
STEFANO PARENTI, *Storia regionale del Rito Bizantino. Volume I: Costantinopoli e dintorni* (Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 47). Münster: Aschendorff 2025. 342 pp. – ISBN 978-3-402-11082-9

• ALEKSANDR ANDREEV, University of Oslo
(aleksandr.andreev@gmail.com)

STEFANO PARENTI opens the first volume of his new *Regional History of the Byzantine Rite* with the story behind the appearance of ROBERT TAFT's *Byzantine Rite: A Short History*, which has faithfully served as an introduction to the liturgical history of the Eastern Churches of the Byzantine Rite and the liturgical life of Byzantium for specialists and non-specialists alike.¹ By the author's own admission (p. 44), the *Storia regionale* is not a 'research volume but a synthesis', seeking to update in light of recent scholarship the framework and observations offered by TAFT. In addition, PARENTI expands the narrative to aspects other than the eucharistic liturgy, which had been TAFT's primary focus, in a discussion that includes also the daily office, hymnography, the rites of Christian initiation and penance, and the worship of Byzantine monks.

Since PARENTI presents his opus as an updating and revision of the *Short History*, it is useful to briefly consider the framework proposed there by TAFT: An originally Antiochian rite was adapted to the topography of the new capital and the practices of the imperial court to achieve a ritual splendor during the 'Golden Age' of Justinian. This was followed by the 'Dark Ages' culminating with the period of Iconoclasm, when it lost its imperial splendor but attained its final structure and became a complete liturgical system. The Victory of Orthodoxy following Iconoclasm led to greater monastic influence on the Constantinopolitan Church. Crucial to this part of the history was the establishment by St Theodore in 799 of a new monastic community at the Studion, for which he invited some monks from the Monastery of St Sabbas in Palestine (Mar Saba). Theodore the Studite thus adapted the Sabbaitic daily office and Palestinian hymnography to the needs of his monastery, adding to them elements from the Constantinopolitan

¹ ROBERT TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (American Essays in Liturgy). Collegeville MN 1992.

cathedral liturgy – such as the eucharistic formulary and the lectionary system – and thus producing a synthetic ‘Studite rite’. The city effectively became bi-ritual – although there had also been a rite of the ‘sleepless’ monks that was practiced in the capital’s monasteries before St Theodore – with a monastic (‘Studite’) rite and a cathedral / parochial (‘Ecclesiastic’) rite. As a result of the Fourth Crusade in 1204, the demoralized cathedral clergy were no longer able to maintain the Ecclesiastic rite in Hagia Sophia, so it gave way to the Studite rite. This Studite rite was also adopted in Palestine in the eleventh century, following the destruction of the Holy Sepulcher by Caliph al-Hakim in 1009. There, local monastics adapted it to their own needs as part of the ‘neo-Sabbaitic synthesis’. During the Paleologan period, Mt Athos became an important monastic center for the Byzantine realm. Since Athonite monasticism was based on a system of lavras and sketes similar to that of Mar Saba rather than the strict cenobitism of the Studion, it received the ‘neo-Sabbaitic’ rite from Palestine and then spread it throughout Byzantium, thanks, in part, to the prominence of the hesychasts. The resulting Athonite flavor of the ‘neo-Sabbaitic’ rite pushed out both the Studite usage and whatever was left of the Ecclesiastic rite and became the Byzantine Rite of today, used both in monasteries and parochial churches. This, briefly, is the story told by TAFT in his *Short History*.

PARENTI’s *Storia regionale* retains the structure and periodization proposed by TAFT, offering throughout corrections or nuances. Thus, the Justinianic ‘Golden Age’ was a time of ‘important reforms... with not always positive repercussions’ (p. 112), including the collapse of the catechumenate, the reform of the penances system, and the development of low-voiced recitation of the anaphora and other presidential prayers. On the ‘Studite synthesis’, PARENTI points out (p. 195) that there is no evidence of Theodore the Studite requesting hymnographers from Mar Saba to implement Palestinian liturgy in Constantinople. Furthermore, he adds, already in Bithynia the monks under St Theodore used some form of the Palestinian daily office, so the ‘Studite synthesis’ that adapted a Palestinian Horologion to the liturgical system of Constantinople ‘precedes and does not follow the transfer of the community to the Capital’ (p. 191). As for the daily office of the ‘sleepless’ monks who occupied the Studion before St Theodore – described by PARENTI in an excursus on monastic liturgy before Iconoclasm (pp. 101–109) – little useful information can be gleaned from the lives of Sts Alexander and Marcellus. Perhaps it consisted of a 24-fold *cur-sus*, though certainly it cannot be identified with later manuscripts such as

