

DOI 10.33294/2523-4234-2025-35-1-58-101

УДК УДК 264-15(477.81)"1606"265.61.62:264.0-15(477:4)"15/16"

ORCID: 0000-0002-7283-6291

Vasyl Popelyastyi

The Sacrament of Repentance in the Ostroh Trebnyk of 1606 and Its Influence

This study focuses on a thorough, source-based analysis of the development of the liturgical Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the Kyivan ecclesiastical tradition in the first half of the 17th century. The *Trebnyk* published in Ostroh in 1606 was the main source for the research. The influence of the Rite of Repentance found in this *Trebnyk* on subsequent editions, particularly Vilnius 1617–1618, 1621, and 1624; Ćimpu lung 1635; Vievis 1638 and 1641; and Lviv 1644 and 1645, is clearly demonstrated. Inaccuracies and errors in bibliographical descriptions of some old printed copies are also indicated. References are provided to online resources where digitized copies of *Trebnyks* can be accessed.

Keywords: *Trebnyk*, Ostroh *Trebnyk*, Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance, confessor, penitent, repentance, penance

Василь Михайлович Попелястий

Таїнство Покаяння в Острозькому требнику 1606 року та його вплив

Фокусом статті є дослідження розвитку літургійного обряду в Київській єклезіальній традиції першої половини XVII ст. на основі безпосереднього та ретельного вивчення оригінальних літургійних джерел, требників, котрі містять цей обряд. Стаття аналізує обряд Сповіді в одному із перших “українських” требників, опублікованому в Острозькій друкарні у 1606 році. Цей обряд вивчено та проаналізовано в порівнянні з іншими літургійними джерелами, як рукописними, так і друкованими, котрі належать до Київської та південнослов’янської богословської та літургійної традицій. Серед рукописів було проаналізовано *Словянський евхологiон* (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, Borg. Ill. 15), створений у XV–XVI ст. для вжитку Київських митрополитів. Було також проаналізовано усі південнослов’янські друковані требники, у котрих зберігся обряд Сповіді, зокрема видані у Горажде у 1523 р., Тирговіште у 1545 р., у Мілешеві 1545 р., та два венеційські видання бл. 1549 та 1570 рр. Серед друкованих требників Київської традиції було проаналізовано видані у Стрятині 1606 р., у Вільнюсі 1617–1617 рр., 1621 р., та 1624 р., у Кимпулунзі 1635 р., у Вієвісі 1638 та 1641 рр., та у Львові 1644 та 1645 рр. Як наслідок, було виправлено ряд помилок та неточностей у бібліографічних описах окремих

II. ІСТОРІЯ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ЖИТТЯ XVII – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

примірників. Було показано вплив обряду Таїнства Покаяння з острозького требника на подальші видання требників Київської традиції, а також скорочення кількості компонентів в обряді у наслідок збільшення частоти приступання до сповіді окремим каянником. Вперше подаються посилання на інтернет ресурси, у яких розміщені оцифровані копії примірників літургійних книг.

Ключові слова: требник, Острозький требник, обряд Таїнства Покаяння, сповідник, пенітент-каянник, покаяння, покута

Religious, confessional, and ecclesiastical self-identification were essential in the Slavonic cultural environment during the first half of the seventeenth century, a period marking the formation of national ideas, nationalities, and national self-identification. The life and theology of any Church can only be fully understood in the context of its prayer and liturgy. Prayer and liturgical celebrations are an essential part of Church life. Therefore, liturgical books serve as significant sources for studying and understanding of Church's inner life. Moreover, Slavonic liturgical documents are unique in that their composition occurred at the crossroads of the Latin and Byzantine traditions, and it is this that constitutes their uniqueness.

A *Trebnyk* is a significant liturgical book in the Slavonic ecclesiastical tradition. It compiles liturgical Rites and prayers that introduce and initiate human persons into a living relationship with their Creator as a Father, beginning with the Sacrament of Baptism. It helps and supports their growth and maturity as Christians, and accompanies them until their natural departure and entrance into the eternal life with funeral services. The invention and spread of book printing in Europe evidently strongly facilitated the tendency toward liturgical unanimity. Therefore, the edition of the first Kyivan Cyrillic *Trebnyk* in 1606 became a significant moment in the development of the Kyivan penitential liturgical Rites because it caused a certain fixing of its liturgy and the stability of its development. It is important to note that two different *Trebnyks* were printed in 1606. One was printed by Gedeon Balaban, the bishop of Lviv, at his nephew Theodor Balaban's printing house in a village Stryatyn (contemporary Stratyn, Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, Western Ukraine). According to the colophon, the printing process began on July 22, 1605, and was completed on September 19. The other *Trebnyk* was printed at the famous printing

house of Prince Konstantyn-Vasyl of Ostroh in 1606 (contemporary Rivne oblast, Western Ukraine). There is no additional information regarding the start or completion date of the printing process in this edition.

It seems that the considerable size (over 700 folios), high printing quality, and the large number of extant copies of the *Stryatyn Trebnyk* (which make it more accessible to scholars) have led some researchers, such as Taras Shmanko (Шманько, 2019, p. 49–50) and Paul Meyendorff (Meyendorff, 1985, p. 104), to emphasize the authority and influence of this edition on later editions. However, I will clearly demonstrate that the *Ostroh Trebnyk* was more influential, particularly in the development of the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance, than the *Stryatyn Trebnyk*.

This study will focus on analyzing the liturgy of the Sacrament of Repentance as found in the *Ostroh Trebnyk* of 1606, along its main theological peculiarities. It will also examine the influence of this Rite on the following editions of *Trebnyks* of the Kyivan tradition in the first half of the seventeenth century. Only thorough studies of the first printed examples and their contents allow the correct understanding of the main reasons and ideas of the process of formation and development of the penitential liturgical tradition found in the Kyivan old printed *Trebnyks*.¹ Indeed, the liturgical Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is one of the most variable with regard to its structure and euchologic components among the Rites of Sacraments, and for this reason it is one of the richest sources for studying liturgical developments.

