

DIMITRA MONIOU (ed.), John Mauropous. Discourses on Contemporary Events. Revised Text with Translation and Notes (*Hellenica* 114). Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso 2025. 197 pp. – ISBN 978-88-3613-609-4

• LUIGI D'AMELIA, Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna
(luigi.damelia@unibo.it)

This recent installment of the *Hellenica* series aims to provide scholars, as well as a broader readership, with a revised text, English translation, and commentary on six orations by John Mauropous: Or. 180, 181/182 (two different redactions of the same text), and 184–187. The six have been singled out from a corpus of fourteen, transmitted almost exclusively by the manuscript Vaticanus graecus 676 (Diktyon [67307](#)) and numbered 177–190 in PAUL DE LAGARDE's edition, which was based on this manuscript. LAGARDE, in turn, relied on a transcription of the codex made by JOHANN BOLLIG and revised by WILHELM STUDEMUND.¹ MONIOU does not dwell on the reasons behind her selection of these particular orations. The title suggests a focus 'on contemporary events', a description that might raise some questions, since references to contemporary circumstances also occur elsewhere in Mauropous' discourses, some of which have been used as sources for the military, social, and ecclesiastical context of the eleventh century. In any case, this choice of texts does not reflect the arrangement of the Vatican manuscript, where the orations follow no evident chronological or thematic order. However, as noted by ELISAVET SOTIRUDI, Or. 181–182, 186, and 187 form a group of predominantly political speeches delivered in Constantinople before Mauropous' transfer to Helenopontus and supporting the policies of Constantine IX Monomachos.² Or. 180, 184, and 185, on the other hand, belong with Or. 179 and 188–190 to a second group, mostly hagiographical in character, dating from his episcopate at Euchaita.

The English titles of the six orations, which translate the headings found in the Vatican manuscript, are given below, reproduced here as printed and in the order in which they appear in the volume (in this sequence, as will

1. IOANNES BOLLIG – PAULUS DE LAGARDE (eds.), *Iohannis Euchaitorum Metropolitanæ quæ in codice Vaticano graeco 676 supersunt*. Göttingen 1882.

2. ELENÉ SOTEROUDE, *Η αγιολογική παραγωγή κατά τον 11ο αιώνα. Η περίπτωση του Ιωάννη Μαυρόποδα*. Unpublished PhD Diss., Thessalonike 2012, pp. 38–39.

become clear below, Or. 182 precedes Or. 181, since the latter is now generally recognised as a later, hasty re-working of the former):

Or. 180 ‘A Discourse by John, the most holy Metropolitan of Euchaïta, in Memory of the Holy Great Martyr Theodore Teron, or the Anthismos’ (pp. 26–43);

Or. 182 ‘A Discourse by John, the Most Holy Metropolitan of Euchaïta, on the Memorial Day of the Great Trophy-bearer and the Recent Miracle Performed against the Barbarians’ (pp. 44–59);

Or. 181 ‘A Discourse by John, the Most Holy Metropolitan of Euchaïta, Delivered on the Third Day after Easter, in Memory of the Great Trophy-bearer’ (pp. 60–65);³

Or. 184 ‘Address of John, the Most Holy Metropolitan of Euchaïta, to the People of Euchaïta, When He First Presented Himself to the Church’ (pp. 66–79);

Or. 185 ‘Discourse of John, the Most Holy Metropolitan of Euchaïta, On the Disturbing Fears and the Signs from God that are Taking Place’ (pp. 80–113);

Or. 186 ‘Thank-offering Discourse of John, the Most Holy Metropolitan of Euchaïta, on the Overthrow of Tyranny. Pronounced on the Fifth Day after the Nativity of Christ’ (pp. 114–167);

Or. 187 ‘A Novel Pronounced by the Christ-loving Emperor, Constantine Monomachos, Concerning the Declaration and Elevation of a Legal Instructor’ (pp. 168–187).

This body of texts is preceded by the editor’s preface (unpaginated), a list of abbreviations (p. [1]), the bibliography (pp. [3]–8), and a brief introduction (pp. 9–24). It is followed by an *Index locorum et nominum* (pp. [189]–190) and an *Index locorum Sacrae Scripturae* (pp. 191–197). A comparable index of biblical loci, certainly a valuable reference tool, was already included in LAGARDE’s edition,⁴ where it naturally covers the much larger corpus transmitted by the Vat. gr. 676, comprising, beside all the orations, 99 epigrams and 77 letters. The introduction is divided into five main sections: ‘John Mauropous: Life and Works’; ‘The Historical Orations of

3. MONIOU’s text and translation of Or. 181 stop at the beginning of § 8 (Οἷα δὲ καὶ τὰ θαύματα τῆς λαμπροφόρου ταύτης ἡμέρας...). As she explains, from this point onwards the oration reproduces passages already found in Or. 182 (p. 65, n. 78; see also p. 13); minor textual variants are recorded in the critical apparatus.