Paris. gr. 331 that contain 24 additional, minor hours (p. 106).²

For the next important stage in TAFT's narrative, PARENTI points out that TAFT's 'neo-Sabbaite synthesis' is based on a series of misunderstandings (pp. 277–278). Nonetheless, PARENTI concludes that a 'neo-Sabbaite synthesis' is 'undeniable', but occurred not as a revision of the Studite liturgy, as TAFT had thought, but as part of the process of 'Byzantinization' of the worship of Palestinian monasteries (p. 278). PARENTI presents the evidence on the origins of the 'Jerusalem' or 'Mar Saba' Typicon. First, Nikon of the Black Mountain juxtaposes Studite and Palestinian practices in the eleventh century, but he refers to the Palestinian practice as 'the rule of Jerusalem' (p. 278),³ specifically referring to a 'typicon of Mar Saba' only for matters of discipline rather than liturgy.⁴ Some sources, such as the thirteenth-century Sin. syr. 136 and Sin. gr. 1097, refer to the monastery of St Theodosius (Deir Dosi), suggesting that it played an important role (p. 281) in the formation of this typicon. On the other hand, we have the late-twelfth-century Sin. gr. 1096, specifically titled as a 'Typicon of the Lavra of our Venerable and God-bearing Father Sabbas',⁵ and the Hypotyposis of Christodulos of Patmos, composed in 1091, that already mentions a 'Typicon of Mar Saba' (pp. 282–283). Thus, the reader is left wondering what the role of Mar Saba in this 'synthesis' was – after all, the evidence appears to be mixed. PARENTI does not answer this question clearly: while critiquing TAFT's conception of the 'neo-Sabbaite synthesis', he retains the term 'neo-Sabbaite' itself.

To my mind, all of this suggests that the processes that eventually produced the modern Typicon of the Byzantine Rite took place in Palestine more broadly, while the firm association with Mar Saba occurred at a later date, perhaps as a result of the fame of the monastery and its founder. As a further piece of evidence, we can add the no less contradictory data of the

²PARENTI previously argued the same in JEFFREY C. ANDERSON – STEFANO PARENTI, *A Byzantine Monastic Office*, 1105 A.D. Washington DC 2016, p. 341, cf. also p. 310, against IOANNES PHOUNTOLĒS, *Ἡ Εἰκοσιτετράωρος Ἀκοίμητος Δοξολογία*. Athens 1963; IDEM, *Εἰκοσιτετράωρον Ὁρολόγιον: Ἀκολουθία τοῦ νυχθημέρου (Κείμενα λειτουργικῆς 1)*. Thessaloniki 1994, pp. 330–423.

³With reference to CHRISTIAN HANNICK et al. (eds), *Das Taktikon des Nikon vom Schwarzen Berge. Griechischer Text und kirchenslavische Übersetzung des 14. Jahrhunderts, I* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae 62). Freiburg i. Br. 2014, pp. 50, 52, 58, 61, 63.

⁴As in *Taktikon des Nikon*, pp. 138, 154.

⁵Edited by ALEKSEY DMITRIEVSKY, *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках православного Востока, III.1. Τυπικά, II*. Petrograd 1917, p. 20.

Horologion (Book of Hours): while all of the Slavic sources are titled as ‘*Chasoslovets* containing the service of the night and the day according to the Typicon of our venerable and God-bearing father Sabbas’,⁶ the comparable Greek manuscripts do not bear this title, while the Greek Horologia that do refer to Mar Saba in their title are different from the Slavic Sabbaite ones.⁷ In any case, this so-called ‘neo-Sabbaite synthesis’ remains a topic requiring more research. Many of the relevant Greek sources have only been studied through the edition of ALEKSEY DMITRIEVSKY, whose classification needs to be reconsidered and possibly revised.⁸ In recent years, one has been studying translations of the Mar Saba Typicon into languages of the Byzantine periphery – Arabic, Georgian, and Slavonic⁹ – but much remains to be done on this front. Notably, other than the Syriac codex Sin. syr. 136, none of these sources are considered by PARENTI in the *Storia regionale*, though perhaps he will draw on them in the promised second volume.