It should be stressed that thorough theological, liturgical, historical and source-based studies on Ukrainian early printed books in general, and the Sacrament of Repentance in particular, are quite rare. Mostly bibliographers have focused on the *Ostroh Trebnyk* for the composition of bibliographical descriptions and catalogues, including Natalia Bondar and Roman Kyselov (2008, p. 108, № 449), Stepan Petrov,

¹ The Rites of the Sacrament of Repentance found in the *Stryatyn Trebnyk* were investigated and discussed by the author of this article. It should be noted that the *Stryatyn Trebnyk* contains two Rites of Confession. It seems that one of them belongs to the monastic practice and that it was performed by a monk after his completion of an imposed penalty, before the reception of the Eucharist. Therefore, it might not be considered the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance *per se*. The second Rite is clearly a sacramental Rite of Confession. It testifies to a strong South Slavonic influence. Nevertheless, it also contains elements of another approach based on the Kyivan liturgical tradition, including readings and prayers of absolution (Popelyastyv, 2020, p. 84–104).

II. ІСТОРІЯ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ЖИТТЯ XVII – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

Ya. Biriuk and T. Zolotar' (1958, p. 31, № 48), Tatiana Bykova (1972, p. 39–40, № 23), Jakym Zapasko and Iaroslav Isaievych (1981, p. 34, № 69), Yuri Labyncey (1982, p. 27, № 23), Fedir Maksymenko (1975, p. 37, № 197), Ihor Mytsko (1990, p. 128), and Ilarion Svetsitsky (1908, p. 72, № 244). This *Trebnik* has also been discussed or mentioned as a part in broader studies of the heritage of the Ostroh cultural and educational center and Ukrainian book printing, for example by Natalia Bondar (2008, p. 393–412), Yaroslava Bondarchuk (2015, p. 390–391), Iaroslav Isaievych (2002, p. 136), and Jakym Zapasko (1966, p. 179–187). There are only a few precise theological and liturgical studies of this book. Aleksandr Andreev provides a brief analysis of the *Ostroh Trebnik* in its historical and liturgical context as part of early Ruthenian edition of the Slavonic *Trebniks* (Andreev, 2022, p. 131–150). Despite having been publishing in 1894, the work of Alexandr Almazov (*Тайная исповѣдь въ Православной восточной Церкви: Опытъ внѣшней исторіи* [= *The Sacrament of Confession in the Orthodox Eastern Church: Experience of the External History*] remains a relevant source (Almazov, 1995, p. 492–497).

Source Description

a) The *Ostroh Trebnik*

The *Ostroh Trebnik* was edited at the famous printing house of Prince Konstantyn-Vasyl of Ostroh in 1606. The book was printed *in quarto*, in red and black ink, and consisted of 256² unnumbered folia. It was decorated with engravings of Prince Konstantyn's coat of arms, headpieces, a tailpiece, and a frame on the title folio (recto side). It also contains a Preface by the priest Demian Nalyvaiko,³ the

² Bondar and Kovalskyi indicate 252 folia and the lack of the gathering with the signature mark 9 [f] (Bondar and Kovalskyi, 2019, p. 570 and 2010–2011, 110, p. 437). However, the copies of the *Trebnik* from the Lviv Historical Museum (СД-131) and the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum (СДК 1529) contain this gathering, which adds an extra four folia. Therefore, the *Trebnik* should contain 256 folia. Cf. Bykova (1972, p. 39). The other two copies found in the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum are defective. Therefore, it is impossible to check the presence of the signature mark.

³ For more about the Ostroh printing house and its involvement in the publication of *Trebnik* see, for instance Bykova, 1972, p. 39–40, № 18; Bondar, 2008, p. 393–412; Bondar and Kovalskyi, 2019, p. 570–572 and 2010–2011, p. 437–438; Bondar and Kyselov, 2008, p. 108, № 449; Isaievych, 2002, p. 118–138; Labyncey, 1982, p. 27, № 23; Maksymenko, 1975, p. 37, № 197; Mytsko, 1990 (a monograph), and 1995, p. 13–23; Petrov, Biriuk and Zolotar',

director of the printing press and the famous cultural figure of his time.⁴ The opening service of the *Trebnyk* is the Rite of the Sanctification of the Water on the first day of August. This differs from the South Slavonic *Trebnyks*⁵ and the *Stryatyn Trebnyk*, 1606 which begin with the baptismal services or the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance (the two Venetian editions). The Rite of the Confession⁶ contains 23 pages and is placed between folia 22 [3r]–25 [2r].

There are only seven extant copies of this *Trebnyk*: three copies are preserved in Lviv, three of them – in the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum (СДК 188, № 185, СДК 189, № 186 and СДК 1529, № 14271/300531) (Sventsitsky, 1908, p. 72, № 244), and one – in the Lviv Historical Museum (СД-131); two copies are found in the National Library of Russia (1.7.31^a and 1.7.31^b) (formerly the M. E. Saltikov-Schedrin State Public Library) in Saint-Petersburg (Bykova, 1972, p. 39–40, № 23), and one copy is preserved in the V. I. Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine in Kyiv (Кир. 666) (Bondar and Kyselov, 2008, p. 108, № 449; Petrov, Biriuk and Zolotar', 1958, p. 31, № 48). Yuri Labyncey mistakenly indicates the existence of one more copy in the National Historical Library of Ukraine (№392989) (Labyncey, 1982, p. 27, № 23). However, this is a copy of the *Stryatyn Trebnyk*, 1606.⁷ This copy is also available on the electronic resource of the National Historical Library (<https://omeka.nibu.kyiv.ua/s/nibu/item/1402>) [accessed October 03 2023].

1958, p. 31, № 48; Sventsitsky, 1908, p. 72, № 244; Zapasko, 1966, p. 179–187; Zapasko and Isaievych, 1981, p. 11 and 38, № 69.

⁴ See, for example, Atamanenko, 2010–2011, p. 254–257 and 2019, p. 360–363; “Nalyvaiko, Demian,” *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.

⁵ The six editions of a printed *Trebnyk* belong to the South Slavonic tradition. The first Cyrillic *Trebnyk* was printed in Cetinje (contemporary Montenegro) in 1495. All extant copies of this *Trebnyk* are defective. Evgenij Nemirovskij affirms that this liturgical book seems to be reprinted in Venice in 1540 (Nemirovskij, 2005, p. 462–475; Nemirovskij, 1996, p. 245–251). The only Rite of the Holy Orders is found in the preserved exemplars of the *Trebnyk*. The other South Slavonic *Trebnyks* were printed in Goražde (contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina) in 1523, in Venice in about 1540, in Târgoviște (contemporary Romania) in 1545, in Mileševa in 1546, and in Venice in 1570. For more about the South Slavonic *Trebnyks* and their Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance, see Popelyasty, 2020, p. 107–134.

