Byzantine Prayer Books as Sources for Social History and Daily Life*

Abstract: This multi-authored article presents a new project to study Byzantine prayer books (euchologia) by a team of scholars at the Austrian Academy of Sciences. The long-term aim of the project is to create a census of all extant prayer book manuscripts for the use of priests in Greek up to the year 1650, in order to facilitate the study of the ‘occasional prayers’ as sources for daily life and social history. After an extended introduction to the history of scholarship and the methodological challenges encountered in the first three years of the project, the first two individual contributions highlight the importance of manuscript study in situ, by addressing issues of codicology and the history of manuscripts as evidenced in the liturgical commemorations they contain. The following three contributions demonstrate the value of the ‘small prayers’ as a largely untapped historical source through the study of prayers for changing religious affiliation, prayers for female purity in conjunction with childbirth, and prayers in the context of primary education.


METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS AND FIRST RESULTS

The search for the lived reality of the children, women and men of Byzantium, requires a closer look at sources that take us away from Constantinople and into the provinces, sources that do not perpetuate the perspective of a few well-to-do aristocrats in the orbit of the court, but reflect the everyday experience of the vast majority of the population. As Peregrine Horden observed: “...the notion that Byzantine society was articulated primarily in a ‘vertical’ direction is one of which we rid ourselves with difficulty. Evidence has after all adhered best to those who exercised authority. One traverses Byzantine society downwards from the top. ... The everyday religion of the laity remains comparably obscure; it can only be glimpsed indirectly through the media of sermon, icon and saint’s life.”

To these media should be added the Euchologia, prayer books, which are the focus of a new research project at Vienna. This article is intended as an introduction to the Vienna Euchologia-Project, its methods and aims, exemplified by a presentation of selected first results, with a special focus on research trips to Patmos, Grottaferrata and the Vatican. A general introduction by Claudia Rapp (Project Leader) is followed by individual thematic contributions by team members Giulia Rossetto, Daniel Galadza, Elisabeth Schiffer, Eirini Afentoulidou, and Ilias Nesseris.

* The project “Daily Life and Religion: Byzantine Prayer Books as Sources for Social History” is funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), Project Number P28219-G25. We are grateful for this support. This article presents new insights gained from on-site visits by the project team to the Holy Monastery of St. John the Theologian in Patmos in October 2016, and the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and the Badia Greca di Grottaferrata in March 2017. We are greatly indebted to the staff of these institutions for their many kindnesses. We also extend our thanks to the Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik for accommodating our publication, and to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions. The Diktyon numbers for each manuscript cited are given in parentheses or in a footnote at its first occurrence.

Prayer books (Euchologia, sg.: Euchologion) usually contain the eucharistic liturgies of John Chrysostom and/or of Basil the Great, as well as (in varying combinations) the liturgies for baptism, marriage, and burial, ordination to various ranks in the clergy, and often also monastic initiation rites for men and women. For this reason, the study of Euchologia has largely been the domain of theologians and liturgical historians with a focus on Christian rituals and their development over time and in different regions.²

In addition to the sacramental liturgies, the prayer books also contain a large number of prayers for a wide array of everyday situations. These prayers are the focus of our ongoing research. They address matters of concern to children, women, and men, most of whom lived in agricultural communities. They have the potential to offer a treasure trove of information on perceptions of and approaches to daily life and social history. If this material was previously unknown, underused or not fully appreciated, this is for a good reason: gathering the material requires extensive and painstaking work with original manuscripts that are often poorly cataloged and scattered across libraries in many locations.

Prayer books were made for the use of the clergy, specifically for use by liturgists, i.e. priests and bishops. As utilitarian objects, the manuscripts tend to be of small or medium size, so that the priest can hold the codex in his left hand as he performs the prayers and uses his right hand for liturgical gestures. Depending on the occasion, these liturgical books were used in different spatial contexts with varying degrees of sacrality. The liturgist used the Euchologion at the altar behind the iconostasis for the celebration of the eucharist; in the congregational space of the church for baptisms, weddings and other rituals; in the private home when he prayed for a woman after childbirth; and outdoors, at the seaside, when he blessed departing ships.

The only pictorial representation of an Euchologion in use is, to the best of our knowledge, the depiction in the Madrid Skylitzes manuscript of the 12th c. that shows the future emperor Basil I in the nave of a church with John, the son of the wealthy widow Danelis, while a priest performs the prayers for ritual brotherhood (adelphopoiesis) (BNE, ms. gr. Vitr. 26-2, [Diktyon 40403], f. 85r). In front of the priest, on a small book stand, lies an open Euchologion.

Euchologia manuscripts are neither pretty to look at nor valuable. Their most common embellishment, if any, consists of decorative bars and elaborate initials underlaid with red, blue, green or yellow color or, rarely, gold. These elements also serve the practical purpose of helping the liturgist to find his place on the page. More often than not, they are written in a well-practiced—but not ornate or scholarly—hand in rather large letters relative to the size of the folio. Legibility, not luxury was the main concern. A significant portion of manuscripts also include palimpsest folios, as re-used parchment was more readily available and less costly than the newly prepared skins of goat, sheep and calf. This is further elucidated in Giulia Rossetto’s contribution.

Euchologia manuscripts can display a specificity that calls for in-depth study. In some instances, colophons and other scribal notes as well as annotations by later users reveal the chronological and geographical coordinates of their production and use. Daniel Galadza’s contribution on liturgical commemorations illustrates this issue. Palaeographical study may further identify the script style of a manuscript as typical for a particular period or region, whether Southern Italy, Constantinople, or elsewhere.

The prayers for specific occasions occupy about half of the total folios of the Euchologia manuscripts, according to a rough estimate. The Byzantines had no single special word for these prayers. The designation that we have found to be most suitable is ‘occasional prayers’ (analogous to ‘occasional poetry,’ i.e. poetry composed for a particular occasion) or, in German, ‘Anlassgebete’. Another appropriate designation is ‘small prayers.’ Some manuscripts contain only the text of these prayers, while others specify in rubrics whether they are pronounced by a priest or by a deacon, at what moment the celebrants make the sign of the cross, and what liturgical objects—such as candles or censers—they should be using.

There is considerable variation in the content and sequence of the small prayers that may reveal the concerns of the communities in which they were first formulated or used. This may yield additional insights into the geographical or chronological origin of a manuscript. Some Euchologia show a focus on Constantinople and the imperial court, others are more concerned with fishing, pointing to communities by the seaside, yet others with animal husbandry, indicating an inland location. The occasional prayers also address concerns that may be particular to a historical period, for example those that express anxiety about interaction with heretics (including Western Crusaders) or conversion to Islam, a topic further elaborated by Elisabeth Schiffer. Often, the small prayers offer rare glimpses into social realities that are largely hidden from the view of other sources, such as a child’s first day at school, discussed by Ilias Nesseris, or the entire sequence of events associated with childbirth, as elucidated by Eirini Afentoulidou.

Neither the number of extant Euchologia manuscripts, nor the number of the occasional prayers they contain is currently known. It may be assumed that throughout the centuries, each priest, each church, each monastery had at least one, and usually several, prayer books in their possession. The earliest extant Euchologion in codex form is the ‘Barberini Euchologion’ in the Vatican Library, Barb. gr. 336 (Diktyon 64879), from the late eighth century, probably of South Italian origin. At the Council of Florence (1438–1439), Constantine XI Palaeologus estimated that there were about 2000 liturgies available for the use of Byzantine (Orthodox) Christians. The actual number of extant Euchologia manuscripts is unknown, partly also due to the lack of sufficiently detailed catalogs, but it may well be in the thousands. From the Byzantine period, at least 300 are preserved on Mount Athos alone and about 140 at St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai. Even after the introduction of printing, Euchologia manuscripts were copied by hand, which would have facilitated the customization of the content for the needs of a liturgist and his community.

It is even more taxing to estimate the total number of occasional prayers, since multiple versions of the same prayer text may address the same specific concern either scattered across different manuscripts or even within the same manuscript. Moreover, the same prayer text was sometimes used, with no or only slight adaptations, for a different concern that is declared in the prayer title. The contribution by Ilias Nesseris offers some valuable examples for the multiple use of prayer texts that can be associated with schooling. The full extent of this issue has only become clear to us in the course of our work over the past two years. It will take many more years of research on the Euchologia manuscripts to establish a representative sample of prayer texts and a representative list of prayer concerns as expressed in their titles.

---

3 The expressions we have so far encountered include εὐχαὶ διάφοραι εἰς πάντα ὄφελα (e.g. in Crypt. Γβ.XI [Diktyon 17903], f. 5r) or εὐχαὶ διάφοραι ἀναγκαῖαι (e.g. in Vat. gr. 2032 [Diktyon 68661], f. 197r).

4 The manuscript was edited by E. Velkovska and S. Parenti, originally in 1995. The most recent, updated edition is Velkovska – Parenti, Evkhologii Barberini.

Byzantine liturgical studies depend to a very large degree on manuscript work—a fate they share with Byzantine legal history. Both fields of research have much to contribute to the study of Byzantine social life and mentalité, and thus deserve greater attention among non-specialists. The reference edition of the Euchologion used for the study of the liturgy was published in Rome in 1873. Byzantinists tend to use the edition by the Dominican scholar Jacques Goar, which he compiled on the basis of manuscripts in Paris, Rome and Grottaferrata without, however, indicating the precise manuscript he consulted in each instance. Goar’s edition of the Euchologion, intended as a book for study, not for liturgical use, was printed in 1647 in Paris. The revised 1730 version printed in Venice is widely available in a 1960 reprint (and on Google books).6 The Russian scholar Aleksei Dmitrievskij undertook a similarly Herculean task when in 1901 he presented a catalog and partial transcription of Euchologia in chronological order, based on his manuscript studies in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Jerusalem, St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai, Patmos, Athos, Athens and Istanbul. In the second half of the 20th century, Miguel Arranz, André Jacob, Robert Taft, Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska have made significant contributions to the study of individual Euchologia manuscripts or certain rituals they contain, a tradition carried on by Robert Taft’s students at the Pontificio Istituto Orientale in Rome. In recent years, a lively international network of scholars, regular conferences and a number of ongoing research projects are all working together to advance scholarship in the field of liturgical studies.7

Social and cultural historians, in their turn, have sometimes resorted to individual prayers and rituals, mostly on the basis of Goar’s edition, to add spice and color to their studies of topics such as adoption, primary education, and dietary habits, to name but a few.8 For example, Euchologia take center stage in a number of recent studies on the ritual of adelphopoiesis (ritual brotherhood).9

THE VIENNA EUCHOLOGIA PROJECT

Founded in October 2015, the Vienna Euchologia Project, located at the Division of Byzantine Research (Institute for Medieval Research) of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, is a collaboration of scholars of Byzantine manuscripts, liturgy, philology, and social history. The aim is to unlock the potential of Euchologia as sources for daily life and social history.10 Studies on individual topics are designed to demonstrate the richness of this under-used source material. Current topics include historical events and conversion, women’s purity, education, pious lay associations, palimpsest Euchologia and the history of liturgical commemorations.

6 Goar only rarely identifies his manuscript sources, leaving this task to scholarly detective work. See, for example, STRITTMATTER, Barberinum S. Marci, and PARENTE – VELKOVSKA, Grottaferrata Γ.β. I.
10 The project was presented at a session of the Oxford Patristic Congress in August 2015, and at the International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Belgrade, August 2016.
In order to lay the groundwork for their historical and social analysis, the project members are collaborating in the creation of an online database. The timeframe extends from the late 8th c.—beginning with the earliest extant liturgical manuscript, Vat., Barb. gr. 336—to 1650, about the time when Goar created the first printed edition. Once it is fully operative, the database will allow searches for the content and concern of the prayers in manuscripts, prayer titles and prayer texts, by century and by region of origin (or later use). Particularly valuable in this initial phase are manuscripts of known date and provenance that can be firmly anchored in time and place as they can help to establish a matrix onto which other Euchologia can later be grafted, based on the content and perhaps also the sequence of their prayers.

Our first destinations for on-site study were libraries where manuscripts have remained in the same place since the Middle Ages. This decision was based on the assumption that the content of the occasional prayers varies according to local need. In October 2016, we spent a week in the library of the Holy Monastery of St. John the Theologian on the island of Patmos. The monastery was founded in 1088. Its library holdings, which are recorded in multiple lists from the 12th century onwards, now include about 1000 Greek manuscripts, in addition to important archival holdings and printed volumes. In March 2017, we worked for a week in the library of the Monumento Nazionale della Badia Grecia di Grottaferrata. The monastery was founded in 1004, and today holds about 1200 manuscripts. Several days in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana gave us a first impression of the extensive material there, especially of South Italian provenance, that awaits further study.

In the following, I will present a number of important results from our first 18 months in the project. It is in the nature of collaborative work that individual contributions are no longer discernible in the end result, so it is important to note that the material presented here has benefited from the contributions of all members of the team. Some of the following remarks will not come as a big surprise to anyone who has looked at this manuscript material, but by way of introduction into the challenges and potential methodological pitfalls of the study of Euchologia, it may be helpful to present them in a combined and coherent fashion.

