

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES

- Barbara Crostini*
9 Greek Astronomical Manuscripts:
New Perspectives from Swedish Collections
- Filippo Ronconi*
19 Manuscripts as Stratified Social Objects
- Anne Weddigen*
41 Cataloguing Scientific Miscellanies:
the Case of *Parisinus Graecus* 2494
- Alberto Bardi*
65 Persian Astronomy in the Greek Manuscript
Linköping kl. f. 10
- Dmitry Afinogenov*
89 Hellenistic Jewish texts in George the Monk:
Slavonic Testimonies
- Alexandra Fiotaki & Marika Lekakou*
99 The perfective non-past in Modern Greek: a
corpus study
- Yannis Smarnakis*
119 Thessaloniki during the Zealots' Revolt
(1342-1350): Power, Political Violence and
the Transformation of the Urban Space
- David Wills*
149 "The nobility of the sea and landscape":
John Craxton and Greece
- 175 Book Reviews

Daniel Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*. Oxford University Press, 2018, xvi + 438 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-881203-6.

A book dealing with the liturgical tradition of Jerusalem and Palestine like the one of Daniel Galadza's it's not an easy read. It is addressed to a knowledgeable audience. As a matter of fact, the whole study, originally produced as a doctoral thesis at the Pontifical Oriental Institute of Rome and defended in 2013, is an extraordinary feat. Not only does it deal with the Hagiopolite liturgical tradition but it also investigates the reasons why it was replaced by the so-called Byzantine or Constantinopolitan liturgical rite.

In his very comprehensive introduction, Galadza expands on the theoretical and historical context of his study. As he notes (p. 5) "the liturgical Byzantinization of the calendar and lectionary of Jerusalem is the focus of this book". Particular reference is made to the term "Byzantinization" in order to understand how two different liturgical traditions went from coexistence and interaction to the replacement of the former (that of Jerusalem) with that of Constantinople (pp. 4-11). After introducing the historiography on this matter and the fact that the old tradition is still being preserved in the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the author stands by the research method he followed, that of textual comparison of the different liturgical traditions. Moreover, he defines some of his research areas, like the Hagiopolite liturgical calendar and lectionary, without examining at all the role of the ecclesiastical architecture and archaeology.

The study consists of two parts. The first part deals with the "Liturgy of the Byzantine Jerusalem" (ch. 1) and "The Historical Contexts of Byzantinization" (ch. 2). The second part of the book focuses on the "Byzantinization" of the "Liturgy of St James" (ch. 3), the "Liturgical Calendar of Jerusalem" (ch. 4) and the "Lectionary of Jerusalem" (ch. 5). After an extensive and detailed analysis spanning almost 250 pages, the author concludes (pp. 350-357) that the Church of Jerusalem lost its authentic liturgical tradition in favour of the so called 'Byzantine rite', during the seventh and thirteenth centuries. This change could be due to the multiple sieges of Jerusalem and the whole Palestine that resulted in

the decrease of the Christian population in the area and the decline of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. We should also note the changes in sacred topography, the large numbers of pilgrims who exposed the local liturgical tradition to foreign influences, as well as the role of monks, who rewrote the cycle of feasts in the Hagiopolite Calendar during a lingering osmosis with the Constantinopolitan liturgical tradition.

Focusing his attention on the sources, such as the manuscripts of the Liturgy of St James, the Jerusalem's liturgical calendar as well as the lectionaries, Galadza notes that despite the Arab conquest in 638, Greek remained the main operational language, whilst Arabic, Georgian and Syrian were also used in the church services. In addition, he concludes that Byzantium did not try to impose its own Constantinopolitan liturgical tradition in Jerusalem and so the 'Byzantinization' of the Jerusalem Patriarchate was "not consciously or systematically imposed by Constantinople", but it "was a gradual and spontaneous reform".

Furthermore, Galadza provides two appendices: one containing a detailed catalogue of 36 Hagiopolite liturgical manuscripts used in his study (pp. 359-387), and a second one with annotated maps and plans (pp. 388-392). The book also contains a glossary (pp. 393-396), quite helpful for a specialised study like this, a bibliography (pp. 397-519) and three indexes (one of *Biblical References*, one of *Manuscript References* and a third *General* index). The indexes could provide a starting point for further research on this complex and specific study.

There's little to be said for such a focused research by an expert in the field of liturgic, such as D. Galadza. However, the author raises an interesting issue that may need further analysis, that of the reintroduction and partial use of the Hagiopolite liturgical tradition. Indeed, during the last decade, in many Orthodox Churches there is an ever-increasing tendency to carry out the so called "archaic" Liturgy of St James. This fashionable celebration has been 'interpreted' as liturgical renewal in the Orthodox Church and has been severely criticised. Commenting on the above, Galadza notes that: "the problem here is not the celebration of JAS [...] but the incomplete understanding of this liturgy, of how it is supposed to function within the current Byzantine rite and the ignorance of the calendar and lectionary directly connected to JAS" (pp. 18-19).