⁶ “ЧИНЪ ІСПОВѢДАНІЮ [= Rite for Confession]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3r]). This and subsequent translations are mine, unless otherwise indicated. In my work, I based myself on copies of the *Trebnyk* preserved in two collections in Lviv (the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum and the Lviv Historical Museum). Copies from the Sheptytsky National Museum are available on the Internet: <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/87> (СДК 188), <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/88> (СДК 189), and <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/140> (СДК 1529).

⁷ This copy is also available on the electronic resource of this Library (<https://omeka.nibu.kyiv.ua/s/nibu/item/5746#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=0>) [accessed January 11 2025].

II. ІСТОРІЯ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ЖИТТЯ XVII – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

All extant exemplars of the *Ostroh Trebnyk* are defective. It should be noted that the *Ostroh Trebnyk* has neither its own pagination nor foliation. Printers indicated only signature marks with Church Slavonic numerals to denote the book's gatherings and folia, starting only with the second gathering. The only Roman numeral IIII is indicated on the folia 2 verso of the first gathering (no signature mark) as a page 4. Therefore, in my paper, I refer to original signature marks and indicate them using Arabic numerals instead of the original Church Slavonic numerals. Consequently, the first number in the reference is the number of the signature mark, and a number put in square brackets indicates an unnumbered folio, including the folio where the signature mark itself is printed.⁸

There is a lack of a reliable information regarding the composition of the *Trebnyk*. Therefore, Demian Nalyvaiko's Preface remains the main source of information. The *Trebnyk* intends to be for the use of priests and deacons. It consists of the most important services. Therefore, services dedicated specifically for bishops are not included in this liturgical book, in particular the Holy Orders and Offices for receiving various heretics and non-Christians into the Orthodox Church, including Roman Catholics.

According to the Preface, the *Ostroh Trebnyk* was the first printed *Trebnyk* of the Ruthenians (“на́ро́дъ ро́у́скаїи”) (*Ostroh 1606*, f. [2r]) and the Kyivan Church. Its publication aimed to establish liturgical uniformity in the services and eliminate the distinctions and discrepancies found in the manuscript *Trebnyks*. Scribal errors and the preferences of certain individuals in choosing a manuscript to copy, including or excluding particular liturgical rites and prayers in their personal *Trebnyks* according to their preferences were cited as the reasons for these discrepancies. Demian Nalyvaiko also emphasized the apologetical goal of this book, which was to prevent the introduction of new liturgical practices (in a negative sense) into the traditional rite (in a positive sense: old, true, correct and unchangeable), particularly those practices associated with the Latin liturgical tradition (as a result of the Union of

⁸ In my references a number enclosed in square brackets indicates an unnumbered folio, while the Latin “r” refers to the recto side of a folio, and “v” – to its verso side.

Brest in 1596). It should be noted that the Ostroh cultural and educational centre was one of the main opponents of the Union of Brest and was actively involved in the confessional polemic (Cf. Isayevych, 2002, p. 131–136; Mytsko, 1990, p. 58–63; Kraliuk, Pasichnyk, and Yakubovych, 2014, p. 240–265)).

The Kyivan Synods had initiated the edition of such a “traditional” *Trebnyk* to eliminate liturgical discrepancies. The responsible persons were appointed. Unfortunately, Nalyvaiko did not mention their names. However, the process of preparation and publication of this liturgical book was interrupted by the Union of Brest in 1596.

It seems that Demian Nalyvaiko himself and other persons from the Ostroh cultural and educational centre were involved in the preparatory process. Consequently, the publication of this *Trebnyk* marked the completion of their work. The oppression of people who reject the Union of Brest caused the postponing of the publication. Therefore, it was realized only thanks to the financial support of Prince Konstantyn-Vasyl of Ostroh in 1606.

Nalyvaiko declares that the *Trebnyk* was completed thoroughly based on the Ruthenian and Greek manuscripts “Б҃ЖІ́АНИ́И ПР҃ИД҃А́КОУА ѿ ѠМѢ́НІА [= without any addition and change]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. [3v]). He emphasized that this book faithfully followed and represented unchanged and true liturgical tradition, “Ѳ҃ДНѸ Ѧ́КОУА ВСТ҃А́Ю́ЩІ [КНИ́ГАХ] НА́ИД҃ОУА́ЛО [= exactly as it found in old books]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. [3v]).

This information correlated with bishop Gedeon Balaban’s indication found in the Preface to the *Stryatyn Trebnyk*, 1606, but with essential differences. The edition of the *Trebnyk* was initiated by a Kyivan Synod before 1596 and aimed to eliminate discrepancies in liturgical Services. Balaban declares that Kyivan metropolitan Mykhailo Rahoza and bishops who had gathered at one of the Synods of Brest-Litovsk held in 1590–1595 entrusted him the edition of this *Trebnyk* (bishop Balaban was a member of those Synods). Nevertheless, it seems that Meletios Pigas, the

II. ІСТОРІЯ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ЖИТТЯ XVII – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

Alexandrian Patriarch and the Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople, gave the main impulse for its edition (*Stryatyn 1606*, f. [2v]–[3r]). According to the *Ostroh*'s Prefaces the edition of the *Trebynk* was discussed at several Synods (*Ostroh 1606*, f. [2v]). It worth noting that between 1590 and 1596, several Synods were held resulting in the Union of Brest in 1596. There is a lack of reliable information to conclude at which Synods the issues related to the *Trebynk* were discussed and to whom its edition was entrusted. Thus, all suggestions for the identification of the Synod/s and their decisions are hypothetical (Popelyastyy, 2020, p. 85, footnote 3). The *Stryatyn Trebynk* was a part of a larger Balaban's project aiming at the publication of liturgical books of which the first book was the *Service Book (Sluzhebnyk)*, 1604, and the *Didactic Gospel (Uchytelnoye Yevanhelie)*, 1606, was the third and the last printed book of the project (Popelyastyy, 2020, p. 85). Nalyvaiko did not mention the addition of other liturgical books. It seems that Kyivan manuscript *Trebynks* influenced the *Ostroh Trebynk*, while the *Stryatyn Trebynk* was modelled on a Greek Euchologion. The latter aims to be as universal and practical as possible, and also includes episcopal services, for example the consecration of the Holy Chrism and the acceptance of apostates and converts to the Orthodox Church.

