

# The Liturgical Service of Marriage in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Wallachia

---

VIOLETA BARBU

**M**ARRIAGE WAS firmly established as a sacrament in the Romanian Lands in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century as the result of a process of liturgical reform that was concluded in 1706, when Antim Ivireanu, Metropolitan of Wallachia, published the edition of the comprehensive office book, the *Moliftelnic*, he translated from the Greek *Euchologion* printed in Venice in 1691. Our paper will first examine the Byzantine and Roman traditions of the liturgy of this sacrament, but also their hybrid adaptations by the Slavonic manuscripts used in the Romanian Church prior to Antim's edition on the one hand and, on the other hand, by the Latinizing liturgical reshuffling undertaken by the Metropolitan of Kiev Peter Movila. The edition of Metropolitan Antim was frequently reprinted during the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, starting with the Bucharest version of 1729 and was also published in Moldavia under the aegis of Prince Constantine Mavrocordat.<sup>1</sup> It not only unified the liturgical language of the two Romanian Lands, but also instituted a common social and institutional discipline of marriage that endured into the present times. Our main concern will be to determine the sources, genealogy and shape of this discipline, as well as its early impacts on Romanian society.

## Byzantium and the rite of marriage

**N**othing reflects better the notion of marriage a particular Church abide by than the liturgical texts each tradition proposes to the faithful in order to perform the rituals of engagement and wedding. Such liturgical ceremonies emphasize not only the sacramental character of the bond between a man and a women – and in so doing, its legitimacy through the offering of the sanctifying grace – but also realize the publicity of wedding and its subjection to the Church's moral rules. Last but not least, the ritual itself, relying on

a complex liturgical symbolism, was proposing an institutional model of marriage meant to shape the behavior of the persons concerned.

In this regard, some elements do singularize the Eastern tradition in comparison with the Western one.<sup>2</sup> First of all, the Eastern liturgy had a key role in dispensing the relevant elements of the canon law in the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine societies. Liturgical life was not limited only to churches and monasteries, the liturgy and the different services could be fulfilled also in chapels and private houses<sup>3</sup>.

In the Latin Church, before the 13<sup>th</sup> century the wedding ritual was part of the Missal, along with other rituals fulfilled before the church's doors, *ante valvas ecclesiae*.<sup>4</sup> The explanation of this fact is that, even being part of Missal, these rituals had not fully gained the liturgical character that will characterize them later. Once the consent of the couple was given expressly before the priest, there followed the celebration of the liturgy with the blessing of the bride. This special blessing had a central role in the first stages of the ritual and it continued even in the *Ritual* of the Gregorian Reforms. The phrase said by the priest *Ego coniungo vos*, along with the invitation to the grooms to unite their hands (right hand), is confirmed for the first time by a *Ordo* from Rouen, from the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>5</sup> Also in that century, the wedding ritual took its place in the *Rituale*, alongside other liturgies called "votive".

In the Post Tridentine age, the *Pro Sponso et Sponsa* wedding ritual was the one provided by the *Roman Ritual* from 1614<sup>6</sup>, which was encoding the medieval ordinance (*Ordo*): the mutual exchange of consent, the holding of the hands, accompanied by the sacerdotal phrase: *Ego coniungo vos*, the blessing of the bride's ring and the final phrase. Despite its unifying character, the Roman Ritual does not dissolve, in the spirit of the *Tametsi* decree of the Trent Council, the laudable habits and ceremonies (*laudabiles consuetudines et caeremoniae*) that might have been used in different places: *vel aliis utatur verbis iuxta receptum uniuscuiusque loci ritum ...* <sup>7</sup> The ritual was performed out of the liturgy and, when was sharing the same body with the latter, the readings were provided by the *Letter to the Ephesians* 5, 22-23 and *Matthew* 19, 3-6.

The richness and the beauty of the liturgical symbolism of the Eastern ritual, which is composed of three acts (engagement and wedding prayers and the prayer for cleansing of the 8<sup>th</sup> day<sup>8</sup>) and which Byzantine origins go back to the 9<sup>th</sup> century, make the service much more complex than the Latin one, more ample, more rich in prayers and references to the union between Christ and Church.<sup>9</sup> If the Latin ritual assimilates the wedding contract in simple liturgical formula, the Eastern one remains close to a "poetic" vision of the union between man and woman, grounded in a profound theological reasoning. In the opinion of the chaplain of the British community from Sankt Petersburg, John

Glen King, member of the Antiques Royal Society, the wedding ritual is more antiquated and so, the most curious amongst the Eastern Church's services: "In all the offices of the Greek church, there is not perhaps a more curious service than this of matrimony, nor any which carries more genuine marks of antiquity".<sup>10</sup>

Although it was recommended to all the faithful of the Eastern Church, it seems that the wedding ceremonial was not considered absolutely necessary to validate the contract of wedding. At least not until 895, when the *LXXIV* and *LXXXIX Novells* of emperor Leo VI the Wise, strengthened in 1084 and 1092 by emperor Alexis Comnen,<sup>11</sup> deemed it mandatory. Leo VI's *Novells* were establishing that the engagement be blessed by the Church (betrothal and blessing) and have the value of wedding,<sup>12</sup> but they did not prohibit that the service be celebrated by the priest at home or in private chapels. The great stages of the engagement and wedding ceremonial are fixed up already in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, as do show some of the answers given in 866 by Pope Nicolas I to Tsar Boris of Bulgary and to Fotios, patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>13</sup> The third chapter of this writing is dedicated to engagement and wedding. The engagement is based on the consent of the two, underlined by the gesture of the groom who puts on the bride's finger the *anulus fidei* ring, the first mention in Medieval Western Europe, in a religious context, of the ring with this value of vow. Then, the grooms go to church, where they are given the blessing and, if it is their first wedding, a veil is put on their heads *et vaelatem caeleste suscipiunt*.<sup>14</sup> The veil ritual is not a liturgical act, but it is the expression of the mutual consent, according to Pope Gelasius' testimony (8<sup>th</sup> century).<sup>15</sup> This veil (*velamen*), where-with the bishop was covering the bride's head and the groom's back must not be confused with the bride's veil, of Roman origin (*flammeum*). After this, the grooms go home wearing the crowns that are kept inside the church (*Post haec autem de ecclesia egressi coronas in capitibus gestant, quae semper in ecclesia ipsa solitae reservari*), which shows that the ritual of crowning the grooms was in use also in Western Europe in the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>16</sup>

As a matter of fact, the manuscript tradition of liturgical ceremonies goes back also to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. The first Western canonists (Leon Allatius in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and Giovanni Battista Pitra in the 19<sup>th</sup> century) who were concerned with the history of the service of marriage assign the composition of engagement and wedding rituals to Methodios, patriarch of Constantinople (842-846).<sup>17</sup> Otherwise, the jurists have emphasized the terminological difference between the two Byzantine rituals (of engagement *sponsali* and of wedding) and the modern terminology.<sup>18</sup> A short philological digression would enable us to understand the crystallization of engagement and wedding services in the Eastern tradition until the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The oldest Greek manuscript containing a Byzantine Euchologion that includes also the wedding sacrament is *Codex Barberini Gr.*

366,<sup>19</sup> of the Vatican Library. It reproduces, in the oldest shape, the version called “of the Great Church of Constantinople”. The first printed philological review of a number of seven Byzantine manuscripts belongs to Jacques Goar, *Euchologion sive rituale Graecorum*, published in Paris in 1647.<sup>20</sup>

The liturgical ritual from *Codex Barberini Gr. 366* begins with the prayer of the blessing in house, which indicates very clearly that the ceremony was not held, at its origin, within a sacred space. The engagement prayers were separated from those of the wedding itself, the latter already containing the common communion from a chalice. In the 10<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries, the engagement service receives an importance equal with that of the wedding service, preceded by the same recommendations and the same impediments.