4. BOLLIG – DE LAGARDE, *Iohannis Euchariorum*, pp. 225–228. MONIOU does not clarify whether her index was compiled independently of LAGARDE’s or, if not, to what extent and where the two differ.

Mauropous'; 'Historical Context and Events' – which provides a concise discussion of each oration, with brief information on its dating, place of delivery, purpose, and contents, largely drawn from previous scholarship; 'The Role of Speeches: Rhetoric in Service of Imperial Policy', with a focus on 'Motifs' and 'The Emperor and his Opponents: The Portraits'; and, finally, a brief note on the translation. No editorial principles are stated, however, for the Greek text, leaving the reader to piece together from the edition itself – often with considerable difficulty (see below) – the nature and extent of MONIOU's interventions in LAGARDE's already philologically sound text.

In the preface, the author states that 'these texts [scil. the six orations] had remained untranslated and uncommented upon in modern Greek and English until now'; that 'This edition provides a revised Greek text based on LAGARDE's 1979⁵ edition, taking careful consideration of Vaticanus gr. 676'; and that 'The accompanying commentary significantly builds upon previous scholarship by providing up-to-date references and clarifications of legal and historical terminology and offering a broader contextual framework for understanding the texts'. Some of these claims, however, are not entirely accurate, while the volume, as will be seen, does not fully deliver on the aims set out in the preface.

A first point that deserves some attention is the bibliography, which is at times insufficient or outdated. A full account of the bibliographical issues would be out of place here, but a few examples may suffice.

Contrary to the statement in the preface, a complete English translation of Or. 187, the well-known Novel, has already been published by ZACHARY CHITWOOD as an Appendix to his monograph, a work with which MONIOU is otherwise familiar and which she cites elsewhere in the volume.⁶

The information on Mauropous' life provided throughout the volume, largely dependent on APOSTOLOS KARPOZILOS' fundamental studies, reflects a traditional biographical reconstruction without taking into account a number of subsequent contributions that have substantially revised it.⁷ Most

5. The date given for the edition is incorrect: it appeared originally in 1882 and was reprinted in 1979.

6. ZACHARY CHITWOOD, *Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition*, 867–1056. Cambridge 2017, pp. 193–203.

7. APOSTOLOS KARPOZELOS, Συμβολή στη μελέτη τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ Ἰωάννου Μαυρόποδος (Δωδώνη. Παράρτημα 18). Ioannina 1982; IDEM, *The Letters of Ioannes Mauropous Metropolitan of Euchaita* (CFHB 34). Thessalonike 1990; IDEM, *The Biography of Ioannes Mauropous Again*. Ἑλληνικά 44 (1994) pp. 51–60.

notably, no reference is made to MARC LAUXTERMANN's more recent reassessment of Mauropous' biography, which both advances new proposals and confirms conclusions already reached by earlier scholarship, likewise overlooked in the volume under review.⁸ Among the points that emerge from this revised picture are that Mauropous was born and educated in Constantinople rather than being a native of Paphlagonia; was not a professional schoolteacher, nor Psellos' teacher in the strict sense of the term; probably returned from Euchaita to Constantinople as early as 1072–73 rather than in 1075; and first entered the monastery of St John the Forerunner at Petra only after the end of his episcopate. In addition, at p. 10, MONIOU states that the Vat. gr. 676 'was likely written by Mauropous himself or in any case under his own supervision'. No bibliographical reference is provided, nor is the manuscript's Diktyon number given; this is especially problematic for the former hypothesis, which finds no support among palaeographers.⁹

One of the first cases in which a relevant bibliographical omission has implications for the interpretation of Mauropous' text occurs in the commentary on Or. 180.12, p. 34, ll. 11–13: Προσλαβόντες δὲ καὶ τὸν ἑξαρχον, ὅστις καὶ αὐτὸς μικρῷ πρότερον ἐξ ἀλλοτρίας ἔφθην ἐπιδημήσας, ἰδοὺ κοινῇ πάντες τὴν χαρμόσυνον ταύτην ἑορτὴν ἄγομεν (...). MONIOU translates: 'Having received the chief magistrate as well, who has arrived a little earlier from abroad, behold, we all partake of this joyful feast together (...)'. In the accompanying note she remarks that 'It is not clear to whom the author refers with the term "chief magistrate"' (p. 35, n. 24). The reference, however, is to Mauropous himself, as is already indicated by the first-person ἔφθην. As SOTIROUDI has observed and LAUXTERMANN subsequently confirmed, Mauropous is here telling the assembled pilgrims that

