’enseignement, les écoles, la culture, in *idem*, *Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle byzantin*, Paris, 1977, pp. 211-212; W. WOLSKA-CONUS, *L’ école de droit et l’enseignement du droit à Byzance au XI^e siècle: Xiphilin et Psellos*, in *TM*, 7 (1979), pp. 3-4.

settled in our venerable Rome”.³² The πατρίς is Trebizond for Xiphilinos.³³ But what is the birthplace of Mauroπους? In letter 9, addressed to the departing governor of Paphlagonia, Mauroπους calls him “the leader of our homeland” (τῆς ἡμετέρας πατρίδος) and identifies himself as “a true Paphlagonian” (οἱ ἀκραιφνεῖς ἡμεῖς Παφλαγόνες).³⁴ In letter 75, written in Euchaita, in which he deplures the fact that a good friend had not been appointed to his own theme of Hellenopontos, but to that of Paphlagonia, he says that “our friend has gone to our province instead of us” (ἀνθ’ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα ὁ ἡμέτερος).³⁵ And in letter 11 (line 16), in which he pleads with a judge to be lenient with smugglers from Paphlagonia, he calls them “my compatriots” (τοῖς ὁμοεθνέσι). In Psellos’ *Encomium*, we read that when Mauroπους had not yet been consecrated as metropolitan, he built a marvellous church “in his very homeland” (ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς πατρίδος) — presumably Paphlagonia.³⁶

The problem is that the term πατρίς does not necessarily mean the place of birth. It is clear that Mauroπους had an emotional bond with Paphlagonia and even identified himself as a Paphlagonian. But do the passages quoted above indicate that he was actually born there, or that it is from there that his family hailed?

In fact, there are solid grounds for believing that Mauroπους was born in Constantinople. In poem 47, in which he bids farewell to his house,³⁷ he explicitly states that the house had been his τιθηνός (nurse), τροφός (child-carer), παιδαγωγός (tutor) and διδάσκαλος (teacher), in short had raised him “from infancy to adulthood” (καὶ πρὸς τέλειον μέτρον ἐξ ἔτι

³² Ed. REINSCH, *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia* (asin n. 21), I, p. 192, §VI.192.2-3.

³³ See POLEMIS, *Orationes Funebres* (asin n. 20), p. 118-119, §3.

³⁴ Lines 9 and 15. The governor was transferred from Paphlagonia to Boukellarion. Letter 6, probably addressed to the same governor, also talks about a transfer from Paphlagonia to Boukellarion and identifies his new place of residence as Klaudioupolis. The commentary of KARPOZILOS, *The Letters* (as in n. 2), pp. 205-206 and p. 207, wrongly states that Mauroπους considers Klaudioupolis to be a city in Paphlagonia: for him it lies in the theme of Boukellarion, as it indeed does.

³⁵ Lines 6-7. For the correct interpretation of letter 75, see KAZHDAN, *Some problems I* (asin n. 8), pp. 109-110.

³⁶ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (asin n. 11), pp. 164, lines 563-568.

³⁷ It is a farewell speech (συντακτικὸς λόγος): see D.A. RUSSELL – N.G. WILSON, *Menander Rhetor*, Oxford, 1981, pp. 194-200. For a similar farewell speech in verse, Prodromos’ poem 79, see W. HÖRANDNER, *Theodore Prodromos and the City*, in P. ODORICO – CH. MESSIS (eds), *Villes de toute beauté: L’ekphrasis des cités dans les littératures byzantine et byzantino-slaves*, Paris, 2012, pp. 49-62.

βρέφους).³⁸ In the same poem and in the next, he calls his house a “paternal hearth” (πατρῶαν ἐστίαν), “paternal home” (πατρικὴ στέγη), “patrimony” (κλῆρον ... πατρικὸν), a treasured possession that he had “inherited from his family” (ἐκ γένους ... κλῆρον).³⁹ And in letter 4 (lines 2-3), a petition addressed to a high official in the imperial administration who lived next door, Mauropous reminds him that they had been neighbours “from the times of our fathers and even earlier” (ἐκ πατέρων ἤδη καὶ ἄνωθεν). Not only does Mauropous claim to have lived in his house from a very young age onward, but he also seems to suggest that the house had been in the family for a long time. To all intents and purposes, it looks as if he was a born and bred Constantinopolitan with family ties to Paphlagonia, his place of origin (πατρίς), but not his place of birth. This also explains how Mauropous can be related to Leichoudes, who hailed from a family based in Constantinople.⁴⁰

We learn from poem 27 that Mauropous’ house was in or near the quarter of the Chalkoprateia. This poem is the verse preface to Mauropous’ *Homily on the Dormition* which he delivered in the sanctuary where the relics of the garment and girdle of the Theotokos were kept: i.e. the Church of the Theotokos Chalkoprateia.⁴¹ In line 28 of the poem, Mauropous writes that he is “a neighbour of your (=Mary’s) sanctuary here” (οἴκῳ τε τῷ σῷ γειτονοῦντας ἐνθάδε). Poem 28, the preface to Mauropous’ *Homily on the Synaxis of the Archangels*, offers another topographical clue: the homily is “a gift from a modest neighbour” (ἐκ γείτονος δώρημα μετριωτάτου) who “can see your sanctuary from nearby” (ὄς καὶ τὸν

³⁸ Poem 47, lines 20-21 and 46-48.

³⁹ Poem 47, lines 16 and 32; poem 48, line 2; poem 47, line 17.

⁴⁰ Ed. POLEMIS, *Orationes Funebres* (as in n. 20), p. 87, §4.39-40: ἐκ ταύτου γένους ἐξανατείας. For the capital as Leichoudes’ place of birth, see *ibidem*, p. 84, §2.23-28.

⁴¹ *Or.* 183, §41.4, ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (as in n. 2), p. 155: ἐσθής τε καὶ ζώνης. For these relics, see J. WORTLEY, *The Marian Relics at Constantinople*, in *GRBS*, 45 (2005), p. 186, n. 39, and D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century*, in M. CUNNINGHAM-L. BRUBAKER (eds), *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Aldershot, 2011, pp. 221, n. 30 and 232-233, n. 147-151. KARPOZIOS, *Συμβολή* (as in n. 6), p. 161, and *The Letters* (as in n. 2), p. 26, confuses Chalkoprateia with the Blachemaes sanctuary which did not have the garment and the girdle of the Holy Virgin, but Her robe (μαφόριον). He also misinterprets *Or.* 183, §37.1-9 (p. 154): he connects the sacrilegious act described there with the fire that devastated the Blachemaes sanctuary in 1070; but it refers to the apocryphal tale of Jephonias, a Jew who allegedly tried to topple the Virgin’s funeral bier.

ὁμῶν οἶκον ἐκ τοῦ πλησίον ... προσβλέπειν ἔχει).⁴² It is not clear which church or chapel of the Archangels Mauropous is referring to. The same poem appears to suggest that Mauropous received his education at a school that adjoined this sanctuary (lines 9-12); but this does not help in locating Mauropous' house because we know so little about schools in Constantinople.⁴³

(4) *Occupation*. As John Mauropous tells us himself on the title page of Vat. gr. 676, he held the rank of deacon. In his *Encomium*, Psellos compares Mauropous to the prophet Samuel, saying that “he had been found worthy of the ephod” already before his consecration as metropolitan (τῆς ἐπωμίδος καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης ἠξίωται): i.e. he had been ordained as a deacon. He also tells us where Mauropous served as a deacon: in a sanctuary dedicated to the true Tabernacle, namely the Holy Virgin.⁴⁴ This sanctuary can without a doubt be identified as the Church of the Theotokos Chalkoprateia because Mauropous tells us so in the metrical preface to his *Homily on the Dormition*, which he delivered in that very church: “now that I have been deemed worthy of cultivating” the eternal meadow of words (τοῖς νῦν γεωργεῖν αὐτὸν ἠξιωμένοις) – please notice the word νῦν, “now”, indicating that his ordination was a recent thing when he delivered his homily.⁴⁵ Since the Church of the Chalkoprateia was administered by the patriarchal clergy,⁴⁶ its deacons resorted directly under the patriarchate. This also explains why Mauropous was offered the important post of chartophylax of the Great Church at some point: this

⁴² Poem 28, lines 18 and 19-20. The homily is *Or.* 177: ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), pp. 95-106.

⁴³ One could think of the school next to the Nea Ekklesia which did have a chapel dedicated to the Archangels Michael and Gabriel; but this school is only attested around c. 900 (see A. MARKOPOULOS, *L'éducation à Byzance aux IX^e-X^e siècles: problèmes et questions diverses*, in *TM*, 21.2 (2017), pp. 62-63) and is perhaps too far away from the Chalkoprateia church for Mauropous to claim that he lived in the vicinity of both churches. Psellos' *Encomium* offers no precise information about Mauropous' school years. Mauropous' letter 20 mentions a former teacher, jealous of his success at court; letter 62 is addressed to two teachers, one his own, the other employed at the school of St Theodore in Sphorakiou; and poem 37 is a monody for a former fellow student (see line 42).

⁴⁴ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (as in n. 11), p. 170, lines 734-743; see ANASTASI, *Encomio per Giovanni* (asin n. 11), p. 33 and KAZHDAN, *Some Problems I* (asin n. 8), p. 88.

⁴⁵ Poem 27, line 12: translation by BERNARD-LIVANOS, *Poems* (asin n. 2), p. 365. For the where and when of this homily see n. 41 above.

⁴⁶ See KRAUSMÜLLER, *Making the Most of Mary* (asin n. 41), pp. 222-223 and n. 37 and 44.

was a promotion within the ranks of the patriarchal clergy. Mauropous declined this promotion.⁴⁷ To the best of our knowledge, he was still a deacon when he was made metropolitan of Euchaita.