Only in Russia, even until the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Church’s presence at this moment of life continued to be optional<sup>21</sup>.

The liturgy of the wedding with blessing as well as the committing of the service (Euchologion) of engagement and wedding is enforced in 17<sup>th</sup> century Wallachia by the 204<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Îndreptarea Legii* (*The Guidance of the Law*, Târgoviște, 1652). It contains two Novells, “tiposite și ijderite” (which means formulated and revealed) by Leo the Wise and by Alexis Comnen: “*Când se face nunta cu tocméle subțiri, dă nemic, proaste, fână de molitve și fână blagoslovenie, după aceea, unul de altul dentr-amândoi de să va căi, atunce neapărat se dășpart și va lua bărbatul altă muiare și muiarea alt bărbat. Iar de să vor fi făcut molitve, blagoslovenia, măcamă de nu să vor fi și împreunat, atunce nunta acéea la acel bărbat și făméie easte pre lége și lăcuința nedășpărțită și niminea nu poate să-i dășpartă*” (when a wedding is held without prayers and blessings, this will result in the grooms’ separation and each other’s marriage with a different person. If the wedding is held following the church rule, than nobody will be able to separate those grooms, despite of the consummation of the marriage).<sup>22</sup> From the very first sentence of the chapter, it results that the wedding without prayers and without the priest’s blessing is not annulled per se, unless the grooms change their minds. Instead, the second sentence underlines that the committing of the sacrament has more legal force than the consummation of the marriage. Even in the extreme case of an unconsummated wedding, the couple remains legally married, through the administering of the sacramental link.

In Transylvania, the 1675 Council, chaired by Sava Brancovici, prescribes, taking in a Protestant influence, just the utterance of “The word of God and oath be also made, to be known what wedding is”.<sup>23</sup>

In what way the wedding ritual, as used in the Romanian lands, was reflecting the particularities of the Byzantine conception on the validity? One distinctiveness of the Eastern ritual was the canonical power of engagement, derived from the fact that, in the eyes of the Eastern Church,<sup>24</sup> the wedding and the engage-

ment were moments of the same contract (*98 canon of Trullo Council*). The same prescriptions and the same impediments were characterizing the engagement as much as the wedding, which led practically to the fusion of the two moments in two services immediately consecutive, unlike in Western Europe, where the engagement period was longer and the liturgical moments were completely separated. The imperial legislation (Emperor Alexis Comnen's *Novell*) tried to impose a reasonable gap between engagement and wedding, but the social practice showed that in the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the two religious ceremonies were fulfilled in immediate succession and by the same liturgical move.<sup>25</sup>

The second particularity evoked above, the explicit absence of the two grooms' consent, one of the foundations of wedding as a sacrament in the Post-Tridentine Catholic practice, is somehow substituted by a series of documents and symbolic signs implying consent, all detailed by the Slavonic and Greek Euchologies, as well as the printed ones. However, at least in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, in the whole area of the Eastern Church, there is no real evidence of the existence of or demand for a consensual exchange of wills. With the remarkable exception of the religious books edited by bishop Peter Movila<sup>26</sup>: the ring exchange, the holding of hands, the drinking from the same Communion chalice stand for him as a genuine manifestation of consent. Even here, the impersonal formula used by the priest (is *becoming engaged-is marrying the serf of God ...*) maintains the ambiguity of the interpretation: who performs this ritual? Is it the priest or the grooms?

## **Peter Movila and the liturgical reform of wedding ceremonial**

**B**UT LET us linger a little more on the consent matter. The one significant exception to the absence of the consent rule can be explained through the sway exerted by the Catholic ritual. The *Trebnik* prepared and printed in 1646 by the bishop of Kiev Peter Movila was influenced in a significant way, after A. Wenger's opinion,<sup>27</sup> by *The Roman Ritual* of 1614 issued by Pope Paul V, but also by the Trento Council's prescription, concerning the pre-matrimonial catechesis of the young who intend to marry.

The *Trebnik* (*Great Euchologion*) included in the wedding ceremony, the direct question addressed by the priest to both grooms, section taken over in the 1677 Russian *Euchologion* as well. This explicit question addressed to the plighted lovers by the priest was uttered before the reading of the engagement prayers, after the priest censors the table and is repeated during the wedding service, after the first group of litanies. To obtain the consent, the following question is put: "do you want voluntarily and unconstrained ... to take ... to be your

wife ...” And the answer: “I do, devout father”. To those that marry, the consent is asked from each in turn, in their language, first from the man and then from the woman: Po skon an ě slova, b pravaet I enixa ruskim zykom glagol : Mae. Imrhk bol dobrā i neprimā.onā i pos umysl pon ti sobh zaonā tā Imirhk , kotorā tāt pered sobh vidi? Ma , belebnŷi ě The free expressed commitment of each groom was marked through the oath formula: ~ Imrhk ver` sobh tebe Imrhk za mal onk` i ,l b` tobh milost, vhr`, iensktivos tixmalebe ne p`w` a do sm rti (I, such, (take) you, such, as wife and to your wedding (I promise) mercy, faith and honor and I shall not leave you until death).<sup>29</sup> The priest holds both their hands, saying: E e Bog s eta, al vek da ne razl` ae (That what God united, man shall not separate).

Before beginning to print the engagement and wedding service, the metropolitan bishop of Kiev makes available for the priests and other bishops the necessary knowledge for understanding the mystery of wedding as well as a number of indications referring to the control of the canonical conditions necessary to the fulfillment of this service.<sup>30</sup> In another place of the *Euchologion*,<sup>31</sup> he selected and restored the principal canonical sources of the sacrament of the wedding, which are the basis of this preliminary canonical inquiry: the 47<sup>th</sup> and 49<sup>th</sup> Canons of the Saint Apostles’ Rules, the 7<sup>th</sup> Canon of the first Ecumenical Council, the 48<sup>th</sup> Canon of Laodicea Council, the Canon referring to wedding of Neochesareea Council, Timothy’s Rule, patriarch of Alexandria and the 111<sup>th</sup> Canon of the Carthage Council. The last one was concerned with the unction and grooms’ Communion. After the enumeration of the canonical sources, follow the elements that define wedding as a sacrament. The wedding is “*The mystery instituted by God for the multiplication of the humankind for the glory of God and for the union between man and woman, through love and friendship and for the help of each other*”. It follows, in a Catholic spirit, the specification that the matter of this mystery are the man and the woman themselves: they are to be considered properly married only after each of the two in person (“cheek”) commit says the words: “I ... take you ... etc.”

The priest accomplishing the office verifies then if this union is voluntarily and unconstrained by the parents, if the boy has the legitimate age of 14 and the girl the legitimate age of 12, if the two witness the Orthodox faith, meaning they recite the Credo, if they have the elementary knowledge of catechism: *Our Father* prayer, *Be joyful, Virgin* – the equivalent of *Ave Maria* prayer –, the Ten Commandments of the Church, the seven cardinal virtues. An important obligation of the priest who commits the mystery would be also to explain to the young grooms what the mystery of wedding means, a sort of pre-matrimonial catechesis, inspired from the Catholic one, area from where comes also the custom of proclaiming the wedding with a loud voice inside the church, to assure

not only the publicity of the event, but also its legality, inviting to the disclosure of a possible impediment.

The relatives and the rest of the wedding party are advised first to attend the religious marriage from the beginning to the end, and only afterwards to feast with the grooms and their families.

Another array of pieces of advice points to how couples tend sometimes to live apart, which may engender a kind of discord that should not be deemed a valid reason for divorce. Only the bishop has the competence to judge how a couple should act in case of impotence or unconsumed marriage.