**Identification of Euchologia**

Not all manuscripts have a title, and there is great variety in phrasing even when they do. In Patm. 689 (*Diktyon* 54928), f. 9r, for example, the title “Euchologion” is followed by prayers for the monastic hours. In our data collection, we therefore make a distinction between ‘ms. Euchologion’ and ‘catalog Euchologion’, the former identified as such in the manuscript itself, the latter only by the printed catalog. We began filling our database with manuscripts based on printed catalogs of manuscript collections and libraries. This posed a first challenge, as catalogs differ in the amount of detail they offer, and most catalogers from past generations (usually trained in the tradition of classical philology) did not have the know-how or the inclination to invest time and effort in the identification of liturgical material. We decided early on in the project to err on the side of caution and to include in our preliminary list of manuscripts for future consultation all those that are labeled ‘liturgical.’ After consultation in situ, that label may be revised. Our collection of information for the database does

---

11 The database is tailored to the requirements of the current project, but is flexible enough to accommodate future developments in scholarship. It is structured in such a way that information can be added by other scholars and can even be fed in through other projects. These future additions may take several forms: expansion of content (details about the eucharistic and other liturgies in the manuscripts, which are currently excluded), extension of the chronological range of the manuscripts of Greek Euchologia beyond 1650, additions of prayer books that follow the Byzantine rite but are written in languages other than Greek (e.g. Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, and the Slavonic languages), or other liturgical or linguistic information.
not include prayers that belong outside the Euchologion context, such as invocations in the margins or on fly leaves, or prayers and curses in colophons.\footnote{12}

The manuscripts display great variation in the presentation of these prayers. Prayers are usually introduced by a title (εὐχὴ εἰς or, in the case of a second prayer for the same purpose, εὐχὴ ἑτέρα or εὐχὴ ἄλλη), often in a different script or ink color, but usually not on a new line. Sometimes they are accompanied by liturgical instructions, for example for the chanting of psalms, or the use of candles. Sometimes the prayers are embedded in a larger liturgical context, which may carry the title of ἄκολουθία, or τάξις, or τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία. The occasional prayers usually appear as a cluster, in the second half of an Euchologion manuscript. Investigating the context in which a prayer is mentioned can point towards its interpretation and use at the time of copying, although it is often difficult to discern a pattern in the sequence of prayers in a manuscript. It may also happen that a second prayer for a purpose that has already been addressed appears several folios later. Sometimes, a number of occasional prayers are added to manuscripts that are not Euchologia, often on fly leaves at the end of a codex.\footnote{13}

Up to three steps (each with its own data sheet) are involved in the study of a manuscript: 1. a brief codicological description of the entire object on the basis of a checklist; 2. a detailed list containing folio numbers, title/incipit/explicit or significant words, keywords in English denoting the content or concern of the prayer, and an indication of the relation of each prayer to previous printed editions,\footnote{14} and 3. transcriptions. We only transcribe prayers that are not previously attested in print or that are not found in our files.

**Identification of Prayer Content and Concern**

Identifying the content and concern of a prayer is crucial for its interpretation in the context of social and cultural history. In the database that is being built as part of the project, it will eventually be possible to search for a wide range of concerns from headaches and childbirth to fishing and winemaking. Consistency in terminology is essential for the searchability of a database. However, there is no standard nomenclature or classification of prayers in the Greek tradition. We therefore take the title of a prayer as our guide in identifying its concern.

This is particularly appropriate as prayers were often adapted to different purposes, so that the same prayer text may have a different meaning and application at different times and in different contexts. A fine example is the prayer for the first steps of a group of children (the plural is used), discussed by Gabriel Radle. The earliest attestation of this prayer is in Sin. gr. NF/MG 53 (Diktyon 61091), a manuscript only slightly younger than the Barberini Euchologion (Vat., Barb. gr. 336). Later manuscripts from the Greek-speaking regions of Southern Italy use the same prayer but under different titles: the first haircut of a child, name-giving on the eighth day or a child’s first day at school. Even within the same manuscript, the interpretation of the prayer changes over time: an Arabic annotation to the Sinai manuscript in a later hand attests not only to the continued use of this manuscript among people for whom Arabic came more easily than Greek, but also a different social

\footnote{12} Such short texts would yield rich material for the linguistic and stylistic study of prayer texts. We note their existence during our on-site visits, but do not include them in the part of the database that is intended for public access.

\footnote{13} These are included in our study.

\footnote{14} To facilitate our work, we have created searchable digital texts of Goar, Arranz, L’evangelio costantinopolitano and Velkovska – Parenti, Evchologij Barberini that serve as our basis for comparison and transcription. Dmitrievskij, Opisanie II will soon be added. There are separate categories for ‘slight differences’, ‘noticeable differences’ and ‘significant differences’. The last column notes if a transcription is made in the third document.
context: ‘Prayer said for the boy after he (has started to) walk, who (may be of any age from) seven years to the very young.’\(^{15}\)

**REGIONAL SPECIFICITY**

How can we be sure that a manuscript was really in use in a particular region? It is rare that regional origin is indicated in the manuscript itself. Patm. 743 (\textit{Diktyon} 54981), for instance, was copied in the year 1180 to be deposited at the ‘most famous Monastery of Patmos’. The scribe is probably identical with the ‘sinful Neilos’ who inscribed his request for prayers in two other locations in the manuscript.\(^{16}\)

Sometimes, the prayer texts themselves contain clues. Patm. 786 (\textit{Diktyon} 55025), 16\(^{th}\) c., ff. 183v–184r contains two prayers for traveling by sea as well as a prayer for the blessing of fishing nets on ff. 114v–115r and one for the construction of a ship on f. 115rv. The presence of prayers connected to seafaring and nautical issues suggests that this manuscript was produced to cater to the specific needs of Patmos’ island location. But, as will be shown shortly, prayer content does not always point to regional provenance.

The political history of Patmos is also present: the fact that the island had contact with the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church and that it was under Crusader rule left its traces in the names listed for commemoration in several manuscripts, as the contribution by Daniel Galadza shows.

Important references to historical people, especially benefactors, or local saints that reveal a certain specificity of time or place may well appear in the part of a manuscript that does not contain the occasional prayers. We have therefore determined that each manuscript must be examined folio by folio, as briefly or as extensively as needed, before our attention focuses on the occasional prayers. In the eucharistic liturgy, it always repays to read the diptycha for the commemoration of saints, as well as the commemoration of the dead, since the addition of names may indicate local cultic preferences on the basis of historical developments.

A good example is Patm. 105 (\textit{Diktyon} 54349) from the first half of the 13\(^{th}\) c. It contains, on f. 92v, prayers for the blessing of fishing nets and for a boat. At first glance, this would point to its use in an island location. But the names mentioned in the liturgical commemorations would indicate that the manuscript was destined for the monastery of St. Meletius of Myoupolis in Boeotia, about 30 kms from the nearest shore.\(^{17}\)

**RELEVANCE OF PRAYERS**

How can we be sure that a prayer that is preserved in a manuscript was of relevance at the time of copying and also in the later history of use of the manuscript? In our study of Euchologia manuscripts, we pay particular attention to ‘traces of use’: dark outer lower edges indicate that these pages

\(^{15}\) Radle, Infants.

\(^{16}\) Name of the scribe on f. 26v, f. 35r, date (without name) on f. 32v, lengthy note (without name) on f. 35v, quoted below.

were turned frequently, perhaps with fingers smudged with soot; wax drops on a page show that it was held open during a ceremony that involved candles. In Patm. 104 ([Diktyon 54348], 13th c.), ff. 27v–28r, a large red stain in the text of the wedding ritual suggests that some wine was spilled during the administration of the common cup.\textsuperscript{18}

It is rare that we hear directly about the perceived usefulness of prayers. One such case is the scribal notice in Patm. 743, f. 35v, mentioned above.\textsuperscript{19} It refers to the prayers for the monastic hours that are contained in this manuscript, but may equally well apply to other contexts where prayers are paramount:

\begin{quote}

`Ὅδε πάλιν ὡς μωρὸ(ς) ἔγραψα κ(αὶ) τ(ὰς) εὐχ(ὰς) | οὐχ ὡς μὴ ἔχετε π(ατέ)ρες έγιοι· τίς | γὰρ ταύτας οὐκ ἔχει; εἰ γὰρ κ(αὶ) | ἔχουν, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καθ’ ἡμέραν | οὐ λέγουν· κ(αὶ) ζημία ψυχικὴ πολλὴ. | ὑμεῖς δὲ Χ(ριστο)ῦ χάριτι, οὐ μόνον | αὐτοὶ λέγετε μετὰ κατανύξεως, | οὐ λέγουν· κ(αὶ) ζημία ψυχικὴ πολλὴ. | ἐγὼ δὲ σκοπήσας μὴ παλαιωθέντες έξας | ἐμπαθείας, θαρρῆς | ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἔγραψα ταύτας κἂν χωρικόγραφ(ας) κ(αὶ) σφαλτὰς ὡς ἀγράμματο(ς). | Καὶ μακάριοι εἰσίν οἱ ταύτας | καθ’ ἡμέραν ὡς ἀντιφάρμακα τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ τ(ῶν) σωμάτ(ῶν) εὐχόμενοι | ἀναγινώσκουσιν. ὁ δὲ στερήσ(ας) αὐτ(ὰς) τὴν ἐνδοξοτάτην μονὴν τῆς | Πάτμου, ἐπικατάρατος ἄστω. +

“Now I have yet again copied even the prayers, fool that I am, as if you holy fathers did not have them. Because there is nobody who does not have them. But even if they have them, many people do not recite them every day. And that does great damage to the soul. So for Christ’s sake, not only should you recite them with great compunction, but also the holy churches of the metochia. As I am uneducated, I have written them out in rustic letters and with mistakes, trusting in (divine) love, because I wanted to make sure that they did not fade because of their age. And blessed are those who read them in prayer every day, as a protection for body and soul. But accursed shall be whoever removes them from the most famous monastery of Patmos.”
\end{quote}

\textbf{Were prayers really used exactly as written?}

It would be good to know more about the use of Euchologia in the Byzantine period. But evidence is scarce and—as yet—inconclusive, even when the prayer texts for one particular concern have been well studied, as in the case of ritual brotherhood (\textit{adelphopoiesis}). 16 different prayer texts are preserved in 69 manuscripts. The two most popular prayers (attested 35 and 45 times, respectively) often appear in conjunction with each other or with additional prayers, while two prayers are attested only once. This suggests that variation in the creation and use of prayer texts was not unusual.\textsuperscript{20} The rich manuscript tradition confirms the enduring popularity of the blessing of male-male relationships through \textit{adelphopoiesis}, but does not permit firm conclusions on which prayer text was used at any given time.

Whether the liturgist felt free to improvise prayers, based on the written version in the Euchologion, remains an open question. The insertion of names, as necessary and appropriate, has already been noted. Explicit stage directions to the liturgist are rare. One example is Patm. 689 (15\textsuperscript{th}–16\textsuperscript{th} c.), f. 70v, where the prayer for illness is followed by a direct address to the liturgist, noting that, if desired, “you may use further prayers for demonic possession.”

\textsuperscript{18} Comparing the black and white images to on-site study shows how difficult it would be to make such an identification only through microfilm.

\textsuperscript{19} The Greek text of this notice has already been published in \textit{KOMINES, ΠΙΝΑΚΕΣ} 11–12.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Rapp, Brother-Making}, Appendix I and Appendix II.
We will never know the full degree of variation that came with oral performance, but it may not have been significant. Comparison with modern practice suggests that it is of the utmost importance for the perception of the validity of a ritual that it be performed every time in exactly the same way.\footnote{D. Krueger, Liturgical Subjects. Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium. Philadelphia 2014.}

**What additional information can Euchologia manuscripts convey?**

True to their utilitarian nature, Euchologia may also contain other texts and even non-textual materials that are of interest to the social and cultural historian: lists of names of prayer communities, recipes, magical formulae, writing exercises, palimpsest leaves, or line drawings. The depiction of a small sailboat in Patm. 786, f. 86v, for instance, further underscores the specificity of the island location.\footnote{For this manuscript, see below, p. 185, 204.} As they were used during the holy liturgy, Euchologia may also have had a special value as ritual objects that came alive during the liturgical performance. Stefan Royé and others have begun to apply this codico-liturgical approach in the Catalogue of Biblical Manuscripts project.\footnote{<https://www.pthu.nl/cbm/> (10.11.2017).}

A final set of questions relates to the origin of small prayers and their prescriptive or normative value. The value of these prayers for historical analysis ultimately hinges on these questions. To what degree did these prayers originate with the Church as an institution? Or is the opposite the case and they reflect the needs of the people which the church then aimed to control through liturgicization? The latter may have been more frequently the case than hitherto acknowledged. A fine example is the wedding ritual. In a seminal study, Gabriel Radle has shown that the nuptial prayers had their origin in private practice. The priest would be called to the private home, where the marital bed was sectioned off by a curtain. He would pronounce blessings on the couple and on their marital bed above which the marital crowns were hung. After seven days, when the curtain and the crowns were removed, this was marked by further prayers by the priest. This sequence later gave rise to the full wedding ritual. But as Radle points out, even after Emperor Leo VI (regn. 886–912) stipulated that the ecclesiastical wedding ritual had legal force, many people lived in socially and publicly recognized unions (perhaps even with priestly blessing), without undergoing the church ceremony.\footnote{G. Radle, The Development of Byzantine Marriage Rites as Evidenced by Sinai Gr. 957. OCP 78 (2012) 133–148.}

The mere fact of textual transmission at any given time does not necessarily reflect the lived reality of the people at that moment. This has been shown with regard to legal writing. Recent studies of the great legal codifications of late Antiquity, the Codex Theodosianus and the Codex Iustinianus urge great caution: some laws are included in these collections simply for the sake of antiquarianism or completeness, although the administrative realities they represent have long since vanished.\footnote{J. Harries, Law and Empire in Late Antiquity. Cambridge 1999, 22.} Nobody wants to be the first to break with tradition. By analogy, we cannot be entirely certain that a particular prayer concern was an issue merely because it is contained in a manuscript of a particular date. It may simply be transmitted as part of an established sequence.

We cannot be certain that a priest was called in to say the occasional prayers every time that a vessel of oil or wine was polluted, that a child had learning difficulties, or someone had a headache. Our best guide to the prayers that were most frequently employed is the traces of use or other indications in the manuscripts themselves.

The Euchologia made for (male) monasteries which contain small prayers for the needs of lay communities, for example for women’s purity and other family matters, must also be considered in
this context. Were these really relevant to the monks in their supposed life of seclusion? At least one manuscript seems to suggest this: in Lesbiacus Leimonos 85 ([Diktyon 45408], 16th c.), f. 16v, the prayer for the 8th day after birth begins as follows: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν, προσάγεται ἐν τῷ ναῷ τὸ βρέφος παρὰ τῆς μαίας· καὶ ἱσταται πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν τοῦ ναοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς ποιεῖ εὐλογητόν· τρισάγιον· τὸ Παναγία· Πάτερ ἡμῶν· Ὅτι σοῦ· τὸ ἀπολυτίκιον τῆς ἡμέρας· ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου τῆς μονῆς. (“It must be noted that on the eighth day after birth, the infant is brought to the church by the midwife. And she stands before the doors of the church. The priest says the Invocation, Trisagion, Panagia, Our Father, the hymn of the day or of the saint of the monastery.”) That ‘the saint of the monastery’ could be chosen as the topic of the short hymn (apolytikion) indicates that the liturgists who performed this initiation rite for a newborn child were in fact monks. This notice in an Euchologion manuscript offers important and otherwise unavailable insights into the close relations between a monastery and the families who lived around it.