Contrary to common belief, John Mauropous was not employed as a teacher.⁴⁸ This is not to say that he did not teach. He did. But all his teaching was of a private nature, without any direct attachment to the Byzantine school system. In poem 47, while deploring his imminent departure from his home, he is reminded of the happy days he spent there reading and writing, but also sharing his knowledge with others: “I arbitrated disputes for both students and teachers, ready to respond to everyone (...) Within your walls I shared [knowledge] with whoever asked, making many young men wise for free” (κρίνων μαθηταῖς καὶ διδασκάλοις ἕρις, / ἔτοιμος ὦν ἅπασιν εἰς ἀποκρίσεις / (...) ἐν σοὶ δὲ ταύτην τοῖς θέλουσι σκορπίσας / πολλοὺς σοφοὺς ἔδειξα προῖκα τῶν νέων).⁴⁹ Schools are not housed in private homes and *maïstores* (teachers) do not teach for free: they depend on student fees to survive. And Mauropous cannot arbitrate disputes if he is part of the system.

In poem 92, looking back at his life till then, Mauropous reports that thanks to his erudition he “cultivated many young minds and (...) elevated them with [his] lessons” (ἐκ μαθημάτων) and “made a contribution to their morals” through his “instruction” (παίδευσις), and he concludes by saying that “some of them are now teachers and deservedly hold illustrious positions”.⁵⁰ There are more texts in his oeuvre in which Mauropous explicitly refers to teaching: in letters 58 and 76, he addresses three students as “the good and most sweet fruit of my teaching” (58.1-2 τὸν καλὸν τε καὶ ἡδιστὸν τῆς ἐμῆς παιδείας καρπὸν) and refers to himself as “their former teacher” (76.11 τὸν πάλαι διδάσκαλον); and in letter 24

⁴⁷ See letter 5. FOLLIERI, *Otto canonici paraclitici* (as in n. 13), p. 10, n. 3, suggests that Mauropous was offered the post after the death of John Chartophylax for whom he wrote a lament (poem 37): this John is attested in 1038 and 1039, but we do not know when the vacancy arose.

⁴⁸ The only one to have understood this correctly is LEMERLE, “*Le gouvernement des philosophes*” (as in n. 31), pp. 199-201.

⁴⁹ Poem 47, lines 26-27 and 30-31: translation by BERNARD-LIVANOS, *Poems* (as in n. 2), p. 413. There is no reason to ‘correct’ them s. reading ἕρις (acc. pl.) to ἔρεις, cf. ὄρνις (acc. pl.) alongside ὄρνεις and ὄρνιθας.

⁵⁰ Poem 92, lines 41, 43-44, 45 and 49-50. For an excellent commentary, see BERNARD, *Writing and Reading* (as in n. 5), pp. 201-202.

he introduces the carrier of the letter as someone who belonged “to the circle of my former students” (24.6-7 τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς κύκλου τῶν ποτὲ φοιτητῶν). Further proof is the *akolouthia* written by Mauropous’ nephew: Διαδοθεῖσα πανταχοῦ * ἡ σὴ φήμη, παμμάκαρ, * πάντοθεν συνεκάλει * πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν σὴν * ὡς εἰς λογεῖον κοινὸν * τοὺς διψῶντας * τὴν τῶν λόγων μάθησιν, “When your [=Mauropous’] fame had spread everywhere, O blessed one, it drew students thirsting for knowledge from everywhere to your house as a common place of learning”.⁵¹

However, teaching takes many forms in Byzantium and not every *didaskalos* is a school teacher. Psellos did most of his teaching when he was *not* holding a professorial chair;⁵² Geometres roused the envy of professional teachers because he, an army officer, was encroaching on their turf by writing on rhetoric;⁵³ Eustathios continued his scholarly activities during his episcopate in Thessaloniki.⁵⁴ When Photios held the high-ranking position of *protasekretis* in the imperial administration (a position with many responsibilities that will have taken up most of his time), he used to teach at home, surrounded by his χορός, his chorus of enthusiastic pupils eager to listen to his lessons.⁵⁵ This too cannot have been a regular school, and Photios was definitely not moonlighting as a *maistor*. His chorus looks more like a private circle of intellectuals or a literary salon, similar to what is generally known as a *theatron*.⁵⁶ Terms such as chorus and *theatron* emphasize the performative aspects of education and culture in Byzantium; the same goes for the term λογεῖον used by Mauropous’ nephew: the *logeion* is the part of the stage where actors deliver their speeches in ancient drama.

⁵¹ Kanon, Ode 3, Strophe 3: lines 38-44: ed. EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπουλος* (asin n. 12), p. 431, and MERCATI, *Ufficio di Giovanni Mauropode* (asin n. 12), p. 521.

⁵² See LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (asin n. 1), pp. 113-120.

⁵³ See M.D. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, vol. II, Vienna, 2019, pp. 158-162, and S. PAPAIOANNOU, *Ioannes Sikeliotis (and Ioannes Geometres) Revisited*, in *TM*, 23.1 (2019), pp. 677-682.

⁵⁴ See E. CULLHED, *Eustathios of Thessalonike: Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*, vol. I, Uppsala, 2016, pp. 8-9, and P. CESARETTI-S. RONCHEY, *Eustathii Thessalonicensis Exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem*, Berlin, 2014, pp. 69*-72* and 120*-127*.

⁵⁵ See P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantin: notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*, Paris, 1971, pp. 197-199, and MARKOPOULOS, *L’éducation à Byzance* (asin n. 43), pp. 66-67.

⁵⁶ For this institution, see, for instance, M. GRÜNBART (ed.), *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Berlin, 2007.

That Mauropous was not a school teacher, is also clear when we look at the school career of his most famous pupil, Michael Psellos. In Psellos' *Encomium for his Mother* (§5d), we read that when he was five, he began school and that he changed school at the age of eight. This happened when his mother had had a dream in which she found herself in the Church of the Holy Apostles and witnessed the Holy Virgin telling two saintly figures, described as Sts Peter and Paul: "Fill her son with the knowledge of literature".⁵⁷ We know that Psellos began his school career at Ta Narsou, a monastery dedicated to the Holy Virgin and other saints.⁵⁸ The dream Psellos' mother had signals the moment that the Theotokos of Ta Narsou handed over the responsibility for her charge to the two principal saints of the Holy Apostles, another educational establishment.⁵⁹ Though there are more moments in Psellos' *Encomium* where he discusses his progress as a student (§6b and 10a), he does not mention any other schools. In §15a we read that Psellos had left school at the age of sixteen, when he had just "begun to apply [himself] to the art of rhetoric": at the time he was an assistant to a *krites*⁶⁰ – the beginning of a bureaucratic career that would eventually lead to his appointment as imperial *asekretis* in 1043.⁶¹

Where does this leave Mauropous? There can be no doubt that Psellos studied with Mauropous because he says so in a number of letters⁶²

⁵⁷ Ed. U. CRISCUOLO, *Autobiografia: Encomio per la madre*, Naples, 1989, pp. 96-97, lines 317-338. Translation by A. KALDELLIS, *Mothers and Sons, Fathers and Daughters: The Byzantine Family of Michael Psellos*, Notre Dame, Ind., 2006, p. 61. For a discussion of this passage, see C. ANGELIDI, *The Writing of Dreams: A Note on Psellos' Funeral Oration for his Mother*, in C. BARBER-D. JENKINS (eds), *Reading Michael Psellos*, Leiden, 2006, pp. 156-158.

⁵⁸ See P. GAUTIER, *Précisions historiques sur le monastère de Ta Narsou*, in *REB*, 34 (1976), pp. 101-110, and LEMERLE, "Le gouvernement des philosophes" (asin n. 31), pp. 212-214.

⁵⁹ As rightly surmised by R. MACRIDES, *The Logos of Nicholas Mesarites*, in M. MULLETT-R.G. OUSTERHOUT (eds), *The Holy Apostles: A Lost Monument, a Forgotten Project, and the Presentness of the Past*, Washington, D.C., 2020, p. 188.

⁶⁰ CRISCUOLO, *Encomio per la madre* (as in n. 57), p. 114, lines 834-842; KALDELLIS, *Mothers and Sons, Fathers and Daughters* (as in n. 57), p. 75. See J.C. RIEDINGER, *Quatre étapes de la vie de Michel Psellos*, in *REB*, 68 (2010), pp. 23-24.

⁶¹ See RIEDINGER, *Quatre étapes* (asin n. 60), pp. 30-37.