The bishops should not omit to recall his flock that the blessing of the wedding inside the house is no longer permitted, the proper place for the engagement and the wedding being inside the church, the parish priests presiding over the ceremony. Moreover, before the religious service, the priest has to introduce the grooms into the meaning of this mystery. Also, the bishop is advised to instruct his priests to hear the confession of the grooms, especially of women, who should confess with much attention and repentance before the committing of the religious service, revealing all sins; the grooms should prepare themselves to receive the sacrament with fast and prayers and take communion before the wedding. The bishop has to know what type of canons to recommend for the confessed mortal sins.

Finally, the five pages of guidance end with specifications referring to the periods over the year when weddings are not permitted: in great fasts, in the fast of the Saint Apostles, in the fast of the Dormition of the Holy Theotokos and of Assumption.

Because this is a great mystery, the parish priests have to guide and advice the people, so the mystery be celebrated with all the honors, in a Christian way. In the annex of this guide, follow the degrees of kinship to the 6<sup>th</sup> relationship, then the spiritual relationships, instituted through baptism,<sup>32</sup> explanations of canonical nature about adoption, “spiritual son conception”, twinning and the “common” wedding. To clarify the degrees of kinship that forbid marriage, are introduced passages from Matthew Vlastares’ *Syntagma*, from Constantine Harmenopol’s *Hexabiblos* and from Theodore Balsamon.<sup>33</sup>

All these precede the engagement service<sup>34</sup> and the wedding one,<sup>35</sup> from which there are missing two parts, that of the giving of communion from the common chalice and Isaiah’s dance, which very clearly show us that Peter Movila followed the official version of the Roman Ritual for the Ruthenian Christians united with Rome, established by the Roman Commission for Eastern Books in 1630, different, as we will see, from the Greek tradition of the Great Church of Constantinople.

## The Slavonic and Greek model in the liturgical ritual of Walachia

**A**MONG THE four printings published in the age of Matei Basarab after the Ruthenian models, compiled and printed by bishop Peter Movila (*Euchologion, Liturgy book, Triodyon and Antologion*), the one Slavonic *Euchologion* of Câmpulung from 1635 does not hold a special place in the historiography.<sup>36</sup>

The Romanian historian Petre P. Panaitescu does mention it briefly<sup>37</sup> and the Jesuit liturgist Alphonse Raes, connecting it to the Ruthenian printings' cycle, appreciates that between this edition and the Latinizing one of Movila, the *Trebnik* (Kiev, 1646), there are however important differences concerning the sacrament of the wedding (the presence of the grooms' consent), the unction of the diseased and the baptism,<sup>38</sup> in other words the Latinizing interventions have not been included in the Romanian book. The Slavonic *Euchologion* from Câmpulung (1635) remained in use until 1680, when the edition of Bishop Theodosie was issued, with a Romanian typical, a step of shy passing to the Romanian versions of engagement and wedding ordinance,<sup>39</sup> translated and printed by Antim Ivireanul at Râmnic (1706) and Târgoviște (1713).

How was shaped the Wallachian tradition of the wedding and engagement ordinances, in comparison with the Moldavian one, represented by *Molitvenicul de-nșeles* of Bishop Dosoftei (1681) and with the Transylvanian one, of the 1689 edition from Balgrad? A first answer concerns the shift from the communion of the grooms, present in the Slavonian sources (*Molitvenicul slavon* from 1635, *Molitvenicul de Bălgrad* from 1689) at the three times sipping from the communion chalice "by the country's habit", which appears in the Greek sources (the Slavonian *Euchologion* with Romanian typical indications, Buzău 1699-1700, translation by Antim Ivireanul 1706, *Molitvenicul lui Dosoftei*, 1681). The second distinctive element is the lections from the Epistles: the Slavonian editions use *Epistle to the Corinthians* (chapter 7), as well as the Buzău *Euchologion* (1699-1700) and *Gospel of John* (chapter 2). In the editions prepared by Peter Movila, Dosoftei and Antim, the lections are taken from the *Epistle to the Ephesians* (chapter 5), after the model of the Greek editions and of the Roman Ritual from 1614. The ceremonial of rounding the table, accompanied by the chanting of the hymn "Isaiah, dance" is missing from the Slavonic *Euchologions*, including the one from Buzău, being introduced by Antim Ivireanul in the 1706 Romanian edition.<sup>40</sup>

So, the first Romanian translation of the engagement and wedding prayers, printed in Walachia, exceeds a little the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The initiative and the realization of translation belong to Antim Ivireanul, then, only



Bishop of Râmnic. He took as a model, as he confesses in the epilogue of the *Euchologion* from Râmnic (1706),<sup>41</sup> the Greek *Euchologion* corrected by Nicola Glykis at Venice (1691), warning that there will be differences from the Slavonic tradition: “This *Euchologion*, if you will to compare it with some Slavonic sources, and it will be revealed that they do not mach, is following the Greek ones”.

At page 46, respectively 54, there are the ordinances of engagement and wedding, translated into not a very different form from the one in use nowadays. It is no wonder that the 1706 *Euchologion* was reproduced with fidelity in Wallachia, beginning with 1713,<sup>42</sup> as much as in Moldavia, in successive editions, all over the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>43</sup>

What type of ceremonial reproduces Antim’s *Euchologion*? To answer this question it is enough to consider his Greek model, of the 1691 edition, published in Venice. According to the philological and liturgical analysis of the form of wedding rite in the Eastern Church, handwritten and printed by Gaetano Passarelli,<sup>44</sup> the form disseminated by the Venetian editions beginning with 1558, 1571, 1622, 1638 etc. and reproduced, with various rite versions in the 1647 J. Goar’s edition,<sup>45</sup> represents a simplified formula, conventionally called type C Hellenic-Eastern.<sup>46</sup> In this formula, the communion from the common chalice specific to the “Episcopal-Constantinopolitan” ritual, is replaced with the three times sipping from the same wine chalice, “of the gifts blessed beforehand”; instead, the *velatio*, the covering of both grooms with a veil, ceremonial respected in A Italian-Greek tradition, mentioned by Pope Nicolas I, is removed. An important role in the stabilization of the third type, printed in the Greek typographies of Venice and whereon Antim’s translation will impose in the Church of Ungrovalahia, was the intervention of *The Commission for Oriental Liturgical Books*, instituted in Rome in 1630, to create a Roman edition of the Eastern *Euchologion*, destined to the Greek-Catholics. Expression of the care wherewith the Post-Tridentine Counter-Reformation wished to unify and formalize the Eastern rites, as it had done with its own rites, the commission met in 1640, chaired by Cardinals Brancacci and Barberini. Its mission was to examine the differences noted between the editions printed in the Venetian typographies, sponsored by the Greeks and some handwritten *Euchologia*, kept in Roman libraries. Four misunderstandings were phrased, of which two concerned the common sipping from the chalice of “the gifts blessed beforehand” and the *velatio*. The two ceremonial elements were excluded from the Roman *Euchologion*, as not being fit neither with the content, nor with the blessing character of the wedding sacrament *nec ad substantium neque ad sanctitatem matrimonij pertineant*.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, the Greek Venetian editors did not understand to give up the chalice ceremonial and the version translated by the Bishop of Wallachia, Antim Ivireanul, is attached to this enduring tradition.

