

## THE BIOGRAPHY OF IOANNES MAUROPOUS AGAIN

In a recent article A. Kazhdan<sup>1</sup> claimed that Mauropous' elevation to the episcopal see of Euchaita took place during the reign of Konstantinos X Doukas (1059-1067) and not in the last years of the rule of Konstantinos IX Monomachos, as it has generally been accepted until now. Kazhdan's thesis inevitably conflicts with the 'traditional view' of Ioannes Mauropous' biography and everything that goes with it, namely the chronology of his letters as well as those of his friend and close associate, Michael Psellos. In the following short notice I should like to draw attention to some texts which were overlooked or little appreciated as primary sources for Mauropous' biography. Let me state from the beginning that they support the traditional view.

### *1. Mauropous, Epigr. 57: On the emperor's image at Euchaita*

In one of his Epigrams, written during his ministry in Euchaita, Mauropous thanks Konstantinos IX Monomachos for his pious deeds towards the Martyr's city. The emperor had renewed the privileges granted by his predecessors to the church of Saint Theodore in Euchaita, and out of gratitude the populace of the city had his image inscribed inside the church of Saint Theodore together with the chrysobull he had issued<sup>2</sup>:

*Εἰς τὴν ἐν Εὐχαΐτοις εἰκόνα τοῦ βασιλέως  
Καὶ τὸν κραταῖον δεσπότην Κωνσταντῖνον,  
τῆς γῆς τὸ θαῦμα, τὸν μέγαν Μονομάχον,  
ἐνταῦθα πράξις εὐσεβῆς ἀναγράφει·  
τὰς δωρεὰς γὰρ τῶν πρὸ τοῦ βασιλέων  
σάλον παθούσας ἐξ ἐπηρείας μέγαν  
χρυσῆς ὑπεστήριξε κίονος βάσει,  
τὸν χρυσόβουλλον ἀνταναστήσας λόγον*

1. «Some Problems in the Biography of John Mauropous», *JÖB* 43 (1993) 87-111.

2. *Iohannis Euchaitorum metropolitae quae in codice Vaticano graeco 676 supersunt*, ed. P. de Lagarde, Göttingen 1882, Epigr. 57, p. 34.

ὡς ἀντέρεισμα καρτερόν πρὸς τὴν βίαν,  
 δι' οὗ τὸ μέλλον ἀσφαλέστερον νέμει  
 τῇ μάρτυρος πόλει τε καὶ παροικίᾳ·  
 ὅθεν δίκαιον ἀντιλαμβάνει γέρας,  
 εἰς τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐγγραφεὶς εὐεργέτας.

[On the Emperor's image at Euchaita: A pious deed does here portray the mighty lord Konstantinos, the great Monomachos, the wonder of the earth. Seeing that the gifts of the emperors before him have been, through spite, severely undermined, he has propped them up with a golden pillar in erecting a chrysobull ordinance like a mighty buttress against violence. By this means he offers a more secure future to the Martyr's city and to the diocese, and so he receives in return a just honour by being inscribed among our benefactors<sup>3</sup>.]

In the epigram Konstantinos Monomachos is not addressed as being deceased but as «the wonder of the earth», that is, a living emperor. It is worth noting that Monomachos is been praised in exactly the same way in another epigram of Mauropous, addressed to Zoe and Theodora<sup>4</sup>:

τὸν εὐτυχῆ μὲν, εὐσεβῆ δὲ τὸ πλέον,  
 τῆς γῆς τὸ θαῦμα, τὸν μέγαν Μονομάχον.

To dispel any doubt that at the time the former epigram was written Mauropous held the post of the bishop of the city, we may point out the following:

(a) The last two lines of the epigram evince that Mauropous speaks on behalf of his flock (cf. «among our benefactors»).