More importantly, however, the entire paradigm of a transition from the Studite to the Sabbaite Typicon depends too much on the work of Russian scholars of the late nineteenth century who approached the history of the Byzantine Rite through the prism of the Slavic – specifically, East Slavic – experience, where a clear transition from the Typicon of Patriarch Alexis the Studite to the Sabbaite Typicon, implemented under Metropoli-

⁶ALEKSANDR ANDREEV, The Slavonic Sabbaite Horologion: A Preliminary Review of the Sources. *Археографски прилози* 44 (2022) pp. 11–45, at p. 16.

⁷For the Greek sources, see STIG SIMEON R. FRØYSHOV, The Palestino-Byzantine Horologion: A First Attempt at Historical Overview and Typology. In: STEPHANOS ALEXOPOULOS et al. (eds), *Byzantine Liturgical Books: An Introduction* (Catalog of Byzantine Manuscripts in Their Liturgical Context. Subsidia 2). Turnhout 2024, pp. 223–269, at p. 267.

⁸DMITRIEVSKY, Описание литургических рукописей, III.1. The author hoped to publish Vol. III.2, but it was never printed. PARENTI cites an important recent work by DIEGO FITTIPALDI, *Die Konstantinopler Rezension des Typikons des Sabas-Klosters bei Jerusalem eingeleitet und herausgegeben nach den griechischen Handschriften Vimarionensis Q 740, Hierosolymitani S. Sabae 628 und S. Crucis 106*. Ph.D. thesis. Universität zu Köln 2021.

⁹E.g., MARTIN LÜSTRAETEN, *Die handschriftlichen arabischen Übersetzungen des byzantinischen Typikons* (Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 31). Münster 2017; EKVTIME KOCHLAMAZASHVILI – ELGUJA GIUNASHVILI (eds), *ტიპიკონი შიომღვიმის მონასტრისა. XIII საუკუნის ხელნაწერის ტექსტი* [Typicon of the Šiomgvime Monastery. Text of a 13th Century Manuscript]. Tbilisi 2005 (see also the review by TINATIN CHRONZ in *Oriens Christianus* 95 (2011) pp. 296–300; ALEKSEY PENTKOVSKY, *Иерусалимский устав и его славянские переводы в XIV столетии*. In: *Преводите през XIV столетие на Балканите*. Sofia 2004, pp. 153–171.

tan Cyprian of Kyiv, took place.¹⁰ In the diversity that was Byzantine monastic liturgy in the eleventh-fourteenth centuries, to what extent is this paradigm valid? And to what extent did it have significant impacts and consequences for daily life? PARENTI (pp. 291–292), citing the monograph of Metropolitan JOB (GETCHA),¹¹ offers the example of more strict practices of fasting legislated in Medieval Rus as a result of the transition to the Sabbaite Typicon, but this example is not convincing: Slavic debates about the practice of fasting had already occurred earlier in the twelfth century, when more strict Byzantine fasting rules were introduced in Medieval Rus in place of the laxer discipline of the Typicon of Patriarch Alexis.¹² The introduction of a Sabbaite All-night Vigil, especially in parish churches, must have had a profound impact on liturgical and practical life, but this remains to be assessed.