What kinds of representations about the life a married couple were woven through the ritual of engagement and wedding and to what extent were different from other rituals of other confessions? Even from the level of the protagonists of the liturgical ceremony, it must be said that the identity and the role of the godparents (*pronubos, paranymphos, κομπάρης*), was different from nowadays reality, as well as the mandatory witnesses from of Latin rite. The latter had only the purpose to guarantee the legality of the wedding and they were not attached to the grooms by a bond of spiritual kinship, like in the Eastern rite, in which the strong relationship established through baptism was, usually, continued up to the wedding and beyond. Keepers and guarantors of the purity of the grooms, with this mission the 4<sup>th</sup> Council from Carthage invested the godparents.<sup>48</sup> The Church itself, through the ritual of engagement and wedding, was associating the godparents to the priest, who was putting, alongside with them, the rings on the grooms' fingers and the crowns on their heads.<sup>49</sup> The rare testimonies from the 17<sup>th</sup> century that are available to us, lead us to believe that the godparents did not need to be necessary a married couple, the role being carried out by the godfather of the bridegroom, as do witness the chroniclers of Constantin Brâncoveanu's reign<sup>50</sup> and, for the sons and daughters of lords, the role was carried out by a man, sometimes an important churchman, who was officiating also the wedding service. In sign of honor, the lord, alongside with the lady were marrying the young boyar couples.<sup>51</sup>

From a liturgical point of view, in the Eastern Church, as the theologian Meletios Syrigos formulated for the first time in *Αντήρησησι κατά Κεφαλαίων Κυρίλλου* appeared in Bucharest in 1690,<sup>52</sup> the priest is the one that manages this sacrament and not the couple of grooms, like in the Latin rite, which outlines the lay character of the sacrament.<sup>53</sup>

## The liturgical ritual of engagement and wedding in the translation of Antim Ivireanul

**B**EFORE WE begin with the sequential analysis of the liturgical offices of engagement and wedding, it is proper to make an important mention. As it was observed this far, the two prayers were making a common body, even that in the social practice, the engagement was preceding the wedding, as a different moment of the arrangement of the wedding and negotiation of dowry.<sup>54</sup> None of the data about the weddings of lords or boyars lead us to believe that engagement was more than this, in any case it cannot be suspected that the young couple was taken to church in order to change rings and get the priest's blessing.

*The engagement prayer* is opened by the first typical indication, according to which the priest has to bless the two grooms to be. In the older editions of Greek manuscripts, there is the indication that the priest verified previously the consent of the plighted lovers.<sup>55</sup> The prayer focused on the changing of the rings, although these are confirmed late in the Romanian lands and, in fact, was part of the “changing ring” match-making ritual. In the memories of Anton Maria Del Chiaro, the ceremonial of the “suitor” enumerates, among the gifts sent by the bridegroom to the bride on the Saturday before the wedding, next to a head ornament, a golden chain, pearl sewn socks and a precious ring, which lacks though any liturgical function.<sup>56</sup> The engagement rings had, after that, to be changed during the religious ceremonial. The Franciscan liturgist Jacques Goar attests in 1647 the tradition of the differentiation of the two rings: the silver was destined to the woman and the gold to the man, distinctive sign of the different status of the two grooms in marriage.<sup>57</sup> Commenting upon this significant difference in the old times, Tertulian suggests to the bride that she has to be restrained by modesty: *cum aurum nulla norat praeter unico digito quem sponsus opignorasset pronubo annulo*.<sup>58</sup> In the historical notes that he adds at the end of the ceremonial,<sup>59</sup> Jacques Goar is amazed by the fact that these rings, like the wedding ones in the next ritual are no more blessed, as it used to be in the old days. Pastor John Glen King observes that, in Muscovite Russia, this old habit was abandoned at the time when he writes and that both the grooms wear golden rings.<sup>60</sup> The wedding rings are attested in the Romanian lands only in the 17th century and some of them are of western origin.<sup>61</sup>

According to the second typical indication, the priest arranged the rings on the Gospel,<sup>62</sup> the gold one to the right, the silver one to the left. The candles were held by the grooms. A rich symbolism, hidden, however, to the earthlings, was there in all the gestures and objects that were accompanying the rite: the lighting of the candles at the beginning of the ritual had the purpose, according to archbishop Simeon of Thessalonique,<sup>63</sup> to embody the unquenched love but, also, signified the light to guide the grooms’ steps, in order for them not to betray the chastity of the nuptial contact. Repeating the gestures of Tobias from the Old Testament, the incensing had to chase out the evil spirits. Before the eyes of the two grooms it is invoked the most venerated couple of the Old Testament, Isaac and Rebecca. From a legal point of view, the engagement ceremony and the changing of the rings could take place when the dowry had already been agreed on and paid.

The first prayer from the engagement service emphasizes on the goods marriage is able to offer (*bono conjugali*) and which the Church considered necessary to a happy cohabitation: to have heirs and everything needed for salvation, the love of peace and help, fidelity, “to carry out into union and the strong

faith”, honest wedding and undefiled bed and “salvation from all sick, anger and need.”<sup>64</sup> This prayer is followed by another one, which focuses on the exemplary couple of Isaac and Rebecca: “*because, from the beginning, You created the man and the woman and, from You merges the man with the woman for help and legacy of human kind*”. Blessing is asked for the grooms “*peaceful life, long life, full mind, love one for each other, gift of children, unwithered crown of glory to keep their bed untempted, abundance from the earth’s harvest to give to the ones in need as well*”.<sup>65</sup> The prayer covers a pedagogical road from the individual goods (long life, full mind) to those common to the couple, to reach the social reverberation of the family, the deeds of mercy for those in need. The second prayer evokes practical models for “the keeping away of the danger out of those who marry”. It is the so-called “prayer of patriarch Abraham”, which invokes, again, the engagement of Isaac and Rebecca, ordering the engagement “*to faith, union, truth and love*”, with the help of the biblical figures: Josef, Daniel and Tamar.

*The wedding prayer* has the following sequences<sup>66</sup>: 1. Psalm 127; 2. Litanies for those who unite for “the togetherness of wedding”: it is asked that the wedding be blessed like that from Cana of Galilee, full mind and harvest to the womb, the married ones are invited to “cheer at the sight of sons and daughters”, “to have avail of good children and life without suspicion”; 3. Opening prayer: “the one that made woman from the rib of ancestor Adam”, then it is asked that the marriage be blessed with birth of children, being invoked Abraham and Sara, Isaac and Rebecca, Ephraim, Manase, Zechariah and Elizabeth; the miracle from Cana of Galilee is also remembered; the sequence ends with another group of requests: prayers for a pleasant life, long life, full mind, love of one for each other into the bound of peace, gift of children, unwithered crown and worthiness of seeing of the sons of their sons, the prayer of abundance and blessing: “*and thou give them from the dew of the upper sky and from the earth’s fat, fill their houses with wheat, wine, oil and all the goodies to help to those in need as well*”; 4. another prayer of supplication to the Holy Spirit, that affirms that the wedding bears the holiness of a mystery and is also expression of the natural law, as God “is the one that gives holiness to the mystery and the one that gives bodily law”; the blessing calls for the gifts enjoyed by the biblical couples of Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob, Josef and Asinetha, Moses and Sephora, Joachim and Anne, Zechariah and Elizabeth, and asks that the grooms be protected like Noah on his ship, like Jonah inside the whale’s womb, like the three young men from the furnace, and wishes them the joy of Saint Helen when she found the cross, prays that the Lord may remember them, as He remembered Enoch, Sim and Elijah and the forty martyrs, sending them crowns from the skies; then are invoked the grooms’ parents, because the parents’ prayers strengthen the foundations of the house; 5. another prayer that asks God to keep the two grooms together, into the union of wisdom; 6. the crowning of the grooms: first, of

the man, then, of the woman; 7-8 readings from *The epistle of Saint Paul to the Ephesians*, chapter 5, 22-33, beginning with: “women, listen to your men”; *The Gospel of John*, chapter 2, 1-11; the first text concerns the mutual duties of both the spouses, while the second speaks about the first miracle from Christ’s earthly life, the wedding from Cana of Galilee; 9. group of Litanies; 10. prayer for honest wedding, undefiled bed, innocent union; 11. group of Litanies; 12. *Our Father* prayer; 13. the three times sipping from “the common” chalice, preceded by the blessing prayer of the chalice by the priest; 14. “Isaiah, dance” chant, the priest’s procession with the married ones around the table; 15. the lifting up of the crowns with the blessing “*praised be you, bridegroom, like Abraham and blessed like Isaac and may you multiply like Jacob*”, “*praised be you, bride, like Sara and be joyful like Rebecca and may you multiply like Rahila*”; 16. another prayer of “blessing of their coming in and out”; 17. another prayer in the name of the Holy Trinity; 18. A sermon is delivered and the grooms kiss each other; 19 dismissal: the Saint Emperors Constantine and Helen and the great martyr Procopios are invoked.