(b) The supposition that Mauropous may had written the epigram before settling in the city, and therefore not in the capacity of its bishop, should, in my opinion, be ruled out. In his first sermon to the faithful of Euchaita, Mauropous states that he had arrived to the city a complete stranger: ἀκοῆ μὲν ὠτὸς καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρότερον ἤκουον τὰ τῆς καθ' ὑμᾶς ἐκκλησίας<sup>5</sup>.

(c) Regarding the privileges accorded to the Church of Euchaita during Mauropous' ministry we possess the additional testimony of Psellos<sup>6</sup>.

3. Translated by C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1972, 220. I have modified the spelling of the emperor's names.

4. Epigr. 55.39-40, de Lagarde, p. 33.

5. Orat. 184, de Lagarde, p. 160. See also Orat. 179, p. 120: εἰ ξένος ὦν ὑμῖν τοῖς αὐτόχθοσι, καὶ οὐκ ἐπηλυσ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νέηλυσ. ... ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα διὰ σὲ παρεπιδήμιος καὶ ξένους. Ibid., p. 130.

6. K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη* 5, Venice - Paris 1876 [hereafter cited as *MB* 5],

2. *Psellos, Ἐγκώμιον εἰς Ἰωάννην τὸν θεοσεβέστατον μητροπολίτην Εὐχαΐτων καὶ πρωτοσύγκελλον*

In his Encomium to Mauropous, written certainly after 1075, Psellos asserts that his friend's appointment to Euchaita came about as a reward by an emperor named Konstantinos, without specifying which one<sup>7</sup>:

Ὁ γέ τοι τοὺς βασιλεῖς πάντας ὑπερβαλόμενος ἀρετῇ καὶ φιλοτιμίᾳ, ὁ τῶ μεγάλῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ ὁμώνυμος καὶ ὁμότροπος, καὶ μόνος πρὸς πάντας γενναίως ἀνταγωνισάμενος, καὶ τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν λαβὼν τῆς τέχνης καὶ τῆς νίκης κατήγορον, καὶ πατέρα τοῦτον σοφῶς προσηγόρευσε. ... Οὗτος δὴ οὖν ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ τὸ ἀρχιερατικὸν ἀξίωμα τούτῳ ἐσκιαγράφησε...

[For he who had in virtue and magnanimity surpassed all the other emperors, who was homonymous of and had the same disposition as Constantine the Great, who had alone nobly resisted all [enemies], who had received the name that indicates the art [of single combat] and victory [therein], prudently addressed him as father...]

The question that arises is which was the Konstantinos who had surpassed in virtue and magnanimity all the other emperors and not only had the same name, but was also of the same disposition, as Constantine the Great. According to the encomiast, this emperor «had alone resisted all enemies and had received his name from the art of single combat, in which he was victorious». Psellos implies, of course, Konstantinos IX Monomachos, the «single combatant». Even Kazhdan admits that «the phrase evidently contains a hint at the name of Constantine IX Monomachos». But immediately afterwards the Russian scholar rejects this identification, on the grounds that Psellos had no reason «to exalt an emperor of the past whom he did not respect ... while he was praising Constantine X as a perfect autokrator»<sup>8</sup>. To discover the degree to which Psellos was critical of Monomachos, as well as whether he appreciated or not the emperor's virtues, particularly his courage and magnanimity, one must refer to the *Chronographia*. Therein Psellos does not deny the good qualities of his «beloved» emperor<sup>9</sup>. In addition, as far as I can recall the reign of Konstantinos X Doukas was spent in tranquility and pleasure, save for a single

157.25-26.

7. *MB* 5, 154.19-23, 29-31.