As in the study of law, the presence of a normative or prescriptive text does not in and of itself imply that it was used in this manner, let alone that it was used with any kind of regularity. Legal disputes were settled in a myriad of extra-judicial ways, and by the same token, people’s religious needs in dealing with higher powers could be addressed by other practices, including magic. Although the sources avoid drawing attention to this, it is well known that priests were involved in the production of amulets and magic charms. Ms. Patm. 689 (15th–16th c.), f. 114v includes a prayer for female breast pain, followed by instructions for writing a phylactery that the woman can wear on her chest.

Like legal codes, Euchologia should not be seen as photographic snapshots of lived reality. Modern scholars should regard them more like a mood board, conveying the general flavor of a period, the colors and textures—or, to use different terminology: the discourses – in which everyday life played itself out.

A CASE FOR BIG DATA

The only way to draw meaningful conclusions from the occasional prayers as evidence for historical situations or developments is by studying their occurrence in a large number of manuscripts over a long period of time. If, for example, the same concern is addressed in new prayers (or adaptations of older prayers) in manuscripts from later centuries, this is a firm indication that it remains a lively issue. Another indication of actual relevance may be the appearance of new concerns at particular moments in time, for example in dealing with different non-Orthodox groups of people. Again, this can only be properly identified and evaluated once a very large number of Euchologia have been collected and analyzed.

As this overview has tried to demonstrate, the study of Euchologia has vast potential, but also poses practical and interpretive challenges. It is only through an extensive collaborative effort, sustained over a long period of time, that the study of these manuscripts, one by one, will eventually yield enough material to observe larger trends. This is a long and arduous road. Along the way, individual manuscripts, like those discussed here, offer their own reward through new insights into liturgical approaches to social and religious life, as articulated in the prayer books of the Byzantine people.

Claudia Rapp
CODICOLOGICAL PATHWAYS IN SEARCH OF EUCHOLOGIA PALIMPSEST MANUSCRIPTS

Leafing through the pages of manuscript catalogs in order to track down the Euchologia each library preserves, one can observe that a considerable number of these codices are—entirely or partially—written on recycled parchment. The most famous is the so-called Archimedes palimpsest (Diktyon 8838), a 13th c. prayer book currently preserved at the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore, which contains—among the erased texts—Archimedes’ Method and Stomachion, speeches by the orator Hyperides, and a commentary on Aristotle’s Categories.26

But there are many more. Here are a few examples of Euchologia extant as scriptiones superiores of palimpsest manuscripts: 10 out of 39 (26%) in the Library of St. Catherine’s Monastery at Mount Sinai,27 9 out of 27 (33%) at the Vatican Library, 7 out of 18 (39%) at the Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale di Grottaferrata. Is this dictated by a particular reason or just the result of chance? On the one hand, as has already been stated,28 Euchologia are utilitarian objects and this could well be one valid explanation for their being frequently written on re-used parchment. On the other hand, it would be easy to assume that Euchologia, because of their smallish size, would be preferred texts for reshaped palimpsest parchment sheets.

Further investigation is necessary to prove or to reject such preliminary assumptions. To this end, this paper presents a case study of the handwritten prayer books of the Libraries of Patmos and Grottaferrata. Because of the need to place the phenomenon of palimpsest Euchologia into a wider context, the analysis takes into account all relevant prayer books preserved in these libraries, including the paper and parchment manuscripts that are not palimpsest.

The questions to be pursued with regard to these Euchologia manuscripts are:
   – Do Euchologia manuscripts have typical dimensions?
   – What exactly do we mean when we state that Euchologia tend to be small in size?
   – How frequently were Euchologia written on reused parchment?
   – What kind of scriptiones inferiores do Euchologia manuscripts preserve?

These points are discussed below through a statistical analysis. Although this is a very limited sample, this investigation could be a first step towards identifying codicological characteristics that are typical of Euchologia manuscripts.

CASE STUDY: PRAYER BOOKS AT PATMOS AND GROTTAFERATA

The material collected by the team at the Library of the Holy Monastery of Saint John the Theologian in Patmos and at the Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale di Grottaferrata is displayed in tables. These aim to provide a general overview of the manuscripts the team inspected and classified as relevant for the purposes of the Euchologia-project, with a special focus on the palimpsests.

The tables’ entries are arranged as hereinafter described.

27 Regarding the Sinai Euchologia, see my forthcoming dissertation: “The Sinai Euchologia Written on Reused Parchment: Communities of Production and Use” (University of Vienna), which my association with the Sinai Palimpsests Project of EMEL (executive director M. Phelps, scholarly director C. Rapp) makes possible. The aim of the project is the creation of an open-access database of images of the palimpsest manuscripts preserved in the Monastery of St. Catherine. For more information, see: <http://sinaipalimpsests.org/> (10.11.2017).
28 See C. Rapp above, p. 174
- **Shelfmark.** After the call number of each manuscript I indicate, in the footnotes, the bibliographical reference to the printed catalogs as well as to selected relevant editions or studies on the manuscripts. Reference to the publications of Velkovska–Parenti 2011 and Taft–Parenti 2014 is also given, where further bibliography on the manuscripts can be found.

- **Writing support and ff. number.** In composite manuscripts made up of paper and parchment, that is those codices containing more than one codicological unit, this is indicated for the relevant section(s) only. For parchment manuscripts, the total number of folios and the number of corresponding sides (recto and verso) are specified.

- **Presence of palimpsest folios and the content of their erased undertext.**

- **Dimensions.** Typical folio dimensions (height/width), in millimeters, are given. An overall quantitative study on the size of Euchologia manuscripts does not exist so far. André Jacob’s study of the Southern Italian manuscripts identifies four sizes of Euchologia manuscripts: 1) large: ca. 250×200 mm; 2) medium: ca. 190×135 mm; 3) small: ca. 170×140 mm and 4) oblong in height (with a deviation of more than 70 mm between height and width): e.g. ca. 225×150 mm. I use these four categories as a frame of reference in order to group the manuscripts from Patmos and Grottaferrata.

- **Date.** The catalogs of Patmos and Grottaferrata are not always reliable. For this reason, dates proposed in the secondary literature are also indicated. Dates are arranged chronologically and are separated by the word *versus* (abbr. *vs*), which distinguishes scholars’ discordant opinions (listed in the footnotes).

- **Place of copying.** Once again, scholars’ discordant opinions are divided by a *versus*.

## PATMOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Writing support and ff. number</th>
<th>Palimpsest?</th>
<th>Typical folio dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 10432</td>
<td>Parchment 277 ff. = 554 sides</td>
<td>Yes: <em>scriptio inferior</em></td>
<td>196×141</td>
<td>13(^{\text{th}}) c. (Paschal tables start on 1234) vs 1234(^{\text{th}})</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes: initial and final flyleaves (I and α)</td>
<td>• Suspected: ff. 73v–74v Tot.: 7 sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown: not investigated yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


30 I refer to Sakkelion, *Πατμικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, and Kallimachos, *Πατμικῆς βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα* for Patmos; Rocchi, *Codices Cryptenses* for Grottaferrata.

31 If the secondary literature is in accord with the dating in the catalogs, *no* footnote is present.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Writing support and ff. number</th>
<th>Palimpsest?</th>
<th>Typical folio dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 105</td>
<td>Parchment + Paper (composite) 114 ff. = 228 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: f. 4 Tot.: 2 sides</td>
<td>183×145</td>
<td>13(^{a}) c. (after 1203)</td>
<td>Boiotia, Monastery of St. Meletius of Myoupolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 647</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>212×160</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 689</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>210×140</td>
<td>15(^{a}) – 16(^{b}) c. vs 16(^{a}) c.(^{37})</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 690</td>
<td>Paper (composite)</td>
<td></td>
<td>216×142</td>
<td>Late 15(^{b}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 691</td>
<td>Paper (composite)</td>
<td></td>
<td>215×145</td>
<td>15(^{a}) – 16(^{b}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 703</td>
<td>Parchment + Paper (composite) 101 ff. = 202 sides</td>
<td>• Suspected (entire parchment section): 122r–162v and 179r–240v Tot.: 202 sides</td>
<td>197×142</td>
<td>12(^{a}) to 15(^{a}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 743</td>
<td>Parchment 36 ff. = 72 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>166×123</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Patmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 763</td>
<td>Paper (composite). Only part 1 (ff. 1–38) is of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>156×104</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 776</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>210×155</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 786</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>148×103</td>
<td>16(^{a}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 795</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>199×143</td>
<td>17(^{a}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 811</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>215×150</td>
<td>16(^{a}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 837</td>
<td>Paper (composite). Only part 1 (= f. 1) is of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>220×145</td>
<td>14(^{a})–15(^{b}) c.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 Diktyon 54886, Sakkelion, Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη 258; Ioannides, Κυπριακός λειτουργικός κώδικας; Komines, Πίνακες 34, pl. 63.
36 Diktyon 54928, Sakkelion, Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη 270; Dmitrievskii, Opisanie II 661–664.
37 Dmitrievskii, Opisanie II 661 vs Sakkelion, Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη 270.
38 Diktyon 54929, Sakkelion, Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη 270; Dmitrievskii, Opisanie II 650–655.
39 Diktyon 54930, Sakkelion, Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη 270; Dmitrievskii, Opisanie II 664–665.
40 Diktyon 54942, Sakkelion, Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη 274; Dmitrievskii, Opisanie II 920–921.
41 Diktyon 54981, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 1, 312–315 (no. 8); Komines, Πίνακες 11–12, pl. 17.
42 Diktyon 55002, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 2, 149–150 (no. 29); Komines, Πίνακες 37, pl. 71.
43 Diktyon 55015, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 3, 394–396 (no. 41); Komines, Πίνακες 32, pl. 59.
44 Diktyon 55025, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 4, 257–260 (no. 51).
45 Diktyon 55034, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 4, 268–269 (no. 60).
46 Diktyon 55050, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 6, 363–365 (no. 77).
47 Diktyon 55076, Kallimachos, Πατμιακής βιβλιοθήκης συμπλήρωμα 7, 150–154 (no. 102).
## Grottaferrata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Writing support and ff. number</th>
<th>Palimpsest?</th>
<th>Typical folio dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.Ι (=gr. 89)⁴⁸</td>
<td>Parchment + Paper (composite) 149 ff. = 298 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>245×185</td>
<td>11th c. vs 13th c.³⁰</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.ΙΙ (=gr. 332)³⁷</td>
<td>Parchment 151 ff. = 302 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>170×140</td>
<td>11th c. vs early 12th c.⁵²</td>
<td>S. Italy: Rossano? (Calabria)³⁴³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.ΙΙΙ (=gr. 13)⁴⁴</td>
<td>Parchment 211 ff. = 422 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: ff. 1r–41v and 46r–211v Tot: 414 sides</td>
<td>186×140</td>
<td>14th c. vs 2nd half 14th c. vs after June 1357⁵⁵</td>
<td>S. Italy: Tropea (Calabria)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴⁸ As in Crisci, Palinsesti, if not indicated otherwise in the footnotes.
⁴⁹ *Diktyon* 17893, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 235–244; Parenti – Velkovska, Grottaferrata Γ.β. I; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 712, n. 132.
⁵² Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 244 vs Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 707, n. 61.
⁵³ Lucà, Origine e datazione 210.
⁵⁵ Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 249 vs Crisci, Palinsesti 27 vs Parenti, Per la datazione; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 713, n. 150.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Writing support and ff. number</th>
<th>Palimpsest?</th>
<th>Typical folio dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.IV (=gr. 308)</td>
<td>Parchment 141 ff. = 282 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>154×111</td>
<td>10th c. vs late 10th c. vs 11th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Campania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.VI=Γ.β.XXIX (=gr. 152)</td>
<td>Parchment 100 ff. = 200 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: ff. 58–61 and 88–89 Tot.: 10 sides</td>
<td>185×130</td>
<td>11th–12th c. vs 1st half 13th c. vs 13th–14th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria / Basilicata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.VII (=gr. 16)</td>
<td>Parchment (composite: a+b+c. Only parts a+b are of interest to the project) 129 ff. = 258 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>a. 189×135 b. 174×138</td>
<td>Early 10th c. vs 10th–11th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria / Basilicata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.IX (=gr. 292)</td>
<td>Parchment 95 ff. = 190 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>103×79</td>
<td>14th c. vs 16th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.X (=gr. 153)</td>
<td>Parchment 115 ff. = 230 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>189×146</td>
<td>10th–11th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria / Basilicata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.XI (=gr. 299)</td>
<td>Parchment 20 ff. = 40 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>146×115</td>
<td>11th–12th c. vs 12th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

58 Diktyon 17898, These are not two different manuscripts. Γ.β.XXIX is the shelfmark assigned by Rocchi to the scriptio inferior of ff. 88–89 (fragments from a liturgical scroll). Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 255–257, 277–278; Crisci, Palimpsesti 28–29, 115–119; Velkovska – Parenti, Evchologij Barberini 466.
59 Velkovska – Parenti, Evchologij Barberini 466 vs Crisci, Palimpsesti 28 vs Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 255.
64 Lucà, Origine e datazione 246.
66 Diktyon 17903, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 263–264; Ruggieri, Cryptensis Euchology.
67 Lucà, Origine e datazione 203 vs Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 263; Ruggieri, Cryptensis Euchology 333.
68 Lucà, Origine e datazione 203.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Writing support and ff. number</th>
<th>Palimpsest?</th>
<th>Typical folio dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XII (=gr. 326)76</td>
<td>Parchment 98 ff. = 196 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: entirely palimpsest&lt;br&gt;Tot.: 196 sides&lt;br&gt;1. Anastasius Sinaita, <em>Viae dux</em> (early 12th c.)&lt;br&gt;2. Grammatical texts (early 12th c.)&lt;br&gt;3. New Testament Lectionary (1st half 12th c.)&lt;br&gt;4. Liturgical texts (early 12th c.)&lt;br&gt;5. Menaea (1st half 12th c.)&lt;br&gt;6. Hagiographical texts (2nd half 10th c.)&lt;br&gt;7. Unidentified Latin text (11th c.?)&lt;br&gt;8. Unidentified text (11th c.?)</td>
<td>150×114</td>
<td>Late 13th c. vs 14th c.70</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XIII (=gr. 184)71</td>
<td>Parchment 188 ff. = 376 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: entirely palimpsest&lt;br&gt;Tot.: 376 sides&lt;br&gt;1. Homiletical texts (9th c.)</td>
<td>225×160</td>
<td>1st half 13th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Grottaferrata vs Salento72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XIV (=gr. 154)73</td>
<td>Parchment 54 ff. = 108 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: entirely palimpsest&lt;br&gt;Tot.: 108 sides&lt;br&gt;1. Paracletica (9th–10th c.)</td>
<td>180×140</td>
<td>1st half 13th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Salento74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XV (=gr. 6)75</td>
<td>Parchment (composite)&lt;br&gt;41 ff. = 82 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>205×140</td>
<td>11th to 13th c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Calabria / Campania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XVII (=gr. 49)76</td>
<td>Paper –</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>206×148</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>S. Italy: Grottaferrata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XVIII (=gr. 147)77</td>
<td>Paper –</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>193×137</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>S. Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ.XIX (=gr. 209)78</td>
<td>Paper –</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>288×200</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>S. Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69 Diktyon 17904, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 264–265; Crisci, Palinsesti 30, 120–125; Velkovska – Parenti, Evchologij Barberini 467; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 711, n. 127.