The cross and the crown, symbolic objects that fulfill an important role in the wedding service, are loaded with positive valences. The cross, found by empress Helen, symbolizes the hardships of marriage and must be carried by the two, whereas the crown the grooms are wearing is a sign of the honor of the laudable estate they have chosen, of their maturity in the responsibility shown towards their family, being, at the same time, according to the old interpretation of Saint John Chrysostom, that of the sacrifice of the forty martyrs, whose martyrdom was rewarded from the sky with the eternal life crown. An expression heavy of significance, from the end of the second prayer, turns our thoughts to Bishop Peter Movila: “a thought making of souls and bodies”.

A moment of attention deserves the crowning time, as specific oriental liturgical rite.<sup>67</sup> The evolution from the ancient legacy takes here also a different path. If the West took over from the pagan marriage such rituals as the flower crown of the bride and the veil (*velatio*), the East remained attached to the *coronatio* type of ritual,<sup>68</sup> which also gave the name of the ceremony, as well as of the very sacrament (the prayer and the mystery of the wedding). Hence, the service draws its constitutive elements from the Jewish wedding ceremony, from the pomp of the Byzantine Basileis’ ceremonial,<sup>69</sup> from the mystic symbolism of the Church (Christ’s wedding with his bride, the Church), transforming this way, if only for a day in a lifetime, the most humble couple into a pair of proud imperial spouses.

Having said that, let now establish in what measure the ritual of the crowning of the grooms was observed and if yes, what kind of crowns were used in the 17<sup>th</sup> century? If we would imagine that each couple which was getting married in the church, however poor it was, was living a moment of splendor, unique in life, when they were crowned “with glory and honor”, we could end by believ-

ing that the prayers of engagement and wedding were the apogee of the religious experience of the person or, even, of an entire life experience. But such a theoretical presupposition is almost impossible to be confirmed, to the extent we have not found any piece from these liturgical objects (crowns), neither from this age, nor from the next age, at least in the form we know them nowadays. Even if we exclude the monasteries from our investigation, a place where weddings were not supposed to take place, the parish churches, the manorial chapels and the town churches from the 17<sup>th</sup> century do not include such items in the donation documents of the founders and benefactors and not even in the rare inventories from the 18<sup>th</sup> century that have preserved. In Moldavia, Captain Erasmus Heinrich Schneider von Weismantel was observing in 1714 some ear crowns on the heads of the grooms from the village where he was billeted with the Swedish troops;<sup>70</sup> we can suppose that only the nobility enjoyed the privilege of being truly “crowned”, situation which does not seem singular in the Orthodox area. In Venice, the Greeks were putting crowns of olive branches and red flowers (*purpureaque feta*), sign of chastity, but also, of fertility, as from flowers fruits grow.<sup>71</sup> It seems that the habit had reached also Walachia; Paul of Alep writes about the girls from the bride’s group that “*on their hair they wear golden leather or yellow tin crowns, paper roses, made in Venice or in German Country, red flowers, jasmine and others*”.<sup>72</sup>

On the heads of the earthlings, the priest was putting crowns of simple flowers, but what about the heads of nobles and lords? Documents of canon law of the 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>73</sup> Russia prove that only nobles were getting “married”, while the common people were content with the popular customs inherited from their ancestors. Also from Russia comes, a century later, the news that before being made on purpose of silver or other metal, the crowns were woven from flowers or shrub branches: “*but now, there are generally in all churches crowns of silver or other metals, kept for that purpose*”.<sup>74</sup> The testimony of the Florentine secretary Anton Maria del Chiaro, from the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, assures us that “*il sacerdote pone una corona in capo di ciascuno degli sposi*”.<sup>75</sup> On the head of voivode Constantin Serban and his bride, Circassian Nedelea (Kiriaki), patriarch Macarie of Antioch, put, on 8 of November 1657,<sup>76</sup> golden crowns, but the blessing of the lordly pair did not take place inside the church, but in the palace.

In the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, also in the Romanian countries appear some indication in the dowry documents about a special ornament which the bride was wearing: the veil for the head, a really tall, complex ornament in which the veil was fastened with a tiara and fixed with silver needles with decorated points<sup>77</sup> “*văletura cu creștet de argint și cu ace*” recorded in the testament of chief seneschal (*stolnic*) Dimitrie Filișanu,<sup>78</sup> “*money per capita*” remembered in the jewels list stolen from the master of the horse (*comis*) Constantin Bărbătesu (1712);<sup>79</sup> as well as *sovon*, a piece of thin cloth which was put on the head of both

grooms,<sup>80</sup> reminiscence of the *velatio* ritual, specific to the Venetian-Levantine liturgical service.<sup>81</sup> Serving to a manorial wedding in Mehedinți County, patriarchal deacon Paul from Alep notes carefully that the bride had the face covered with a veil<sup>82</sup>. The iconographical proof from this period (the Brancovan fresco from the great church of Târgoviște, the fresco from Hurezi catholikon etc.) presents us, like in the Byzantine iconography,<sup>83</sup> the couple from Cana of Galilee “crowned” and the bride adorned with a short veil, the Byzantine *maforion*, similar to the one displayed, for example, by empress Helen, mother of emperor Constantin, in the thumbnails of the same age.<sup>84</sup>

In the Jewish ceremonial, from which the dance of Isaiah may also stem, a chalice (usually of glass) was struck down to the ground, as sign of fragility and shortness of human life.<sup>85</sup> Christianized, but not entirely, like in the Catholic rite, the presence of the wine glass from which the grooms sip three times must be symbolically connected to the miracle of exchanging the water into wine, foreshadowing of the Eucharist but, also, to the communion of the two from the same “chalice” of their living together. That this symbolic relation was not clear even to the priests, is proved by the foreign travelers’ reports, critical observers of the jokes made by priests in the moment of wine sipping,<sup>86</sup> quite shocking for the Catholic missionaries, who were confusing the glass with the Eucharistic chalice.

Outside of the symbolism carried by some objects of liturgical ceremonial, other representations are offered by human models. Many biblical couples are brought before the eyes of the grooms and wedding party during the wedding service: Moses and Sephora, Abraham and Sara, Isaac and Rebecca, Josef and Asinetha, patriarchs of peoples, blessed with many children. In this regard too, like in other rituals of the Eastern liturgical tradition (hierurgies or mysteries), images called to animate the mind of the grooms and wedding party stand out mainly from the patriarchal world of the Old Testament. From the New Testament are taken as examples Zechariah and Elizabeth, Joachim and Anne, who embody the consolation of sterility, saved by a miracle accomplished through faith.<sup>87</sup>

Finally, the dance of Isaiah with the hands put together, one of the elements taken over from Judaism, symbolizes the way of the wedlock around a circular axis, which enters into the same symbolism of an uninterrupted eternity to which belong also the rings and the crowns.