8. MARC D. LAUXTERMANN, Biographical Notes on John Mauropous. *Byzantion* 92 (2022) pp. 366–395.

9. For a brief bibliography on the manuscript, see, for example, NIGEL G. WILSON, Books and Readers in Byzantium. In: *Byzantine Books and Bookmen: A Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium*. Washington, D.C. 1975, pp. 1–15, here 12–13; DANIELE BIANCONI, 'Piccolo assaggio di abbondante fragranza': Giovanni Mauropode e il *Vat. gr. 676*, *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 61 (2011), pp. 89–103, here 100–101. The hypotheses concerning Mauropous' possible autograph manuscripts put forward by VASSILIKI LIAKOU-KROPP, Zu der Schreibernotiz im Codex Athina, BXM 1609. In: ANTONIO BRAVO GARCÍA (ed.), *The Legacy of Bernard de Montfaucon, Three Hundred Years of Studies on Greek Handwriting: Proceedings of the Seventh International Colloquium of Greek Palaeography (Bibliologia, 31A–B)*. Turnhout 2010, vol. 1, pp. 67–74, and vol. 2, pp. 701–706 (pls. 1–4), remain to be demonstrated.

he too has only recently arrived from afar to preside over the festival and its celebrations.¹⁰

A second example concerns Or. 186.66, p. 158, ll. 5–7: Ἄμα τοίνυν ἐντεῦθεν τὸ ῥωμαϊκὸν συνεστράτευε, καὶ τὸ βαρβαρικὸν ἐκ συνθήματος ἐκεῖθεν προσήγγιζεν· ἤδη δὲ καὶ τὸ βόρειον οὐ μακρὰν ἀφεσθηκὸς ἀπηγγέλλετο (...). MONIOU translates: ‘At the same time, the Roman army was marching from one side, and the barbarian army was approaching from another according to a prearranged signal. The northern forces were reported to be close by (...)’. With regard to the latter forces, she comments: ‘Probably a reference to the Rus’ who responded to the emperor’s call and arrived as allies after the war of 1043’, thus reproducing an interpretation originally proposed by ALEXANDER KAZHDAN (although not explicitly cited here).¹¹ No reference is made, however, to JONATHAN SHEPARD’s discussion of this very passage in an article cited elsewhere by MONIOU, which challenged Kazhdan’s identification of τὸ βόρειον with a Russian force and the chronological assumptions on which it rested.¹²

Finally, the commentary notes, which refer to patristic sources and parallels as well as to other Byzantine sources (especially historians and chroniclers), do not always cite the most up-to-date editions: see, for instance, pp. 81, n. 3, and 91, n. 47, where Gregory of Nazianzus’ *Orationes* 42 and 36 respectively are cited from Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca* – perhaps relying in this respect on the editions provided by the TLG – rather than from their critical editions in the *Sources Chrétiennes* series.

Let us now turn to the Greek text and its translation. In the paragraph ‘Translation’ (p. 23), the editor states that LAGARDE’s edition ‘is improved where necessary taking into account codex Vaticanus graecus 676. Additionally, the notes highlight the sources of the texts, given that Lagarde–Bollig’s source commentary is incomplete. The text is rendered in a clear and precise manner, despite Mauropous’ rhetoric in several places’. The Greek text edited by MONIOU appears generally correct, although it is not entirely free from minor typographical errors.¹³ As far as can be inferred

10. SOTEROUDE, *Αγιολογική παραγωγή*, p. 120; LAUXTERMANN, *Biographical Notes*, pp. 383 (with n. 88)–384.

11. ALEXANDER P. KAZHDAN, 8/1 (1963) (= *Mélanges G. Ostrogorsky* I) pp. 177–184.

12. JONATHAN SHEPARD, John Mauropous, Leo Tornicius and an Alleged Russian Army: The Chronology of the Pecheneg Crisis of 1048–1049. *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 24 (1975) pp. 61–89.

13. E.g. Or. 180.20, p. 40, l. 13 (μὲν pro μέν); 182.5, p. 46, l. 15 (δὲ pro δέ); 182.16, p.

from the critical apparatus, most of her textual interventions apparently consist in adopting orthographical forms that adhere more closely to the Vatican manuscript and to the graphic conventions of medieval manuscripts. Indeed, the apparatus records, for example, the following graphic forms found in the Vat. gr. 676 and normalised in LAGARDE's edition: $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$ in cod. / $\kappa\check{\alpha}\nu$ in LAGARDE (22 times); $\mu\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in cod. / $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in LAGARDE (34 times); $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}$ in cod. / $\kappa\alpha\theta'\ \acute{\alpha}$ in LAGARDE (22 times), and so forth. Some entries, however, are difficult to understand. At Or. 180.20, p. 40, l. 3, for instance, the apparatus reads 'δήπου Vat. gr. 676: δή που LAGARDE'. It is unclear on what basis the two forms can be distinguished in the manuscript: η and π are not joined in the manuscript, but the same is true when the two letters unquestionably belong to the same word, as, for example, in ἡπειρος (f. 124r, l. 15), ἀκατάληπτος (f. 137v, l. 6), ληπτός (ibid., l. 8), and elsewhere. Some further reservations are also in order.