⁶² Ed. S. PAPAIOANNOU, *Michael Psellus: Epistulae*, 2 vols, Berlin, 2019, vol. I, pp. 454, 466 and 433: letters Π 173 (S 182), lines 7-8, Π 175 (S 183), lines 45-50, and Π 163 (KD 45), lines 25-29. See F. BERNARD, *Educational Networks in the Letters of Michael Psellos*, in M. JEFFREYS-M.D. LAUXTERMANN (eds), *The Letters of Psellos: Cultural Networks and Historical Realities*, Oxford, 2017, pp. 18-19.

as well as in the encomium he wrote in his honour.⁶³ But if he left school at the age of 16, having studied at Ta Narsou and at the Holy Apostles, then the schooling Psellos received from Mauropous must have taken place when the former was making a career in the civil service and the latter was employed as a deacon at the Chalkoprataia church. The two will have met after working hours at Mauropous' home to study rhetoric and philosophy, to read together the classics and the church fathers, and to engage in intellectual discussions. This is the setting of a private gathering, not a regular school.⁶⁴

(5) *At Court*. There is little to add to Karpozilos' account of Mauropous' time at court.⁶⁵ De Gregorio has shown that poems 46 and 50 refer to the *Second Typikon* of the Holy Mountain issued by emperor Monomachos in 1045 and ratified in 1046.⁶⁶ Bernard has rightly argued that poem 70 refers to an edition of schedographic exercises produced by Monomachos.⁶⁷ Roskilly has pointed out that the establishment of a daily liturgy in the Hagia Sophia celebrated in poems 44 and 45 does not necessarily date to the later part of Monomachos' reign.⁶⁸ There has been some speculation that Mauropous as a "true Paphlagonian" may have enjoyed the support of the Paphlagonian dynasty,⁶⁹ which may be true or not: fact is that he does praise George, the brother of Michael IV, in poem 26. Mauche and Roskilly even went as far as to suggest that this Paphlagonian connection may

⁶³ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (asin n. 11), pp. 150-151, lines 203-214; cf. p. 144, lines 7 and 10, pp. 144-145, lines 37-39, and p. 155, line 332.

⁶⁴ If J.N. LJUBARSKIJ, *Η προσωπικότητα και το έργο του Μιχαήλ Ψελλού*, Athens, 2004, p. 74, is right in assuming that Psellos' letters KD 13-15 (=Π243 and 245-246, ed. ΠΑΠΑΙΟΑΝΝΟΥ, *Epistulae* (asin n. 62), vol. II, pp. 610-615) are addressed to Mauropous, then we have further proof that Mauropous taught in off-hours: see LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (asin n. 1), pp. 102-103.

⁶⁵ KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (asin n. 6), pp. 28-33 and 87-90, and idem, *The Letters* (asin n. 2), pp. 12-15.

⁶⁶ G. DE GREGORIO, *Epigrammi e documenti: poesia come fonte per la storia di chiesa e monasteri bizantini*, in C. GASTGEBER-O. KRESTEN, *Sylloge Diplomatico-Palaeographica I: Studien zur byzantinischen Diplomatie und Paläographie*, Vienna, 2010, pp. 29-48.

⁶⁷ BERNARD, *Writing and Reading* (asin n. 5), pp. 264-265.

⁶⁸ ROSKILLY, *Λογιώτατοι ποιμένες* (asin n. 10), p. 92, n. 396. The traditional date is based on the fact that Skylitzes ends his account of Monomachos' reign with a list of the emperor's "good works", among which he mentions the daily liturgy; but this obviously does not mean that Monomachos waited till the end of his life to do these good works. See H. THURN (ed.), *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, Berlin, 1973, p. 477, §29.20-26.

⁶⁹ See P. MAGDALINO, *Paphlagonians in Byzantine High Society*, in S. LAMBAKIS (ed.), *Η βυζαντινή Μικρά Ασία (6ος-12ος αι.)*, Athens, 1998, p. 146.

initially have caused Mauropous problems when Monomachos came to power: this too may be true or not.⁷⁰

(6) *Episcopate*. Karpozilos has established that the date of Mauropous' consecration as metropolitan of Euchaita was 1049-50 and that this appointment was in fact a form of internal exile;⁷¹ I see no reason to call this into doubt.⁷² The date is based on a letter Psellos wrote soon after the arrival of Mauropous in his metropolitan see, in which he tells him that things are not much better at court than they are in Euchaita.⁷³ And he goes on by saying that a new arrival had disturbed the traditional court hierarchy. This is the Alan princess who became Monomachos' mistress shortly before the death of empress Zoë in 1050.

But how long did Mauropous stay in Euchaita? It is clear from the *Encomium for John of Euchaita* that he was present when Psellos delivered his speech,⁷⁴ and as the *Encomium* dates from 1075 or later but before 1078 (the year Psellos died),⁷⁵ we know for certain that Mauropous had permanently returned to Constantinople in 1075-78. However, there is good reason to believe that he did not wait till 1075 to leave Euchaita. The town must have fallen into the hands of the Selçuks sometime after the Byzantine defeat at Mantzikert in 1071: nearby Amaseia surrendered in c.

⁷⁰ N. MAUCHE-J. ROSKILLY, *There and Back Again: On the Influence of Psellos on the Career of Mauropous*, in *BZ*, 111(2018), p. 725.

⁷¹ See KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (as in n. 6), pp. 39-41; idem, *The Letters* (as in n. 2), p. 17; and idem, *The Biography* (as in n. 8), pp. 54-60. LJUBARSKIJ, *Η προσωπικότητα και το έργο* (as in n. 64), pp. 78-79 and n. 13, reach the same conclusion.

⁷² MAUCHE-ROSKILLY, *There and Back Again* (as in n. 70), pp. 721-736, date the consecrations slightly later, in 1053-54. Their date is based on Psellos' account of how he and his friends, Xiphilinos and Mauropous, wished to leave court and retire to the monastery: ed. REINSCH, *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia* (as in n. 21) I, pp. 191-196, §VI. 191-202. The first to go was Xiphilinos, and then it was Psellos' turn, and then... nothing: Mauropous has miraculously vanished from the story. One cannot build a case on such flimsy evidence.

⁷³ Letter Π 162 (KD 34), ed. PAPAIOANNOU, *Epistulae* (as in n. 62), vol. I, pp. 429-432; for an English translation, see LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (as in n. 1), pp. 123-125. In lines 9-23 Psellos responds to a letter from Mauropous in which the latter apparently had complained that his passage to Euchaita had been a terrifying experience because of heavy weather in the Propontis and the Black Sea. In letter 64.6-19, too, Mauropous explains to the Patriarch that the journey to Euchaita had lasted no less than two months and scared him out of his wits because of "assaults of winds", "hurricanes" and "storms of evil". Likewise, in his address to the inhabitants of Euchaita upon arrival (*Or.* 184, §8, 14-15; ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (as in n. 2), p. 161), Mauropous tells them that the journey had been long and difficult and had seriously affected his health.

⁷⁴ See DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (as in n. 11), pp. 144-145, 150 and 170-171: lines 30-44, 186-192, and 756-763.

⁷⁵ That the *Encomium* dates from after the death of Xiphilinos in 1075, becomes clear from what Psellos says in the *Funeral Oration for Leichoudes*: ed. POLEMIS, *Orationes Funebres* (as in n. 20) p. 87, §4.31-39.

1074 and it is reasonable to assume that Euchaita, less well protected than Amaseia, must have been taken at an earlier date.⁷⁶ Since Mauropous was not present at the synod that was held on 14 March 1072 and which was attended by a record number of metropolitans and archbishops,⁷⁷ it is likely that he arrived in Constantinople after that date: probably late 1072, possibly 1073.

Dramatic evidence for the moment that Mauropous abandoned his metropolitan see (oddly overlooked in the secondary bibliography) can be found in his own collection of literary works, Vat. gr. 676. The personal secretary of Mauropous, Isaiah, who had been involved in the production process and acted as an intermediary between the author and the scribe,⁷⁸ put together a table of contents on fol. III^{r-v}, which has a metrical heading: Ἰωάννου πόνοι τε καὶ λόγοι τάδε / ὃς σύγκελλος ἦν καὶ πρόεδρος ἐνθάδε, “These are the literary works of John, who *was* synkellos and bishop here”.⁷⁹ Please notice the past tense: ἦν. This does not mean that Mauropous ceased to be bishop; it just means that he was no longer “here”, in Euchaita. As “here” presupposes that Isaiah was still there, he wrote his little rhyme either shortly before the town was taken by the Turks or after its capture. He too left eventually and joined Mauropous in Constantinople, where he handed over the collection to a professional scribe for it to be copied in what is now Vat. gr. 676.

Another thing to notice –not only in this heading, but also in Mauropous’ own book epigram on fol. I^v– is that Mauropous still held the title of *synkellos* when the manuscript was produced. But in the title to Psellos’ *Encomium*, which dates to 1075 or shortly thereafter, Mauropous holds a higher title: by then he had become *protosynkellos*.⁸⁰ The 1070s

⁷⁶ See J. HALDON, *Euchaita: From Late Roman and Byzantine Town to Ottoman Village*, in J. HALDON et al. (eds), *Archaeology and Urban Settlement in Late Roman and Byzantine Anatolia: Euchaita–Avkat–Beyözü and its Environment*, Cambridge, 2018, pp. 228 and 250-252.

⁷⁷ Ed. N.A. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *Un décret synodal inédit du patriarche Jean VIII Xiphilin concernant l’élection et l’ordination des évêques*, in *REB*, 18 (1960), pp. 55-78.

⁷⁸ See BIANCONI, «*Piccolo assaggio di abbondante fragranza*» (asin n. 3), pp. 102-103.

⁷⁹ BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. vi. KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (asin n. 6), p. 42, thinks that this indicates that Mauropous was πρόεδρος τῶν συγγέλλων, but this title does not exist: one can be σύγκελλος, πρωτοσύγκελλος, πρόεδρος τῶν πρωτοσυγγέλλων or πρωτοπρόεδρος τῶν πρωτοσυγγέλλων, but not πρόεδρος τῶν συγγέλλων.