8. Kazhdan, 111.

9. Συμπαθεστέραν γοῦν ἔγωγε ψυχὴν οὔτε πρὶν ἐωράκειν, οὔτε νῦν ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων κατανοῶ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φιλοτιμοτέραν ἢ βασιλεῖ πρέπουσαν, and πλεῖστα μὲν εὐδοκιμηχῶς ταῖς πολιτικαῖς πράξεσιν, οὐκ ἐλάττω δὲ κἂν τοῖς ἠθεσιν ἀφείς παραδείγματα τοῖς ἄριστα βιοῦν ἐθέλουσιν. Michael Psellos, *Chronographia*, ed. S. Impelizzeri, 2, VI, 169, pp. 116-118, and 203.3-5, p. 152.

attempt against his life: ἄπαξ μὲν ἐπιβουλευθεὶς καὶ τοῦ κλύδωνος ἀρπαγεῖς, τὸν δὲ λοιπὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς χρόνον ἀθορύβως καὶ εὐθύμως διενεγκών...<sup>10</sup> Doukas' motto was: «Would that I were better known as a scholar than as ruler» (τοῖς δὲ λόγοις ἐξόχως προσκείμενος «᾿Ωφελον» ἔλεγεν «ἐκ τούτου ἢ τῆς βασιλείας γνωρίζεσθαι»<sup>11</sup>). To transform, therefore, the easy-going and scholarly Konstantinos X Doukas to a «single combatant» would not accord well with his better known traits. It is much more likely that it was Konstantinos Monomachos who had earned this appellation, he who had faced, during his reign, the revolts of Georgios Maniaces and Leon Tornikios, not to mention the Russian and the Pecheneg attacks.

This passage, however, in the Encomium is not the only instance in which Psellos compares Monomachos to Constantine the Great; nor should the word-play on his name be considered a unicum. The following passages attest that the attributions used in the Encomium for Monomachos were more or less standard themes in the Psellian discourses πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τὸν Μονομάχον: (a) σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἅμα εἰρηνικός τις καὶ μάχιμος, δημοτικός τε καὶ μόναρχος<sup>12</sup>; (b) ἐκράτησας σὺ μόνος, ὦ βασιλεῦ, τῆς ἐμῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις δυνάμεως καὶ νενίκηκας. ἐόρταζε τοῖνον τὰ ἐπινίκια καὶ λαμπρὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς τροπαίοις κάταγε θρίαμβον καὶ στεφανωσάμενος θῦε τὰ Μονομάχεια<sup>13</sup>; (c) τὸ δ' ὅπως τὸ τῆς μοναρχίας ἡμῶν διασώξεις χρῆμα, καὶ οὐ φεύδεται σε τὸ ὄνομα, οὐδὲ αὐτὸς καταφεύδῃ τῆς κλήσεως, τοῦτο καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπερεκπέπληγμα<sup>14</sup>; (d) ἐνταῦθα δὲ δακτύλῳ θεοῦ γεγραμμένον ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς που πάλαι τῷ σοὶ ὁμωνύμῳ καὶ βασιλεῖ, ὦ σε καὶ παραβάλλω, καὶ φειδοῖ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐχ ὑπερτίθεμαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἴσόν σοι δίδωμι<sup>15</sup>.

### 3. Psellos, Epist. 34, SM 2, 53-56

The chronology of Mauropous' appointment can be also established from a letter of Psellos. Writing only a short while after Mauropous had settled in Euchaita, Psellos describes to his friend the instability prevailing at court, which he euphemistically calls Eden: ἐνταῦθα μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐστῶς, οὐ μόνιμον, ἀλλὰ πάντα κινεῖται καὶ μεταβάλλεται<sup>16</sup>. The highlight, however, of the court-life was that a new Moon had recently risen, overshadowing

10. Ibid., 2, VIIa, 28.3-4, p. 318.

11. Ibid., 2, VIIa, 29.8-9, p. 318.

12. Michael Psellos, *Scripta Minora*, ed. E. Kurtz und F. Drexler, Milan 1936-1941 [hereafter cited as *SM*], vol. 1, 19.24-25.

13. Ibid., 32.10-13.

14. *MB* 5, 113.11-13.

15. Ibid., 140.23-26.

16. *SM*, Epist. 34, vol. 2, 54.13-14.