70 Crisci, Palinsesti 30; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 711, n. 127 vs Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 264.


72 Parenti, Rito di confessione vs Lucà, Origine e datazione 210; Arnesano, Libri inutiles 199.

73 Diktyon 17906, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 267–268; Crisci, Palinsesti 31, 126–130.

74 Arnesano, Libri inutiles 199.


76 Diktyon 17909, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 269–270; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 720, n. 252.

77 Diktyon 17910, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 270–271; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 713, n. 152.

78 Diktyon 17911, Rocchi, Codices Cryptenses 271; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 721, n. 260.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Writing support and ff. number</th>
<th>Palimpsest?</th>
<th>Typical folio dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ. XX   (=gr. 145)</td>
<td>Parchment (composite, a+b. Palimpsest is only part b) 64 ff. = 128 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: ff. 20r–64v&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;  Tot.: 88 sides&lt;sup&gt;S&lt;/sup&gt; 1. Astronomical and astrological texts (late 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;–early 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.)  2. John Chrysostom, <em>Ad Theodorum lapsum</em> (2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; half 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.)</td>
<td>195×145</td>
<td>a) 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. vs 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; half 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. vs late 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;–early 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.  b) 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. vs 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; half 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. vs 1. half 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.</td>
<td>S. Italy: Salento&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ. XXI  (=gr. 44)&lt;sup&gt;83&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Parchment (composite, a+b. Only part a is palimpsest and of interest to the project) 18 ff. = 36 sides</td>
<td>• Yes: ff. 1r–18v  Tot.: 36 sides&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt; 1. Liturgical text (early 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.)  2. Praxapostolos (2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; half 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.)</td>
<td>207×155</td>
<td>a) Late 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;–early 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. (ff. 1–18) vs 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;–15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.&lt;sup&gt;84&lt;/sup&gt;  b) 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. (ff. 19–23)</td>
<td>S. Italy: Salento&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ. XXIV (=gr. 240)&lt;sup&gt;86&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>320×230</td>
<td>1592–1597</td>
<td>S. Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ. XXXVII (=gr. 79): parts II to V&lt;sup&gt;86&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Parchment (composite) 153 ff. = 306 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>II.170×136  III.180×151  IV.160×142  V.195×142</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ. XXXVIII (=gr. 200)&lt;sup&gt;87&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>290×222</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>S. Italy: Salento&lt;sup&gt;88&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γβ. XLIII (=gr. 139)&lt;sup&gt;88&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Parchment 241 ff. = 482 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>199×140</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; half 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. vs 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.&lt;sup&gt;90&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Constantinople vs S. Italy&lt;sup&gt;91&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt.Ζ.δ. II (=gr. 295)&lt;sup&gt;89&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Parchment 136 ff. = 272 sides</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>110×90</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>S. Italy: Northern Calabria / Basilicata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>79</sup> *Diktyon* 17912, ROCCHI, Codices Cryptenses 272; CRISCI, Palinsesti 32, 133–135; TAFT – PARENTI, Il Grande Ingresso 709, n. 101 and 712, n. 144.
<sup>80</sup> LUCÀ, Frammenti.
<sup>81</sup> ROCCHI, Codices Cryptenses 272 vs CRISCI, Palinsesti 32 vs LUCÀ, Frammenti 524 and 528; TAFT – PARENTI, Il Grande Ingresso 709 and 712.
<sup>82</sup> LUCÀ, Frammenti 522.
<sup>84</sup> ROCCHI, Codices Cryptenses 272; CRISCI, Palinsesti 32; ARNESANO, Repertorio 43 vs TAFT – PARENTI, Il Grande Ingresso 715, n. 184.
<sup>85</sup> *Diktyon* 17916, ROCCHI, Codices Cryptenses 274–275; TAFT – PARENTI, Il Grande Ingresso 721, n. 261.
<sup>87</sup> *Diktyon* 17935, ROCCHI, Codices Cryptenses 282–283.
<sup>88</sup> LUCÀ, Origine e datazione 203.
<sup>90</sup> TAFT – PARENTI, Il Grande Ingresso 704, n. 25 vs ROCCHI, Codices Cryptenses 285.
<sup>91</sup> LUCÀ, Origine e datazione 207 vs TH. ST. CHRISTODOULOU, Η νεκρώσιμη ακολουθία κατά τους χειρόγραφους κώδικες 10ου – 12ου αιώνας II: Εισαγωγικά, κοινολογικά και παλαιογραφικά κείμενα. Thera 2005, 17.
PRELIMINARY RESULTS

The 14 relevant Patmos manuscripts range in date from the 12th (a. 1180) to the 17th c. In most cases, their provenance is unknown. Ten are written on paper (71%), two exclusively on parchment (14.5%) and two are composite codices made up of both paper and parchment folios (14.5%). Parchment manuscripts are attested among the Euchologia until the 13th c., Euchologia on paper first appear in the 13th–14th c.

In general, the parchment manuscripts are smaller than those on paper. According to Jacob’s grouping, only three codices (21%) are of small size: Patm. 743, Patm. 763, and Patm. 786. The remaining 11 (79%) are of medium size. Three of the medium size manuscripts (Patm. 690, Patm. 691, Patm. 837) are oblong in height. The average dimensions of the small manuscripts are 156×110 mm; the average dimensions of the medium size manuscripts are 206×146 mm.

Three of the four manuscripts made up of parchment folios (75%) contain at least one palimpsest folio. They are all of medium size. Going further into detail, it is possible to observe that 211 out of the 1056 parchment sides are palimpsest: this means 20% of the total. The palimpsest manuscripts’ date is well defined: 12th–13th c.

Patmos’ palimpsest folios among the Euchologia are registered neither in catalogs nor in the secondary bibliography. They are listed here for the first time. Future study (with the support of multi-spectral imaging, given the poor legibility of the scriptiones inferiores) would be desirable.

In Grottaferrata, 23 of the manuscripts the team looked at in situ have been considered relevant for the project (date range: 10th c. to 1602). Their provenance is almost exclusively Southern Italian, with the exception of the renowned Crypt. Γ.β.I, an Euchologion which reflects the Constantinopolitan tradition in its content, but whose place of copying remains unknown, and of Crypt. Γ.β.XLIII that according to Lucà could have been copied in Constantinople.

Out of these 23 codices, 5 are written on paper (22%), 17 exclusively on parchment (74%) and 1 is a composite codex made up of parchment and paper folios (4%). Parchment manuscripts are attested among the Euchologia until the 16th c., paper manuscripts are extant from the 14th c.

Regarding the dimensions: in the Library of Grottaferrata, parchment manuscripts are smaller than the paper ones; only paper codices exceed 290 mm in height. One of the smaller manuscripts (Crypt. Γ.β.IX, mm 103×90, a. 1090) is also among the manuscripts of older date. According to Jacob’s grouping we can divide the Grottaferrata manuscripts by size as follows:

- small = six complete and three parts of manuscripts (30%): Γ.β.II, Γ.β.IV, Γ.β.VII (part b), Γ.β.IX, Γ.β.XI, Γ.β.XII, Γ.β.XXXVII (parts II, IV), Ζ.δ.II.
- medium = ten complete and three parts of manuscripts (48%): Γ.β.III, Γ.β.VI, Γ.β.VII (part a), Γ.β.X, Γ.β.XIV, Γ.β.XV, Γ.β.XVII, Γ.β.XVIII, Γ.β.XX, Γ.β.XXI, Γ.β.XXXVII (parts III, V), Γ.β.XLIII.
- large not oblong = two manuscripts (9%): Γ.β.II, Γ.β.XXXVIII.
- large oblong = three manuscripts (13%): Γ.β.XIII, Γ.β.XIX, Γ.β.XXIV.

As in Patmos, medium manuscripts constitute the most significant group, followed by the small ones. The average dimensions of the small manuscripts are 148×118 mm; the average dimensions of medium size manuscripts are 193×142 mm.

Palimpsest codices are present in each size category (two small, five medium and one large size). Seven out of the 18 parchment manuscripts (39%) contain rewritten folios. They range in date from the 13th to the 14th c. and were all written in Southern Italy: two in Calabria, three in Salento, one

---

93 Exceptions are Patm. 763 and Patm. 786, very similar in format. These two paper codices are the smallest investigated in Patmos.
The correlation of palimpsest material in Euchologia and high incidence of recycled sheets in Southern Italy remains to be investigated.


<http://palin.iccu.sbn.it/>(10.11.2017)

Luca, Frammenti.

The Archimedes palimpsest, with its 195×146 mm, can be included in this category too.

Even if not always of great philological interest, the erased text layers of these manuscripts and their codicological characteristics can provide information about the way of working and the interests of the communities that produced Euchologia manuscripts, reusing old parchment. Furthermore, their palaeographical value makes them worthy of attention.
CUSTOMIZED BOOKS: NAMES, INTERCESSIONS, AND COMMEMORATIONS
IN THE EUCHOLOGION

Euchologia manuscripts reflect a variety of changing liturgical practices. Scribes and liturgical practitioners from the tenth to the twelfth centuries, such as the scribe Iovane Zosime of Sinai (d. ca. 986) or Nikon of the Black Mountain (ca. 1025–ca. 1100/1110) near Antioch, noted—sometimes with a degree of exasperation—divergences in liturgical practices.101 This diversity was due primarily to various local and regional traditions. Because each Euchologion manuscript was destined for use by the clergy within a specific community, each manuscript was unique.102 Thus, even the common rites and rituals contained in an Euchologion included a certain degree of “customization”—whether by the selection of texts to include in the codex, modifications to the text of prayers themselves, or through additional marginal notes.103

The customized character of Euchologia is most apparent in the Diptychs, commemorations of the living and the dead during the Eucharistic prayer or Anaphora, and Ektenes, petitions of litanies recited by the deacon, both within the Eucharistic liturgies, as well as through references to saints of particular importance to the local community where the manuscript was copied and used.

NAMES IN THE DIPTYCHS

Apart from the names of people being prayed for during liturgical services, the name of the local bishop would also be commemorated in liturgical rites. The most ancient point of the Divine Liturgy where the clergy prayed for specific people were the Diptychs for the Living (τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων) and the Diptychs for the Dead (τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κοιμηθέντων), which the bishop, priest, and deacon would recite at the end of the Anaphora.104 Most often, Euchologion manuscripts indicate in rubrics that the Diptychs should be recited at the appropriate point of the liturgy, without giving names,105 while some manuscripts leave an empty space on the folio for names to be written in later.106 Other points during which specific names would be inserted into the Divine Liturgy include the preparatory Prothesis Rite (πρόθεσις, προσκομιδή), and the petitions of the Great Ektenes (ἡ μεγάλη ἐκτενή or τὰ εἰρηνικά) and the Ektenes after the Gospel reading.107 Here, the names of the church hierarchy would be mentioned, although civil authorities could also be commemorated by name.108

103 For example, the addition of local alternatives written in the margins of marriage prayers copied in Crypt. Γ.β. XI (12th c.): Ruggieri, Cryptensis Euchology, here 342–345.
104 Here, the term “diptych” refers to the “liturgical unit” and list of names, rather than the material object on which these lists were written or fastened. See P. N. Trempelas, Δίπτυχα. ThEE 5: 107–113; G. Winkler, Die Interzessionen der Chrysostomusanaphora in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. OCP 36 (1970) 301–336 (I. Teil) and OCP 37 (1971) 333–383 (II. Teil); R. F. Taft, A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, vol. 4: The Diptychs (OCA 238). Rome 1991.
105 Such prescriptions are given in marginal notes in Crypt. Γ.β.ΙΙΙ (14th c.), f. 111r and f. 113v during the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (f. 98r–116r), and in Patm. gr. 811 (16th c.), f. 145v and f. 184v, which also include several names within the text of the Diptychs of the Anaphora.
106 Vat. gr. 1554 ([Diktyon 68185], mid 11th c.), f. 16v; Patm. gr. 690 (late 15th c.), f. 4v–5r.
108 Vat. gr. 1554 (mid 11th c.), f. 34v; allows for the commemoration of civil authorities by name in the Anaphora of St. Basil the Great.
The liturgical texts of prayers and Ektenes in the manuscripts usually omit specific names, since these changed, and simply write “ὁ δὲ [εἶνα]” (“so-and-so” or “N.N.”), allowing the clergy to insert the current name from memory.

Nevertheless, some manuscripts offer noteworthy exceptions. Euchologion codex Patm. gr. 703, a composite manuscript assembled from quires ranging in date from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, contains the Divine Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great, along with various other rites, such as marriage and brother-making. On the margins of the folios between the Diptychs for the Dead and for the Living, as well as in Ektenes from the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, one finds numerous names written in by the scribe and by later hands. Prayers to God “for the soul of” certain people (μνήσθητι Κύριε τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ δούλου σου…) confirm the people mentioned were already deceased, but the names of the several bishops are listed near the Diptychs for the Living with their ecclesiastical titles and honorifics, suggesting they were mentioned here because they were commemorated among the living hierarchy during liturgical services. The names of Pope Pius II (d. 14 August 1464); Patriarch Bessarion (written as both Βησαρίονος and Βησσαρίωνος; d. 18 November 1472); and Archbishop Hieronymus (Ἱερώνυμος), most likely Hieronymus Landus (d. 1497?), archbishop of Crete from 29 March 1458 and later titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople (29 March 1474–1497), were to be mentioned in the general commemoration of the church hierarchy (Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε…) at the end of the Anaphora and during Ektenes of the liturgy. Reference signs supra lineam indicate where the names written in the margins were to be inserted. Another marginal note with a list of names of fifteenth-century Popes of Rome includes two additional popes among the dead after Pius II, suggesting the manuscript was updated by additional marginal notes and continued to be used even after 1464. Additional marginal notes include at least seventy names commemorated for the forgiveness of their sins, some of them Latin or Italian names transliterated into Greek, such as Gerardus (Γεράρδιος), Barbara (Μπάρμπαρα), and Benedictus (Μπενέδικτος), and some with titles,
such as priest (ἱερεύς), hieromonk (ἱερομόναχος), monk (μοναχός), nun (μοναχή), and even the wife of a priest or a senior nun (πρεσβυτέρισσα). The addition of names by later hands and the revision of titles given to bishops commemorated among the living points to the continued use of the manuscript in the community for the commemoration of people during liturgical services.