b) The Ostroh Trebynk and the Following Editions

The Rite of Confession found in the *Ostroh Trebynk* was very influential. It is present (with some changes discussed below) in numerous later editions of *Trebynks*, which belong to the Kyivan liturgical tradition. This Rite appears for the first time (after the *Ostroh Trebynk*), in the *Trebynk* published in Vilno (contemporary Vilnius, Lithuania) in 1617–1618. For the analysis of this Rite of Confession, I base myself on the copy of the *Trebynk* from the Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (I-CT-4443), which is not mentioned in printed catalogues of Cyrillic early editions.⁹ The book was printed *in quarto*, in black and red, and it is decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, and initials. A ruled (linear) frame encloses folia on both sides (recto and verso). Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals,

⁹ It should be noted that there are two completely different Rites of Confession in different copies of Vilnius *Trebynk* published in 1617–1618: one "Orthodox" and the other "Uniate." In this article, I will focus solely on the traditional, so-called "Orthodox" Rite of Confession.

placed on the top right-hand corner of a folio on its recto side. This exemplar is defective and is missing many folia from the beginning. It starts only at the folio 33r. According to the library card catalogue, this copy (in full) should contain 338 folia.¹⁰ The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is placed between the Rite of Holy Communion for the Sick and the Order of Engagement. The Rite of Confession begins on folio 39r and contains eight folia. The last two folia of this Rite ([45] and [46]) are left unnumbered and without signatures. Folio 44 is the last numbered folio of the Rite of Confession, and the next Order of Engagement begins at folio 45r. Thus, the original foliation of the book is followed despite the greater number of folia dedicated to the Rite of Confession.

The next *Trebnyk* to be published was produced by the Orthodox Brotherhood printing house in Vilnius in 1621 (according to the title page on the 20th of December). The book was printed in a small format,¹¹ only in black, and it is simply decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, and initial letters. The title page alone is decorated with a border. Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals, which are placed on the right top corner of a folio on its recto side. It comprises of 312 folia, including a Dedication (Preface) (without foliation) to Job Boretsky, the Orthodox Kyivan Metropolitan (1620–1631), and Meletiy Smotrystky, the Orthodox Archbishop of Polotsk (1577?–1633). The additional part without foliation contains a Calendar (Sobornyk), two sample Sermons (Predmova) for Marriage, one *Teaching before* and one *Teaching after the Confession*, *Questions for the Confession*, and two funeral sample Sermons.¹² The Dedication contains doctrinal instructions regarding the matter and form of the five Sacraments (except the Eucharist and Holy Orders). There is also a recommendation for priests in the Dedication to read and consult the

¹⁰ The card catalogue of Stefanyk Library. This catalogue is available on the Internet: Image-Catalogue, <http://image.lsl.lviv.ua/#> [accessed January 23 2025]. See also a manuscript note of the copy of *Vilno 1617* from Stefanyk Library inserted into the book. It should be noted that the hand-written folio is incorporated into this copy of *Vilno 1617*, which contains the Rite for the blessing of salt.

¹¹ The contemporary digital Catalogue of Russian State Library indicates that *Vilno 1621* was printed in *duodecimo* (see for example http://aleph.rsl.ru/F/KBNRBTS1QPKG92GK535NS3U3NMGV2F7NM9SGL91KRG5FM5MFLD-10508?func=full-set-set&set_number=002000&set_entry=000001&format=999 [accessed April 22 2020]). However, *Книга Беларусь* indicates its size as *in sextodecimo* (Galenchanka, 1986, 95).

¹² It should be noted that all Sermons, Teachings and Questions are written in so-called *prosta mova*, that is the contemporary vulgar language.

II. ІСТОРІЯ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ЖИТТЯ XVII – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

Syntagmation of Gabriel Severos, the Greek Metropolitan of Philadelphia, translated into Slavonic (the doctrinal treaties on the Seven Sacraments published in Venice in 1600 and already translated into Middle Ukrainian in the monastery in Derman' near Ostrih in 1603).¹³ The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is placed on folia 88v–97r respectively, between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction. It should be noted that there is the indication on the title folio that this *Trebnyk* is the first edition of a *Trebnyk* published by the Orthodox Brotherhood.¹⁴ Doctrinal instructions regarding the Holy Sacraments found in the Dedication of the *Trebnyk* published in Vilnius in 1621 and its reference to the *Syntagmation*, rather than to the *Teaching from the Trebnyk* (1617–1618) (*Vilno 1621*, f. [3r] –[6v]), are among other arguments supporting the view that the *Trebnyk* published in Vilnius in 1617–1618 was not an independent and distinct Orthodox edition.

The Vilnius Orthodox Brotherhood published the *Trebnyk* for the second time in Vilnius in 1624, as is clearly indicated on the title page.¹⁵ This book was printed *in octavo* in two colors (in black and red) and contains 186 folia. It is decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, initials, two miniatures, and the text is put within specific ruled borders. Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals, which are placed on a right top corner of a folio on its recto side. The Preface is addressed to priests. The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is found on folia 56v–62r respectively, between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction.¹⁶

Some scholars, including Ivan Sakharov (1849, p. 86, № 251), Ivan Karataev (1883, p. 330, № 401),¹⁷ Vukol Undolsky (1871, p. 42, № 317), Aleksandr Almazov (1995, p. 496), and Alfonso Raes (1935, p. 372–373),¹⁸ mention the edition of the

¹³ For more about Severos' *Syntagmation* and its Slavonic translation see, for example Popelyasty, 2015/2016, 236–245; Yasinovskiy, 2017, 73–80.

¹⁴ The argument of the edition of *Vilno 1621* was for the first time discussed by Mykhailo Wawryk (1967, p. 599–600).

¹⁵ In my work I based my research on the photocopy of *Vilno 1624* from the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (ФСР № 2258).

¹⁶ For more about *Vilno 1624* see, for example Galenchanka, 1986, p. 98; Karataev, 1883, p. 374, № 287; Labyncey, 1982, p. 48, № 126; Milovidov, Старопечатный, p. 7, № 68; Undolsky, 1871, p. 37, № 273.

¹⁷ Karataev refers to Sakharov description and indicates that he, Karataev, did not see this *Trebnyk* in person (Karataev, 1883, p. 330).

¹⁸ Raes refers to Karataev description. Raes also affirmed that he did not see this *Trebnyk* in person (Raes, 1935, p. 373).