«the sun-like and far-shining couple»<sup>17</sup>:

Καὶ νῦν ἀτεχνῶς ὑπὸ σελήνην καὶ ἡλίουσ ἐσμέν. καὶ ἡ τάξις παρὰ πολὺ διαλάττουσα· οὐ γὰρ τὴν ἑβδόμην ἢ παρ' ἡμῖν σελήνη ζώνην, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρῶτην ἀμφέπει· καὶ ὑποκάθηνται γε αὐτῇ ἡ ἡλιῶσα καὶ τηλαυγῆς συζυγία, ἐκεῖθεν τὸ φῶς ἐπιχορηγούμενοι καὶ ἡρέμα ἡμῖν ἐπεγγέοντες. ... τὸ δὲ σχῆμα [i.e., τῆς σελήνης] οἷον οὐ γλώττης, ἀλλ' ὀφθαλμῶν. ἐπιπρέπει δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ κάλλος καὶ ἡ νεότης καὶ τὰ ἄνθη τῆς φύσεως.

[To put it simply, we are now under the Moon and the Suns. The order has been much altered, for our Moon does not go about in the seventh zone but in the first; and below Her is situated the sun-like and far-shining couple, who receive thence their light and cast it gently upon us. ... Eyes only can appreciate Her figure; words cannot described it. Beauty, youth, and the flowers of Nature beseem Her.]

Who can this Moon that surpasses the Suns be? Anastasi<sup>18</sup> identified the Moon with the empress Eudokia, and this view has been accepted by Kazhdan, who thereby dated Mauropous' appointment during the reign of Doukas. A more careful reading, however, of the relevant passage does not confirm this deduction. Psellos here speaks of a young and beautiful woman whose splendour and mien cannot be adequately described in words. We know nothing of the physical appearance of Eudokia Makrempolitissa at this time; but we do know that she had been a widow, had given birth to six children (three sons and three daughters), and was certainly no longer young<sup>19</sup>. These facts alone should disqualify her from being identified with the splendid Moon that had risen suddenly in the court.

But what was the event which had taken place at court and which Psellos considered so extraordinary that he felt obliged to inform his friend about it? The story which Psellos recounts in his letter seems to have been far more interesting and exciting than the elevation of the widow Eudokia to the throne, together with her timid son Michael VII and the infant Konstantinos («both of whom stood almost rooted to the spot, quite overcome with awe and reverence for their mother» in the words of Psellos himself<sup>20</sup>). It is about an attractive young woman, a newcomer to the

17. Ibid., 55.7-12, 20-22.

18. R. Anastasi, «Michele Psello al metropolita di Euchaita (Epist. 34 pp. 53-56 K.-D.)», *Studi di filologia bizantina* 4 (1988) 105-120.

19. Cf. D. I. Polemis, *The Doukai: A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London 1968, 34.

20. ἐμέεσσε γοῦν τῶν υἱέων, οἱ δὲ μονοῦκ ἐπήγεσαν ἐκείνην ἀκριβῶς δεδιότες καὶ σεβαζόμενοι, *Chronographia*, 2, VIIb, 1.11-13, p. 320. The translation is by E. R. A. Sewter, *Michael Psellus, Fourteen Byzantine Rulers*, New York 1979, 345.

court — and I believe that this can be none other than the Alan princess with whom Monomachos had fallen passionately in love.

Kazhdan challenges this identification on two grounds:

(a) He doubts that in the letter the word *συζυγία* means «the married couple», i.e., Konstantinos IX and Zoe. He writes: «The natural interpretation of the passage is that the empress ruled the country and the emperors held an inferior position: there were two emperors — ‘the sun-like and the far-shining pair (*συζυγία*)’ in Psellos’ words. ... In this case, the Suns were her co-rulers — Michael VII and the porphyrogennetos Konstantios»<sup>21</sup>.

(b) He accepts unquestionably that Eudokia is being described as the Moon in a letter of Psellos to a certain Psephas<sup>22</sup>.