Considerable space in the apparatus could have been saved by stating the adopted editorial criteria once in the prolegomena or by adding *ut semper* at the first occurrence of each such form. More generally, some discussion of the scribe's graphical habits, together with a clear statement of the editorial principles adopted in dealing with them, would have been useful, especially in the light of the now substantial literature on the treatment of orthography in editions of Byzantine texts. This applies, for instance, to the addition of a secondary accent to a properispomenon followed by a monosyllabic enclitic (which in the Vatican manuscript appears to reflect a classicising tendency), as well as to the editor's fluctuation, following LAGARDE, between $\tau\check{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ and $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$, whereas the manuscript appears consistently to read the elided form $\tau'\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$. The principles governing punctuation, particularly in relation to rhythmic clausulae, likewise deserved attention. Finally, in the specific case of the alternation $\mu\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ / $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, I am not entirely convinced that the graphic form $\mu\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ – though widely attested in Byzantine manuscripts – should invariably be reproduced when the syntactical context clearly indicates the conjunctive force of $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ('nor'). See e.g. Or. 185.31, p. 108, ll. 5–8: Μίαν πάντες ἀφῶμεν φωνὴν ἐλεεινὴν πρὸς θεόν, μίαν ἀναπέμψωμεν δέησιν, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ ἐλεγχθῆναι μὴ δὲ τῇ ὀργῇ παιδευθῆναι παρακαλοῦντες, μὴ δὲ τὰ Σοδόμων παθεῖν μὴ δὲ γενέσθαι ὡς Γόμορρα (...) ΜΟΝΙΟΥ translates: 'Let us all offer just one prayer to God, let us send up one sup-

56, l. 8 (τὴν τὴν pro τὴν); 181.4, p. 62, l. 24 (περηφανώς pro περιφανώς); 185.17, p. 90, l. 15 (μαλλον sic); 185.17, p. 92, l. 22 (και sic); 185.21, p. 96, l. 14 (κτώμενός, φησι, ... pro κτώμενος, φησί, ...); 185.24, p. 102, l. 2 (συμπτώματων pro συμπτωμάτων); 185.27, p. 104, l. 16 (περηφρόνησιν pro περιφρόνησιν); 185.33, p. 110, l. 3 (παρακευὴν pro παρασκευὴν).

plication, beseeching Him not to rebuke us in His wrath, nor chastise us in His anger, nor to suffer the fate of Sodom, nor to become like Gomorrah (...)'.

More serious is the fact that, where the lemma of a critical unit should in theory differ from LAGARDE's edited text, it does not always correspond to the text actually printed. In many cases, MONIOU's text instead retains LAGARDE's normalised forms or even his necessary corrections of the manuscript readings.¹⁴ This creates an inconsistency, since elsewhere she does accept the manuscript reading into her text.¹⁵

In general, critical entries do not always conform to established philological conventions and consequently give rise to considerable ambiguity. I shall limit myself to pointing out a few examples:

Or. 180.1, p. 26, l. 9 (διαπύσιος): in the critical apparatus one reads 'διαπύσιος: διαπύσιος Vat. gr. 676 and LAGARDE'. Quite apart from the curious and, unfortunately, not isolated intrusion of English into a critical apparatus otherwise written in Latin, it would have been appropriate to indicate explicitly that the correction is the editor's own, for instance by adding *correx*i or *ego* after the lemma. MONIOU also records in the apparatus the manuscript's marginal annotations, which were already reported – and, I would say, more precisely – in the apparatus of LAGARDE's edition. Indeed, in the revised edition, these annotations are indiscriminately subsumed under the standard formula 'mg in Vat. gr. 676', without distinguishing between different hands or indicating the nature of the individual notes. For example, no distinction is made between the later brief explanatory annotations and the note entered in the margin of f. 233r (at Or. 185.8, p. 84, l. 9): γρ(άφεται)· πίπτουσαι. This note records an erroneous reading originally entered in the main text and subsequently corrected by the same scribe, a feature of some significance for the history of the manuscript, as discussed by DANIELE BIANCONI, whose contribution in this regard is not taken into account.¹⁶

14. E.g. Or. 180.6, p. 28, l. 1 (κἄν instead of κἄν); 180.22, p. 42, l. 5 (πρέσβυς instead of πρέσβις); 182.6, p. 48, l. 6 (κἄν instead of κἄν); 182.8, p. 50, l. 8 (καθ' ἅπερ instead of καθάπερ); 182.16, p. 56, ll. 1–2 (ἐφ' ὅσον instead of ἐφόσον); 181.7, p. 64, l. 4 (ὑπεστροφμένη [recte] instead of ὑπεστρομμένη); 181.7, p. 64, l. 7 (ἐπ' ἴσης instead of ἐπίσης).