Trebnyk by the Orthodox Brotherhood printing press in Vilnius in 1628. It seems that only Ivan Sakharov and Aleksandr Almazov personally worked with this edition. Karol Estreicher also mentions the copy of this edition from the Krasinski Library (Estreichers, 1936, p. 285). Nevertheless, they were, probably, mistaken in the identification and dating of the copy they saw. No contemporary scholars know about an edition of the *Trebnyk* in 1628.¹⁹ Moreover, there is a clear indication on the title folio that the publication of the *Trebnyk* in Vievis (old Evje) in 1638 is the third edition of the *Trebnyk* by the Orthodox Brotherhood printing press.²⁰

This *Trebnyk* was printed *in octavo*, only in black,²¹ and decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, initials, and one miniature. Text is put within an ornamental border.²² Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals, which are placed on a right-hand top corner of a folio on its recto side. Galenchanka suggests that “the full exemplar should contain 314 folia” (Galenchanka, 1986, p. 108). The Rite of Confession is placed on folia 88 v–97r, between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction.²³

The next *Trebnyk* was edited by the Orthodox Brotherhood in Vievis in 1641. This book was also printed *in octavo*, only in black, and decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, initials, and three miniatures. Two of them, the Crucifixion with four persons interceding (verso side of the title folio) and the Descent to Hades ([7v]) are the same as in *Vilno 1624*. The third miniature is the Cross (Golgotha) enclosed in the decorated frame with the abbreviations “Іѣ.” and “Хѣ.” (upper) and “ІІІ.” “КѦ.” (below) ([7r]). The text is within a ruled border. Book foliation is given with Cyrillic

¹⁹ For example, cf. Galenchanka, 1986.

²⁰ I used the copy of *Evje 1638* found in the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 382, old 370). This copy is bound with the *Sluzhebnik*, and is defective, missing some folia, including the title folio. For the giving of the copy's title, I refer to the bibliographical description, where the title is found in Russian transliteration and not in the original Church Slavonic (Galenchanka, *Книга Беларусі*, 108 and on-line Catalogue of RSL). Therefore, I give only the Ukrainian transliteration of the title in my work.

²¹ Galenchanka indicates printing in red and black. It seems to be a mistake. The two copies of *Evje 1638* from Lviv collections (the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum and Vasyl Stefanyk Library (I-CT-3840)) are printed only in black.

²² Galenchanka mistakenly indicates ruled border instead of ornamental (Galenchanka, 1986, p. 108). The copy of the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 383, old 371) is now available online: <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/135#?c=&m=&s=&cv=&xywh=-2395%2C-305%2C8436%2C6080> and <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/136#?c=&m=&s=&cv=&xywh=-2395%2C-305%2C8436%2C6080>.

²³ For more about *Evje 1638* see, for example Bondar and Kyselov, 2008, p. 47, № 56; Galenchanka, 1986, p. 108; Karataev, 1883, p. 465–466, № 473; Lukianenko, 1979, p. 159–160, № 89; Milovidov, *Старопечатная*, p. 13, № 171; Svetsitsky, 1908, 72, № 246; Voznesenskii and Nikolaev, 2019, p. 63–64, № 89.

letters as numerals, which are placed on a right-hand top corner of a folio on its recto side. The *Trebnik* also contains a Preface addressed to priests. This is the same Preface as is found in *Vilno 1624* and *Evje 1638* (Lukianenko, 1979, 167–170, № 92).²⁴ The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is found on folia 80r–87v, also between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction. Vera Lukianenko affirms the similarity of contents of *Evje 1638* and *Evje 1641* while observing that the design of a folio's frame is the main difference. The ornamental border of *Evje 1638* is replaced by ruled border in *Evje 1641* (Lukianenko, 1979, p. 169).²⁵ The text on the title page clearly indicates that this is the fourth edition of the *Trebnik* by the Orthodox Brotherhood.

In 1635 the *Trebnik* was printed in a newly established printing house in Cimpulung (Cîmpulung, Dovhe Pole in Slavonic), Wallachia (contemporary Romania).²⁶ Timotei Aleksandrovich Verbitsky was the main printer. This book was printed in *quarto*, in black and red, and decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, initials. Only the title folio is enclosed by a decorative border. Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals, which are placed on a right-hand top corner of a folio on

²⁴ Lukianenko compared only *Evje 1641* and *Evje 1638*. I compared Prefaces in *Evje 1641* and *Vilno 1624*, because the Preface is missing in the copy of *Evje 1638* found in the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum.

²⁵ In my work, I based my research on the copy of *Evje 1641* preserved in the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 459, old 453) and two copies found in the National Library of Poland (BN.Cyr.9 adl. (Mf. 92028) [the title folio is preserved] and BN.Cyr.15 (Mf. 93652)). These later copies are available online: <https://academica.edu.pl/reading/readSingle?page=2&uid=136453849>; <https://polona.pl/item/trebnik-sirec-molitovni-k-imeaj-v-sebe-c-e-rkovnya-posledovania-iereem-podobausaa,MTM2NDUzODQ5/1/#info:metadata> and <https://academica.edu.pl/reading/readSingle?cid=138104028&uid=136458461>; <https://polona.pl/item/trebnik-sirec-molitovni-k-imeaj-v-sebe-c-e-rkovnya-posledovania-iereem-podobausaa,MTM2NDU4NDYx/5/#info:metadata> [accessed January 23 2025]. It should be mentioned that only an approximate dating of this *Trebnik* appears in the Soviet Union and Russian catalogues (Galenchanka, 1986, p. 111, № 139; Lukianenko, 1979, p. 167–170, № 92; Voznesenskii and Nikolaev, 2019, 68–70, № 92). The reason for this is that the only one defective copy of *Evje 1641* is found/known? in Russian collections, that is the copy preserved in the National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg (X. 5A. 1) (former the M. E. Saltikov-Schedrin State Public Library). Vera Lukianenko, who identified and described this copy for the first time, dated it to 1640–1641 (the title folio of the copy is missing) (Lukianenko, 1979, p. 167–170). It seems that Russian scholars are unaware of the two exemplars of *Evje 1641* held in the National Library of Poland. The copy from the Andrew Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 459, old 453) was correctly identified as a copy of *Evje 1641* for the first time in my doctoral dissertation and subsequently in this article. According to Svetsitsky's *Catalogue*, this copy belongs to a Vilnius edition of 1638 (the copy's title folio is also lacking). The *Catalogue* also indicates that two copies of the *Trebnik* printed in Vievis in 1638 are found in the collection. Nevertheless, the original Svetsitsky's *Catalogue*'s dating was later mistakenly corrected from 1638 to 1621 in pencil in the copy of the *Catalogue* used by the Museum's staff (Svetsitsky, 1908, p. 72, № 245). *Kniza Belapysci* attributes this copy (СдК 459, old 453) as one of three copies of *Evje 1638* preserved in the Museum (Galenchanka, 1986, p. 108). For more information about *Evje 1641*, see also Svetsitsky, 1908, p. 72, № 245; Żurawińska and Jaroszewicz-Pierśławcew, 2004, p. 78–79, № 75.