In this way, Euchologia are sources of social and ecclesiastical history—not only from the content of prayers to be said, and what these prayers say about those praying them, but also as testimonies of the names of those for whom the prayers were said.

**INTERCESSION AND COMMEMORATION OF SAINTS**

Equally as important as for whom one would pray, Euchologia manuscripts customized devotion towards saints to whom intercessory prayers were recited and whose commemorations were particularly significant to the local community.

Specific intercessory requests in some prayers were addressed to saints for help with certain problems, either by attributing the text of prayers to them or by singing hymns and saying prayers in their honor during liturgical rites. Saints’ names are particularly abundant in dismissal prayers of liturgical rites from about the twelfth century onward, although the saints’ names mentioned seem to depend upon the devotion and discretion of the clergy. Local patron saints or the attributed authors of liturgical rites, like St. John Chrysostom or St. Basil the Great, would more likely be mentioned at the conclusion of services attributed to their authorship. Names of saints with local importance could also be inserted into petitions of litanies at the Divine Liturgy, as can be seen in the Diakonikon, Sin. gr. 1040 (Δίκτυον 59415), or during the Litē at Vespers, as attested in the twelfth-century liturgical Typikon from Mar Sabas Lavra, Sin. gr. 1096 (Δίκτυον 59471).

In Patm. gr. 743, the otherwise generic prayer for kollyba (κόλλυβα) dedicated to saints (Εὐχὴ εἰς τὰ κόλλυβα τῶν ἑορτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐνδόξων ἁγίων, γινόμενα ἀνυπέρθετως) explicitly mentions St. John the Theologian, the patron of the Patmos monastery where Monk Neilos copied the manuscript in 1180. Thus, mention of spe-
specific saints other than the Theotokos or St. John the Baptist can provide more information on where a manuscript was used.

Alongside prayers, Euchologia manuscripts often contain scriptural readings from the lectionary of the liturgical year necessary for the Divine Liturgy or for other sacramental rites and blessings. Although Patm. gr. 104 (ca. A.D. 1234) bears the title “Euchologion” at the beginning of the manuscript (Εὐχολόγιον σὺν Θεό περιέχον τὴν ἁπάσαν ἄκολουθίαν, f. 1r), 220 out of a total of 277 folios contain Gospel readings for the liturgical year. Among the standard commemorations from the life of Christ or the Theotokos and widely venerated saints, one also finds the commemorations of St. Mamas of Caesarea (2 September, f. 54r–55r), St. Eustathius (20 September; f. 62r), Sts. Constantine and Helen (21 May; f. 99v–101r), and St. Theodore Stratelates (8 June: f. 101r–102r)—saints whose commemorations are usually omitted in abbreviated liturgical calendars such as this one, suggesting the copyist had reason to include their names because of a local cult of veneration. In the Southern Italian Euchologion Crypt. Γ.β. III (14th c.) the final folios (f. 205r–211v) contain a Latin liturgical calendar identical to that found in Western Sacramentaries, including numerous commemorations associated with Rome—but written in Greek (Ἀρχὴ χρόνηου τῶν λατίνων καὶ ἡ μήνες αὐτῶν). That the Grottaferrata manuscript would include a Western calendar is consistent with other “Latinized” liturgical practices in the manuscript, including the recitation of the Creed with the Filioque (τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός, Υἱοῦ τε ἐκπορευόμενον) during the Liturgy of St. Basil (f. 80r–80v) and by the godparents (οἱ ἀνάδοχοι) during Baptism (f. 141r–142r). Both the Patmos and Grottaferrata Euchologia show how the commemoration of saints in the liturgical calendar can reveal the local color of the community where the manuscripts were used.

Concluding Remarks

These are just a few examples of the variability and customization of the text found in Byzantine Euchologia, as necessitated by the clergy and community where the manuscript was used. Further systematic study of these manuscripts will reveal patterns in adaptations made to liturgical books and shed more light on the divergent liturgical practices of local communities. Future studies must be aware of the importance of all the liturgies in the manuscript—including the particular aspects of their customization—in order to understand the Euchologion’s individual prayers for the community in which it was used.

Daniel Galadza

---

123 Theodore Stratelates is commemorated on two dates in Byzantine liturgical calendars—his death on 8 February 319 (Synaxaria families Fa and Ox) and the transfer of his relics to Euchaita in Asia Minor on 8 June 319 (Synaxaria families H and P). The 8 June commemoration is more frequently celebrated in other Patmos manuscripts, such as the Synaxarion Patm. gr. 226 ([Diktyon 54470], 9th–10th c.) [siglum P]. See H. DELEHAYE, Propylaeeum ad Acta sanctorum novembris. Synaxarium ecclesiae constantinopolitanae. Brussels 1902, 449–454 (8 February) and 735–740 (8 June); J. MATEOS, Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise. Ms. Sainte-Croix nº 40, Xe siècle (OCA 165–166). Rome 1962–1963, vol. 2:245 (Index).

RETURNING TO THE FOLD: OBSERVATIONS ON PRAYERS FOR MUSLIM APOSTATES IN BYZANTINE EUCHOLOGIA

Change of religious affiliation is not a phenomenon that is widely reflected in Byzantine sources. Nevertheless it is addressed for various reasons in different kinds of texts:125 Imperial law and canon law provide a prescriptive framework for conversion, while documents of the patriarchal chancery, including patriarchal letters,126 furnish supplementary details from legal practice, as their composition is owed to specific circumstances.127 Chroniclers and historiographers refer to historical events that led people to abandon—voluntarily or under duress—their inherited or adopted belief.128 Hagiographic texts offer further examples on the issue of conversion, likewise embedded in narrative form and with a particular agenda.

The Life of Nikon Metanoeite (BHG3 1366, 1367), for example, reports—among other deeds of the saint—Nikon’s efforts to convert the inhabitants of Crete to Christianity in the years after Nikephoros Phokas’ reconquest of the island. When Nikon arrived there in 961, it had been under Arab control for more than four generations and a large percentage of its inhabitants had apparently converted to Islam. Reportedly, Nikon’s inspiring example eventually led to multiple conversions to Orthodoxy.129

In view of the scarcity of evidence for the concrete circumstances of conversion, the evidence from the euchologia is particularly welcome. Some euchologia manuscripts also contain conversion prayers. Evidence from manuscripts at the libraries considered here shows that among conversion prayers, there is an emphasis on the re-admission of former Orthodox Christians who had embraced Islam. By contrast, apostasy from Islam of Muslims by birth seems to have been, on the whole, very rare.130 Among the manuscripts under consideration, there is only one, Patm. 647, that transmits the order for conversion of Muslims by birth, entitled Τάξις γινομένη τοῖς ἀπὸ Σαρρακηνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν πρὸς τὴν καθαρὰν καὶ ἀληθινὴν πίστιν τῶν Χριστιανῶν (Taxis for those who turn

---

125 For a study based on Greek and non-Greek sources for Muslim-Christian conversion see Sähner, Swimming Against the Current, for a study on Byzantine heresiological texts see Eleuteri – Rigo, Eretici. See also the volume Conversion in Late Antique Christianity, Islam, and beyond, ed. by A. Papaconstantinou et alii. Farnham – Burlington 2015, presenting a wide range of contributions related to the topic of religious affiliation.


127 Ibidem, esp. 237–238, 247–248, 255, 261–262, 271. The majority of instances of conversion registered in the patriarchal chancery between 1315 and 1402 concern conversion from the Latin Church to Orthodoxy. There is only one documented instance of an Orthodox who converted to Islam and then sought re-admission (Nikolaos Bulgaris, a.1391; ibidem no.15). We note also one instance of a Muslim by birth, a certain Antonios (a.1374; ibidem no.6), who had converted to the Latin Church and afterwards requested admission by the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. See also J. Preiser-Kapeller, Webs of Conversion. An Analysis of Social Networks of Converts Across Islamic-Christian Borders in Anatolia, South-Eastern Europe and the Black Sea from the 13th to the 15th c., available at <https://www.academia.edu/1243539/> (10.11.2017).

128 One example is given in Theophanes, Chronographia, 300, 20–26 (ed. C. de Boor I. Leipzig 1883 [reprint Hildesheim 1980]): in 718, after an earthquake in the region of Syria Calif Umar II prohibited the consumption of wine in the cities and enforced conversion to Islam, see P. A. Hollingsworth in ODB s.v. Umar II; for further instances see Sähner, Swimming Against the Current, esp. 270–279.

129 See The Life of Saint Nikon, ed. D. F. Sullivan. Brookline 1987, 82–86. It is not clear from the text whether these were instances of conversion or re-admission.

130 The apostate would expect capital punishment according to Muslim law, see Sähner, Swimming Against the Current, esp. 269–270.
from the Saracens to the pure and true belief of the Christians). The following seeks to shed some light on prayers for former Orthodox Christians who had apostatized to Islam and were striving for re-admission.

The earliest prayers concerning the reconciliation of apostates occur in our sample in cod. Crypt. Γ.β.IV (10th c.). The title of this section reads as follows:

Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίῳ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μεθοδίου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως διάταξη πρὸς Χριστιανοῦς ὑπαχθέντας μὲν ἑθνική πλάνη, ἐπιστρέφοντας (cod. ἐπιστρέφοντας) δὲ εἷς αὐτῆς καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσδραμόντας (f. 139v; [D]).

Diataxis of our father among the saints, Methodios, bishop of Constantinople, addressed to Christians who were led astray by pagan deceit, but reverted and approached the church of God.

This heading is followed by a rubrical specification concerning the age of the candidates at the time of apostasy and the circumstances of apostasy (ff. 139v–140v; [Da–De1]). These are decisive factors for the kind of preparation required for re-admission. This rubric then leads to a prayer entitled εἰς τὸ αὐτό (εἰς τοὺς ἀπὸ ἀρνήσεως εἰς ἐπιστρέφοντας (ff. 140v–141v; [D1]; First prayer of atonement for those reverting from denial). This is followed by another prayer: Β’ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ inc.: Κύριε Κύριε, ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων ποιητὴς καὶ δεσπότης; (beginning on f. 101rv; 135 [D3]; Second (prayer) on the same topic, inc.: Oh Lord, oh Lord, creator of all things and master).

This earliest appearance of the diatage/diataxis in our manuscripts is attributed to patriarch Methodios I (843–847). It aims at regulating the reconciliation of Christian apostates and features an intended sequence of prayers since they are marked by A’ and B’. Muslims are not mentioned explicitly. As an official patriarchal document the diataxis of Methodios I is also widely transmitted in non-liturgical contexts. For instance, the earliest legal witness of the diataxis, cod. Oxon. Bodl. Libr. Laud 39 (Diktyon 48261), is of Italo-Greek origin and dates to the beginning of the tenth century, i.e. some decades before the Euchologion Crypt. Γ.β.IV. As far as I can see, the authorship of Methodios I has not been doubted. An exchange of prisoners in September 845 has been suggested as...

---

131 See IOANNIDES, Κυριακός λειτουργικός κώδικας 529–531. The τάξις was edited by J. Maj on the basis of the Constantinopolitan Euchologion Paris., Coisl. 213 ([Diktyon 49354], a.1027), see Maj, Coislin 213, 50–57. For the context of the τάξις, see D. J. SAHAS, Ritual of Conversion from Islam to the Byzantine Church. Greek Orthodox Theological Review 36 (1991) 57–69, and ELEUTERI – RIGO, Ἐκκλησία 53–57.

132 In a next step, more Euchologia manuscripts will be consulted, starting with the ones kept at Sinai and Mount Athos, and in libraries in Jerusalem and Russia, already studied by DMITRIEVSKII, Opisanie II.

133 Bibliographical references for this manuscript are mentioned in the tables by G. Rossetto above, p. 187.

134 The diataxis was edited in ARRANZ, Diataxis 289–315 (with translation into French) and in IDEM, L’Eucologio Costantino-politano 283–293. For our purposes the earlier edition (ARRANZ, Diataxis) is of a greater value since it is based on a variety of textual witnesses (including Crypt. Γ.β.IV). The later edition—due to its focus—is based on three manuscripts representing the Constantinopolitan tradition (Crypt. Γ.β.I [preference is given to this manuscript by the editor]; Paris., Coislin 213; Athen., EBE 662 [Diktyon 2958]). The text of the diataxis is quoted hereafter according to Arranz’ earlier edition following his numbering system [D, D1–D6]. (The text is also printed in GOAR 689–694 and in Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ. Rome 1873, 473–478 [based on Crypt. Γ.β.I]). After the completion of this contribution, E.-M. Synek very kindly brought to my attention that the Diataxis is also studied by H. B. Kragenhorst, Buß- und Beichtordnungen des griechischen Euchologions und des slawischen Trebniks in ihrer Entwicklung zwischen Osten und Westen (Das östliche Christentum N.F. 51). Würzburg 2003, 102–165 (with translation into German).

135 The continuation on f. 101rv is already referred to in a notice by a recent hand on the bottom of f. 141v. This is not mentioned in Arranz, Diataxis 301, but in PARENTI, Crypt. Γ.β.IV 47.