⁸⁰ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (asin n. 11), p. 143, line 2.

witnessed a tremendous inflation in ecclesiastical titles due to the fact that so many prelates fled their sees before the Turkish threat and thus lost their principal source of income.⁸¹ Higher dignities meant higher stipends. One of the beneficiaries of this state subvention appears to have been Mauroπους in the period that he retained his position as metropolitan bishop of Euchaita, but already resided in Constantinople. Further proof is to be found on two anonymous lead seals. The list of eleventh-century metropolitans of Euchaita is incomplete and far from certain,⁸² but there are two seals that roughly date to the period of Mauroπους' episcopate:

- (1) Ἄθλητά, σῶζεις
 σύγκελλον οἰκτρὸν Εὐχαΐτων ποιμένα. (mid eleventh century)
- (2) Μάρτυς, θύτην σὸν
 τὸν Εὐχαΐτων πρωτοσύγκελλον σκέπε. (third quarter of eleventh century)⁸³

The first of these two seals offers a text that is strikingly similar to lines 2-3 of the book epigram that Mauroπους put on the title page of his collection: Ποιμὴν μὲν οἰκτρὸς Εὐχαΐτων ὁ γράφων, / ἔστιν δὲ καὶ σύγκελλος, "The author is the wretched shepherd of Euchaita, and he is a synkellos as well".⁸⁴ As there is no parallel for the metrical structure of these two seal inscriptions (the combination of a pentasyllable and a dodecasyllable),⁸⁵ it is highly likely that they are both by Mauroπους, who, even on his seals, stood out as an unusually gifted poet.

To sum up, the sequence of events appears to have been that Mauroπους put together his collection of literary works while still in Euchaita and then left for Constantinople in c. 1072-73. His secretary soon

⁸¹ See ROSKILLY, *Λογιώτατοι ποιμένες* (asin n. 10), pp. 361-363.

⁸² *PBW* Manuel 20122: early 11thc.; *PBW* Michael 106 (Radenos), attested in 1028-32; *PBW* anonymous 20255 (Theodoros), 2nd quarter of the 11th c.; *PBW* Eustathios 20148, 2nd quarter of the 11th c. ?; John Mauroπους; *PBW* Basileios 116, attested in 1082 and 1094; *PBW* anonymous 20154 (Theodoulos), late 11thc. I am deeply grateful to Alexandra Wassiliou-Seibt for her help with sigillographic matters; all remaining errors are my own.

⁸³ Ed. A. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Corpus der byzantinischen Siegel mit metrischen Legenden*, vol. I, Vienna, 2011, pp. 78 and 582: nos. 55 and 1370.

⁸⁴ See LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (asin n. 1), p. 93.

⁸⁵ N. OIKONOMIDES, *The Anonymous Seal*, in *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography*, 4 (1995), p. 76, wrongly assumes that their poet was unable to fit his titles into the metrical structure of the dodecasyllable. In the case of Mauroπους, it is a deliberate choice.

followed with a clean copy. The manuscript itself, Vat. gr. 676, was copied before Mauropous was promoted to the rank of *protosynkellos*.

(7) *When not in Euchaita*. There seems to be a general misconception that the only reason why Mauropous may have visited Constantinople during his episcopate (i.e. between c. 1049-50 and c. 1072-73) was to discuss the terms of his retirement. While it is true that Mauropous was deeply unhappy with his appointment (mainly because Euchaita was a provincial backwater, which lacked the intellectual excitement of the capital) and wrote many a letter to his good friend Michael Psellos in which he asked to be relieved from his post,⁸⁶ Mauropous will have had many reasons for visiting Constantinople whenever he had the chance: family occasions, social contacts, literary and cultural engagements, meetings with the patriarch and other prelates. It cannot have been solely to request an audience with the emperor in order to discuss the prospect of early retirement.⁸⁷

I know of two, possibly three, occasions where we find the metropolitan bishop of Euchaita in the capital for reasons that, as far as we can judge, had nothing or little to do with his wish to resign: the introduction of the Feast of the Three Hierarchs (see the next Note), the appearance of Halley's comet, and a third time he happened to be away from his see. Let's start with occasion no. 3. In the *Homily for the Anthismos* (a flower festival held in honour of St Theodore the Recruit at the end of Spring), Mauropous tells the pilgrims that "I too have only just arrived from afar" (καὶ αὐτὸς μικρῶ πρότερον ἐξ ἀλλοτρίας ἔφθην ἐπιδημήσας) to lead the festival and its celebrations.⁸⁸ There are references to refugees

⁸⁶ See LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (asin n. 1), pp. 98-99 and 108-110.

⁸⁷ The only evidence for such an audience with the emperor is letter Π 168 (KD 229): ed. PAPAIOANNOU, *Epistulae* (as in n. 62), vol. I, pp. 445-447. KARPOZIOS, *Συμβολή* (as in n. 6), pp. 44-45, and *The Letters* (as in n. 2), pp. 23-24, dates this audience to the later part of Monomachos' reign; MAUCHE-ROSKILLY, *There and Back Again* (as in n. 70), pp. 737-739, date it to the later part of Constantine X Doukas' reign.

⁸⁸ Or. 180, §12.12-14: ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 134. As rightly observed by E. ΣΟΤΙΡΟΥΔΙ, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή κατά τον 11ο αιώνα: Η περίπτωση του Ιωάννη Μαυροπόδα, διδακτορική διατριβή*, Univ. of Thessaloniki, 2012, p. 120, the first-person ending ἔφθην clearly indicates that the leader of the festival (ἔξαρχος) is Mauropous himself – and not some other person (as incorrectly inferred by KARPOZIOS, *Συμβολή* (asin n. 6), p. 152 and n. 95).

and cities plundered in this homily, and the tone is rather pessimistic, even up to the point that Mauropous accuses the saint of abandoning his people and not living up to expectations.⁸⁹ The most likely date for this homily is the 1060s when the Turkish raids intensified, leading to the capture of nearby Neocaesarea in 1068.⁹⁰ It is not clear where Mauropous had been when he returned to his war-plagued region, but it cannot be excluded that it was Constantinople and that he had been invited to discuss the worsening situation in the East.

The historical context of the *Homily on the Portents* (Or. 185) is thankfully more straightforward. It is a fire-and-brimstone sermon which Mauropous delivered on the occasion of the appearance of Halley's Comet in the year 1066.⁹¹ The historian Michael Attaleiates describes it as a bright comet, spewing forth smoke and mist and sending out tendrils that grew in size and stretched toward the east: it appeared in May and lasted for forty days.⁹² Mauropous, too, mentions fire, smoke and rays, but also says that the comet looked like a gigantic cross hovering in the sky; he also reports that it rained blood and that the saints looked different on their icons.⁹³ Mauropous sees the comet as a sign of divine wrath. As he reminds his audience, God has many reasons to be mightily wrath with His people (Mauropous included, as he does not omit to add): the clergy are for sale, the vanity of bishops destroys the church, and ecclesiastical authority has become a mockery; the worldly powers are corrupt and oppress the people with the burden of heavy taxes; and the common people do not longer know their place in society.⁹⁴ Greed rules the world. If the faithful do not repent, show true remorse for their manifold sins and pray to God for

⁸⁹ See especially the peroration of this homily, §19-21: ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), pp. 136-137.

⁹⁰ See HALDON, *Euchaita* (asin n. 76), p. 251.

⁹¹ KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (as in n. 6), p. 157, follows V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie*, Paris, 1958, p. 473, in dating the comet to 1061. This is based on a mistake in the 19th-c. edition of Skylitzes Continuatus: ιδ´ instead of δ´ for the indiction year (for the modern edition, see the next footnote).

⁹² I. PÉREZ MARTÍN, *Miguel Attaleiates: Historia*, Madrid, 2002, p. 69.1-7; translation by A. KALDELLIS-D. KRALLIS, *The History: Michael Attaleiates*, Cambridge, Ma., 2012, p. 167 (§15.6). Attaleiates is the source used by Skylitzes Continuatus: ed. E. TH. TSOLAKIS, *Ἡ συνέχεια τῆς χρονογραφίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτη*, Thessaloniki, 1968, p. 117.6-11; translation by E. MCGEER, *Byzantium in the Time of Troubles: The Continuation of the Chronicle of John Skylitzes (1057-1079)*, Leiden, 2020, p. 66 (II, §10).

⁹³ Or. 185, §7-10: ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), pp. 166-167.

⁹⁴ Or. 185, §13-19: ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), pp. 168-171.

forgiveness, it will be the end of things and apocalypse is sure to follow.⁹⁵ Mauropous held this sermon when the comet and other supernatural phenomena were still visible: i.e. probably in late May or early June 1066.⁹⁶ And he held it in Constantinople: “our city here, the crown of the world and the queen of cities” (τὴν ἡμετέραν δὲ πόλιν, τὴν κορυφὴν λέγω ταύτην τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ τῶν πόλεων δέσποιναν), which, he says, “someone once rightly called a ‘city of jesters’” – pray that it may not turn into “a city of mourners”.⁹⁷

(8) *Three Hierarchs*. According to the synaxarion of 30 January, the Feast of the Three Hierarchs was introduced by John metropolitan of Euchaita, “who was learned and well acquainted with Greek *paideia* as his writings show, but who above all excelled in virtue” (τᾶλλα μὲν ἐλλογίμω καὶ παιδείας ἐλληνικῆς οὐκ ἀμαθῶς ἔχοντι, ὡς τὰ αὐτῷ πονηθέντα δείκνυσιν, ἀρετῆς δὲ εἰς ἄκρον ἐληλυκότι). The story goes that during the reign of Alexios I Komnenos a dispute had broken out among intellectuals in the capital, some supporting Gregory of Nazianzos, others Basil the Great, and a third group John Chrysostom, with each faction claiming that their church father was the greatest of all. As the saints were not happy with this development, they had appeared to John of Euchaita in a vision, asking him to put an end to this quarrel, which he did: he settled the dispute and introduced a common feast for all three.⁹⁸ All the elements of this story (dispute, vision, common feast) derive from the homily that Mauropous wrote for the Three Hierarchs, *Or.* 178.⁹⁹ There are two versions of this homily: a later and more polished version in Mauropous’ own collection of literary works, Vat. gr. 676; the other, less elaborate and refined, which is transmitted in more than a hundred homiliaries.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ *Or.* 185, §22-33; ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), pp. 172-178.