15. E.g. Or. 180.11, p. 32, l. 4 (μὴ δέ instead of μὴδέ); 180.20, p. 40, l. 11 (τὰ δέ instead of τάδε); 181.2, p. 60, l. 6 (ἐπιπλέον instead of ἐπὶ πλέον); 181.5, p. 62, l. 6 (καθά instead of καθ' ἃ); 184.6, p. 68, l. 3 (καθάπερ instead of καθ' ἅπερ); 184.8, p. 70, l. 22 (μὴ δ' instead of μὴδ'); 185.30, p. 106, l. 16 (προσέτι instead of πρὸς ἔτι).

16. BIANCONI, 'Piccolo assaggio', pp. 100–101.

Or. 180.7, p. 30, l. 10 (παραδιδούς): the critical apparatus simply reads ‘διδούς Vat. gr. 676’. As it stands, this entry suggests that παραδιδούς is an editorial correction introduced by MONIOU, while the Vatican manuscript – and, one is led to assume, LAGARDE’s edition as well – reads διδούς. This is not, however, the case: παραδιδούς was already adopted by LAGARDE, whose apparatus clearly indicates that it results from a correction by the same hand as the main text (C²), which restored -ρα at the end of χεῖρα and πα- at the beginning of παραδιδούς, both omitted by the scribe through a *saut du même au même* across the line break: χεῖ(ρα) | (πα)ραδιδούς (f. 175r).

Or. 180.13, p. 34, l. 3 (τελεσθεῖσα): in the critical apparatus one reads ‘τελευθεῖσα Vat. gr. 676 et LAGARDE: τελεσθεῖσα corr.’. Besides the fact that a critical entry conventionally begins with the lemma adopted in the text, rather than with a rejected variant or a corrected error, the emendation is unnecessary: the Vatican manuscript correctly reads τελεσθεῖσα (f. 178r), while τελευθεῖσα is simply LAGARDE’s misreading of the manuscript, marked with a *sic*.

Some of MONIOU’s few textual corrections or conjectures are certainly welcome and represent useful improvements to the text. I would, however, question her emendation of ὅσπερ – transmitted by the Vat. gr. 676 and retained by LAGARDE – to ὡσπερ in the parenthetical phrase ὡσπερ νόμος ἐκείνων, referring to the predatory practices of the barbarian ‘Scythians’, that is, the Pechenegs, who had crossed the frozen Danube en masse in the winter of 1046–1047 (Or. 182.10, p. 52, l. 10). The transmitted ὅσπερ can be explained as an instance of attraction whereby the expected neuter ὅπερ (‘which is their custom’) takes the masculine gender of the predicate noun νόμος, and is in fact attested elsewhere in Mauroπους, including in the Vat. gr. 676 itself: cf. Io. Maurop., Or. 179.9, ed. LAGARDE, p. 122: ὅσπερ νόμος ἐκείνου; 190.36, ed. LAGARDE, p. 217: ὅσπερ νόμος αὐτῆς, as well as in other authors; see, for example, Mich. Psell., Or. pan. II.316–318, ed. GEORGE DENNIS, p. 31: Σὺ δὲ κύριε (...) ἐμυκτήριζες μὲν τὰς βουλάς αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἤλεγχες δέ, ὅσπερ σὸς νόμος, οὐδ’ ἐχρῶ τῷ κολάζειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀνέχεσθαι.

I turn, finally, to the English translation. Making these texts available to a wider readership is in itself a valuable undertaking, particularly given the still considerable number of Byzantine works that, despite having been critically edited and extensively studied, remain untranslated into modern languages. Assessing the stylistic quality of a translation into a language

that is not the reviewer's own inevitably calls for some caution. Moreover, any translation allows a certain degree of freedom and reflects the translator's individual choices and sensitivity. MONIOU has clearly opted for a relatively free translation, which generally provides an accessible and lively reading and conveys something of the immediacy of Mauropous' oratory. At times, however, this freedom comes at the expense of fidelity to the Greek: words and significant details are omitted, some passages appear to be misunderstood, and rhetorical features of Mauropous' prose are lost even where they might reasonably have been reproduced in English.

As regards omissions or quite free renderings, I shall limit myself to a few examples among the many that could be cited, italicising the words or phrases at issue:

Or. 180.1, p. 26, ll. 6–8 ἡ ἡμέρα δὲ σύνθημα κοινὸν τοῖς συντρέχουσιν, εἰς τιμὴν ἀνέκαθεν ἐτησίαν ἀνακειμένη τῷ μάρτυρι (...). MONIOU translates: 'The day serves as a common signal to those present, being an annual tribute to the martyr (...)'. The omission of ἀνέκαθεν ('from ancient times') removes a significant piece of information concerning the antiquity of the annual celebration of St Theodore Tiron.

