

GEORGIOS ANDREOU, *Il Praxapostolos bizantino: Edizione del codice Mosca GIM Vlad. 21 (Savva 4) (Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 46)*. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag 2023. 596 pp. – ISBN 978-3-402-11075-1

• GEORGI PARPULOV, Hellenic College Holy Cross  
(gparpulov@hchc.edu)

By the ninth century (Diktyon 73403 is an early example), some Greek scribes had started breaking up the Acts and Letters of the Apostles into ‘lections’ (ἀναγνώσματα) and copying these in the order in which church-goers would hear them read aloud over the year. Manuscripts put together in this manner are of double interest: first, as witnesses to the text of the New Testament; second, as evidence for certain rites and observances of the Byzantine Church. The former aspect was recently studied by GIBSON;<sup>1</sup> ANDREOU now deals with the latter one.<sup>2</sup> He delivers a lot more than promised in his title by publishing not one but thirteen separate codices. All are of the lengthier type called *l<sup>a</sup>e*, with readings for the whole week instead of just for Saturdays and Sundays (*l<sup>a</sup>esk*). The *Mosquensis* (Diktyon 43629) was probably given priority because in 2007 ANDREOU could study it hands-on at the ‘prestigioso Museo Storico di Mosca’ (p. 31), while most of the others he only saw on microfilm (pp. 140–156). When they differ from the *Leithandschrift* (as they often do), these supplementary witnesses are recorded on the side.<sup>3</sup> One of them (Diktyon 1785) refers to Constantinople as ‘this reigning city’ (ταύτη ἡ βασιλεύουσα πόλις) (p. 266) and must have been produced there. Two (Diktyon 65044 and Diktyon 68698), on the other hand, were copied in Southern Italy, for people who most probably had never set foot in the Byzantine capital.<sup>4</sup>

1. SAMUEL GIBSON, *The Apostolos: The Acts and Epistles in Byzantine Liturgical Manuscripts* (Texts and Studies III.18). Piscataway 2018.

2. Strangely enough, without once referring to GIBSON’s work.

3. ANDREOU fails to note that ALEKSEI DMITRIEVSKII already published excerpts from two of them, (Diktyon 58661) and (Diktyon 22223), the latter of which he cited under its old shelfmark 252 (the new one is 86): *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках православного Востока*, I. Kyiv 1895, pp. 78–79, 98, 101, 129, 132, 137, 140, 149, 151, 153, 154–158.

4. It would be interesting to compare the manuscripts used by ANDREOU to Diktyon 17319, an eleventh-century (*sic*) Acts and Epistles lectionary of the *l<sup>a</sup>e* type copied at an (unnamed) convent in Antioch.

ANDREOU identifies the New Testament text just by chapter and verse but transcribes in full all titles and rubrics that explain, as it were, the circumstances of its oral delivery. For important feast days, e.g. the anniversary of the founding of Constantinople on 11 May (pp. 422–424), liturgical instructions of this sort are quite detailed and may include the psalm verses and short hymns which precede a reading from the Acts or Epistles, the names of the saints commemorated on a given date, and various special notes. The second Wednesday after Pentecost, for example (pp. 81, 190),<sup>5</sup> was

festival (σύναξις) of the Most Holy Mother of God in the Old Petra.<sup>6</sup> The procession goes out at about the ninth hour of the night. At first they chant: ‘Have mercy on us, O Lord, have mercy’, till [they reach] the Forum. After the Forum: ‘Most Holy Mother of God, bulwark (τειχος) of Christians’, till [they reach] the city wall at the Land Gate (τειχος τῆς Χερσαίου Πόρτας).<sup>7</sup> From then onward [they chant]: ‘Unconquerable bulwark (τειχος)’...

This brief sample offers a glimpse of the rich source material that ANDREOU has made available to scholars. Thanks to him, one can study worship in the context of both time (the church calendar) and space (urban topography). The information is so densely packed that one wonders what scribes themselves made of it. ‘Let the reader figure this out’ (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω), one of them added after the words ‘according to the rule of the Church’ (κατὰ τὸν τύπον τῆς ἐκκλησίας) (pp. 450–451). Which Church? What rule? By way of guidance, ANDREOU provides three very detailed indices of New Testament lections (pp. 529–537), hymns (pp. 539–544), and feast days (pp. 545–580). The third one lists a few obscure saints, such as ‘our holy father Macaris (Μάκαρις) the Confessor, who [suffered] under the impious [emperor] Leo’ (pp. 566, 465, 100).<sup>8</sup> Cases like him are referenced in the introduction, which explains that the festal calendar in all thirteen manuscripts is essentially that of the Patriarchate of Constantino-

5. See also DMITRIEVSKII, Описание, p. 151.

6. RAYMOND JANIN, Les sanctuaires du quartier de Pétra (Constantinople). Échos d’Orient 34 (1935) pp. 402–413 at pp. 412–413.

7. I found no mention of this gate in NESLIHAN ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER, Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel-Istanbul: Historisch-topographische und baugeschichtliche Untersuchungen (Millennium-Studien 18). Berlin 2007.

8. ANDREOU indexes him as Μάκαρι, which I think is the genitive rather than nominative form. The name is probably of Egyptian origin; cf. Apophthegmata Patrum (collectio systematica) XII.11: Ἡρώτησάν τινες τὸν ἄββᾶ Μάκαριν etc.

ple, that certain saints were added to it under the influence of the Studite Monastery, and that many are merely listed by name without a hint as to how they are to be commemorated<sup>9</sup> (pp. 70–102). There is also a detailed discussion of the custom of chanting three select psalm verses (ἀντίφωνα) at certain points during the Divine Liturgy (pp. 102–116).

Even without considering his additional commentary, it is no exaggeration to say that ANDREOU did a giant amount of work. Anyone who has tried to read the liturgical rubrics in a Greek biblical manuscript will know how hard it can be to decipher them. ANDREOU's misreadings are few in number: the most striking one is Σύναψις for Σύνοψις, which is unfortunately repeated several times (pp. 47, 145, 150, 162);<sup>10</sup> there is also ἐμφορουμένων for ἐμφερομένων (pp. 47, 162), ὡς αὐτός for ὡσαύτως (p. 363), προκείμενον οἶον εἰς τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν instead of προκείμενον οἶον ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν (ibid.), and ἐν τῷ κυκλῖν for εἰς τὸ κυκλῖν (pp. 85, 391). The author could have been more persistent in introducing modern punctuation (his editorial principles are explained on pp. 133–135): τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων Καλλινίκου, καὶ Θεοδότῃς (p. 456), for example, does not need a comma, while ἀπὸ ἑκτῆς τῆς ἑορτῆς (p. 404) by all means does: 'after [Ode] VI, [the *troparion*] of the feast day'.

These are just minor defects, and all in all the book is very useful. Liturgical historians will have it at hand as a primary source for the cathedral rite of Constantinople. Hagiologists will find in it information on many a saint's cult. Biblical scholars will value it as a guide to the rubrics in Greek New Testament manuscripts.

### Keywords

New Testament lectionaries; church calendar; Byzantine liturgy

9. ANDREOU calls this *atrofia calendaristica* (pp. 98–99).

10. The entire passage that starts with this word has been transcribed incompletely (italicised words are missing from ANDREOU's text on p. 162): Σύνοψις καὶ ὑποτύποις τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν ἐμφερομένων ποιοῦσα τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην Κυριακὴν τοῦ Πάσχα μέχρι τῆς Κυριακῆς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων... Τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ Κυριακῇ τοῦ Πάσχα· ἡ τριήμερος ἀνάστασις τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.