136 The usual designation is διάταξις, for διαταγή we have noted only one occurrence so far, in Crypt. Γ.β.IV, f. 139v.


138 My knowledge is based on the PINAKES database, see <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/id/2893> (10.11.2017), and on L. BURGMANN et alii, Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts. I: Die Handschriften des weltlichen Rechts (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 20). Frankfurt/Main 1995, no. 148, pos. 38–39.
the possible occasion for the composition of the text.\textsuperscript{139} The appearance of the \textit{diataxis} in Euchologia manuscripts may be connected with the liturgical reform that is also associated with Methodios I.\textsuperscript{140}

The transmission of the \textit{diataxis} and its prayers in the 13 manuscripts under consideration here\textsuperscript{141} can be summed up as follows:

- A title is not always given, neither for the \textit{diataxis} in longer form nor for single prayers.\textsuperscript{142}
- The title of the \textit{diataxis} in ΓβΙV becomes the generic title of [D3] (with slight variations).
- [D3] and [D4] appear repeatedly as single prayers in Euchologia manuscripts, with and also without a title. In some manuscripts, both prayers bear a title that explicitly mentions Muslim apostates.\textsuperscript{143}
- The complete sequence of the prayers in Arranz’ edition ([D1]–[D5] and one prayer after union [D6]) primarily reflects the transmission in two Euchologia representing the Constantinopolitan liturgical tradition, Paris., Coisl. 213, and Athen., EBE 662. Crypt. ΓβΙ, which follows that tradition, contains only [D1]–[D4].\textsuperscript{144}
- In addition, there is one manuscript in the libraries under consideration that also transmits the \textit{diataxis} in “complete” form: Patm. 647.\textsuperscript{145} This manuscript occupies a rather special position, since it was written in Rome in 1583 by Ioannes Sanctamauras\textsuperscript{146} on the basis of a Cypriote manuscript. It transmits ordination rites and the \textit{diataxis} for re-admission of apostates as well as the \textit{axis} for the conversion of Muslims. Furthermore, it contains non-euchological content, i.e. the \textit{metaphrasis} of the Acts of the Apostles by Ioannes Sanctamauras.\textsuperscript{147} Because of two notes referring to the year 1591 concerning marriage and baptism ceremonies, it can be concluded that this manuscript was also located in Messina.

\textsuperscript{139} Grumel – Darrouzés, \textit{loc. cit.}; Eleuteri – Rigo, Eretici 39. For an example of Muslim converts to Orthodoxy who refused to be repatriated on the occasion of a prisoner exchange in 859/860, see \textit{PmbZ} 10 648. (I thank Andreas Rhoby for this reference.)


\textsuperscript{141} Crypt. ΓβΙV, ff. 139v–141v and 101rv; Crypt. ΓβΙΙ, ff. 136r–139v; Vat. gr. 1554, ff. 87v–88v (early 12th c.); Vat. gr. 1970, ff. 162r–162v; Diktyon 64782, ff. 110r–113r (12th c.); Vat., Barb. gr. 329 (Diktyon 64782), ff. 110r–113r (12th c.); Crypt. ΓβΙV, f. 111r (12th c.); Crypt. ΓβΙ, f. 14v–15r; Patm. 703, f. 188rv; Vat. gr. 1552 (Diktyon 68183), ff. 33r–34v (12th c.); Crypt. ΓβΙl, ff. 104v–108v; Patm. 647, ff. 31r–38r. (For the dates of the Patmian manuscripts and those at Grottaferrata, see the tables above in the section by G.Rossetto above, pp. 184–189.)

\textsuperscript{142} Methodios is mentioned in the \textit{diataxis’} title in manuscripts Crypt. ΓβΙV, Vat. gr. 1554 (early 12th c.), Vat., Barb. gr. 393, 1. half 12th c.) and in three manuscripts representing Constantinopolitan tradition: Paris., Coisl. 213, (a.1072), Athen., EBE 662 (13th c.) and Crypt. ΓβΙ. In Vat., Barb. gr. 393 Methodios is mentioned twice, in the title of the \textit{diatasis} [D] on f. 111r, but also on f. 114r in the heading of [D3]: εὐχή ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρνησαμένων καὶ ἐπιστρεφόντων: ποίημα τοῦ ἁγίου Μεθοδίου. This is the case for [D3] in Vat., Barb. gr. 393, f. 111r (12th c.), Crypt. ΓβΙl, f. 114r, Patm. 703, f. 188rv, Vat. gr. 1552, f. 33r (12th c.) and for [D4] in Crypt. ΓβΙl, f. 137v, Vat., Barb. gr. 431, f. 113r (12th c.), Vat. gr. 1811, f. 139v (a.1147).

\textsuperscript{143} The title given in these three manuscripts differs slightly from all the other witnesses in focus: \textit{Diataxis of our most holy patriarch Methodios regarding reverts of a different kind and age} (Μεθοδίου τοῦ ἁγίου πατριαρχοῦ διάταξις περί τῶν διαφόρων τρόπων καὶ ἡλικίας ἐπιστροφῶν). See the detailed study on the liturgical texts transmitted in this manuscript, Ioannides, Κυπρικὸς λειτουργικὸς κώδικας. For the location history of this manuscript, see A. D. Komines, Ἀγνωστόν ἐργόν τοῦ κυπριοῦ ἀντιγραφέα κωδίκων Ἰωάννου Σανκταμαύρα. \textit{Diptycha} 1 (1979) 7–19, esp. 12–14.

\textsuperscript{144} A few years later Ioannes Sanctamauras (<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/copistepossesseur/id/1380> [10.11. 2017]) held the post of the \textit{scriptor graecus} at the Vatican Library (1585–1612), see also Ioannides, Κυπρικὸς λειτουργικὸς κώδικας 511, no.3.

for some time. It is assumed that it reached Patmos at the beginning of the 17th c., under
unknown circumstances. The question of the purpose and usage of this manuscript remains
open.

[D2] is not extant in our manuscripts, except for Crypt. Γ.β.I and Patm. 647. (It is, however
part of the diataxis in Paris., Coisl. 213, Athen., EBE 662).

Anathemata that would be pronounced in the process of re-admission are not constitutive
elements of Methodios’ diataxis (but they are part of the above-mentioned taxis for the
conversion of Muslims by birth).

The introductory rubric to Methodios’ diataxis offers an idea of the re-admission process: the
age of the reconvert at the time of apostasy was a decisive factor, as was the consideration of whether
the conversion had occurred under duress or voluntarily. This determined the period preceding func-
tion, which could last from seven days for children up to two years of fasting for adults to expiate
voluntary apostasy. Prayers [D3] and [D4] refer to the fact that the person seeking re-admission
had already received baptism.

Among the legal instructions concerning apostates, we encounter general regulations for some-
one who has renounced baptism in Basilica LX 54,22, based on Cod. Iust. I.7.3: An apostate would
not be allowed to testify, to leave a last will and to become an heir. Apostates from Christianity to
Islam, however, are mentioned explicitly in Ecloga tit.17,6 (περὶ τῶν μαγαρισάντων): Those who
fall into the hands of the enemy and renounce our blameless Christian belief should at their return
to the community be delivered to the church. Along these lines, Nomocanon 48 states that if it hap-
pens that someone has been captured by pagans and has converted to Islam he/she should be blessed
and ointed, but he/she should not be baptized. The latter regulation corresponds exactly to what has
been observed about the re-admission process in the relevant prayers.

This preliminary assessment demonstrates that the Euchologia manuscripts in the three library
collections under consideration here show some variation with regard to re-admission prayers for
Muslim apostates. While the relevant texts are well represented in the Euchologia manuscripts in
Grottaferrata and the Vatican, this concern is addressed only in two Patmian manuscripts. It re-
 mains to be seen whether this reveals a historically significant regional pattern. The manuscripts
at Grottaferrata and the Vatican transmit prayers that were also parts of patriarch Methodios’ I
diataxis. Regarding their transmission we note variation in sequence and in completeness, as even
single prayers from the diataxis are used. Admittedly, however, all these observations are based on
a relatively small percentage of Euchologia manuscripts. Therefore, the next steps will comprise ex-
panding the base of manuscripts and the detailed study of the rubrical instructions, wherever extant,

---

148 The rubric’s incipit runs as follows: Εἰ μὲν παιδίον συνελήφθη καὶ ἠρνήσατο ἢ φόβῳ καὶ ἀμαθείᾳ, καὶ ἀμαθείᾳ. It is contained
in these manuscripts of the libraries studied here: Crypt. Γ.β.IV, ff. 139v–140v; Vat. gr. 1554, ff. 87v–88r (early 12th c.); Vat.,
Barb. gr. 393, ff. 111r–112r (1. half 12th c.) and in Crypt. Γ.β.I, 104v–105r. It is also transmitted in Coisl. 213, ff. 132r–133r
(a.1027) and Athen. 662, ff. 235r–235v (13th c.)

149 The various regulations were already pointed out by Arranz, see the commentary after each prayer in ARRANZ, Diataxis.


151 For further studies it should be noted that legal aspects involved in the issue of conversion and apostasy are particularly tan-
gible when it comes to intermarriages, see E.-M. Synek, Islamisch-orthodoxe Mischehen. Ostkirchliche Studien 65 (2016)
42–63, esp. 44–63.


153 This expression would become the usual denomination for Christians who had converted to Islam, see LBG s.v.

154 See L. BURGMANN, Ecloga. Das Gesetzbuch Leons III. und Konstantinos’ V. (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsge-
schichte 10). Frankfurt/Main 1983, 158 and 228.


156 Patm. 703 [D3] on f. 188r, this section dates from the 12th c., (see also the tables by G. Rossetto above, p. 183, and the section
by D. Galadza above, p. 193) and Patm. 647 (a.1583), which represents a special case due to its genesis.
in order to learn more about the ritual setting of these prayers. Further down the line, a comparative reading of the *diataxis* and other works attributed to Methodios I has to be undertaken, as well as the comparison of its textual transmission in legal and liturgical witnesses, in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the ecclesiastical practices, including prayers, concerning re-admission into the church.

*Elisabeth Schiffer*

THE CHILDBED PRAYERS IN THE BYZANTINE EUCHOLOGIA: PRELIMINARY NOTES

In the year 1294 the newborn daughter of the emperor Andronikos II was in mortal danger. The emperor followed the advice of an “experienced and venerable woman” and lit candles in front of the icons of the twelve Apostles; the candle in front of Simon lasted longer, the girl survived and was named Simonis. In Byzantine hagiography similar stories of women and men seeking divine assistance in various situations concerning pregnancy and childbirth abound; these practices are reported in positive terms. In other cases, birth-related practices were condemned by the Byzantine Church as sorcery. Thus, Theodore the Stoudite praised his mother Theoktiste for not following the example of other women, who suspended amulets on their newborn children and revered the woman who guided them in such sorcery, but was satisfied simply by sealing her children with the sign of the cross. In the narrations of Pachymeres and Theodore Studites all three persons performing birth-related ritual actions without clerical mediation are women: the anonymous “experienced and venerable” one at Simonis’ birth, the equally anonymous “author and guide and teacher” rejected by Theoktiste, and Theoktiste herself, who sealed her children with the cross. The Euchologia, however, omit from their scope concerns such as conception, a safe delivery or infant mortality. They are not an accurate account of women’s life in Byzantium, and to unlock their potential one should not take them as such. They rather represent the voice of ecclesiastic authorities on fields considered by the Byzantine Church to be the responsibility of the clergy, including childbirth which is the focus of this contribution.

The prayers for the 40 days after birth in Goar’s edition of the Euchologion are the following:

- four prayers for the accouchée (γυνὴ λεχώ) on the day of birth;
- one prayer for the midwives;
- one prayer for the accouchée on the 15th or 20th day;
- one prayer for the eighth day, in which the child is “sealed” (i.e. by the sign of the cross) and given a name;
- two prayers for the churching of the woman and three for the churching of the child on the 40th day;
- one prayer in the case of a miscarriage.

---

158 ARIANTZI, Kindheit 51–91.
160 The ecclesiastic discourse on women, childbirth and purity are the object of analysis in the course of the Herta-Firnberg-Project “Female Identities at a Liminal State: An Analysis of Childbed Prayers in Byzantine Prayerbooks” (Eirini Afentoulidou, FWF T 884-G25, beginning 01.01.2018)
161 Goar 261–272.
Although Goar does not identify his manuscripts, his edition represents a later stage in the development of Euchologia. Indeed, prayers on the topics just listed are found in more or less the same order in the manuscripts from the 15th c. onwards. Miguel Arranz was the first to examine childbed prayers with attention to chronological and geographical aspects. In his attempt to reconstruct the ancient Constantinopolitan Euchologion, he analysed and edited prayers for the admission of the child on the eighth and 40th day, and prayers for the churching of the mother. Other childbed-related topics were outside Arranz’ chronological scope, as they are not attested in extant Euchologia prior to the 15th c. Thanks to recent research trips, we are in a position to gain a clearer picture of the chronological development and the geographic distribution of the childbed prayers.

**The prayers and their development**

- Eighth c.: sealing and churching of the child in front of the church

The earliest extant Euchologia contain exclusively pre-baptismal prayers for the admission of the child to the church: one prayer for the *sealing of the child on the eighth day* (Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ ἱκετεύομεν) and one for the *churching of the child on the 40th day* (Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέραις). Prayers for these occasions are found in nearly all Euchologia throughout the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine centuries. From the late 15th c. the prayer Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ διὰ τοῦ μεγαλοφωνοτάτου τῶν προφητῶν Ἡσαΐου is attested. The prayer Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἡ πηγὴ τῶν εὐλογίων, attested for various occasions in the life of a child since the 9th c., is occasionally transmitted in the context of childbed since the 13th c.

- 10th–13th c.: churching of the woman

From the 10th c. onwards, the first prayers for the *churching of the woman* are attested in some Euchologia, although it is from the 13th c. that practically every Euchologion transmitting prayers for the churching of the child also includes prayers for the churching of the woman. The earliest is Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ παραγενόμενος. The second, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν καὶ ἱκετεύομεν αὐτὸς ὁ Πατήρ, is attested from the 12th c. onwards.

- 15th c.: prayers for the day of birth said at home

At the beginning of the 15th c. Symeon of Thessaloniki wrote the treatise Περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν in the form of questions and answers, one of which is the following:

**Q. Why is a prayer said by the priest at the birth of an infant?**

**A. When an infant is born by a pious woman, the priest comes and praises God, giving thanks, because a human is born to the world. And he seals and blesses the newborn, and prays that it is preserved and receives the baptism and chrismation. For the mother he prays for what brings her salvation, and he administers her and the women who are with her grace and sanctification. And he gives them permission to pursue their work without being prohibited, or partaking of pollution, or...**
being insecure by the envious apparitions of the Evil one in any way; for they assisted the birth resulting from sin and voluptuousness, which some call, as it is, forerunner of corruption and death.\textsuperscript{169}

Symeon testifies to the existence of such prayers as an established practice by his time. Prayers for the mother and midwives on the day of birth are first attested in manuscripts from the 15\textsuperscript{th} c. However, the number of different prayers attested in the 15\textsuperscript{th}–16\textsuperscript{th} c. strengthens the hypothesis that such prayers must have existed for a while: so far, 17 prayers for the woman on the day of birth have been found on the basis of recent research (s. Appendix). The number of new prayers is explained by the high degree of intertextuality: they are a rearrangement of motifs and formulas found in other prayers, or are prayers usually said for another occasion, such as exorcisms or absolution prayers.