With regard to *συζυγία*, I should like to point out another passage of Psellos where Konstantinos IX Monomachos and Zoe are represented as a «married couple» in exactly the same manner as in the above-mentioned text: *ἡ γὰρ τῶν βασιλευόντων συζυγία μοναρχία γεγονυῖα διὰ τὴν σύμπνοιαν λαμπρότερον τὸ κράτος ἐντεῦθεν προδείκνυσιν, οὐ διαιρούμενον ἐν διαιρουμένοις σώμασι, συνενούμενον δὲ μᾶλλον τῇ ὁμοιοῖα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ταυτότητι*<sup>23</sup>. Psellos uses the same word to indicate marriage in another passage as well; and it is significant that he employs precisely *συζυγία* in connection with Monomachos’ designs to crown the Alan princess empress after the death of Zoe: *τόν τε νόμον τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῷ τῆς συζυγίας ἐπιμετρήσαντα*<sup>24</sup>.

So much, then, for this word and its usage in Psellos. As for the letter of Psellos to Psephas, there is nothing therein to suggest that the person described as «the light-giving and never overshadowed Moon»<sup>25</sup> is the empress Eudokia. The evidence is completely lacking. The lady in question could have been any other empress, even the very empress Zoe whom both Mauroπους and Psellos more than once call *σελήνη*: *ἔπειτα ταύτην τὴν σελήνην τοῦ κράτους, / τὴν κοσμολαμπῆ καὶ διαπρεπεστάτην*<sup>26</sup>. It is Psellos in particular who persists in this designation, describing Monomachos as the Sun who sheds his light upon the Moon. Naturally, in his laudatory speeches Psellos does not employ mere symbols. For he is making a concrete point by bearing in mind and pointing out the physical characteristics of the imperial couple: their blond hair and light complexion, which bear justice to his symbolism. The empress Zoe had golden hair and fair skin: *τὴν τε κόμην*

21. Kazhdan, 93, 94.

22. *Ibid.*, 94.

23. *Πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κῆριν Κωνσταντῖνον Μονομάχον*, SM 1, 10.23-27.

24. *Chronographia*, 2, VI, 153.2-3, p. 100.

25. *τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῆς αὐτοκράτορος βασιλίδος, τῆς θείας ὄντως ψυχῆς, τῆς φωτοδότιδος καὶ ἀνεκλήπτου τὸ φῶς σελήνης*, Epist. 198, MB 5, 490-491.

26. Epigr. 54, de Lagarde, 31.124-125.

εἶχε ξανθὴν καὶ τὸ σῶμα δι' ὄλου λάμπων λευκότητι<sup>27</sup>. The emperor's appearance is even more extravagantly praised and more closely likened to the sun: τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν ἠλιώσαν ἀπέδειξε καὶ πυρσὴν... κάλλεσι μὲν ἄν ἡλίου τὴν κεφαλὴν εἶκασεν<sup>28</sup> ... κόμαις ἐπιχρύσοις ἀστράπτεις, χρώμασιν ἀμιμήτοις πυρσεύεις ... οὐχ ὄλος ἡλιος, οὐχ ἡλίου λαμπρότερος, φαίην ἄν ἔγωγε;<sup>29</sup> The specific link that justified the portrayal of the imperial couple as Sun and Moon was their good looks, a feature much exploited in the rhetoric of Psellos: (a) ἡ δὲ βασιλις ... οἶά τις σελήνη δαδουχεῖ τὰ ἀνάκτορα. Δεῖται δὲ ἡλίου ἵνα λαμπροτέρου φανῆ μεταλαβοῦσα φωτός, ... ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τῷ λαμπρῷ τούτῳ φωστῆρι συμπεριοδεύουσα τηλαυγῆς ἐστι καὶ λαμπρά<sup>30</sup>; (b) λάμπει καὶ αὐθις ἡ βασιλις, καὶ ἦν σελήνη μὴ ἔχουσα ἡλιον· γῆς ἐζητεῖτο φωστήρ, καὶ τοῦτον εἶχε σε ἡ Μιτυλήνη<sup>31</sup>. In view of the above, to ascribe the designation σελήνη to Eudokia without any specific evidence is, to say the least, arbitrary.