With regards to the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the author implicitly expresses his regret for the ‘Byzantinization’ of its ancient liturgical tradition, pointing out some failed attempts to return to its original form during the first half of the 20th century. While Galadza mainly ascribes the failure of these efforts to the Greek-centred character of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, he contrasts this with the calls to restore the ancient liturgical tradition within the Melkite Greek Catholic Community.

The fact that the liturgical tradition of Jerusalem was not active for centuries makes its restoration quite difficult, while the proposals for its partial reinstatement have been criticised *inter alia* as aiming to corrupt the liturgical life of the Orthodox Church. But that’s another story.

This is an excellent and neat publication by Oxford University Press. However, there are a couple of things that may have escaped the author’s attention. Many authors’ names are absent from the Bibliography even though they can be found as bibliographic references in the footnotes. There should be some logical explanation for all these absences but it is not provided anywhere.

Another point is the great number of oversights in the writing and accentuation of the Greek words and passages. This is quite surprising as the author deals mostly with Greek texts and he is expected to have a good knowledge of Greek. We note hereupon some words and phrases that need correction.

Σιῶν instead of Σιών (p. xiv); Τᾶ instead of τὰ (p. 1); ἱεράς instead of ἱεραῖς (p. 21); ἐκείνοις instead of ἐκείνοις (p. 23, n. 100); Ἱεράτικον instead of Ἱερατικόν (p. 25, n. 106); ἀνάγιον instead of ἀνώγιον (p. 36); θείων instead of θείων (p. 38, n. 57); χρησιτὸς instead of χρηστὸς (p. 42); Σηγησάτω instead of Σιγησάτω (p. 59); Φοκᾶ instead of Φωκᾶ (p. 87); δειχωνίας instead of διχονοίας (p. 98); συγγραφῆνται instead of συγγραφῆναι (p. 136); Ἱεροσωλυμίταις instead of Ἱεροσολυμίταις (p. 137); Σαρκὶ instead of Σαρκὶ (p. 142, n. 418); Διπτυχὰ instead of Δίπτυχα (p. 144, n. 436); χρημαρτίζουσαν instead of χρηματίζουσαν (p. 147, n. 454); Συγγραγικῶν instead of Συγγραφικῶν (p. 149, n. 469); Κυρπίων instead of Κυπρίων (p. 160, n. 23); ἡμῶν instead of ἡμῶν (p. 163); τῶν instead of τῶν (p. 170, n. 85); Ἱεροσόλυμον instead of Ἱεροσολύμων (p.

170, n. 85); Λειτουργία [...] Ἰακώβου instead of Λειτουργία [...] Ἰακώβου (p. 170, n. 85); ἡμῶν instead of ἡμῶν (p. 171); Ἀδελφότητος instead of Ἀδελφοθότητος (p. 199, n. 257); ἀωνείας instead of ἀγνεΐας (p. 204, n. 281); τοῦον instead of τοῦτον (p. 210); ἱστοριαν instead of ἱστορίαν (p. 216, n. 351); Λειτουργικῆς instead of Λειτουργικῆς (p. 235, n. 100); Ἑβδομά instead of Ἑβδομάς (p. 236, n. 104); Βαπτίστου instead of Βαπτιστοῦ (p. 251, n. 164); ποιητὰ instead of ποιητικὰ (p. 255, n. 183); Κωνσταντωνσταντινουπόλεως [...] δὲ instead of Κωνσταντινουπόλεως [...] δὲ (p. 268, n. 249); προσκύνησις instead of προσκύνησιν (p. 288); ζωοπιῶ instead of ζωοποιῶ (p. 288); πενήκοστα instead of πενήκοντα (p. 294); ἑξακοσίων instead of ἑξακοσίων (p. 294); εν instead of ἐν (p. 294); ὄγδοήκοντα instead of ὄγδοήκοντα (p. 294); Ὅμοιον instead of Ὅμοιον (p. 374); ὀρύς instead of ὄρους (p. 368); αγίας instead of ἀγίας (p. 374); ζωοπιῶν instead of ζωοποιῶν (p. 374); συγῶρη(σ)ον instead of συγγῶρη(σ)ον (p. 374); Κρυπτοφῆρρης and Κρυπτοφῆρρης (p. 377); Θεουραρίω instead of Φευρουαρίω (p. 383); Ἰωάννου instead of Ἰωάννου (p. 386)

Despite these remarks, D. Galadza's book on *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* is a very well-argued and well written study, skilfully weaved by the author. Undoubtedly, he deals with a large amount of literature and proves to handle very efficiently the subject in question. In addition, he provides English translations of many liturgical texts and hymns as well as a glimpse of Jerusalem's lost liturgical tradition. It is actually the first major attempt to study the history of Jerusalem's liturgy and its Byzantinization and by doing so the history of the Christian community of the Holy City and Palestine during the Middle Ages.

Dr Demetrios Agoritsas
University of Ioannina