The dismissal uses the invocation of Holy Emperors Constantin and Helen,<sup>88</sup> as models for the royal honor and faith cooperation, and of Saint Procopios, for patience in hardships. As signs of abundance and prosperity, at the moment of the dance round the table, inside the church are thrown money and confectionery, sweets with almonds and raisins, at the rich weddings, nuts, hazelnuts and chestnuts and even loaf, at the less wealthy ones.<sup>89</sup> Under the feet of the grooms and wedding godparents inside the church was laid a new carpet, offered by the godfather, “according to their lasting habit”.<sup>90</sup> Embodiment of the start-

ing marriage, for it is a new object, of domestic use, the ritual of the new carpet also receives the meaning of long blending of two destinies.

\*

IT WOULD be an exaggeration to pretend that all the expressive load of the symbolic cloth of the engagement and wedding service would have had a modeling impact on the couples in the time we are trying to describe, if not for the fact that their translation into Romanian exceeds the chronological limits of the period under scrutiny. But there still remain some gestures invested with a symbolic value, which might have impregnated deep into the memory of the couple: the crowning, even if, in the poor world of villages, it was made with straw crowns, as does consign a foreign traveler in Moldavia, the ring exchange, the dance of Isaiah. Engraved in memory, should have survived also the characters of the Old Testament that the grooms were advised to follow the example, the forefathers of peoples: Isaac and Rebecca, Abraham and Sara. It is precisely the time when the expression “when God had brought me together with my husband”<sup>91</sup> begins to be used in consciousness, as a discursive mark of a blessed union.

□

## Notes

1. Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria literaturii române în secolul al XVIII-lea*, vol. I, București, 1901, p. 512; Ion Gheție, *Baza dialectală a românei literare*, București, Editura Academiei, 1975, p. 387-389, 403-406.
2. Suitbert Bückmann, *Das Sakrament der Ehe und der Segen der Kirche für Familie und Haus im byzantinischen Ritus*, Heilige Feiern der Ostkirche 4, Paderborn, Schöningh, 1940; *Der Gottesdienst des Ehesakraments*. Zusammengestellt, übersetzt und eingeleitet von Theodor Nikolaou (Liturgische Texte und Studien 3), second edition, München, 2002; Frans Van de Paverd, “Forme celebrative del matrimonio nelle Chiese orientali”, in *La celebrazione del matrimonio cristiano. Atti della V settimana dei professori italiani di Liturgia*, Bologna, EDB, 1977, p. 11-116; John Meyendorff, “Christian Marriage in Byzantium: The Canonical and Liturgical Tradition”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XLIV, 1990, p. 99-107; Peter Plank, “Die orthodoxe Trauung. Eine gottesdienstgeschichtliche Skizze”, *Orthodoxes Forum*, XVII, 2003 p. 47-65; E. Herman, “Euchê epi digamôn”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, I, 1935, p. 467-489, *molitva* (prayers) for the second marriage.
3. See for instance *Novells IV and XV* of emperor Leo VI the Wise, Ioannis M. Konidaris, “The Ubiquity of Canon Law”, in *Law and Society in Byzantium: Ninth-Twelfth Centuries*, edited by Angeliki E. Laiou and Dieter Simon, Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Library and Collection, Harvard University Press, 1994, p. 146.
4. From here results the meaning of the phrase *matrimonio in facie ecclesiae*; it is a transition phrase between the private area (home of the fiancée) and the sacred



- area (church); Hans Schmidt, "Rituel et sacramentalité du mariage chrétien", *Quaderni Liturgici*, I-II, 1975, p. 20.
5. J.-B. Molin, P. Mutembe, *Le rituel de mariage en France du XII<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1974, p. 212-213.
  6. Used until 1969, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1927, col. 2207; Pierre-Marie Gy, *La liturgie dans l'histoire*, Paris, Cerf, 1990, p. 161-162.
  7. *Rituale Romanum*, Romae, 1614, tit. VII, c. II, n. 2 and 6.
  8. *Molitvenicul (Euchologion)* from 1706 translated by the metropolitan bishop Antim Ivireanul does not include the prayer for cleansing of the 8<sup>th</sup> day; see Jacques Goar, *Euchologion sive rituale Graecorum*, Lutetiae Parisiorum, ed. Simon Piget, 1647, p. 400-401: *In orationem pro solvendis coronis octavo die*; origins of this ritual of the 8th day are to be searched in Tobias' story who spent a week of praying with his wife, after the wedding, before consummation of marriage, to gain divine blessing; consummation of marriage, marked by prayer from the eight day ended the stages by which marriage was considered valid.
  9. Vladimir Khoulap, *Coniugalia Festa. Eine Untersuchung zu Liturgie und Theologie der christlichen Eheschließungsfeier in der römisch-katholischen und byzantinisch-orthodoxen Kirche mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der byzantinischen Euchologien*, Das östliche Christentum N.F. 42, Würzburg, Augustinus, 2003.
  10. John Glen King, *The Rites and Ceremonies*, London, 1772, p. 239.
  11. Gaetano Ferreri, "Diritto matrimoniale secondo le Novelle di Leone il Filosofo", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVIII, 1909, p. 159-175; *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, col. 2319-2320; Angeliki Laiou, *Mariage, amour et parenté à Byzance aux XI<sup>e</sup>-XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris, 1992, p. 12.
  12. P. Noailles, A. Daine, *Les Novelles de Leon VI le Sage*, Paris, 1944, v. *Novells* LXXVI (p. 79-81) and CIX (p. 128-131); Spiros Troianos, "Die kirchenrechtlichen Novellen Leons VI und ihre Quellen", *Subseciva Groningana*, IV, 1990, p. 235-236.
  13. *Fontes latini historiae bulgaricae*, vol. II, Serdicae, 1960, p. 68-69.
  14. If it is a second marriage, the two grooms are not worthy of covering their head with veil: *Verumtamen velamen illud non suscipit qui ad secundas nuptias migrat*, *ibidem*, p. 201; E. Herman, *Euché epi digamón*, p. 467-489.
  15. *Nuovo dizionario di liturgia*, edited by Domenico Sartore and Achille Triacca, Roma, Edizione Paoline, 1983, s.v. *Matrimonio*.
  16. Gaetano I. Passarelli, "La cerimonia dello Stefanoma (Incoronazione) nei riti matrimoniali bizantini secondo il Codice Cryptense G.b.VII (X sec.)", *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, XCIII, 1979, p. 381-391.
  17. Korbinian Ritzer, *Le mariage dans les Eglises chrétiennes de I<sup>er</sup> au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1970, p. 13-14.
  18. Alphonse Raes, *Le mariage, sa célébration et sa spiritualité dans les Eglises de l'Orient*, Chevetogne, 1958, p. 53-56, 57-68; *Der Gottesdienst des Ehesakraments zusammengeschelt*, translation and presentation made by Theodor Nikolaou, München, 1998; *Idem*, "Das Ehesakrament aus orthodoxer Sicht: theologische und kirchenrechtliche Aspekte", *Orthodoxes Forum*. Zeitschrift des Instituts für Orthodoxe Theologie der Universität München, XVII, 2003, p. 29-46.
  19. *L'eucologio Barberini gr. 336*, a cura di Stefano Parenti e Elena Velkovska, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides liturgicae", *Subsidia*, LXXX, Roma, 1995, p. 1-158; the Romanian

translation included in *Canonul ortodoxiei, I. Canonul apostolic al primelor trei secole*, translation by Ioan Ică jr., Deisis, Stavropoleos, 2008, p. 909-1032; Alexis Pentkovskij, “Le Cérémonial du mariage dans l’Euchologe byzantin du XI-XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. La mariage Conférences de Saint Serge. LX<sup>e</sup> semaine d’Etudes Liturgiques, 1993”, *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, LXXIX, Roma, 1994, p. 259-287.