⁹⁶ *Or.* 185, §2; ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 165.

⁹⁷ *Or.* 185, §17.1-5; ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 169. The “someone” calling Constantinople a “city of jesters” is Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 36, §12 (*PG* 36, col. 280.25). For Constantinople as the place where Mauropous delivered his speech, see KARPOZIOS, *Συμβολή* (asin n. 6), pp. 159-160.

⁹⁸ *AASS*, Iun II (1698), cols. 934-936 = *PG* 29, cols. cccxc-cccxciii. For the text quoted, see *ibidem*, col. 934. See KARPOZIOS, *Συμβολή* (asin n. 6), pp. 162-163.

⁹⁹ See SOTIROUDI, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή* (asin n. 88), pp. 151-159.

¹⁰⁰ See SOTIROUDI, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή* (asin n. 88), pp. 150-151.

There are three reasons why the story cannot be right. Since Mauropous put together his collection of literary works when he was still in Euchaita, i.e. before c. 1072-73 (see Note 6 above), the homily predates the reign of Alexios Komnenos by at least ten years. The second reason to seriously doubt this story is that Mauropous was no longer metropolitan of Euchaita during the reign of Alexios Komnenos, but had retired to the Petra monastery (see the next Note). The third reason is that even the date of the feast itself is incorrect, though that does not become clear from the Bollig-Lagarde edition, which presents the title of oration 178 as follows: μηνὶ Ἰαννουαρίῳ λ. Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου μητροπολίτου Εὐχαΐτων λόγος εἰς τοὺς τρεῖς ἁγίους πατέρας καὶ διδασκάλους, Βασίλειον τὸν μέγαν, Γρηγόριον τὸν Θεολόγον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Χρυσόστομον.¹⁰¹ In the manuscript (Vat. gr. 676, fol. 132^v), however, the date of the day has clearly been tampered with. The original number has been scratched away and replaced with λ´ by a later scribe, who also added the name of the author: this hand is most probably early Palaeologan.¹⁰²

Strangely enough, previous scholarship has failed to notice that the opening passage of the homily leaves no doubt that the text was originally written for the 27th, and not the 30th, of January: Πάλιν Ἰωάννης ὁ τὴν γλῶσσαν χρυσοῦς καὶ πάλιν ἡμῖν ἐπιφανῆς ἑορτὴ· τρίτος μέντοι μὴν οὗτος, ἐξ οὗ τῷ μεγάλῳ λαμπρῶς ἐπανηγυρίσαμεν. ὡς δὲ δυσχεραῖνοι τάχα μηδὲν πορρωτέρῳ τεταγμένος τῶν ὁμοτίμων, ἄγχιστά που κάκεινους αὐτῷ συνηγάγομεν. τίνας τούτους φημί; [...] Βασίλειον καὶ Γρηγόριον [...]. τούτων γὰρ ἑκατέρῳ, τῷ μὲν ἑωρτάζομεν χθές, τῷ δὲ μικρὸν πρὸ τῆς χθές, “It is golden-mouthed John again and it is a splendid feast for us again. It is three months ago that we celebrated this great saint magnificently [13 November]; but so as not to displease him by keeping him too far away from his equals in stature, we have brought him and those two close to one another. Who do I mean? [...] Basil and Gregory [...]: we celebrated the latter yesterday [25 January, the feastday

¹⁰¹ BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 106.

¹⁰² As Georgi Parpulov kindly confirms (per litteras, 8 January 2021), it is an archaizing hand of c. 1280-1330.

of St Gregory], and the former not long before yesterday [1 January, the feastday of St Basil]”.¹⁰³ This is an explicit reference to the second feastday of John Chrysostom, the Translation of his Relics, on 27 January.¹⁰⁴ A little further on, we can read that John Chrysostom no longer accepts that he has two feastdays, whereas the other two have only one: his second feastday will from now on be a common feastday for all three of them.¹⁰⁵

It is therefore fairly certain that the number that was crossed out in the manuscript was κζ´. The reason why a Palaeologan user of the manuscript replaced it with λ´, is that the original idea of celebrating the Three Hierarchs on 27 January and thus effectively abolishing the feast of the Translation of Chrysostom’s Relics was soon abandoned. As the oldest homiliaries that contain Mauropous’ homily date from the twelfth century¹⁰⁶ and as the earliest secure attestation for the feast dates from the year 1136,¹⁰⁷ there is every reason to believe that the synaxarion text was right in dating the introduction of the Feast of the Three Hierarchs on 30 January to the reign of Alexios Komnenos. Even though the date had changed to 30 January, Mauropous’ homily continued to be used – and as time went by, more and more texts related to the feastday were attributed to him: the *akolouthia* itself, the *kanones* in honour of the Three Hierarchs, and various poems.¹⁰⁸

To sum up, the Feast of the Three Hierarchs was introduced at two separate moments in time: (i) the ‘official’ introduction during the reign of Alexios Komnenos, with the feastday on 30 January; (ii) an abortive

¹⁰³ Or. 178,§1.1-7: BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 106.

¹⁰⁴ See SOTIROUDI, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή* (asin n. 88), pp. 149-150.

¹⁰⁵ Or. 178,§3.5-7 and§4.1-7: BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 107.

¹⁰⁶ According to the *Pinakes* website, the oldest mss. are Esc. Y.II.3, Lavra Δ 80, Istanbul, Panagia Kamariotissa 10, and Marc. gr. VII.25, all four dating to the 12th c.; followed by a number of manuscripts dating to the 13th c., and many more dating to the 14th c. and later.

¹⁰⁷ The source is the *typikon* of the Pantokrator monastery (a. 1136): τῆ δὲ ἑορτῆ τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλείου, τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου, ed. P. GAUTIER, *Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator*, in *REB*, 32 (1974), p. 41, line 191. See M. D’AMBROSI, *The Icon of the Three Holy Hierarchs at the Pantokrator Monastery and the Epigrams of Theodore Prodromos on Them*, in S. KOTZABASSI (ed.), *The Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople*, Boston-Berlin, 2013, pp. 143-151.

¹⁰⁸ For the *akolouthia*, see SOTIROUDI, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή* (asin n. 88), pp. 168-169; for the *kanones*, see J. HUSSEY, *The Canons of John Mauropous*, in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 37 (1947), pp. 72-73; for the poems, see S.G. MERCATI, *Presunti giambi di Demetrio Triclinio sulla festa dei tre gerarchi Basilio, Gregorio Nazianzeno e Giovanni Crisostomo*, in *Collectanea Byzantina*, Bari, 1970, vol. I, pp. 529-537.

attempt, sometime before c. 1072-73, at the instigation of John Mauropous, with the feast to be celebrated on 27 January.

In the many homilies that transmit the pre-final, less polished version of the homily, it is unanimously attributed to “John, the most holy metropolitan of Euchaita” (just as in the case of the Palaeologan interpolator in Vat. gr. 676).¹⁰⁹ Even without this evidence it is reasonable to assume that Mauropous composed the homily after his consecration to the see of Euchaita because it is not very likely that, as a humble deacon, he would have been in a position to suggest changes to the liturgical calendar. He must have delivered the homily in Constantinople because he directly addresses the three intellectual factions in the capital (the followers of Gregory, Basil and John) as if they are present.¹¹⁰ So this is another occasion on which we find Mauropous visiting his home city during the period of his episcopate.

Mauropous cannot have contemplated introducing a new liturgical feast without the support of the patriarch. Of the three patriarchs under whom he served during his episcopate, John VIII Xiphilinos (1064-75) is the most likely candidate because of their friendship and shared passion for learning. As noted by many scholars, the homily contains a protracted invective against Julian the Apostate, which reads as an indictment of contemporary like-minded philosophers¹¹¹ – and one immediately thinks of the accusations of hellenism levelled against John Italos in 1076-77 and, again, in 1082.¹¹² Now that we know that Mauropous’ homily dates from before c. 1072-73, it is less certain that John Italos is the target here; but it is reasonable to assume that tensions had been building up for a long time before Italos had to defend himself in public. An early sign of the

¹⁰⁹ For the title in Vat. Reg. gr. 15, for example, see the apparatus criticus in BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 106.

¹¹⁰ See SOTIROUDI, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή* (asin n. 88), p. 149.

¹¹¹ Or. 178, §36-§39: BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), pp. 116-117. For a discussion, see SOTIROUDI, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή* (asin n. 88), pp. 156-158.

¹¹² See P.A. AGAPITOS, *Teachers, Pupils and Imperial Power in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, in Y.L. TOO-N. LIVINGSTONE (eds), *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*, Cambridge, 1998, pp. 187-191; A. KALDELLIS, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 144 and 202; and H. SARADI, *The Three Fathers of the Greek Orthodox Church: Greek Paideia, Byzantine Innovation and the Formation of Modern Greek Identity*, in I. NILSSON-P. STEPHENSON (eds), *Wanted Byzantium: The Desire for a Lost Empire*, Uppsala, 2014, pp. 140 and 146-148.

growing intolerance toward free-thinking intellectuals is the declaration of faith Psellos had to sign in 1054 and his subsequent tonsure.¹¹³ Not long after his return from monastic exile, Psellos wrote the famous letter to Xiphilinos (“Plato is mine?”), in which he defended himself against the accusation that he, though notionally a monk, was pursuing a secular career and showed an unhealthy interest in pagan thought.¹¹⁴ From a slightly later date are the treatises and letters Niketas Stethatos wrote against those who dared to theologize by means of rational thought.¹¹⁵ There is clearly a certain unease about intellectuals reading too much Plato and dabbling in philosophical speculation, but it is impossible to point at a specific moment during the patriarchate of Xiphilinos when tensions boiled over and Mauropous was asked to soothe tempers by reminding the audience that the three church fathers offered a middle way between the extremes of Hellenic thought and Christian obscurantism.