Or. 180.12, p. 34, ll. 10–11 ἔνθεν τοι καὶ πᾶν ὅσον ἔκδημον καὶ ὅσον ἐγκάτοικον εἰς ταὐτὸ συνελθόντες ἐν γεγόνασιν ἄθροισμα καὶ μία ἐκκλησία καὶ σύμπνοια. MONIOU translates: 'Hence, all who have come from near or far to the same place have united, becoming a single assembly and church'. The final καὶ σύμπνοια ('and concord') is omitted, thus reducing Mauropous' climactic tricolon to two members.

Or. 180.13, p. 34, ll. 2–3 λαμπρὰ μὲν γὰρ ἦδη καὶ ἡ πρὸ μικροῦ τῷ γενναίῳ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ χώραν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ μάλιστα (...). MONIOU translates: 'The previous feast, held a little time ago, was splendid. It was celebrated throughout the empire but especially in our country (...)'. The rendering 'throughout the empire' is rather free: κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ χώραν ('in every city and region') is a well-attested formula, particularly in Byzantine hagiographical literature,¹⁷ while ἐνταῦθα means simply 'here', rather than 'in our country'.

Or. 180.22, p. 42, ll. 1–2 Ὅρᾳς οὗ προήχθην ἀπονοίας καὶ τόλμης· δέον μόνον δεῖσθαι καὶ ἱκετεύειν, δικαιολογεῖσθαι τεθάρρηκα καὶ οἶον ἐγκαλεῖν

17. E.g. Life of St Epicharis (BHG 2123), 2.2, ed. FRANÇOIS HALKIN, p. 342; Passio of St Tryphon (BHG 1856), 4.6 and 5.6, ed. PIO FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, pp. 56 and 57 respectively; Passio of St Athanasius at Clysma (BHG 193), 2.11, ed. ATHANASIOS PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 361.

τε καὶ παραμέμφεσθαι (...). MONIOU translates: ‘You see to what degree of senselessness and boldness I have come; although I should only ask of and supplicate myself towards you, I dared to justify myself and blame you (...)’. The single verb ‘blame’ flattens the coordinated pair ἐγκαλεῖν τε καὶ παραμέμφεσθαι (‘accuse and reproach’), while the attenuating οἷον (‘as it were’) is omitted altogether.

Or. 185.17, p. 90, ll. 1–2 (...) σπήλαιόν τε ληστῶν¹⁸ καὶ φονευτῶν οἰκητήριον (...). MONIOU translates: ‘ (...) a den of thieves and murderers (...)’. The omission of οἰκητήριον (‘dwelling-place’) also results in the loss of the chiasmic structure of the Greek.

Or. 185.21, p. 96, ll. 2–4 Ποῦ τηνάλλως φερόμεθα, τὴν μικρὰν καὶ πολὺπόνον ζωὴν ἀναλίσκοντες ἀβούλως καὶ ἀνοήτως, καὶ τὸν βραχὺν τοῦτον χρόνον δαπανῶντες εἰς μάταια; MONIOU translates: ‘Where are we led astray, heedlessly and foolishly, and spend this short time of our much-laboring life on vain things?’ Here two parallel cola, τὴν μικρὰν καὶ πολὺπόνον ζωὴν ἀναλίσκοντες (‘using up our short and toilsome life’) and τὸν βραχὺν τοῦτον χρόνον δαπανῶντες (‘spending this brief span of time’), are compressed into a single clause. This rather free rendering conflates the synonymous ἀναλίσκοντες and δαπανῶντες into ‘spend’ and effaces the syntactic parallelism of the Greek.

In other cases, however, the Greek text appears to have been misunderstood, or at least rendered somewhat imprecisely. A few examples may be given:

Or. 180.7, p. 30, ll. 1–2 Τούτῳ γὰρ ἐδόθη παρὰ Χριστοῦ, ὑπὲρ οὗ παθεῖν εἴλετο, ἄνω μὲν τὸ συνεῖναι καὶ συμβασιλεύειν αὐτῷ βασιλείαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ αἰώνιον (...). MONIOU translates: ‘Being chosen by Christ to suffer for His sake, he was deemed worthy of sharing in His heavenly kingdom as an immortal and eternal co-ruler (...)’. The translation reverses the syntax: ὑπὲρ οὗ παθεῖν εἴλετο means ‘for whose sake he chose to suffer’, not ‘being chosen by Christ to suffer’; moreover, ἄφθαρτον καὶ αἰώνιον qualify βασιλείαν (‘an incorruptible and eternal kingdom’), not the martyr.