PARENTI's stated goal in writing the *Storia regionale* was to 'identify the data considered certain today, discuss what is doubtful and leave open the questions to which it is not yet possible to give a sensible answer' (p. 44). In this, he has been quite successful, insofar as his well-referenced volume reveals a masterful knowledge of the relevant liturgical and non-liturgical sources and a command of the relevant literature both in Byzantine historical liturgy and in related disciplines. Perhaps one *desideratum* remains: the reader may have expected greater engagement with sources in the languages of the Byzantine periphery. Besides the East Slavic example of the transition to the Mar Saba Typicon, PARENTI discusses the Slavic Typicon of Patriarch Alexis the Studite (pp. 202–205), the Georgian Typicon of George Mtatsmindeli (pp. 206–207), the above-mentioned 'neo-Sabbaite' Sin. syr. 136 (p. 281),¹³ and, of course, the all-important Georgian Old Iadgari (pp. 227–228 and throughout). A few other sources are mentioned

¹⁰First formulated by Archimandrite SERGY (SPASSKY), Полный месяцеслов Востока, I. Восточная агиология. Moscow 1875, pp. 120–123, subsequently picked up by IVAN MANSVETOV, Церковный устав (Типик), его образование и судьба в греческой и русской церкви. Moscow 1885, pp. 75–78.

¹¹JOB GETCHA, La réforme liturgique du métropolite Cyprien de Kiev. L'introduction du typikon sabaïte dans l'office divin (Patrimoines. Orthodoxie). Paris 2010, pp. 373–374.

¹²ANDREY VINOGRADOV – MICHAEL ZHELTOV, «Первая ересь на Руси»: русские споры 1160-х годов об отмене поста в праздничные дни. Древняя Русь: вопросы медиевистики 73 (2018) pp. 118–139.

¹³PARENTI cites, respectively, ALEKSEY PENTKOVSKY, Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита в Византии и на Руси. Moscow 2001; KORNILY KEKELIDZE, Литургические грузинские памятники в отечественных книгохранилищах. Tiflis 1908, pp. 228–313; ALEKSEY PENTKOVSKY, Иерусалимский устав в Константинополе в Палеологовский период. Журнал Московской патриархии 5 (2003) pp. 77–87, at p. 78.

in passing. Perhaps more attention will be paid to the peripheral material in the promised second volume, which will treat the history of the Byzantine Rite in the ‘Middle East, the Balkans, South Italy, and the Mediterranean islands’ (p. 27). Of course, systematic study of many of these sources yet remains to be undertaken, making their incorporation into a synthetic volume such as this one quite difficult.

Still, what we know so far shows the importance of such peripheral sources for the history of worship in Constantinople because they were translated there or are at least based on no-longer-extant Greek protographs originating in the capital. I will offer just a few examples from Slavic studies. For the daily office, the Slavic *Chasovnik* probably reflects a late-ninth or early-tenth-century Bulgarian translation of a Constantinopolitan palatine Horologion,¹⁴ while the Slavic *Chasoslovets* has curious parallels with the Euchologion Coislin 213 and probably reflects the worship of the Monastery of Patriarch Alexis or some other ‘Studite’ establishment in the late eleventh century.¹⁵ The so-called Liturgical Compendium of Ravula (Sin. slav. 2) testifies to a now-lost Horologion of Evergetis, translated under St Sava of Serbia together with the Typicon of that monastery.¹⁶ Even the obscure term *πρωθύπνια*, which PARENTI finds in the fifth-century *Vita sancti Hypatii* (BHG 760) as a term for a prayer office between Vespers and Midnight, appears as the name of just such an office in a Novgorodian Horologion manuscript from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century that probably reflects ninth-century Constantinopolitan monastic cell prayer.¹⁷ Sources from the Melkite periphery have been investigated to a lesser extent, but STIG FRØYSHOV has proposed that a set of Horologia in Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic, all dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, reflect the ‘central’ Horologion of Constantinople.¹⁸

Similar observations can be made outside of the realm of the daily office, re-

¹⁴ALEKSANDR ANDREEV – TATIANA AFANASYEVA, К истории древнеболгарского часослова. *Scripta & eScripta* 23 (2023) pp. 105–133.

¹⁵ALEKSANDR ANDREEV – TATIANA AFANASYEVA, Цикл молитв Василия Великого в составе древнерусских часословов XIII–XIV вв. *Древняя Русь: Вопросы медиевистики* 96.2 (2024) pp. 143–156.

¹⁶As shown in a presentation that I gave at the Eastern Christian Daily Office Research Group meeting at the University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu, on 21 March 2025.

¹⁷ALEKSANDR ANDREEV, Byzantine Night Prayer in a Late Novgorodian Source: The Case of St. Petersburg, RNB, Sof. 1129. *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 67.1–2 (2023) pp. 95–113.