²⁶ In my work I based my research on the copy of *Cimpulung 1635* found in the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 1118, old 1071). This copy is available online: <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/97?c=&m=&s=&cv=&xywh=-2395%2C-305%2C8436%2C6080>

its recto side. Each number is preceded with indication “лн [= folio].” The *Trebnyk* consists of 226 folia, including the coat of arms of Matei Basarab, the Prince of Wallachia (1632–1654), on the verso side of the title folio; poetry regarding the coat of arms signed by Uriil Nasturel; two Prefaces and the Afterword. The authorship of the first Preface is attributed to Matei Basarab (indicated in the title). The second Preface is the editorial dedication to Matei Basarab. This Preface, according to Dennis Deletant, is signed by Ioan Glebkovych in some copies and in the others by Ivasco Baleanul. Thus, Deletant points that two editions of *Cimpulung 1635* exist [Deletant, 1982, p. 485, footnote 8]. The Prefaces informs that Matei Basarab established the Printing house in order to provide service books because of their shortage. Peter Mohyla, the Kyivan Metropolitan, sold him the Printing press and five type faces and also sent Timotei Verbitsky to operate the press (*Cimpulung 1635*, f. [2v]–[9v]). The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is found on folia 39r–47v, between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction.²⁷

In the middle of 40ies of the 17th century two different editions of a *Trebnyk* were published in Lviv. The first edition of the *Trebnyk* was published in the private printing press of Mykhailo Sliozka in 1644.²⁸ This book was printed *in octavo*, mostly in black. Only the title folio on its recto and verso sides and the next first folio of the table of content (recto side) are printed in red. It is decorated with headpieces, tailpieces, initials, two miniatures, and decorated border on the title folio. The text is enclosed within a ruled border. Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals, which are placed on a right-hand top corner of a folio on its recto side. The book consists of 287 folia. The Sacrament of Repentance is placed on folia 71?–78r between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction.²⁹

²⁷ The foliation is incorrect. For more information about *Cimpulung 1635* see, for example Bianu and Hodoș, 1903, p. 103–104, № 35; 529–532; Bondar and Kyselov, 2008, p. 46, № 49; Lukianenko, 1979, p. 126–128, № 55; Karataev, 1883, p. 448–449, № 426; the on-line Catalogue of RSL.

²⁸ In my work, I based my analysis on two copies of *Lviv 1644* found in the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 1472 and СдК 379, old 367). The latter copy is available on the Internet: <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/show/131#?c=&m=&s=&cv=7&xywh=8588%2C14%2C1374%2C990>.

²⁹ For more information about *Lviv 1644* see, for example Estreichers, 1936, 285; Karataev, 1883, p. 509, № 573; Svetsitsky, 1908, p. 73, № 247; Zapasko and Isaievych, 1981, p. 65, № 325; Żurawińska and Jaroszewicz-Pierśławcew, 2004, p. 84–85, № 83. Fedir Maksymenko’s description of *Lviv 1644* contains many mistakes, including

The following year, in 1645, another *Trebnyk* was published in Lviv at the printing house of Arsenii Zhelyborsky, the bishop of Lviv.³⁰ Andrei Skolsky was the main printer. This edition was printed *in quarto*, in black and red and decorated with engravings of the decorated frame on the title page, Arsenii Zhelyborsky's coat of arms on its verso side, headpieces, tailpieces, and initials. The text is enclosed within decorative borders. Book foliation is given with Cyrillic letters as numerals, placed on a right-hand top corner of a folio on its recto side. The *Trebnyk* comprises of 356 folia. It also contains a Preface, dated May 12, 1645, attributed to Arsenii Zhelyborsky. In the Preface, Zhelyborsky denies accusations of avarice and explains his reasons for the establishing of the printing house and edition of the *Trebnyk*. He affirms that the primary motivation for the typography was the spiritual benefits of believers. Furthermore, the clergy of Lviv eparchy asked him to found the printing house in line with his predecessor, the bishop Gedeon Balaban. Arsenii Zhelyborsky also aimed at the establishing a continuous book printing process, with the *Trebnyk* being the first result. This edition was designed to be very practical and easy to read, with red rubrics, table of contents and correction of mistakes. However, according to Zhelyborsky, there were no incorporations into and corrections of the content of the *Trebnyk*, because he expected a new revised edition of a *Trebnyk* for the whole Kyivan Church to be published soon (*Lviv 1645*, f. [3v]–[4v]). The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance is found on folia 62r–72v, between the Marital Services and the Rite of the Sacrament of Holy Unction.³¹

different title and year of publication (Maksymenko, 1975, p. 30, № 156). For more about the printing house of Mykhailo Sliozka see, for example Isaievyh, 2002, p. 211–218.

³⁰ In my work I based my analysis on the copy of *Lviv 1645* found in the Andrey Sheptytsky Museum (СдК 193, old 189). This copy is available on the Internet: <https://dlib.ucu.edu.ua/items/browse?page=1>. The copy of *Lviv 1645* preserved in the National Library of Poland (BN.Cyr.131 (Mf. 92582)) is also available on the Internet: <https://academica.edu.pl/reading/readSingle?cid=137608154&uid=136458923> and <https://polona.pl/item/eyhologion-siest-molitvoslov-ili-trebnik-imeaj-v-sebe-cerkovnaa-razlicnya.MTM2NDU4OTIz/4/#info:metadata> [accessed January 23 2025].

³¹ For more information about *Lviv 1645* see, for example Bondar and Kyselov, 2008, p. 72, № 194; Estreichers, 1936, 285; Karataev, 1883, p. 514–515, № 590; Kolosovs'ka and Hatskova, 2000, p. 128–134, № 169–175; Svetsitsky, 1908, 73, № 248; Zapasko and Isaievyh, 1981, p. 66, № 335; Żurawińska and Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew, 2004, 85–86, № 84. For more about the printing house of Arsenii Zhelyborsky see, for example Isaievyh, 2002, p. 218–219.