Or. 182.10, pp. 50–52, ll. 1–5 Τὰς μὲν οὖν ἄλλας τούτων ἐφόδους εἰς οὐδὲν ἢ μικρόν τι πάνυ κακὸν ἀποσκηπτούσας ἀνέκοπτε ταχὺ καὶ συνέστελλον ἢ βασιλέως προμήθεια, τὴν ἐξ ὕψους ἔχουσα συμμαχίαν, τὴν ἐσχάτην δὲ ταύτην καθ’ ἡμῶν ἔλασιν ἢ μᾶλλον ἀπέλασιν ὥς λόγος τῶν οἴκοι – οὐκ οἶδα τί ποτε φήσω, πότερον αὐτῶν ἀδικίαν πρὸς ἄλλους ἢ ἐτέρων

18. A quotation from Jer. 7:11, not Is. 1:21 as stated on p. 91, n. 45, owing to an inversion of nn. 44 and 45.

μᾶλλον πλεονεξίαν ἐπενεχθεῖσαν τούτοις ἐκ τύχης; (...). MONIOU translates: ‘Their other incursions, which inflicted no small or minor harm, were quickly repelled and contained by the emperor’s divinely aided foresight. But this last incursion or rather expulsion on our part – I don’t know what to call it, whether injustice towards others or rather a greater covetousness on their part induced by fate? (...)’. This translation fails to preserve the carefully articulated antithetical structure of the Greek. The earlier Pecheneg incursions are said to have caused no harm or only very slight damage (εἰς οὐδὲν ἢ μικρόν τι πᾶν κακόν), not ‘no small or minor harm’. More importantly, Mauroπους sets their earlier raids against their final mass advance into Byzantine territory (καθ’ ἡμῶν ἔλασιν), which, through the pointed wordplay ἔλασις / ἀπέλασις, is immediately redefined as an expulsion from their own lands (ἀπέλασιν... τῶν οἴκοι). The resulting reversal of perspective is further developed through the antithetical parallelism between their wrongdoing towards others (αὐτῶν ἀδικίαν πρὸς ἄλλους) and the aggression inflicted upon them by others (ἐτέρων... πλεονεξίαν... τούτοις). MONIOU’s ‘expulsion on our part’ and ‘a greater covetousness on their part’ thus efface the rhetorical patterning of the passage while also reversing the syntactic distribution of agency.

Or. 182.10, p. 52, ll. 8–11 Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ παμπληθεὶ πάντες ἅμα, τὸν ποταμὸν ἀθρόοι πεζεύσαντες ἡπειρωθέντα κρυστάλλῳ, καὶ τὴν ἀπόβασιν κλέψαντες, ὥσπερ [*lege* ὅσπερ, see above] νόμος ἐκείνων, τὴν παραποταμίαν ἐκάκωσαν ἐκ μέρους καταδραμόντες. MONIOU translates: ‘For they all came together in a vast multitude, having crossed the river altogether on foot, as it had frozen like crystal, resembling thieves (as was their custom!) and having encamped, they encroached upon our territory, seizing the riverbank, which was their law, and making a partial assault on the opposite bank’. Some imprecision can also be observed in this description of the Pechenegs’ crossing of the Danube. The phrase τὸν ποταμὸν (...) ἡπειρωθέντα κρυστάλλῳ is better understood as referring to the river having been turned into solid ground by the ice (ὁ κρύσταλλος), thus allowing them to cross it on foot en masse, rather than as meaning that it ‘had frozen like crystal’.¹⁹ Likewise, τὴν ἀπόβασιν κλέψαντες describes their furtive

19. MONIOU herself has identified a parallel for this expression in Bas. Caes., *Hom.* XIX.5 (In ss. quadraginta martyres Sebastenses CPG 2863 / BHG 1205): Τότε τοίνυν αἱ θριοὶ διανυκτερεύειν κατεδικάσθησαν, ὅτε λίμνη μὲν, περὶ ἣν ἡ πόλις κατόικισται, ἐν ἣ ταῦτα διήθλουν οἱ ἄγιοι, οἷόν τι πεδίον ἱππύλατον ἦν, μεταποιήσαντος αὐτὴν τοῦ κρυστάλλου· καὶ ἡπειρωθεῖσα τῷ κρύει, ἀσφαλῶς ὑπὲρ νῶτον πεζεῦειν παρείχετο τοῖς περιοίκοις (PG 31, col. 516B).

crossing, rather than their ‘resembling thieves’. Finally, τὴν παραποταμίαν ἐκάκωσαν ἐκ μέρους καταδραμόντες refers to their ravaging part of the Byzantine territory along the river after the crossing, whereas the references to ‘seizing the riverbank’ and to an assault on ‘the opposite bank’ do not appear to correspond to anything in the Greek text.