¹⁸FRØYSHOV, *Palestino-Byzantine Horologion*, p. 256.

garding, for example, the prayers of the Euchologion. The East Slavic version of the Euchologion of the Great Church, translated under Metropolitan Cyprian at the end of the fourteenth century, probably reflects a no-longer-extant Greek Euchologion of the Great Church from the 1380s, compiled during or shortly after the tenure of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos.¹⁹ Elements of an earlier patriarchal Euchologion can also be found in the so-called Trebnik of Stefan Dušan, translated in the 1340s or 1350s.²⁰ The same probably applies to Slavic hymnographical collections and notated musical books, though research is still necessary here to identify the Slavic redactions and connect them with Greek originals. Of course, these observations are explained by the well-known phenomenon that while liturgy develops in the center – in the case of the Byzantine Rite, Constantinople – its sources tend to survive on the periphery, especially among foreign-language communities that translate and adapt the central liturgy to their needs. The liturgical historian's task is made more difficult, however, by the fact that liturgical translations carried out for these peripheral communities typically do not replace each other, but continue to coexist, often within a single source, where they may also be supplemented by examples of local liturgical creativity.²¹ It will be interesting to see how PARENTI deals with this problem in the promised second volume of his book.

In reviewing the *Storia regionale*, one cannot overlook PARENTI's polemic with STIG FRØYSHOV. In 2020, FRØYSHOV proposed a 'new narrative' for the history of the Byzantine Rite, specifically challenging the idea of the 'Studite synthesis'.²² He pointed out that, first of all, the Palestinian liturgy that was practiced at the Studion and elsewhere in Constantinople – which FRØYSHOV calls 'Hagiopolite'²³ – was not necessarily monastic, but orig-

¹⁹TATIANA AFANASYEVA et al., Евхологий Великой церкви в славяно-русском переводе конца XIV века. Moscow – St. Petersburg 2019, pp. 36–37.

²⁰TATIANA AFANASYEVA, «Требник Стефана Душана», его состав и место в славянской традиции требника. Древняя Русь: Вопросы медиевистики 81.3 (2020) pp. 127–142.

²¹A good example of this is the recently-edited thirteenth-century Horologion Yaroslavl Museum-Reserve 15481, which contains texts from four different translations of the Horologion, as well as prayers translated from Latin and prayers originally composed in Slavonic: ALEKSANDR ANDREEV – TATIANA AFANASYEVA – ALEXANDRA SOBOLEVA, Ярославский часослов второй половины XIII века. Исследование и издание текста. Moscow – St. Petersburg 2024.

²²STIG S. R. FRØYSHOV, The Early History of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople: New Perspectives on the Formative Period of the Byzantine Rite. Dumbarton Oaks Papers 74 (2020) pp. 351–382.

²³Ibid., p. 352, FRØYSHOV termed the rite 'Hagiopolitan', but subsequently adopts the

inated in the Anastasis cathedral of Jerusalem (the Holy Sepulcher). Furthermore, Palestinian genres of hymnography (canons and stichera) were known in Constantinople before the arrival of St Theodore at the Studion: FRØYSHOV offers the examples of hymns composed by Germanus of Constantinople (d. 742) and Andrew of Crete (d. 740) as early as the beginning of the eighth century. Moreover, FRØYSHOV's work on the Horologion revealed that the book used for the daily office in Jerusalem was reorganized in the seventh century, with a daily *cursus* augmented to 24 services and the beginning of the *cursus* set to the first hour of the day rather than Nocturns, but the Horologion manuscripts that testify to the Studite practice or Constantinopolitan usage more broadly reflect the Jerusalem Horologion from before this reform. Finally, FRØYSHOV pointed out that many of the hymnographers of the eighth to tenth centuries were affiliated with the palace or the patriarchate, rather than with monastic communities, and that it was the Hagiopolite rite rather than the rite of the Great Church that was adopted in Bulgaria in the late ninth century and then spread elsewhere in the Slavic lands as part of Byzantine missionary efforts.²⁴ If FRØYSHOV's observations are correct, they would mean that the Hagiopolite daily office was received in Constantinople from Jerusalem as early as the seventh century. It was disseminated much more broadly than just in the Studion and its affiliated monasteries, because in the ninth century it was this Hagiopolite rite, rather than the Ecclesiastic rite of Hagia Sophia, that was used for missionary purposes.