Let us consider now some details from the letter concerning the newly risen Moon in the imperial court, and specifically the change in the Moon's path from the seventh to the first zone: οὐ γὰρ τὴν ἐβδόμην ἢ παρ' ἡμῖν σελήνη ζώνην, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρώτην ἀμφέπει· καὶ ὑποκάθηνταί γε αὐτῇ ἡ ἠλιώσα καὶ τηλαυγῆς συζυγία... (SM 2, 55.8-10). Psellos is practically saying that the newly risen Moon had moved from the seventh and outermost zone, according to early Greek astronomy<sup>32</sup>, and is now occupying the innermost one, thereby being nearest of all the other planets to the Earth. If this is what Psellos is saying in his letter, how does Eudokia Makrembolitissa fit into the picture?

Apart from the fact that the lady referred to was young and beautiful, Psellos adds that she was delightful, in that she knew both how to speak and when to keep silent without offending anybody: σεμνώνει δὲ τὴν μὲν παβήσιαν αἰδοῖ, παβήσια δὲ τὴν αἰδώ (SM 2, 55.15-16). This presiding lady (ἡ προκαθημένη) radiated with beauty though clad ἐν ἡμελημένῳ τῷ σχήματι (55.13), i.e., without wearing a royal garment, for her radiance was brilliant enough to shine through a cloud. It does not look as if Psellos is describing a well known person like the aged Eudokia, the mother of six children, but a newcomer in the palace who held everybody spellbound with her youth and elegance (cf. τὸ κάλλος καὶ ἡ νεότης καὶ τὰ ἄνθη τῆς φύσεως

27. *Chronographia*, 1, VI, 6.6-7, p. 252.

28. *Ibid.*, 2, VI, 126.10-11, 16, pp. 68-70.

29. *MB* 5, 116.21-24. Cf. also *ibid.*, 107.23-29, 134.6-7

30. *MB* 5, 130.7-10, 17-18.

31. *Ibid.*, 136.20-21.

32. According to the Platonic scheme of spheres or zones, which Psellos seem to have in mind, the order of the planets, from this geocentric point of view, is the following: Moon, Sun, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and then the other stars.

55.21-22). The phrase ἐν ἡμελημένῳ τῷ σχήματι I take as a clear reference to the fact that the Alan princess had not been bestowed with the imperial insignia, despite Monomachos' wish (according to Psellos) to crown her: ἐβούλετο μὲν οὖν ταύτην καὶ βασιλικῇ ἀναδῆσαι ταινία ... τοῦ μὲν σχήματος αὐτῇ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἐκοινώνησε<sup>33</sup>. But the most interesting point seems to have escaped notice. The Alan princess appears to have entertained hopes for some kind of advancement but refrained from unfolding her plans, out of consideration for the aged emperor. Still, she could prevent the worst, if she only saw to it that things went astray as little as possible: καὶ τὸ βαθύτερον τῆς γνώμης αὐτῇ μεταβαλεῖν μὲν εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον τὰ πράγματα, μὴ δόξαι δὲ τοῦτο ποιεῖν αἰδοῖ τοῦ ἀνδρός· τοσοῦτον αὐτῇ μέλον καὶ τῆς περὶ ἐκεῖνον ὑπολήψεως καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ πράγματα κατορθώσεως· ἄλλοτε γοῦν ἄλλο τι τῶν τραχυθέντων λειοῖ καὶ τῶν εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐκβεβηχότων μειοῖ<sup>34</sup>.