On the other hand, none of the almost one hundred South Italian manuscripts studied so far, a large part of which dates from the 10\textsuperscript{th}–13\textsuperscript{th} c., includes childbed prayers other than those said on the eighth or 40\textsuperscript{th} day at the church, with one possible exception.\textsuperscript{170} This is a manifestation of regional variation, but also suggests that childbed prayers said at home by the priest were a later development.

Some prayers are written specifically for the midwives, or are vague enough to be said for both midwives and the accouchée. The prayer Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ περὶ τῶν ζώων ἐν τῇ ὀθόνῃ is first attested in the 15\textsuperscript{th}–16\textsuperscript{th} c., Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἀληθινὸς ἄρτος in the 16\textsuperscript{th} c.\textsuperscript{171} In other manuscripts, however, including those used by Goar, the latter is read for the accouchée sometime between birth and churching.\textsuperscript{172}

– 15\textsuperscript{th} c.: miscarriage

From the 15\textsuperscript{th} c. the prayer Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ τεθείς, an adaptation of the prayer for birth with this incipit, is transmitted occasionally. Another prayer, Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἐλεήμων, is first attested in the 16\textsuperscript{th} c.\textsuperscript{173}

\section*{Concerns of Childbed-Prayers}

The main concerns addressed in the prayers presented above are the following:

a) Admission into the Church

The full admission into the church through baptism was anticipated by the prayers for the child on the eighth and on the 40\textsuperscript{th} day, in the context of which the child was referred to by his or her Christian name for the first time. The supplications mainly regard growth, a Christian life and the perspective of baptism. In this context it is important to draw attention to questions of the gendered language used in relation to the child.\textsuperscript{174}

b) Ritual purity of the accouchée and the midwives

According to Byzantine canon law, a woman was barred from entering the church, touching sacred objects and receiving Holy Communion for 40 days after birth.\textsuperscript{175} For the midwives the time of exclusion also lasted several days, depending on the source. Purification of the woman who had given birth was the main concern in the prayers for the 40\textsuperscript{th} day. Although these prayers are never titled “purification”, the discourse is that of purity. In the prayers for the day of birth the emphasis is on the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{169} De sacramentis. PG 155, 208.
\textsuperscript{170} Crypt. Γ.β.XII (Late 13\textsuperscript{th} c. vs 14\textsuperscript{th} c.) has an otherwise unknown prayer for the accouchée (Εὐχὴ εἰς λειων, f. 2v). There is no indication as to whether the prayer was said on the day of birth, or the 40\textsuperscript{th} day.
\textsuperscript{171} Patm. 690 (GOAR 263) and Patm. 786 respectively.
\textsuperscript{172} On the 15\textsuperscript{th} or 20\textsuperscript{th} day in Goar. On the eighth in Patm. 689.
\textsuperscript{173} Vindob. theol. gr. 286 (Diktyon 71953).
\end{footnotesize}
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sinful state shared by fallen humanity, reminiscent of the interpretation by Symeon of Thessaloniki. The wording is similar to that in the “recycled” miscarriage prayers.

c) Well-being of mother and child

The prayers attested from the 15th c. represent a shift from the church to the household, manifested not only in the space of their performance, but also in their topics. In some of the prayers for the day of birth, the health of mother and child becomes a central concern. Motifs are borrowed from early prayers for illness. The requests to guard and to protect mother and child from demonic influence address fears which were a major concern of other birth-related rituals and practices mentioned at the beginning of this section. Incidentally, texts in the grey zone between prayer and magic are often found in miscellanies alongside liturgical content or in Euchologia proper, none of which is earlier than 15th c. 176

d) Household

Some prayers include a blessing of the house/household (οἶκος), in which the child was born. Thus, whereas in the earlier prayers said at church the community is almost exclusively the Church, in the later prayers said at home the emphasis is on the household and its network, i.e. the midwives.

Conclusions

This overview demonstrated the potential of analysing the prayers in their historical development based on manuscript tradition and in relation both to other Euchologion prayers and to texts beyond the Euchologion—which should include Slavonic and Latin texts at a future stage. 177 The changes in the concerns and the discourse of the prayers indicate changes in attitudes and perceptions. The Euchologion is a mirror of what people valued, feared and hoped for, and at the same time reveals which of the concerns the Church hierarchy regarded as being their responsibility.

Appendix: Prayers for the accouchée on the day of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. of earliest occurrence178</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.XII, 2v.</td>
<td>Late 13th c. vs 14th c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin. gr. 968 (Diktyon 59343), 74r</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ πάντα ἐν σοφία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin. gr. 968, 75v; Vindob. theol. gr. 286, 37v; Patm. 689, 79v-80r.</td>
<td>1426; middle of 15th c.; 15th–16th c.</td>
<td>Κύριε Σαβαὼθ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ὁ ἰώμενος (also baptismal exorcism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin. gr. 968, 75r; Patm. 690, 67v; also edited in GOAR 263</td>
<td>1426; late 15th c.</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ τῷ ἐνυποστάτῳ σου λόγῳ (also for midwives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden A 151 (Diktyon 13475), f. 28v; GOAR 261</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε παντοκράτορ ὁ ἰώμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden A 151, f. 29r; GOAR 261</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ τεχθεὶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden A 151, f. 30r; also edited in GOAR 262</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ εὐδοκήσας κατελθεῖν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

176 Patm. 689 (15th–16th c.), Patm. 690 (Late 15th c.), Patm. 703 (15th c.), Vat., Barb. gr. 311 ([Diktyon 64854], 16th c.), Vat. gr. 1538 ([Diktyon 68169], 2nd half 15th c.), Vat. gr. 2032 (1549). See A. Vassiliev, Anecdota Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina, pars prior. Moskow 1893, 323–345.
178 For Patmos and Grottaferrata manuscripts, see the table above in the contribution by G. Rossetto, p. 183–189. The earliest occurrence is based on the dates given in catalogs, which are not always reliable. Whenever more than one of the manuscripts examined have the same date (which is not unusual, given that most datings are vague and approximate), I give all. Needless to say, this table is only of a provisional character and will be updated or revised, as the material grows and the tools get refined.
179 It is not clear whether this prayer for the accouchée is said on the day of birth or on a later day.
SCHOOLING PRAYERS: SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

Introduction

It is a commonplace that in Byzantium the Church dominated many aspects of its political, social and cultural life.\(^{181}\) It also exerted a strong influence over education, since it was the Church that usually provided the necessary space for the schools and many of the instructors themselves belonged to its ranks.\(^{182}\) Therefore it does not come as a surprise that under the aegis of the Church and over the course of time certain prayers and rituals were developed for the blessing of this important life stage.\(^{183}\) At the level of primary education, which is our focus here, these prayers concern the pupils’ first day at school. Information on the higher levels of education, by contrast, is provided by sources other than liturgical manuscripts, for instance Byzantine textbooks for secondary education containing schedographies which include some prayers outside a liturgical context for the students who begin their instruction in this method.\(^{184}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. of earliest occurrence(^{178})</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vat., Barb. gr. 410 (Diktyon 64953), 134r.</td>
<td>15\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ χοὸς πλάσας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindob. theol. gr. 286, 37r.</td>
<td>Middle of 15\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ τὴν ὁδόν μετανοίας ἄφησαν (also absolution prayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindob. theol. gr. 286, 59v; Paris. gr. 330, p. 123.</td>
<td>Middle of 15\textsuperscript{th} c.; 2\textsuperscript{nd} half of 15\textsuperscript{th} c.(^{180})</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ὁ παντοκράτορ ὁ ποιήσας τὸν σώμαν καὶ τὴν γῆν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 690, 66r.</td>
<td>Late 15\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ πλάστης καὶ δημιουργός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 690, 66v.</td>
<td>Late 15\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε Ἡσυχία Χριστέ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ τεχθείς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 690, 66v.</td>
<td>Late 15\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῆς Εὕας συγχωρήσας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 690, 67v.</td>
<td>Late 15\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν οἶκον ἁγίασον (also absolution prayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 689, 79r.</td>
<td>15\textsuperscript{th}–16\textsuperscript{th} c. vs 16\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν οἶκον ἁγίασον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 786, 120r.</td>
<td>16\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν (also for 40th day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patm. 811, 9r.</td>
<td>16\textsuperscript{th} c.</td>
<td>Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ μη βουλόμενος τὸν θάνατον (also absolution prayer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{178}\) The three folios containing the prayers for the day of birth (p. 123–128) were inserted into the 12\textsuperscript{th} c. Euchologion Paris. gr. 330 (Diktyon 49902). I wish to thank Christian Förstel for suggesting a date for these folios (e-mail 2017-06-20).

\(^{180}\) A. Kiousopoulou, Χρόνος καὶ ἡλικίες στὴ Βυζαντινὴ κοινωνία. Ἡ κλίμακα τῶν ἡλικιῶν ἀπὸ τὰ ἁγιολογικά κείμενα τῆς μέσης ἐποχῆς (7ος – 11ος αἰ.). Athens 1997, 72.


\(^{182}\) See Nesseris, Παιδεία Ι 40.

\(^{183}\) It has been shown that μάθησις (i.e. learning) was perceived by many authors of saints’ lives as the decisive factor that distinguished infancy from childhood and signaled the passing from one to the other, see A. Kiousopoulou, Χρόνος καὶ ἡλικίες στὴ Βυζαντινὴ κοινωνία. Ἡ κλίμακα τῶν ἡλικιῶν ἀπὸ τὰ ἁγιολογικά κείμενα τῆς μέσης ἐποχῆς (7ος – 11ος αἰ.). Athens 1997, 72.

\(^{184}\) For children’s education as depicted in saints’ lives, see also Arianzti, Kindheit 168–181. For another important life stage, which came earlier in a child’s life, see Radle, Infants.

\(^{184}\) These prayers eventually became an integral part of the corpus of schedographies they were initially attached to and were treated as didactic texts themselves, for instance in cod. Vat., Barb. gr. 102 (Diktyon 64650), a. 1288/89, see J. J. Keaney, Moschopulea. BZ 64 (1971) 303–321, esp. 305. For the teaching method of schedography, see F. Nousia, Byzantine Textbooks of the Palaeologan Period (StT 505). Vatican 2016, 49–92.
Goar’s edition of the Greek Euchologion includes, among other prayers for various needs and occasions, two individual prayers for a child that begins instruction at the primary school, namely (I) Εὐχὴ ὅταν ἀπέρχεται παιδίον μανθάνειν τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (Prayer for when a child departs to begin instruction in the sacred letters), inc. Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῇ σῇ εἰκόνι τιμήσας … (Oh God, our God, who have honoured us with your own image…) and (II) Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ μαθεῖν πάντα ἱερά γράμματα (Prayer for the learning of all sorts of sacred letters), inc. Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐνοικήσας καὶ φωτίσας τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἐκείσ τεσσάρων πρεσβυτέρων… (Oh Lord Jesus Christ, our God, you who have dwelt in and enlightened the hearts of the twenty-four Elders …). Goar, in his usual manner, does not indicate which manuscript was his exemplar for the first of these two prayers, but he mentions “Cryptoferratensis Basilii Falascae codex”, i.e. Crypt. Γ .β.III from the second half of the 14th century, as his textual base for the second. These prayers, which are laden with the usual references to enlightened and wise figures from the Bible, such as David and Solomon in I, are rather generic in their formulation and wording and offer no realia of school life nor information as to how or where they were read.

The various vitae of saints give the impression that most of the children in Byzantium were astute and overachieving students with precocious learning abilities, but this is, of course, a literary topos. It is precisely in this context that we have to examine the Ἀκολουθία εἰς παίδας κακοσκόπους, which, as Jane Baun has convincingly shown, refers to pupils with learning difficulties rather than misbehaving children. The Akolouthia consists of the necessary troparia and two prayers (III.1 and III.2) which are variations of II (Goar printed the first of them without any title, while the second one is simply entitled Εὐχὴ ἑτέρα) and closes with a synaptē. Of some interest is the mention—in addition to some biblical figures, such as Moses (only in III.1) and the 24 Elders (in II and III.2)—of the names of the Apostle Matthias and saints Agapitos, Prokopios, Philetos (in II and III.2), probably simply due to the connotations created by their names (Ματθίας – μανθάνω, Προκόπιος – προκόπτω etc.).

---


186 For this identification, see STRITTmatter, Barberinum S. Marcii, 331, n. 4.


190 The author was able to prove this point by examining the Akolouthia in conjunction with some quasi-magical formulas that exist in two post-Byzantine manuscripts, see BAUN, Coming of Age 127–129. Two similar formulas are also found in cod. Dresden A.151 (15th c.), f. 2r, entitled: Ἐρμηνεία, πῶς ὀφείλεις ποιεῖν εἰς παῖδας κακοσκόπους and Ἕτερον εἰς ἀργόσκοπον παῖδα respectively. The fact that in the title of the second formula the adjective ἀργόσκοπος (obviously meaning ‘slow on the uptake’) is alternatively used here as a synonym for the term κακόσκοπος, strengthens further BAUN’s argument.

Prayers I and II (and the aforementioned variants of Prayer II that form part of the Akolouthia) obviously attest to a later development of the schooling prayers within the framework of the liturgical tradition(s) of the Euchologiston, as can be deduced by the fact that apart from a single occurrence in a manuscript of the 14th c. (Prayer II in the already mentioned Crypt. Γ.β.III, ff. 156v–157r), no other manuscript is earlier than the 15th c.\(^{192}\)

But what about earlier traditions of prayers for learning? We have been able to locate four additional prayers which have remained hitherto unnoticed, significantly expanding our basis of known schooling prayers beyond the three texts edited by Goar. They are transmitted by more than 25 Euchologia manuscripts that we have been able to investigate so far on the basis of catalogs and through autopsy. We examined 15 of these manuscripts in the libraries of the Vatican and Grotaferrata during the second research trip of the Vienna Euchologia Project in March 2017.