Psellos composed a literary comparison of the styles of Gregory of Nazianzos, Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nyssa: as Papaioannou rightly notes, whereas Mauropous in his homily attributes the wisdom of the three hierarchs to divine inspiration, Psellos seeks an explanation in the individual character of each of the four, all perfect by nature.¹¹⁶ This looks like an implicit rebuke to his old teacher, with whom he will have disagreed profoundly because Mauropous’ stance, not only in this homily, but also elsewhere, tends to be far more traditional than that of Psellos.¹¹⁷ However, as Psellos’ treatise cannot be dated, this does not help in situating Mauropous’ homily in its historical moment.

¹¹³ See KALDELLIS, *Hellenism in Byzantium* (as in n. 112), pp. 195-196, and idem, *Mothers and Sons, Fathers and Daughters* (as in n. 57), pp. 31-33 and 47-48.

¹¹⁴ See K. METZLER, *Pagane Bildung im christlichen Byzanz: Basileios von Kaisareia, Michael Psellos und Theodoros Metochites*, in M. GRÜNBART, *Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Berlin, 2007, pp. 293-299.

¹¹⁵ See F. LAURITZEN, *The Debate on Faith and Reason*, in *JÖB*, 57 (2007), pp. 75-82.

¹¹⁶ For the treatise, see C. BARBER-S. PAPAIOANNOU (eds), *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art: A Byzantine Perspective on Aesthetics*, Notre Dame, Ind., 2017, pp. 108-117. For Papaioannou’s analysis, see ibidem, p. 109; see also S. PAPAIOANNOU, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*, Cambridge, 2013, pp. 71-74.

¹¹⁷ See KALDELLIS, *Hellenism in Byzantium* (as in n. 111), pp. 202 and 216.

Iconography is of no help either. Mauropous dedicated an icon to his three “teachers” (poem 17) and donated an icon of his three “teachers” to a monk called Gregory (poem 86); it is not clear whether this is the same icon or another one in his possession.¹¹⁸ The oldest representation of the three hierarchs known to us is in the Theodore Psalter (1066), fol. 35^v, as an illustration of the Righteous mentioned in *Ps.* 32:1.¹¹⁹ This is followed by the Dumbarton Oaks Psalter (1083-84), fol. 4^v, which shows the three hierarchs standing in a zone below the Holy Virgin, John the Baptist and an Archangel.¹²⁰ However, the same compositions, but with different saintly figures, can be found in other manuscripts: similar to the Theodore Psalter is the Barberini Psalter (c. 1050), fol. 53^r, but that one chooses John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzos and Sts Kosmas and Damianos to illustrate the Righteous of *Ps.* 32:1;¹²¹ similar to the Dumbarton Oaks Psalter is the Berlin Psalter (c. 1080), fol. 2^v, but that one offers John Chrysostom, Basil the Great and St Nicholas.¹²² The influence of mural decorations in Byzantine churches, with rows of saints bearing witness to the divine mysteries, is noticeable in these compositions,¹²³ and it is questionable whether the choice of Basil, Gregory and John (rather than other hierarchs) in these two eleventh-century examples is a deliberate nod to a newly introduced feast or just accidental.¹²⁴

(9) *Petra Monastery*. Toward the end of the *Encomium for John Mauropous* (written in 1075 or shortly thereafter), Psellos revealed to the audience the shocking secret of the metropolitan of Euchaita, which was that he wished

¹¹⁸ See MONDINI, *Il Canzoniere di Giovanni Mauropode* (asin n. 2), pp. 387-392 and 564-565.

¹¹⁹ S. DER NERSESSIAN, *L'illustration des Psautiers grecs du Moyen Âge*, II: Londres, Add. 19352, Paris, 1970, fig. 60. See C. WALTER, *Pictures of the Clergy in the Theodore Psalter*, in *REB*, 31 (1973), p. 240.

¹²⁰ The folio is nowadays lost. For an old photo, see S. DER NERSESSIAN, *A Psalter and New Testament Manuscript at Dumbarton Oaks*, in *DOP*, 19 (1965), pp. 155-183, fig. 2.

¹²¹ See WALTER, *Pictures of the Clergy* (asin. 119), p. 240 and fig. 2.

¹²² G. STUHLFAUTH, *A Greek Psalter with Byzantine Miniatures*, in *The Art Bulletin*, 15 (1933), pp. 310-326, fig. 7.

¹²³ See G. PARPULOV, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters*, Plovdiv, 2014, pp. 102-103.

¹²⁴ C. WALTER, *The Date and Content of the Dionysiou Lectionary*, in *ΔΧΑΕ*, 13 (1988), p. 183 and n. 20, identifies the three hierarchs in a miniature in Athous Dionysiou 587 (c. 1070-80), fol. 40^v. But as Georgi Parpulov kindly informs me (per litteras, 29 March 2021), the figure on the right is St Nicholas, not Gregory of Nazianzos.

to resign and retire to a monastery.¹²⁵ Although Psellos thought the plan was absolutely outrageous and even suggested to Mauropous to return to his flock (in the midst of marauding Turks?),¹²⁶ Mauropous had it his way. There is a letter by the same Psellos, still clearly outraged, in which he ironically compliments Mauropous on his monastic lifestyle, though he is curious to know why monks are so keen on the proceeds of their harvests – is that not beneath their level?¹²⁷

There can be little doubt that the monastery to which Mauropous retired at the end of his life (by then in his mid 70s or late 60s, depending on the precise date of birth) was the monastery of St John the Baptist at Petra. First of all, it is there that Mauropous wrote the *Life of St Baras*, the mythical founder of the Petra monastery.¹²⁸ Secondly, the *kanon* that his nephew Theodore wrote for him, brings its encomiastic biography to the following end: Ἰωάννης καλεῖται * καὶ σοῦ τὸ ὄνομα * ὡς ἐκείνου τοῦ πάνυ * τοῦ θεοῦ κήρυκος, * οὗ καὶ ζηλωτῆς * κατὰ δύνάμιν γέγονας· * ὅθεν ἀθανάτου * νῦν ἀπολαύεις δόξης, “Your name, too, is John, just like that of that marvellous, divine herald, in whose footsteps you have followed to the best of your abilities; and therefore you now enjoy immortal glory”.¹²⁹ John Mauropous is called a zealous follower (ζηλωτῆς) of his namesake because the Petra monastery is dedicated to John the Baptist, the herald in the desert. Thirdly, Mauropous wrote many hymns as a monk, and one

¹²⁵ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (as in n. 11), pp. 170-173, lines 756-844. For Mauropous’ wish to retire to a monastery, see especially lines 766-767 and 830-837. See ANASTASI, *Encomio per Giovanni* (as in n. 11), pp. 31-32.

¹²⁶ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (as in n. 11), pp. 172-173, lines 806-844.

¹²⁷ Π 167 (KD 105), ed. PAPAIOANNOU, *Epistulae* (as in n. 62), vol. I, pp. 440-445. See KAZHDAN, *Some problems I* (as in n. 8), pp. 96-97, LJUBARSKIJ, *Η προσωπικότητα και το έργο* (as in n. 64), p. 83, and LAUXTERMANN, *Intertwined Lives* (as in n. 1), p. 111. Psellos’ letter cannot be a reply to Mauropous’ letter 1 (as suggested by KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (as in n. 6), pp. 27-28, and *The Letters* (as in n. 2), pp. 199-200) because, in his letter, Mauropous does not discuss harvests, taxes, or monastic vocations.

¹²⁸ Ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη* (as in n. 14), vol. II, pp. 38-45. For the text, see also L. D’AMELIA, *Per una nuova edizione dell’ encomio di S. Baras (BHG 212), tradizionalmente attribuito a Giovanni Mauropode (XI sec.)*, in *RSBN*, 56 (2019), pp. 125-143. For the fictional nature of this saint’s life, see P. CANART, *Le dossier hagiographique des SS. Baras, Patapios et Raboulas*, in *AB*, 87 (1969), pp. 445-459, and LAUXTERMANN-PAOLETTI, *Three Verse Inscriptions* (as in n. 1), p. 86.

¹²⁹ *Kanon*, Ode 8, Strophe 3: lines 192-199: ed. EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπουλος* (as in n. 12), p. 436, and MERCATI, *Ufficio di Giovanni Mauropode* (as in n. 12), p. 527. FOLLIERI, *Otto canoni paracletici* (as in n. 13), p. 16, incorrectly assumes that the *sticheron* Σὺ μὲν ὡς φιλήσυχος (ed. EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπουλος*, p. 436 and MERCATI, *Ufficio di Giovanni Mauropode*, p. 518) refers to Mauropous’ monastic vocation. But it refers to his “desire to live like a reclusive intellectual”, as BERNARD, *Writing and Reading* (as in n. 5), p. 207, puts it.

may find implicit references in these hymns to the Petra monastery: e.g. νάουσαν πέτραν καὶ πηγὴν * ἀναβλύζουσαν ὡς νάματα θαύματα * τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν ἡ πηγὴ, * τῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας τὸ μέγα πέλαγος, * Χριστός, ἡ πέτρα τῆς ζωῆς, * ἔδειξέ σε, Πρόδρομε· * διὸ ἰάσεως * ῥεῖθρα βλύσον μοι τακέντι νοσήμασιν, “Christ, the source of mercy, the vast sea of compassion, the rock of life, has shown you, O Forerunner, to be a water-flowing rock and a source that gushes out miracles like streams; therefore, let rivers of healing flow to me as I am wasted away by illnesses”;¹³⁰ and ποιμανόν με, Πρόδρομε, * θρέμμα χρηματίζοντα * τῆς σῆς ἀγέλης * καὶ πρόβατον * ποιμνης τῆς σῆς, “O Forerunner, tend me because I am a nursling of your herd and a sheep of your flock”.¹³¹ In the first example, John the Baptist is explicitly called a *petra* (similar to the rock that gave water to the Israelites); in the second, Mauroπους declares himself to belong to the flock of John the Baptist: i.e. the monastic community of Petra.