I fail to understand how these details from Psellos' account, details which have not been seriously considered, fit into the thesis proposed by Anastasi and Kazhdan. A last word about this remarkable story told by Psellos. The situation at court, he writes, was so fluctuating (ἀλλὰ πάντα κινεῖται καὶ μεταβάλλεται, *SM* 2, 54.14) that Mauropous, who had departed from the capital not long ago, should come and witness it with his own eyes: καὶ τί μοι τῇ γλώττῃ, ἀλλὰ μὴ τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν πίστην λαμβάνεις τῶν γινομένων; (56.1-2). It was, indeed, a period of many changes: the empress Zoe had died, Monomachos had lost every sense of decency engrossed as he was in his love affair, and Boilas, an enemy of Psellos, had in his firm grip the infirm emperor.

#### 4. *Mauropous' position in Euchaita: an honorary appointment?*

Was Mauropous' episcopate in Euchaita an honorary appointment, or was it an election forced upon him, virtually amounting to exile? From his various statements and complaints we gain the impression that he was compelled to leave Constantinople and assume the ministry of the Church in Euchaita. Kazhdan has challenged this view, thinking that Mauropous' episcopate was «an honourable appointment/election after a stay in the province»<sup>35</sup>. But then, why Euchaita and not a more prestigious see?

That Mauropous yielded to pressure and accepted an unwelcome nomination we have his own statements in his epigrams, his letters and even in his first sermon in Euchaita as witnesses<sup>36</sup>. In this sermon he went as

33. *Chronographia*, 2, VI, 153.1-2, 5-6, p. 100.

34. *SM* 2, 55.23-29.

35. Kazhdan, 99.

36. A. Karpozilos, *Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ Ἰωάννη Μαυρόποδος*,



far as to remark that the very ordination was forced upon him and that he had to submit, granting rather than receiving a favour: 'Ἀλλὰ γενναῖον μὲν που κάκεινο (ἤδη γὰρ τολμήσω νεανιεύσασθαι, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ θαρρήσας) τὸ βιασθῆναι περὶ τὸν θρόνον καὶ τέλος ἐνδοῦναι, μὴ λαμβάνειν δόξαντας χάριν, ἀλλὰ διδόναι καὶ πεισθέντας μᾶλλον ἢ πείσαντας<sup>37</sup>. In his letters he is more outspoken and explicit. Besides accusing his friend(s) of having betrayed and abandoned him, he likens his stay in Euchaita to an expulsion or exile: τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς μικροῦ τι παντάπασι διὰ τὸν ἐκτοπισμὸν ἀγνοούντων, and ὁ ἄτοπος οὗτος ἐκτοπισμὸς ὀλίγου δεῖν οὐδένα τῶν ὀδοιπόρων ἐπικαταίρειν ἐᾶ<sup>38</sup>. In what sense is Mauropous using the word ἐκτοπισμός? There can be no doubt but that the term designates his 'exile'. Besides, it is not simply a coincidence that, while speaking of St. John Chrysostom's expulsion, he employs the same phraseology: καὶ σοῦ τῆς ἀδίκου διὰ δικαιοσύνην ὑπερορίας, τοῦ καινοῦ μαρτυρίου<sup>39</sup>. Even Psellos admits in a letter that his friend is unfortunate in suffering exile and contempt. This letter must have been written between 1050-1052, at a period when Psellos was still residing in Constantinople, but nevertheless suffering dishonour. Reflecting upon their respective situation, Psellos remarks<sup>40</sup>:

ἐγὼ δέ σοι τοσοῦτον ἐρῶ περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ καὶ σοῦ· σὺ μὲν δυστυχεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐτυχεῖς, ἐγὼ δὲ εὐτυχῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ δυστυχῶ· ἔστι δὲ ὁ λόγος χρησμῶ μὲν ἔοικώς, οὐδαμῆ δὲ λοξός· δυστυχῶν γὰρ αὐτὸς τῶν ὧν ἴσμεν ὑπερορίαν καὶ περιφρόνησιν, εὐτυχεῖς τὴν τῆς λαχούσης σε προεδρίαν τε ἅμα καὶ προσεδρείαν· εὐτυχῶν δ' ἐγὼ τὸ τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἔχειν, ἀτυχῶ τὸ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον τὴν ἀτιμίαν ὑφίστασθαι.