In a response to FRØYSHOV, PARENTI argued that 'the method employed together with a diffuse lack of attention to the relevant scholarly literature make [Frøyshov's] conclusions highly questionable'.²⁵ He went on to defend two seemingly contradictory positions. On the one hand, FRØYSHOV's 'new narrative' was not new but had already been articulated by various scholars between 1992 and 2020, including by PARENTI himself.²⁶ On the other hand, the liturgical sources do not support FRØYSHOV's interpretation. PARENTI set forth key objections: manuscript attributions of hymns

term 'Hagiopolite', which I use here as well. Cf. IDEM, *Palestino-Byzantine Horologion*, p. 232, note 55.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 355–356.

²⁵STEFANO PARENTI, *The Beginning of the Hagiopolite Liturgy in Constantinople: New Narrative or Historical Novel? About an Article by Stig R. Frøyshov*. *Medioevo Greco* 22 (2022) pp. 399–427, at p. 400.

²⁶E.g., IDEM, *The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople: Evolution of a Local Tradition*. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 77 (2011) pp. 449–469.

are too unreliable and too prone to problems of homonymy and pseudepigraphy to support the thesis that *heirmoi* by Germanus were in use in Constantinople in the pre-Iconoclastic era; the Horologion sources claimed by FRØYSHOV to be Constantinopolitan are, in fact, not from the capital and, anyway, the beginning of the daily *cursus* with the first hour rather than with Nocturns / Matins is not a sufficient criterion for localization; and in the case of Bulgarian missionary liturgy, one finds ‘vestiges of the [Ecclesiastic] rite in the Old-Russian books’²⁷ and other Ecclesiastic features in Slavic sources.

PARENTI’s 2022 article cannot be considered the final word in this dispute – indeed, PARENTI himself admits as much, writing that his response focuses only on ‘points that may be of interest to Byzantinists, referring to a future publication for other more strict liturgical observation’.²⁸ Presumably, this ‘future publication’ is the *Storia regionale*, and so the reader expects from it a more in-depth critique of FRØYSHOV’s position. Alas, one cannot say that we are completely satisfied in this. At the beginning, Parenti repeats his earlier criticism of FRØYSHOV’s 2020 article, stating that ‘the rereading that [FRØYSHOV] attempted of the arrival of the Jerusalem rite in Constantinople is marred by a certain number of bibliographical omissions... and, compared to Taft’s *Short History*,... does not offer any significant novelties that have not already been reported by other scholars’ (p. 43). Throughout the book, PARENTI repeats many of the claims already advanced in the 2022 article. Thus, he points out the usage of the term ‘kathisma’ in the *Miracula Artemii* composed between 658 and 668 as an example of Palestinian hymnography known in Constantinople prior to the time of Theodore the Studite (pp. 232–233).²⁹ According to the *Miracula*, the ‘kathisma’ is sung at the beginning of the Ecclesiastic *Pannychis*, and this leads PARENTI to conclude that while ‘in the mid-seventh century, Hagiopolite hymnographic collections were in circulation in Constantinople and used in the worship of the secular churches, [o]bviously this does not mean the adoption of the Hagiopolite rite in its entirety’ (p. 233). PARENTI briefly touches on the subject of the hymnography attributed to Germanus and Andrew. On Germanus of Constantinople, he repeats his earlier objections that manuscript attributions are unreliable and marred by problems of homonymy (p. 234).³⁰ Concerning the canons ascribed to Andrew of

²⁷IDEM, Beginning of the Hagiopolite Liturgy in Constantinople, p. 411.

²⁸Ibid., p. 400.

²⁹Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 413–414.

³⁰Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 403–404.