It is generally believed that John Mauroπους retired to the Petra monastery not once, but twice: both before and after his episcopate.¹³² This is a mistake based on a Palaeologan interpolation in the title of Mauroπους’ collection of hymns for the Holy Virgin, the *Theotokarion*. In the two oldest manuscripts, Monac. gr. 619 (12th c.) and Athous Vatop. 1004 (13th c.) the title is: κανόνες παρακλητικοὶ τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου· ποίημα Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ, οὗ τὸ ὄνομα ἐντέτακται τῇ ἀκροστιχίδι ἐκάστης ἐνάτης ὁδοῦ; but in later manuscripts, Athous Lavra I 77 (a. 1345), Vindob. Theol. gr. 78 (14th c.), Meteor. Stephanou 54 (15th c.) and Sin. gr. 853 (15th c.), the title has become: [...] ποίημα Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ τὸ ἐπίκλην Μαυρόποδος, τοῦ ἐν ὑστέροις χρόνοις χρηματίσαντος ἀρχιερέως Εὐχαΐτων [...].¹³³ Since Mauroπους was primarily known in later

¹³⁰ Ed. S. LAVRIOTIS, *Κανὼν παρακλητικὸς εἰς τὸν τίμιον Ἰωάννην τὸν Πρόδρομον*, in *Ἀγιορειτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, 1 (1937), fasc. 11, p. 44 (ode 9, strophe 5). See FOLLIERI, *Otto canonii paracletici* (as in n. 13), p. 17.

¹³¹ Ed. S. LAVRIOTIS, *Κανόνες εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἰωάννην τὸν Πρόδρομον*, in *Ἀγιορειτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, 1 (1937), fasc. 10, p. 10 (ode 7, strophe 4). See EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπους* (as in n. 12), pp. 408-409.

¹³² See, for example, EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπους* (as in n. 12), p. 408; FOLLIERI, *Otto canonii paracletici* (as in n. 13), p. 16; KARPOZILOS, *Συμβολή* (as in n. 6), pp. 27-28, and *The Letters* (as in n. 2), p. 12.

¹³³ See D.A. KAKLAMANOS, *Le Théotokarion de Jean Mauroπους et sa tradition manuscrite (XII^{ème}-XV^{ème} siècles)*, in *Κόσμος*, 6 (2019), pp. 123, 133, 144, 158, 182, and 189.

times as the metropolitan of Euchaita who allegedly introduced the Feast of the Three Hierarchs during the reign of Alexios Komnenos, it is reasonable to assume that the Palaeologan scribe to whom we owe this interpolation thought it necessary to identify the author of the *Theotokarion* with the legendary initiator of the liturgical feast. Why he thought that Mauropous had to be first a monk and then a bishop, is another matter. But it is a guess and it cannot be used as evidence for the biography of John Mauropous.

On the title page of Vat. gr. 676, Mauropous identifies himself as a member of the secular clergy: a deacon at first and a metropolitan and synkellos in later life. He does not call himself a monk, and none of the writings in Vat. gr. 676 (except for the *Life of St Dorotheos* (Or. 190), which he wrote for the monks of Chiliokomon near Euchaita) are of a monastic character. As we have seen, Psellos was startled and even upset by Mauropous' decision to don the habit, which would make little sense if we were to follow the Palaeologan interpolator in thinking that Mauropous was already a monk.¹³⁴ The nephew of Mauropous, Theodore, puts the tonsure at the end of his uncle's life.

Another reason why it is highly unlikely that Mauropous was already a monk in the Petra monastery in the years before his episcopate, is that the monastery, if it already existed back then, must have been utterly insignificant — hardly the place where one would expect to find the leading intellectual of the age. There is not a single reference to the Petra monastery in the historical sources before the year 1071. The oldest testimonies are three manuscripts copied at the behest of Nicholas abbot of the Petra monastery: Par. gr. 1617 (10 Jan. 1071), Athen. EBE 20 (Sept. 1071), and Athous Pantel. 27 (1072).¹³⁵ It is worth noting that two of these manuscripts mention Romanos IV Diogenes in their colophons: Par. gr. 1617, a *menaion*, was completed ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ῥωμανοῦ Διογένους (“during the reign of Romanos Diogenes”); Athous Pantel. 27, a lectionary, ἐπὶ τῆ

¹³⁴ As rightly pointed out by R. ANASTASI, *A proposito di un recente libro su Psello*, in *Siculorum Gymnasium*, 27 (1974), pp. 414-415.

¹³⁵ See E.D. ΚΑΚΟΥΛΙΔΙ, *Ἡ βιβλιοθήκη τῆς μονῆς Προδρόμου-Πέτρας στὴν Κωνταντινούπολη*, in *Ἑλληνικά*, 21 (1968), pp. 16-18.

ἀφαιρέσει τῶν αἰσθητῶν ὀφθαλμῶν Ῥωμανοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Διογένους καὶ τῇ ἐπελεύσει τῶν ἀθέων Τουρκῶν (“in the time of the blinding of Emperor Romanos Diogenes and the attack of the impious Turks”).¹³⁶ This appears to indicate that the Petra monastery was somehow linked to Romanos Diogenes. However, it became an imperial endowment only in c. 1084-95 when John Nesteutes, with the support of the empress mother Anna Dalassene and patriarch Nicholas Grammatikos, turned it into one of the most lavish monasteries of the capital.¹³⁷

As Psellos was still alive when his friend and teacher donned the habit, we can date Mauropous’ tonsure to the years 1075-78. At that time the Petra monastery was probably still a relatively small monastic community, but its fortunes seem to have been in the ascendant, from the reign of Romanos Diogenes to that of Alexios Komnenos. The reason why John Mauropous chose the Petra monastery may have been that he and John Nesteutes, the abbot of the monastery, not only shared Paphlagonian roots but also Pontic experiences. John Nesteutes was born in Paphlagonia and began his monastic career in the monastery of Chryse Petra, which lay not far from Euchaita.¹³⁸ In the *Life of St Dorotheos of Chiliokomon*, Mauropous relates that when the saint founded the monastery of Chiliokomon (not far from Euchaita either), he adopted the rules laid down in the *typikon* of the monastery of Chryse Petra, which he had received from its abbot, Arsenios.¹³⁹ It is clear from the description given by Mauropous that he quite regularly visited the monastery of Chiliokomon and spoke with its monks.¹⁴⁰ It is reasonable to assume that he also had regular contacts with Chryse Petra, another important monastery in the vicinity of Euchaita and with links to Chiliokomon. It does not require a huge leap of imagination to envisage the two Johns, Mauropous and

¹³⁶ Ed. ΚΑΚΟΥΛΙΔΙ, *Ἡ βιβλιοθήκη τῆς μονῆς Προδρόμου-Πέτρας* (as in n. 135), pp. 16-17.

¹³⁷ See LAUXTERMANN-PAOLETTI, *Three Verse Inscriptions* (as in n. 1), pp. 85-88.

¹³⁸ See the synaxarion text edited by M. CASSIN-M. CRONIER, *Du Prodrome de Pétra à la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki: Jean le Jeûneur, Georges Doukas Nestongos et l’histoire du Prodrome après 1453*, in *REB*, 76 (2018), p. 51. For the monastery see E. KOUNTOURA-GALAKE, *The Location of the Monastery of Chryse Petra*, in *Σύμμεικτα*, 13 (1999), pp. 69-75.

¹³⁹ *Or.* 190, §21-23, ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (as in n. 2), pp. 214-215: see especially §22.1-3 ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ἀρσένιος, ὁ τὴν ἀρετὴν περιβόητος ἐκεῖνος ἐν μονασταῖς, ὃς καὶ τῆς Χρυσῆς καλουμένης Πέτρας (οὐδ’ ἐκεῖνη δὲ πόρρω) ἀριστα ἤρξε καὶ ἀφηγήσατο

¹⁴⁰ See SOTIROUDI, *Ἡ αἰολογική παραγωγή* (as in n. 88), pp. 140-141.

Nesteutes, meeting in person and discussing monastic life long before their paths would cross again in the Petra monastery.