20. Engagement service is edited following manuscripts *Cryptoferratensis*, *Bessarionis* and *Barberinum S. Marci*, J. Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 383, that of the wedding after *Barberinum S. Marci* and *Barberinum 88*, p. 396; in comments that accompany liturgical texts, Jacques Goar appealed to the work of Saint Simeon of Thessalonique, as well as doctrine and interpretations of some Uniate theologians such as Leon Allatius, Georgios Coressios and Panteleimon Ligaridis, p. 11 (separately numbered).
21. Andrew Blaine, *The Religious World of Russian Culture*, Haga, 1975, p. 173-188; Eve Levin, *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs 900-1700*, Cornell, Cornell University Press, 1989, p. 6.
22. *Îndreptarea Legii (1652)*, edited by a staff coordinated by Andrei Rădulescu, București, Editura Academiei, 1962, gl. 204, p. 213.
23. See Petru Maior, *Istoria bisericească a românilor*, edited by Ioan Chindriș, Cluj-Napoca, Viitorul românesc, 1995, p. 254.
24. From all the Eastern Churches, only in the Russian one, under Peter the Great, was attempted to remove the engagement’s canonical character, see *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, col. 2319.
25. Jacques Goar, *Euhologion*, p. 397-398; between the moment of the engagement, as agreement over the dowery, and the moment of the wedding, usually passed a variable period of time; in this section, by engagement we will understand only the liturgical ceremonial.
26. Jacques Goar, *Euhologion*, p. 380, 384; by comparing diverse codices that he had at hand, the Franciscan liturgist records the progressive elimination of the consent from the characteristic notes from the beginning of the engagement’s ritual and the silence of the modern recessions (XVII<sup>th</sup> century), which provide only entering of the couple in the church, lighting of candles and blessing given three times with the sign of the cross.
27. “Les influences du Rituel de Paul V sur le Trebnik de Pierre Moghila, Mélanges en l’honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu”, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*” (Strasbourg, 1956), p. 477-499; Violeta Barbu, *Purgatoriul misionarilor. Contrareforma în țările române în secolul al XVII-lea*, București, Editura Academiei, 2008, p. 343.
28. Peter Movila, *Trebnik*, vol. I, 407; an Occidental traveller who visited Ukraine at the end of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century noted that affirmation of the consent was part from the ceremonial of wedding, John Struys, *The Voyage of Sir John Struys*, London, 1684, p. 142-144.
29. Peter Movila, *Trebnik*, vol. I, p. 416.
30. *Ibidem*, p. 359-363.
31. *Ibidem*, p. 44-46.
32. *Ibidem*, p. 364-392.
33. *Ibidem*, p. 393-396.
34. *Ibidem*, p. 397-404.

35. *Ibidem*, p. 405-426.
36. C. Cornescu, "Rânduiala cununiei, a mărturisirii și a maslului în diferite ediții ale Molitvenicului slav și român folosit în Biserica Română", *Mitropolia Olteniei*, 1962, nr. 10-12, p. 606.
37. See notes of editors Ștefan Gorovei and Maria-Magdalena Székely in P. P. Panaitescu, *Peter Movilă. Studii*, p. 134.
38. Alphonse Raes, "Le rituel ruthène depuis l'Union de Brest", *Orientalia Cristiana Periodica*, I, 1935, no. 3-4, p. 375-379; *idem*, "Le Liturgicon ruthène depuis l'Union de Brest", *Orientalia Cristiana Periodica*, VIII, 1942, p. 95-139; semantically, A. Raes S. J. includes in the list of editions of Ruthenian Euchologies also *Trebnicul* from Câmpulung 1635, see "Le rituel ruthène ...", p. 367.
39. In Transylvania, influences of Reformation may be noticed in the *Euchologiam* printed in Bălgrad in 1689 by priest Ioan from Vinț: marriage is the third out of the 5 sacraments; see Dumitru Vanca, "Cununia în secolul al XVII-lea în Transilvania, considerații pe marginea Molitfelnicului de Bălgrad", *Credința Ortodoxă*, 1998, III, nr. 3-4, p. 104-115; Eugen Pavel, *Carte și tipar la Bălgrad (1567-1702)*, Cluj-Napoca, Clusium, 2001, p. 141: „*a treia, căsătoria, care, prin grașala lui Adam și Evei, s-au părut unora că Dumnezeu au lepădat destoiniciia căsătoriei, cum au stricat și raiul din Edem cu potopul apei, pentru că s-au început într-îns păcatul, iar Domnul Hristos cu minunea ce-au făcut întâi vin din apă, în Cana Galileii, au arătat în loc cinstea căsătoriei. Ioan 2, Efes. 5, stih 32*".
40. C. Cornescu, "Rânduiala cununiei ...", p. 608-609; in comparative analysis of the different versions, C. Cornescu reports also to the Slav Euchologion from *Ms. rom. 167*, f. 6-223v, dating from the fourth decade of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century; this mirrors a different version than the Euchologion from 1635: lessons are taken out from the Genesis, principal litany read when the rings are put from the engagement prayer are only two requests up against five from the other versions, wedding practice begins with the hymns of saint emperors Constantine and Helen.
41. Daniela Poenaru, *Contribuții la bibliografia românească veche*, Târgoviște, Muzeul Județean Dâmbovița, 1973, p. 183; Gabriel Ștrempel, *Antim Ivireanul*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1997, p. 156-157.
42. As small differences, would be noting the typical indication before engagement: grooms are standing at the middle of the church, in front of the tetrapod, priest is putting the two rings on the Gospel, that made of gold and the one made of silver, furthermore from the edition from 1706, appears evidenced the wedding spiritual parents' role: the priest is giving to the spiritual parents the lit torches to be hold behind the grooms (*Molitvenic*, Târgoviște, 1713, f. 51<sup>v</sup>).
43. Dimitrie Bejan, *Edițiile românești ale Molitvenicului*, București, 1937.
44. Gaetano Passarelli, "Stato della ricerca sul formulario dei riti matrimoniali", in *Studi bizantini e neogreci, Atti del IV congresso nazionale di studi bizantini*, a cura di Pier Luigi Leone, Galatina, Congedo Editore, 1983, p. 241-248.
45. J. Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 380-395.
46. The other two types are: A (the Italian-Greek group), characterised by presence of lesson before wedding and B (tradition of Constantinople), characterised by common communion at the chalice and *velatio*, grooms' covering with veil, see G. Passarelli, "Stato della ricerca sul formulario dei riti matrimoniali", p. 244-245.