[I will say this much about myself and about you: You are unfortunate and yet fortunate, while I am fortunate and yet unfortunate. This statement sounds like an oracle, but is quite unambiguous. Although you, among those whom I know, are unfortunate in suffering exile and contempt, yet you are fortunate in having the bishopric and the care of the see that fell to your lot. Although I am fortunate in being at home, yet for my own part am unfortunate in having to suffer the dishonour in my native city.]

By way of conclusion I should like to remind the reader that Mauro-

Ioannina 1982, 36-39, 44-45; Id. *The Letters of Ioannes Mauropous Metropolitan of Euchaita*, Thessalonike 1990, 22-24.

37. Orat. 184, de Lagarde, 162.19-22.

38. Karpozilos, *The Letters*, Epist. 61.22, p. 167, and 65.8-10, p. 175.

39. Orat. 178, de Lagarde, 119.2-3.

40. Epist. 173, MB5, 440.10-441.4.

pous' writings, his epigrams, letters, and orations, are transmitted in a collection preserved in codex Vaticanus Gr. 676 (11th cent.). This collection was arranged personally by Mauropous. Among his 99 epigrams there is not a single one dedicated to Doukas, his wife Eudokia, or a later emperor such as Romanos Diogenes. On the contrary, I find about 13 epigrams referring explicitly to Monomachos or to Zoe and Theodora<sup>41</sup>. The same can be said about his 14 orations, most of which were delivered on religious occasions in Constantinople or Euchaita. Among them there figure prominently three orations connected to Monomachos' reign (nos. 181, 182, and 186); these orations, as is well known, were delivered by Mauropous after the Pecheneg attack and the defeat of Leon Tornikios. In the collection there is also included the well known Novella for the School of Law of the same emperor (no. 187). With regard, now, to the letters, there is only one addressed to Monomachos without there being any doubt as to its recipient<sup>42</sup>. The categorical testimony, however, of Psellos that the emperor τὴν δέ γε ἐπιστολήν σου [i.e., of Mauropous], τὴν καλὴν ὁμοῦ καὶ σοφὴν, πολλακίς διεξελήλυθε, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχαίους λόγους συνέκρινε<sup>43</sup>, testifies to the fact that Mauropous wrote more than once to Monomachos, even from Euchaita. The «old discourses» to which the emperor compared the letter refer, naturally, to happier times for Mauropous.

On the basis of the foregoing analysis, Kazhdan's proposed dates for Mauropous' letters must be ruled out simply on chronological grounds. Be that as it may, the learned bishop of Euchaita, in making a selection from his writings, chose those that marked important events in his life. His intention was to delineate his career, which began at the court of Konstantinos IX Monomachos and reached its dramatic climax with the appointment to the metropolitan see of Euchaita at about the same time that Leichoudes and Psellos fell from power. Last but not least, a scribal note found and repeated verbatim in several manuscripts transmitting Mauropous' epigrams also associates him with Monomachos' reign: Οὗτος ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Μονομάχου καὶ Ζωῆς τῆς βασιλίσσης, ἔτη δὲ τὸ ἀπὸ τότε συντείνει ἐξηκοντατέσσαρες πρὸς τοῖς πεντακοσίοις<sup>44</sup>.

University of Ioannina

APOSTOLOS KARPOZILOS

41. Epigr. 31.38, 44.4, 45.3, 54, 55, 57, 70-74, 94, 95.

42. Epist. 26, Karpozilos, 103-107. Cf. Kazhdan, 102.

43. Epist. 80, *MB* 5, 314.3-5.

44. Karpozilos, *Συμβολή*, 57-60.