Or. 185.17, p. 90, ll. 1–4 Πόλιν μὲν τινα πόρνην οἱ προφηταὶ θρηνοῦσι, σπήλαιόν τε ληστῶν καὶ φονευτῶν οἰκητήριον καὶ παραπικραίνοντα οἶκον καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα προσαγορεύοντες, τὴν ἡμετέραν δὲ πόλιν, τὴν κορυφὴν λέγω ταύτην τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ τῶν πόλεων δέσποιναν, ἥδη μὲν τις εὐστόχως τῶν θεηγόρων ὠνόμασε πόλιν παιζόντων· εὐξαίμην δ’ ἂν ἔγωγε, μὴ καὶ πόλιν θρηνοῦντων ἐπικληθῆναι. MONIOU translates: ‘Indeed, the prophets lament over a certain city, calling it a harlot, a den of thieves and murderers, a dwelling place of iniquity that exhibits the home. A great father of the church referred to our city, the pinnacle of the inhabited world and queen of cities, as a city that is wholly unserious. I would pray, however, that it is not to be called a city that mourns’. In this passage, already partly discussed above, παραπικραίνοντα οἶκον (‘an embittering house’ in the NETS), a recurrent syntagm in Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek. 2:5, as noted by MONIOU, and elsewhere) referring to the rebellious house of Israel, is misunderstood in the obscure rendering ‘a dwelling place of iniquity that exhibits the home’. In the following sentence, ἥδη and εὐστόχως are left untranslated, while ‘a city that is wholly unserious’ is a questionable rendering of Gregory of Nazianzus’ πόλις παιζόντων (‘a city of people given to pleasure’), duly identified in the notes, an expression that stands in deliberate parallelism with the following πόλις θρηνοῦντων (‘a city of people in mourning’).

Or. 185.21, p. 96, ll. 8–13 Ποῦ σοι, Παῦλε μακάριε, τὸ θεῖον ἀπόφθεγμα Ὁ καιρὸς, ἀδελφοί, συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν, ἵνα καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ μὴ καταχρῶνται, καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες ὥσιν ὡς οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες, καὶ οἱ μηδὲν μὲν οὖν ἔχοντες ὡς τὰ πάντα κατέχοντες ἢ καὶ διὰ τέλους καθεύδοντες· οὕτω γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀνεστρέψαμεν πρὸς τὸν λόγον τὰ πράγματα, περὶ ὧν θεοπνεύστως ἀλλαχοῦ προηγόρευσας· ἐνστήσονται δὴποτε καιροὶ χαλεποί, τοὺς νῦν τούτους ἀντικρυς λέγων, καθ’ οὓς ἔσονται, φησί, τοιοῖσδε καὶ τοιοῖσδε [perperam pro τοιοῖδε καὶ τοιοῖδε] οἱ ἄνθρωποι, πᾶν εἶδος κακίας ἐφεξῆς καταλέγων καὶ τὸν καθ’ ἡμᾶς τοῦτον βίον παριστῶν ἐναργῶς. MONIOU translates: ‘O blessed Paul, where is your divine saying, The appointed time, brethren, has grown short (1 Cor. 7:29); From now on, those who are concerned in the affairs of this world should not make excessive use of them, and those who own property should behave like those who do not, and those who are penniless should behave like those who have

everything in abundance. We have upended everything (2 Cor. 6:10). For, referring to our own times, he has said: difficult times are ahead, as there will be, such people, listing every kind of evil in succession and painting a clear portrait of the life we now lead'. The scriptural references and their treatment in this passage present some problems. The first Pauline quotation is not confined to 1 Cor. 7:29, as indicated by MONIOU, but also draws on 1 Cor. 7:31 (οἱ χρώμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι). Mauropous then echoes 2 Cor. 6:10 (ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες) in οἱ μηδὲν μὲν οὖν ἔχοντες ὡς τὰ πάντα κατέχοντες, adding ἢ καὶ διὰ τέλους καθεύζοντες ('or even as though they were to possess everything for ever'), which is omitted in the translation. The reference to 2 Cor. 6:10 is therefore misplaced after 'We have upended everything', rather than attached to the words that actually echo the verse. Moreover, 'We have upended everything' omits πρὸς τὸν λόγον and thus obscures Mauropous' point that contemporary behaviour has reversed the Pauline dictum just quoted. The following sentence is considerably reshaped: περὶ ὧν θεοπνεύστως ἀλλαχοῦ προηγόρευσας and τοὺς νῦν τούτους ἀντικρὺς λέγων are compressed into 'referring to our own times, he has said', while καθ' οὓς ἔσονται, φησί, τοιοῖδε καὶ τοιοῖδε οἱ ἄνθρωποι means 'during which, he says, men will be such and such', not 'as there will be, such people'. Finally, the biblical quotation ἐνστήσονται ... καιροὶ χαλεποὶ (2 Tim. 3:1), followed by a clear allusion to the catalogue of vices in 2 Tim. 3:2–5 (τοιοῖδε καὶ τοιοῖδε οἱ ἄνθρωποι, πᾶν εἶδος κακίας ἐφεξῆς καταλέγων), is not identified, unlike in LAGARDE's edition.

Despite the reservations expressed above, the volume has the merit of making a significant group of Mauropous' orations more readily accessible, especially to readers unable to engage directly with the Greek text. Its usefulness would, however, have been considerably enhanced by fuller engagement with recent scholarship, a clearly defined editorial method, and a closer adherence to the Greek in the translation.

Keywords

John Mauropous; textual criticism; Byzantine rhetoric; homiletics