47. *Archive De Propaganda Fide, Commissione per Libri Orientali (CLO)*, vol. 14, f. 127-129.
48. J. Goar, *Euchologhion*, p. 384.
49. Ene Braniște, *Liturgica teoretică*, București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe române, 1978, p. 247-249.
50. „Deci dă vreamă ce acel Costandin postelnicul era botezat de doamna Ilinca, care o ținea mai sus-pomenitul Șerban vel logofăt, se cădea să-l cunună iarăși acea doamnă împreună cu soțul ei”, Radu Greceanu, *Istoria domniei lui Constantin Basarab Brâncoveanu voievod (1688-1714)*, edition by Aurora Ilieș, București, Editura Academiei, 1970, p. 196; the text refers to a custom preserved until today, not to the personal wish of Prince Constantin Brâncoveanu, as Constanța Ghițulescu believes, “Familie și societate în Țara Românească (secolul al XVII-lea)”, *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie*, XX, 2002, p. 98; to families of low condition, the wedding godfather has the role of submitting the bride the money gathered from the messmates, during the moment when the roast was served at the table, Anton Maria Del Chiaro, *Istoria delle moderne rivoluzioni della Valachia*, edited by Nicolae Iorga, București, 1914, p. 74-75.
51. Matei Basarab was the godfather of the *paharnic* Peter Băleanu, son of the great *vornic* Ivașco Băleanu, with the daughter of the great *clucer* Socol Cornățeanu *DANIC, AN, CII-6*, august 21, 1639, whose father, Ivașco, had died at the beginning of 1638: see also the testimony of Paul de Alep in *Călători străini despre țările române*, vol. VI, edited by Maria Matilda Alexandrescu Dersca-Bulgaru and Mustafa Ali Mehmet, București, Editura Enciclopedică, 1976, p. 210.
52. Fol. 88b-89a; Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia dogmatică ortodoxă*, vol. III, București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1978, p. 195.
53. According to decisions of the Florence Council (1430), renewed by the Trento Council, the Catholic priest is only a witness of the commitment of the two grooms, who are celebrating themselves the rite, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, col. 2255-2258; the most important contestation of this theory was made by the Spanish theologian Melchior Cano, *De locis theologicis*, Salamanca, 1562.
54. Constanța Ghițulescu, “Familie și societate în Țara Românească (secolul al XVII-lea)”, p. 89-90.
55. J. Goar, *Euchologhion*, p. 384.
56. Anton Maria del Chiaro, *Istoria delle moderne rivoluzioni della Valachia*, p. 71.
57. J. Goar, *Euchologhion*, p. 382.
58. *Ibidem*, p. 384.
59. *Ibidem*, p. 384.
60. John Glen King, *The Rites and Ceremonies*, p. 231.
61. Marin Matei Popescu, *Podoabe medievale în țările române*, București, Meridiane, 1970, p. 29 and 64.
62. *Molitvenic 1706*, fol. 46; the engagement service on fol. 46-53.
63. Simeon of Thessalonique, *De honesto et legitimo conjugio*, PG, CLV, p. 507-514.
64. *Molitvenic*, 1706, fol. 49.
65. *Ibidem*, fol. 55.
66. *Ibidem*, fol. 56-68.
67. Jean Dauvillier, Carlo de Clercq, *Le mariage dans le droit canon oriental*, p. 40; Gaetano I. Passarelli, *La cerimonia dello Stefanoma (Incoronazione) nei riti matrimoniali bizan-*

- tini secondo il Codice Cryptense G.b.VII (X sec.)*, p. 381-391; Stavros Perentiales, *Pratiques de mariage et nuances de continuité dans le monde grec*, Montpellier, 2002, p. 16-23.
68. Jean-Claude Bologne, *Histoire du mariage en Occident*, Paris, J. Clattes, 1995, p. 71.
69. W. T. Theadgold, "The Bride-shows of the Byzantine Emperors", *Byzantion*, II, 1979, p. 395-413.
70. *Călători străini despre țările române*, vol. VIII, p. 352-354; according to Simion Florea Marian, *Nunta la români, studiu istorico-etnografico comparativ*, edited by Teofil Teaha, Ioan Șerb, Ion Ilișiu, București, Editura Grai și Suflet, 1995, p. 205-206.
71. J. Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 397.
72. *Călători străini despre țările române*, vol. VI, p. 122-123.
73. C. Pavlov, *Cours de droit canonique*, Mosca, 1902, p. 366 sq.
74. John Glen King, *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church art in Rusia*, London, 1772, p. 232.
75. Anton Maria del Chiaro, *Istoria delle moderne rivoluzioni della Valachia*, p. 74.
76. *Călători străini despre țările române*, vol. VI, p. 237.
77. Marin Matei Popescu, *Podoabe medievale*, p. 50-51.
78. *DRH, B*, vol. XXXIV, edited by Violeta Barbu, Gheorghe Lazăr, Oana Rizescu, București, Editura Academiei, 2002, <post April 15>, 1649.
79. Șt. Grecianu, *Genealogii documentate ale familiilor boierești*, București, 1913, Supl. III, p. 157; other attestations in Constanța Ghițulescu, "Zestrea între normă și practică. Țara Românească în secolul al XVII-lea", *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie*, XIX, 2001, p. 262-263; Florentina Nițu, *Prețuri de podoabe și orfevrerie în spațiul românesc (secolele XVI-XVII)*, București, Editura Universității, 2006, p. 132-133.
80. *DLR*, tom X, IV<sup>th</sup> part, s.v., attestation from 1627; in *Euchologions* does not appear at all the prayer when the veil was put, which was attested by the *Euchologion* of J. Goar (*Oratio ad velandum, Euchologion*, p. 371).
81. Cf. women's costumes worn by the Wallachian women, of all social conditions, from Transylvania and Wallachia in the XVII<sup>th</sup> century in the two *Costumbilder aus Siebenbürgen*, preserved in *Quart. Germ.* 892 from Széchény Library from Budapesta; Oborni Teréz, Tompos Lilla, Bencsik Gábor, *A régi Erdély népeinek képekönve*, Budapest, Mercurius, 2009, pl. XLIV, XLV, LIII, LIV, LVI, LVII; similarly see also portrait no. 79 "princesse de Valachie" from *Recueil de cent estampes représentant différentes nations du Levant tirées sur les tableaux peints d'après nature en 1707 et 1708 par les ordres de M. de Ferriol, ambassadeur du Roi à la Porte. Et gravées en 1712 et 1713 par les soins de Mr. Le Hay*. A Paris, chez Le Hay [...] et Duchange, graveur du Roi, 1714.
82. *Călători străini despre țările române*, vol. VI, p. 210; deacon Paul of Alep records, frequently that in everyday life, women and young girls from the Romanian countries did not have their faces covered; as segregation instrument, wearing the veil day by day by the women, in Byzantium, following X<sup>th</sup> century, is a controversy amongst historians, see José Grodidier de Matoris, *La femme dans l'Empire Byzantin* in *Histoire mondiale des femmes*, edited by Pierre Grimal, Nouvelle Librairie de France, 1987, vol. III, p. 28-44.
83. Christopher Walter, "Marriage Crowns in Byzantine Iconography", in *idem, Prayer and Power in Byzantine and papal Imagery*, Variorum Reprints, Aldersot, 1993, p. 1-17.

84. Violeta Barbu, *Miniatura manuscriselor brâncovenesti*, București, Meridiane, 2000, p. 60-61.
85. J. Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 398.
86. In Transylvania, was the custom, condemned by the Calvinist reformers, that grooms to lick honey, see Ioan Lupaș, *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni*, second edition, Cluj-Napoca, 1995, p. 207-208.
87. Richard A. Batey, *A New Testament Nuptial Imagery*, Leiden, Brill, 1971.
88. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia dogmatică ortodoxă*, vol. III, p. 201.
89. Paul de Alep, in *Călători străini despre țările române*, vol. VI, p. 210, 237; Anton Maria del Chiaro, *Istoria delle moderne rivoluzioni della Valachia*, p. 74.
90. Paul de Alep, in *loc. cit.*, p. 210.
91. *DRH, B*, vol. XXXII, edited by Violeta Barbu, Gheorghe Lazăr, Oana Rizescu, București, Editura Academiei, 2002, p. 130: Sofiica, daughter of Neagu from Popești, married with the great master of the horses (*comis*) Radu Mihălcea Căndescu, 30 April 1647.

### **Abstract**

#### The Liturgical Service of Marriage in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Wallachia

Marriage was firmly established as a sacrament in the Romanian Lands in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century as the result of a process of liturgical reform that was concluded in 1706, when Antim Ivireanu, Metropolitan of Wallachia, published the edition of the comprehensive office book, the *Moliftelnic*, he translated from the Greek *Euchologion* printed in Venice in 1691. Our paper examine the Byzantine and Roman traditions of the liturgy of this sacrament, but also their hybrid adaptations by the Slavonic manuscripts used in the Romanian Church prior to Antim's edition on the one hand and, on the other hand, by the Latinizing liturgical reshuffling undertaken by the Metropolitan of Kiev Peter Movila. Extensive examination of sources, genealogy and shape of this discipline reveals its early impacts on Romanian society.

### **Keywords**

marriage, ritual, 17<sup>th</sup> Century, Wallachia