Crete, PARENTI simply states that they ‘could date back to the time of his stay in Jerusalem’ before coming to the capital (p. 234). Yet this is far from a settled matter. SERGEY PRAVDOLYUBOV, relying, admittedly, on the late *Vita of Andrew* by Macarius Macres (BHG 114), suggests the opposite, namely, that the majority of canons were composed on Crete toward the end of Andrew’s life.³¹ Hagiography, of course, can be an unreliable source, but one important piece of evidence seems to have been ignored by PARENTI: the presence of Ode 2 in canons attributed to Andrew and Germanus, as well as to Theodore the Studite, which is an archaic feature found in the Old Iadgari that continues in Constantinople, while the canons of John and Cosmas composed in Jerusalem already lack Ode 2. In fact, the second ode was interpolated into some canons by John and Cosmas in later Palestinian sources – a feature of Byzantinization.³² That the presence of Ode 2 is an early Constantinopolitan feature is confirmed by the fact that we find such interpolated second odes in the Slavic Heirmologion, as well as in Slavic manuscripts that have original Bulgarian hymnography and so can be tied to Bulgarian translations from the late ninth or early tenth century.³³ Canons with Ode 2 are also found in the eleventh-century Novgorodian Putyata’s Menaion,³⁴ but are not mentioned by the Typicon of Patriarch Alexis the Studite or found in any of the Slavic sources associated with Studite practice.

In his *Storia regionale*, PARENTI goes on (p. 237) to completely dismiss the problem of canons composed by Andrew and Germanus, proposing that the existence of canons in Constantinople does not necessarily imply the celebration of Matins according to the Hagiopolite rite: after all, the Dresden *Praxapostolos* prescribes a canon at the *Pannychis* on the eve of the first Saturday of Lent (ὁ κανὼν τοῦ ἁγίου) and the canon Κύματι θαλάσσης on

³¹SERGEY PRAVDOLYUBOV, Великий канон Андрея Критского: История, поэтика, богословие. Ph.D. thesis. Sergiev Posad 1987, pp. 54–55.

³²STIG S. R. FRØYSHOV – ALEKSANDRA NIKIFOROVA – NATALIA SMELOVA, Byzantine Influence before Byzantinisation: The Tropologion Sinai Greek NE МГ 56+5 Compared with the Georgian and Syriac Melkite Versions. *Religions* 14/11 (2023) 1363, section 5.

³³ROMAN KRIVKO, Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели. Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета. Серия 3: Филология 1/11 (2008) pp. 56–102.

³⁴St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Sof. 202, f. 70r; see also the edition by VIKTOR BARANOV – VITALY MARKOV, Новгородская служебная минея на май (Путятина минея). XI век: Текст, исследования, указатели. Izhevsk 2003.

the eve of Great Saturday.³⁵ Actually, canons at the *Pannychis* is a Hagiopolite feature. We find the canon as part of *Pannychis* – the service that FRØYSHOV terms ‘Shortened Hagiopolite *Pannychis*’³⁶ – according to the Evergetis Typicon composed in the 1050s or 1060s,³⁷ and according to the Studite Horologion presumably translated in the 1060s or 1070s together with the Typicon of Patriarch Alexis, as reflected in the thirteenth-century *Chasoslovets* St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Q.п.I.57 (f. 131v).³⁸ In both sources, this is not, of course, the primary place of the canon, but rather a place for chanting additional canons that did not ‘fit’ in Matins or canons of a penitential or intercessory theme – as is still the case for Compline in the Byzantine Rite today.

Other aspects of PARENTI’s critique also await fuller development. This is the case with the discussion of the Horologion imported to Constantinople from Jerusalem. FRØYSHOV has shown – admittedly, in a paper that came out after both PARENTI’s response and the *Storia regionale*³⁹ – that the Horologia of Jerusalem and Mar Saba of the seventh–ninth centuries had a particular 24-hour structure that is not reflected in the Constantinopolitan manuscript sources. This strengthens the arguments for backdating the appearance of the Hagiopolite rite and its Horologion in Constantinople to the seventh century or even earlier, although questions still remain about exactly when and why a reform of the Horologion was carried out in Jerusalem. The question of the Bulgarian mission is not addressed in the first volume of the *Storia regionale* either. On this matter we can say for certain that the earliest daily office translated into Slavonic – both in the presumably monastic version of the Glagolitic Psalter Sin. slav. 38 + Sin. slav. 2/N and a fragment discovered by Nina Glibetić⁴⁰ (which may

³⁵KONSTANTIN AKENT’YEV, Типикон Великой Церкви Cod. Dresde A 104. Реконструкция текста по материалам архива А. А. Дмитриевского (Subsidia Byzantinorossica 5). St. Petersburg 2009, pp. 70, 88 (not pp. 68, 86, as cited by PARENTI).