The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the *Ostroh Trebnyk*: A Comparative Study

For the analysis, I will divide the liturgical Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance into four sections, as this division logically follows from the structure of the Service itself: a) pre-confessional (before the avowal of sins), b) confessional, c) post-confessional, and d) additional prayers. It should be noted that there is no division into sections with distinct titles in the liturgical Rite. However, the structure of the Service itself suggests that those wishing to confess their sins should first enter a church (temple), meet the priest-confessor, and approach him. Next, a collection of prayers and the confessor's instructions and exhortations follow with the aim to prepare, encourage, and motivate the sinner to the sincere avowal of sins. The sinner then confesses his sins before the ordained minister, who estimates their gravity, and either absolves or withholds absolution of the penitent. If the latter, the confessor imposes a penance and postpones the absolution until has been completed. Subsequently, both the confessor and penitent continue with an exhortation to stimulate the sinner to the fulfillment of the imposed penance, conversion, and to change his life for the better in order to be reunited with God and an ecclesiastical community (as sin destroys unity) and be enabled again to enter the Heavenly Kingdom.

The structure of the Rite is as follows:

<i>Pre-confessional section:</i>
Entrance ceremonies; Usual opening prayers; 3 prayers and 4 Psalms:
Pss 50 and 4; <i>ѿѡ помѡлѡиѡ</i> [= Let us pray to the Lord] and <i>Гѡ бѡже спсѡиѡ насѡ</i> [= O Lord, God of our salvation];
Ps 6 and <i>Вѡко гѡ всѡдрѡжитѡлю , призѡвѡли прѡбѡвѡники вѡсѡтѡнѡю</i> [= O Master, Lord Almighty, Who calls the righteous to holiness];
Ps 12 and the prayer <i>Гѡ спсѡи мѡѡ , ѡже прѡкомѡ скон нѡдѡлѡномѡ</i> [= O Lord, my Savior, Who, through Your Prophet Nathan].
<i>Confessional section:</i>

II. ІСТОРИЯ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ЖИТТЯ XVII – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

The instruction, 3 exhortations, doctrinal questions, the Creed, the list of sins, and the stereotype formula of the all-embracing confession.
rising up of the penitent
the instruction: <i>и вѣпрошае ігѣ</i> [and [the confessor] question him [the penitent];
the exhortation: <i>Сѣ ннѣ чѣдо</i> [= This is today, O child];
the first doctrinal question, the Creed and the second doctrinal question;
the exhortation: <i>Сѣ ннѣ брѣте , и ли чѣдо , и ли гѣне , прѣстоѣ ѡггѣли не вѣидимо</i> [= Behold, brother or child or master, angels are invisibly present;”
the list of questions/sins: <i>Вѣко сѣоу и ли дщѣ</i> [= How did you, son or daughter];
the exhortation: <i>Мнѣго тѣ вѣхѣ гѣлаѣ чѣдо</i> [= I could say a lot to you];
the stereotypical formula of the all-embracing confession (repeating after the priest): <i>Исповѣдаюся бѣоу , и прѣчѣстѣи мѣтери ігѣ</i> [= I confess to God and to His most pure Mother].
<i>Post-Confessional section:</i>
casting down;
the prayer: <i>Гѣ бѣе нѣшѣ , иже петрѣви и блѣудниѣм сѣзѣмн гѣхѣм ѡстѣвѣ</i> [= O Lord, our God, Who remitted the sins of Peter and the Harlot through their tears];
Scripture readings: 1 Tim 1,15-17 and Mt 9,9-13;
the Dismissal.
<i>Absolution:</i> consideration, 2 instructions, 3 prayers
consideration of the worthiness of the penitent to receive the Eucharist;
in case of positive answer: spontaneous instruction: the forgiveness: <i>Чѣдо , прошае тѣ хѣ бѣѣ не вѣидимо , и ѡзѣ</i> [= O child, Christ God forgives you invisibly and I]; the forgiveness prayer: <i>Бѣе прѣстѣбви на дѣно дѣѣ прѣрѣѣ</i> [= the forgiveness prayer: O God, Who through Nathan forgave David, the Prophet];
in case of negative answer: instruction regarding the imposition of penance; the exhortation: <i>Чѣдо не вѣудн тѣ тѣжѣко кѣѣщѣтѣѣѣ</i> [= O child,

may it not be difficult for you to repent;

Additional Prayers: 2 prayers for the absolution after the completing of the penance:

Млѣдливъ ѿ мѣстивъ ѿи , блгмъ члво лѣбче [= Compassionate and merciful Lord, good Lover of mankind];

Влко ѿи їи хї , ѿже скон оѣченнко ѿ апламы зпобѣдѣхъ ѿпѣцѣти члво рѣхъ [= O Master, Lord Jesus Christ, Who commanded his disciples and Apostles to forgive men their sins].

a) Pre-Confessional Section

In line with the *Stryatyn Trebnyk* the entrance ceremonies and the pre-confessional part of the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance found in the *Ostroh Trebnyk* are also very similar to those in the South Slavonic printed *Trebnyks*. However, there are some peculiarities in the Ostroh edition.

According to the *Ostroh Trebnyk*, the usual place for the confession is a church. However, the confessor might also take the penitent to some “silent place”³² (such possibility is not present in the South Slavonic printed *Trebnyks* as well as in the *Stryatyn Trebnyk*). There is no explicit explanation for this change in the location of Confession in the text. The sinner’s entry into the church should also express his repentance. According to the rubric, the penitent should enter “with fear and humility and with folded arms.”³³ After the minister’s request “Make a bow before God to Whom you have come”³⁴ the confessant³⁵ makes three prostrations to the ground before the Holy Altar while acknowledging his sinfulness and requesting for the divine mercy and forgiveness of his sins “I have sinned, O Lord, forgive me; accept

³² “мѣсто еіѣмѣльнѣ” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3r]).

³³ “сѣтрѣхѣмъ ѿмѣрѣніемъ, ѿсѣгѣнама рѣкѣма” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3r]).

³⁴ “поклонѣса еѣхъ кѣнімоѣже їи прѣбѣхъ” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3r]).