**Further prayers added from Euchologia manuscripts**

The new prayers are the following four. They can be identified by their incipit, although, as can been seen in the table below, they appear under different titles in the various manuscripts:

- (IV) Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ πάσης κτίσεως δημιουργός, ὁ τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Δαβὶδ χαρισάμενος τῆς πνευματικῆς χάριτος… (Oh Lord our God, the Creator of all things, you who endowed your slave David with spiritual grace…)
- (V) Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς εὐλογίαις σου, καὶ ἄφθονος ἐν ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις σου… (Oh Lord our God, you who are abundant with your blessings and profuse with your benefactions…)
- (VI) Αγία Τριὰς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, εὐλόγησον τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματική… (Oh Holy Trinity our God, bless this child with all spiritual blessings…)
- (VII) Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἡ πηγὴ τῶν εὐλογιῶν, ὁ φυλάσσων τὰ νήπια, καὶ φρουρῶν αὐτὰ διὰ τὴν ἀκακίαν… (Oh Lord our God, you who are the source of all blessings, you who guard infants and protect them on account of their innocence…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prayer Type</th>
<th>Title in Ms.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Εὐχή ἐπὶ παιδίου, διδομένου μαθητευθῆναι (Prayer for a child delivered [to a teacher] to begin instruction)</td>
<td>13th/14th c. (pace Dmit.) vs 14th (Gard.)</td>
<td>Sin. gr. 971, ff. 203r–205r(^{193})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Εὐχή ἐπὶ παιδίου διδομένου εἰς τὸ μαθητευθῆναι (Prayer for a child delivered [to a teacher] to begin instruction)</td>
<td>13th (Dmit.) vs 14th c. (Gard.)</td>
<td>Sin. gr. 982, f. 63v(^{194})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{192}\) Prayer I is found in the following manuscripts: i. Dresden A.151 (15th c.), f. 1v; ii. Lesb. Leimōnos 85 (first half of the 16th c.), ff. ρλv–ρλαr; iii. Leipzig Eing. 1966/356 (\[Diktyon 38313\], first half of the 16th c.), f. 207r; iv. Sin. gr. 996 (\[Diktyon 59371\], a. 1566), f. 97v; v. BN Matri. gr. 241 (4793) (\[Diktyon 40268\], ca. 1580), ff. 101v–102r; vi. EBE, Metochion Panaghiou Taphou 134 (\[Diktyon 6531\], a. 1584), f. 100v; vii. Escur. gr. 53 (R.III.19) (\[Diktyon 15324\], 16th c.), f. 26v.

Prayer II is also transmitted by cod. Dresden A.151, f. 2v. Prayers I and III.2, which form part of the Akolouthia, are transmitted by all the manuscripts also containing I with the addition of Sin. gr. 996 and Meteoria, Hagias Triados 64 (\[Diktyon 74075\], a. 1623).

\(^{193}\) Diktyon 59346, Gardthaüsen, Catalogus 208; Dmitrievskij, Opisanie II 249–262, at 257.

\(^{194}\) Diktyon 59357, Gardthaüsen, Catalogus 213; Dmitrievskij, Opisanie II 232–245, at 238; for this date, see also Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 710, n. 114. A slightly earlier date in the 12th–13th c. had been proposed by S. Parenti, Un eucologio poco noto del Salento El Escorial X.IV.13. Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano 15.2 (2011) 157–197, at 168.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prayer Type</th>
<th>Title in Ms.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No Greek title given in catalog</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Marc. gr. III.12, f. 481v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Εὐχή ἐπί παιδός δοιμόμενον εἰς τὸ μαθῆν τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (Other prayer for a child delivered to a teacher to learn the sacred letters)</td>
<td>late 14th c.</td>
<td>Jerusalem, Patriarchiké Bibliothēkē, Hagiou Saba 377, f. ρντ f96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Εὐχή ἐπί παιδός δοιμόμενον, εἰς τὸ μαθῆν τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (Prayer for a child delivered to a teacher to learn the sacred letters)</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Karditsa, Monē Korones 8, ff. ρντ–ρντf97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No Greek title given in catalog</td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>Marc. gr. XI.20, f. 302f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ παραδοῦναι παῖδα εἰς σχολίον (lege σχολεῖον) (Prayer for a child delivered to school)</td>
<td>11th c. vs early 12th c.</td>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.II, f. 122f99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Εὐχή (Other prayer)</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Vat., Ottob. gr. 344, ff. 197r–v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ παραδοῦναι παιδίον β΄ (Second prayer after the hair-clipping of a child)</td>
<td>late 8th c.</td>
<td>Vat., Barb. gr. 336, f. 203r–v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἑτέρα (Other prayer)</td>
<td>11th c.</td>
<td>Vat., Barb. gr. 336, f. 203r–v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ κουρεῦσαι παιδίον β΄ (Prayer for the hair-clipping of a child)</td>
<td>early 10th c. vs 10th–11th c.</td>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.VII, ff. 57v–58r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εἰς καμπανισμὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ παραδοῦναι εἰς μ(αθήματα ?) (Prayer for kampanismos and for a child beginning instruction)</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1833, f. 29r203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


199 For the dates and bibliography on this and the rest of the Grottaferrata manuscripts mentioned here, see the section by G. Rossetto above, p. 186–189.


201 Velkovska – Parenti, Evchologij Barberini 411–412.


203 *Diktyon* 68642, Canari, Codices Vaticani 272–278, at 273; Jacob, Καμπανισμός 225; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 704, n. 23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prayer Type</th>
<th>Title in Ms.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς καμπανισμὸν παιδῶν (Prayer for kampanismos of children)</td>
<td>11th c. vs early 12th c.</td>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.ΙΙ, f. 121v204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ καμπανισμὸν καὶ εἰς παιδὸ ἐρευνῷ θεολόγου (Prayer for kampanismos and for a child delivered [to a teacher] to begin instruction)</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1811, f. 67r205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>[Prayer comes after the prayer for the hair-clipping of a child] No title in ms.</td>
<td>1152/1153</td>
<td>Sin. gr. 973, f. 56v206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ καμπανιζομένων (Prayer for kampanismos)</td>
<td>11th c. vs 12th c. (Canart, Jacob)</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1863, f. 125v207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς παιδίσκην (Prayer for a boy or a girl)</td>
<td>1299/1300</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 2111, ff. 11v–13v210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς καμπάνισμα (Prayer for kampanismos)</td>
<td>late 15th c.</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1538, f. 173v214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Προσευχὴ εἰς καμπανισμὸν παιδὸς (Prayer for kampanismos of a child)</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>Vat., Barb. gr. 303, ff. 99v–100v213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς καμπανισμὸν (Prayer for kampanismos)</td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>Corsinianus gr. 7 (41.E.31), ff. 19r–21v215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

204 Jacob, Καμπανισμός 226.
207 Diktyon 68492, Canart, Codices Vaticani 384–387, at 385; Jacob, Καμπανισμός 229. The commemoration of the Norman king of Sicily William I or II in the ektenē of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (f. 94r: Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ θεοφυλάκτου ἡμῶν Γουλιέλμου ῥηγός etc.) allows for a date between 1156 and 1189 (the regnal years of William I were 1154–1166 and those of his successor William II 1166–1189), see M. Re, Precisazioni sulla datazione del Vat. gr. 1863. Biblos 45 (1996) 45–47; Iedm, I manoscritti in stile di Reggio vent’anni dopo, in: O Italiotes ellenismos apo ton Z´ston IB´aiona, ed. N. Oikonomides. Athens 2001, 99–124, at 108 (here the author makes the supposition that the king mentioned in the manuscript is William II, thus opting for a date in the period 1166–1189); Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 707, n. 72.
208 Diktyon 73381, Jacob, Καμπανισμός 231–232; Iedm, Euchologes 143.
209 Diktyon 64986, Jacob, Καμπανισμός 230; Iedm, Euchologes 191; Arnesano, Repertorio 31; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 709, n. 99.
210 Diktyon 68741, Jacob, Καμπανισμός 233–235.
211 Diktyon 67859, Jacob, Καμπανισμός 237–238; Arnesano, Repertorio 34; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 712, n. 140. 
212 Jacob, Καμπανισμός 238.
213 Diktyon 64846, Jacob, Euchologes 145.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prayer Type</th>
<th>Title in Ms.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ παιδίου ἀρχομένου ὑπὸ χέρα (Prayer for a child who is led by the hand for the first time)</td>
<td>9th c.</td>
<td>Sin. NF/MG 53, ff. 75v–76r²¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς τριχοκουρίαν (Prayer for hair-clipping)</td>
<td>early 10th c. vs 10th–11th c.</td>
<td>Crypt. Γ.β.VII, f. 77r²¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ παιδίου λαμβάνοντος ὄνομα ὅτε εἰς τοὺς πυλώνας ἔρχεται τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Prayer for a child receiving name when entering the [royal] doors on the eighth day)</td>
<td>late 10th c.</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1833, f. 71v²¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>No title in ms.</td>
<td>11th/12th (Dmit.) vs 13th c. (Gard.)</td>
<td>Sin. gr. 961, ff. 53v-54r²¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς παιδὰ λαμβάνοντα χέρας ὅτε εἰσέλθῃ εἰς τοὺς βασιλικοὺς πυλῶνας (Prayer for a child who is led by the hands entering the royal doors)</td>
<td>first quarter of the 12th c.</td>
<td>Vat., Barb. gr. 329, ff. 49v-50r²²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ παιδὸς παραδιδομένου εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (Prayer for a child delivered [to a teacher] to be instructed the sacred letters)</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Vat., Ottob. gr. 344, f. 197²²¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ παιδὸς παραδιδομένου εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (Prayer for a child delivered [to a teacher] to learn the sacred letters)</td>
<td>1st half 13th c. (Jacob) vs 12th/13th (Taft-Parenti)</td>
<td>Vat., Barb. gr. 443, f. 54v²²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ διδάξαι παιδόν εἰς μάθησιν (Prayer for the instruction of a child; for learning)</td>
<td>late 13th c.</td>
<td>Ambros. gr. 709 (R 24 Sup.), f. 180v²²²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to Prayers I and II in the printed edition of the Euchologion, these texts do not provide any tangible and concrete information about the circumstances under which they were read. It is reasonable to assume that IV and V (and likewise I–II) were composed ad hoc for the pupils’ first day at school and read out by clergymen since, as we have mentioned before, at this elementary level they would probably have served in the capacity of instructors as well. However, this is an assumption that remains to be proven as additional manuscript evidence comes to light.

²¹⁶ The new finds of Sinai, ed. by P. Nikolopoulos et alii. Athens 1999, 150. For this manuscript, see also C. Kanavas, L’euchologio MG 53 (sec. IX) del monastero di S. Caterina del Sinai (unpubl. doctoral diss.) Rome 2013; Radle, Infants.
²¹⁷ Passarelli, L’euchologio Cryptense Γ.β. VII 122.
²¹⁸ Canart, Codices Vaticani 277; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 704, n. 23.
²¹⁹ Gardthäusen, Catalogus 205; Dmitrievskij, Opisanie II 75–83, at 78 [prayer inc.: Δέσποτα Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ φυλάσσων τὰ νήπια …]; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 706, n. 47.
²²⁰ Jacob, Euchologes 151; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 708, n. 78. 
²²¹ Polidori, Liturgia 64; Arnesano, Repertorio 33; Taft – Parenti, Il Grande Ingresso 708, n. 87.
Regarding their provenance and chronology, since all four prayers newly presented here are attested in manuscripts that are, on the whole, earlier than those that transmit the prayers edited by Goar, they must represent an earlier stage in the development. In fact, based on the titles of Prayers VI and VII in the manuscripts, we are faced with a complex manuscript tradition: these prayers were originally composed for entirely different events (i.e. child who starts walking/hair cutting/καμπανισμός/naming a child on the eighth day), and later appropriated (or re-appropriated) in the then-current liturgical praxis to serve another need, namely the blessing of the pupil’s first day at school. Even so, they remained within the same larger context of denoting a rite of passage at a certain stage during infancy. Ordinarily in the manuscripts there is no distinction of gender made in the titles of the schooling prayers. A sole exception is the title of Prayer VI in cod. Vat. gr. 2111, where it is stated that the prayer may concern a male and/or a female child (παιδίσκη). This is highly unusual and one could hope that additional material with relevant information will come to light at some point.

Moreover, it would appear that the new prayers belong to different branches of the liturgical tradition: for instance, IV is mainly transmitted by Sinaiatic, Jerusalem and Cypriot codices indicating perhaps a possible connection with the geographical area of the Eastern Mediterranean, while V is only attested in manuscripts from Southern Italy. A very strong South Italian connection can also be observed with Prayers VI and VII. Remarkably, none of the four new prayers seems to be connected with a manuscript belonging to the Constantinopolitan tradition.

In conclusion, the close examination of the schooling prayers illustrates that further investigation of the numerous Euchologia manuscripts is a sine qua non for better understanding the Byzantine liturgical tradition overall, since the material published up to the present day amounts to only a fraction of what really exists; furthermore that this tradition was multifaceted and not monolithic, but changed according to the needs of the local societies over the course of time.

Ilias Nesseris

ABBREVIATIONS


ARRANZ, L’eucologio costantinopolitano = M. Arranz, L’eucologio costantinopolitano agli inizi del secolo XI. Hagiasmatarion & Archieratikon (Rituale & Pontificale) con l’aggiunta del Leiturgikon (Messale). Rome 1996.

BAUN, Coming of Age = J. Baun, Coming of Age in Byzantium: Agency and Authority in Rites of Passage from Infancy to Adulthood, in: Authority in Byzantium, ed. P. Armstrong. Farnham – Burlington 2013, 113–135.


RADLE, Infants; JACOB, Καμπανισμός. See also the section of E. Afentoulidou above, pp. 200–201.
Byzantine Prayer Books as Sources for Social History and Daily Life


Goar = J. Goar, Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Graecorum complectens ritus et ordine Divinae Liturgiae, officiorum, sacramento torum, consecrationem, benedictionum, funerum, orationum ... editio secunda expurgata et accuratior. Venice 1730; (reprint Graz 1960).


Sakkelion, Πατμιακὴ Βιβλιοθήκη = I. Sakkelion, Πατμιακὴ Βιβλιοθήκη ἢτοι ἀναγραφὴ τῶν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νήσον Πάτμον. Athens 1890.