³⁶FRØYSHOV, Palestino-Byzantine Horologion, p. 249.

³⁷ROBERT JORDAN (ed.), The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis. March–August. The Movable Cycle (Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations 6.6). Belfast 2005, pp. 692, 706, 712.

³⁸See also ANDREEV – AFANASYEVA – SOBOLEVA, Ярославский часослов, pp. 107–108.

³⁹FRØYSHOV, Palestino-Byzantine Horologion, pp. 239–241. I am grateful to Prof. FRØYSHOV for permitting me to read a number of drafts of that paper.

⁴⁰PETRA FETKOVÁ et al. (eds), Psalterii Sinaitici pars nova (monasterii s. Catharinae codex slav. 2/N) (Schriften der Balkan-Kommission, Philologische Abteilung 38). Vienna 1997, pp. 128–132; NINA GLIBETIĆ, A New Eleventh-Century Glagolitic Fragment from St. Catherine’s Monastery: The Midnight Prayer of Early Slavic Monks in the Sinai.

well have originally belonged to the same codex)⁴¹ and in the presumably cathedral version of the Cyrillic *Chasovnik*⁴² – was clearly Hagiopolite. The ‘vestiges of the [Ecclesiastic] rite’ that PARENTI identifies in Slavic books in his 2022 paper are just that. Some of the Slavic Psalters have Ecclesiastic hypopsalmata, but ‘none of the manuscripts has anything like a complete set of refrains and those which most frequently include them... place them apparently at random in the midst of various other elements’.⁴³ The typicon manuscript Moscow, State Historical Museum, Khlud. 16-д + St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Pogod. 48 is not an Ecclesiastic rite document but ‘a cathedral version of the Studite Typicon’⁴⁴ – that is, the Typicon of Patriarch Alexis the Studite. So far we have seen no evidence that the Slavs received the Ecclesiastic rite from Constantinople, but perhaps this question, too, as well as the putative reform of the Horologion in Jerusalem, will receive further development in the promised second volume of the *Storia regionale*. In the first volume, PARENTI – as we have seen above – follows TAFT’s *Short History* both in dating the appearance of the Hagiopolite rite in Constantinople with the establishment of St Theodore’s monks at the Studion and in calling this rite ‘Studite’ (p. 256) and ‘monastic’ (p. 271), though he sometimes also uses the term ‘hagiopolite’ (p. 257).

TAFT’s *Short History* had two key strengths: it was short and it presented a historical narrative tied to important dates in the social and political history of Byzantium. This made the text particularly useful for teaching undergraduates or seminarians or as an introduction to the field for non-specialists in Byzantine liturgical history. PARENTI’s *Storia regionale* does not fundamentally challenge TAFT’s historical paradigm, but does add to it considerable detail and nuance. It thus functions not as a substitute for the *Short History*, but as a complement to it and would serve well as a text for graduate students or advanced undergraduates or as a handbook for specialists in the growing field of Byzantine historical liturgy. Its engagement with

Археографски прилози 37 (2015) pp. 11–48.

⁴¹As observed by GEORGI PARPULOV, Psalters. In: Byzantine Liturgical Books: An Introduction, pp. 193–199, at p. 194, note 12.

⁴²ANDREEV – AFANASYEVA, К истории древнеболгарского часослова.

⁴³CATHERINE MARY MACROBERT, The Classificatory Importance of Headings and Liturgical Directions in Church Slavonic Psalters of the 11th–15th Centuries. *Byzantinoslavica* 57 (1996) pp. 156–181, at p. 168.

⁴⁴ELENA UKHANOVA, Кафедральное богослужение Русской церкви XIII–XIV вв. Ученые записки Российского православного университета ап. Иоанна Богослова 5 (2000) pp. 32–42, at p. 37.

the sources and literature make it an essential starting point for any further research. For all this, we must be grateful to the author, while eagerly awaiting his promised second volume.

Keywords

Byzantine Rite; historical liturgy; daily office; hymnography