The title of the *Life of St Baras* in ms. Lesb. Leimonos 43 (late 13th c.) attributes to Mauropous the rank of “archdeacon”: Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ καὶ ἀρχιδιακόνου τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς ταύτης σεβασμίας μονῆς τῆς εἰς ὄνομα τιμωμένης τοῦ τιμίου ἐνδόξου προφήτου Προδρόμου καὶ Βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ Πέτρας ἐπικεκλημένης, τοῦ Μαυροπόδου.¹⁴¹ This heading is rather peculiar because archdeacons belong to the secular clergy, which is why the combination of μοναχός and ἀρχιδιάκων/ἀρχιδιάκονος is very rare in our sources.¹⁴² An additional problem is that canon law does not allow ex-bishops to fulfill clerical duties in monasteries.¹⁴³ Lequeux argues that since Mauropous became a monk in the monastery of Petra after, and not before, his consecration, he cannot have held the rank of archdeacon. This may be true or not (might canon law not be overruled by what the Byzantines call οἰκονομία?), but I do not think this justifies postulating the existence of another individual with the same name, as Lequeux does: John Mauropodes.¹⁴⁴ The family name of Mauropous is almost certainly Μαυροπόδης (or Μαυρόποδος): Μαυρόπους is simply a variant form (see Note 1). The fact that the *Life of St Baras* is not to be found in Mauropous’ collection of literary texts, Vat. gr. 676, is not an argument either: the collection dates from before c. 1072-73 (see Note 6) and the *Life of St Baras* dates to the late 1070s or the 1080s. I do agree with Lequeux that the heading is suspect: ἀρχιδιακόνου may be a case of textual corruption or a later interpolation. The whole attribution may even be wrong. But in order to assess whether or not the *Life of St Baras* is rightly attributed to John

¹⁴¹ Ed. PAPAPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη* (as in n. 14), vol. II, p. 38. For the manuscript, see D’AMELIA, *Per una nuova edizione dell’encomio di S. Baras* (as in n. 128), pp. 127-128. See also M. CACOUROS, *L’éloge de Saint Baras (BHG 212), «fondateur» du monastère du Prodrome à Pétra: pérégrinations à Constantinople à travers le manuscrit Lesbou Leimónos 43*, in *TM*, 22/1 (2018), pp. 567-592.

¹⁴² The only text I have been able to find is a document dating from 1044, where one of the signatories is a certain Ἰωάννης μοναχὸς καὶ ἀρχιδιάκων, ed. J. LEFORT-N. OIKONOMIDÉS-D. PAPAHRYSANTHOU, *Actes d’Iviron: I. Des origines au milieu du XI^e siècle*, Paris, 1985, p. 251.

¹⁴³ See J. DARROUZÈS, *Le mouvement des fondations monastiques au XI^e siècle*, in *TM*, 6 (1976), p. 161, n. 2.

¹⁴⁴ See X. LEQUEUX, *Jean Mauropous, Jean Mauropodes et le culte de Saint Baras au monastère du Prodrome de Pétra à Constantinople*, in *AB*, 120 (2002), pp. 104-106. Lequeux is followed by CACOUROS, *L’éloge de Saint Baras* (as in n. 141), pp. 575-576 and 578, and P.A. YANNOPOULOS, *Saint Patapios: entre l’histoire et la légende*, in *Erytheia*, 24 (2003), pp. 15-18.

Mauropous/Mauropodes, we need a new edition and a detailed study of its stylistic and literary features.¹⁴⁵

A final remark concerns his Christian name: Ἰωάννης. When Mauropous received the tonsure, he did not change his name: he remained John. This was not an unusual choice in the middle Byzantine period: many monks and nuns retained their given names upon entering the monastery.¹⁴⁶

(10) *Hymns*. Mauropous is one of the most prolific hymnographers in the history of Byzantium: he is the author of at least 150 *kanones*, which have come down to us in collections of varying size, such as we find in Vat. Pal. gr. 138, Vindob. Theol. gr. 78 and Athous Lavra I 77, all three dating to the fourteenth century.¹⁴⁷ Many of these *kanones* indicate in their acrostichs that they were composed when Mauropous was a monk (Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ), but there are exceptions such as the *kanones* on St Theodore the Recruit, the patron saint of Euchaita.¹⁴⁸ These hymns bear the title: ποίημα τοῦ ὁσίου Ἰωάννου μητροπολίτου Εὐχαιτῶν, and refer in the acrostic to the author as Ἰωάννης. As D’Aiuto rightly speculated, these may very well have been composed when Mauropous was still in Euchaita.¹⁴⁹ In one of his Euchaitan homilies, Mauropous mentions a confraternity that took care of the cult centre of the saint in various ways, among which he singles out “the ceaseless singing of hymns” (ὑμῶν ἀσιγήτων ᾠδῶν).¹⁵⁰ Further proof can be found in the *Encomium for John of Euchaita*, where Psellos enumerates all the good things Mauropous had done for the cathedral church of

¹⁴⁵ See L. D’AMELIA, *The Laudatio S. Barae BHG 212*, in D. DŽELEBDŽIĆ et al., *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies: Thematic sessions of free communications*, Belgrade, 2016, p. 288.

¹⁴⁶ See A.M. TALBOT-S. MCGRATH, *Monastic Onomastics*, in M. KAPLAN (ed.), *Monastères, images, pouvoirs et société à Byzance*, Paris, 2006, pp. 89-100.

¹⁴⁷ For the older bibliography, see FOLLIERI, *Otto canoni paraclitici* (as in n. 13), pp. 20-30; E. FOLLIERI, *The «Living Heirmologion» in the Hymnographic Production of John Mauropous, Metropolitan of Euchaita*, in E. WELLESZ-M. VELIMIROVIĆ (eds), *Studies in Eastern Chant IV*, Crestwood, 1979, pp. 54-75; and F. D’AIUTO, *Tre canoni di Giovanni Mauropode in onore di santi militari*, Rome, 1994, pp. 20-25. For editions after 1994, see F. D’AIUTO, *Un canone di Giovanni Mauropode in onore dei ss. Cosma e Damiano*, in *RSBN*, 37 (2000), pp. 99-157, and A. PANAGIOTOU, *Ο Ιωάννης Μαυρόπους υμνογράφος του Αγίου Νικολάου: κριτική έκδοση*, Athens, 2008.

¹⁴⁸ Ed. in the *Τριώδιον κατανυκτικὸν περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν τῆς ἀγίας καὶ μεγάλης τεσσαρακοστῆς*, Rome, 1879, pp. 113-119.

¹⁴⁹ See D’AIUTO, *Tre canoni di Giovanni Mauropode* (as in n. 147), p. 55, n. 112.

¹⁵⁰ *Or.* 189, §6.9-12, ed. BOLLIG-DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchaitorum* (asin n. 2), p. 209.

Euchaita, including a radical reorganization of the communal singing.¹⁵¹ He too mentions the “ceaseless singing” (ἀσιγήτοις φωναῖς), but he also indicates that Mauroπους composed new chants: “He adjoined groups of singers to the choirs, increased the number of chants, and added melodies to melodies” (προστέθεικε ταῖς χοροστασίαις τοὺς κύκλους τῶν ψαλλόντων, ἐπηύξησε τοῖς μέλεσι μέλη, καὶ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς ῥυθμοὺς προσενήνοχεν).¹⁵² Mauroπους’ interest in liturgical chant led him to put together and copy by hand the service books for each day of the month, as he proudly tells us in poems 97 and 98: he donated these *menaia* to the cathedral church of Euchaita.¹⁵³

But most of the hymns will have been written after his retirement to the Petra monastery in c. 1075-78; by then he must have been quite advanced in age. Some of his later Marian hymns seem to indicate that he had lost his eye sight (probably because of old age cataract) and had difficulty walking: an old man, still celebrating his Theotokos, still singing Her praises.¹⁵⁴ His nephew Theodore tells us that Mauroπους died on the 5th of October in an otherwise unspecified year, μεστὸς ἡμερῶν * θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων * ἤδη γενόμενος, “already full of days both heavenly and earthly”.¹⁵⁵ Only one of his *kanones* can be dated: the Marian hymn ἐπὶ προσδοκίᾳ βαρέος πολέμου κατὰ τὴν μεγαλοῦπολιν ἐκ διαφόρων ἔθνῶν τῆς Ἰταλῶν γλώσσης συγκροτηθησομένου, “at the time of the expectation that various peoples of the Italic tongue would launch a grievous attack on the capital”, i.e. after the disastrous Battle of Dyrrachion in late 1081 and the subsequent Norman invasion of the Balkans in early 1082.¹⁵⁶ 1082, then, is the *terminus post quem* for the year of death; depending on the date of birth (see Note 2), Mauroπους was somewhere between 72 and 82 years of age in 1082. But death may have

¹⁵¹ Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (asin n. 11), pp. 161-162, lines 494-527.

¹⁵² Ed. DENNIS, *Orationes Panegyricae* (asin n. 11), p. 161, lines 503-505.

¹⁵³ See F. D’AIUTO, *L’innografia*, in G. CAVALLO-G. DE GREGORIO (eds), *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo. 3. Le culture circostanti. Volume I. La cultura bizantina*, Rome, 2004, p. 285.

¹⁵⁴ See EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπουλος* (asin n. 12), pp. 423-425.

¹⁵⁵ Heading of the *Akolouthia* and Kanon, Ode 9, Strophe 2: lines 217-219: ed. EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπουλος* (asin n. 12), pp. 428 and 436-437, and MERCATI, *Ufficio di Giovanni Mauropode* (asin n. 12), pp. 517 and 528. For the expression, cf. the *Life of St Lazaros of Galesion*, ed. H. DELEHAYE, *Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, vol. III, Brussels, 1910, p. 588, line 13: πλήρης ἡμερῶν τῶν τε ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος γεγονώς.

¹⁵⁶ Ed. S. LAVRIOTIS, *Κανὼν παρακλητικὸς εἰς τὴν ὑπεραγίαν Θεοτόκον*, in *Ἀγιορειτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, 1 (1937), fasc. 11, pp. 34-38. See EFSTRATIADIS, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαυρόπουλος* (asin n. 12), pp. 421-423.

been slow to catch up with him, and given the great number of hymns that go under his name, it is reasonable to assume that Maupous died sometime in the mid or late 1080s, perhaps not a saint as his nephew wanted him to be, but definitely one of the greatest poets and hymnographers of Byzantium.