³⁵ Several terms for the identification of the confessant are used in the text, including “Хотѣи клѣтиса [= one, who wants to repent]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3r]); “Хотѣи ѿповѣдѣтиса [= one, who wants to confess]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3v]); ѿповѣдѣщѣниса [= one, who is confessing] (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [1v]); ѿповѣдѣниса [= confessant] (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [1r]);

me, O Lord, who repent, and have mercy on me; Lord, cleanse me, a sinner, O Lord, Who created me, have mercy on me; I have sinned countless times, O Lord, forgive me for Your holy name's sake.”³⁶ This formula differs from the one found in the *Stryatyn Trebnyk* (the different redaction).³⁷ Then the confessor³⁸ places the Gospel on the analogion before the Altar, and the penitent puts his head and hands on the Gospel. The South Slavonic *Trebnyks* and the *Stryatyn Trebnyks* indicate that both the Gospel and the Cross should be placed on the analogion. Next, the priest recites the usual opening prayers,³⁹ beginning with “Blessed is our God,”⁴⁰ followed by two Psalms 50⁴¹ and 4, three pre-confessional prayers (in different redactions or variations), viz. “O Lord, God of our salvation,”⁴² “O Master, Lord Almighty, Who calls the righteous to holiness” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [4r]–22 [4v]) and “O Lord, my Savior, Who, through Your Prophet Nathan,” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [1r]). In between these prayers, Psalms 4 and 12 are recited.

In the first prayer “O Lord, God of our salvation,” the minister appeals to God, recalling His great mercifulness and patience with sinners, as well as His desire for the conversion of their lives for the better and, thus, not their death (which is inevitable caused by a sinful life). Hence, the priest asks God to grant sinners “*мѣсто ѿ вѣ́мѧ ѿисти́ннаго пока́нїѧ* [= a place and time for true

³⁶ “Сѡгрѣшѣхъ г҃и прѡсѣи мѧ , прѣимѣи мѧ г҃и кѧѡщѡгогѡ ѡпомѧѡи мѧ . г҃и ѡцѣстѣмѧ г҃рѣшнаго , сѡзѡбѡвимѧ г҃и ѡпомѧѡи мѧ . бѣзѡнѣлѣ г҃и сѡгрѣшѣхѣхъ , прѡсѣи мѧ ѡмѣни твоѣго рѧѡи с҃го” (Ostroh 1606, f. 22 [3r–22 [3v]]).

³⁷ «Гѣ свѣрѣшнхѣ, помѣюи мѧ, ѡ прѣстѣ мѧ. прѣимѣ мѧ Гѣ клѣнцѣсѧ, помѣюи мѧ ѡ прѣстѣ мѧ. Гѣ свѣрѣшнхѣ мѧ, ѡ прѣстѣ мѧ. Гѣ крѣшнцѣ свѣрѣшнхѣ, помѣюи мѧ, ѡ прѣстѣ мѧ.» (*Stryatyn 1606*, f. 139v–140r).

³⁸ It is worth noticing the author of the *Trebynyk* constantly uses the term “priest [= *ігумен* or *ігумен*” to identify the confessor in the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance see, for example *Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3r]–22 [3v].

³⁹ «Ңа, цѣю нѣныи оутѣшнѣтелю дѣи истинныи . трѣтѣе . по ѡтѣиашъ, прѣидѣте поклонимсѧ ѿ [= then “Heavenly King, Comforter, Spirit of truth!,” the Trisagion, after “Our Father” “Come, let us worship” thrice]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3v]).

⁴⁰ “БЛ҃ГІНЪ Б҃ГЪ НЛ҃Ш” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3v]).

⁴¹ Aleksandr Almazov mistakenly indicates that Psalm 50 is not present in *Ostroh 1606*'s Rite of Confession (Almazov, 1995, p. 493).

⁴² The prayer is preceded by priestly exclamation “[= Let us pray to the Lord]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [3v]).

repentance]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [4r]),⁴³ forgiveness of all trespasses committed willingly and unwillingly, and finally for the uniting to the Church (because sin destroys not only the relationship with God but also the connection with their ecclesia-community).

In the second pre-confessional prayer “O Master, Lord Almighty, Who calls the righteous to holiness,” the priest recalls that God calls sinners for conversion and desires the growth of righteous men in holiness. Therefore, the confessor asks God to accept the repentance of the penitent, and forgive all his sins and filthiness or defilements (“ѡбѣ́рѣ́хъ ꙗ́ко ѡчи́сти” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 22 [4v])), and to keep him safe from sinful inclination, in particular corporal ones, and cleanse his conscience. The priest also beseeches God to strengthen the sinner for the fulfilment of the Divine Commands and make him worthy to receive the Eucharist. Thus, the penitent’s final hope is unity with the Holy Spirit and the inheritance of the Heavenly Kingdom as the result of changing his way of life from a sinful one to a life with God.

In the final pre-confessional prayer “O Lord, my Savior, Who, through Your Prophet Nathan,” the minister recalls two examples of divine forgiveness: King David and Manaseh. Moreover, the priest emphasises that the Lord Himself has ordered the forgiveness of others’ sins numerous times, particularly the command to forgive seventy times seven. Thus, the priest asks God to forgive the sins of the confessant too, since he also repents.

b) The Confessional Section

In line with other Cyrillic printed *Trebnys* (the South Slavonic and the *Stryatyn*), the confessional part in the *Ostroh Trebnyk* begins with the rising of the confessant. The following rubric also prescribes that the priest should “question him [the penitent] with love and in meekness and with humility and with all gentleness,”⁴⁴

⁴³ The similar phrase is also found in the *Euchologium Slavonicum*: “мѣсто ѿ крѣмъ покаяніа” (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 46r). Significant differences are found among the other sources. They say, for example “ѡмръщѣхъ ꙗ́ко покаяніѣмъ” (*Goražde 1523*, f. [25r]); “ѡмръщѣхъ ꙗ́ко покаяніѣмъ” (*Mileševa 1546*, f. [29r]); “[= прощѣно покаяніѣ]” (*Venice 1570*, f. [1v]), “ѡтвѣръжѣхъ мѣсто покаяніа” (*Stryatyn 1606*, f. 141r).

⁴⁴ “въпросае ѿго лѣбѣѣи ѡчи́стѣи ѿмѣрѣніѣмъ , ѿбѣрѣхъ крѣстоуѣѣи” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [1r]).

and indicate that God is the witness of his confession and that the confessor is also a sinful person.

Then the priestly exhortation “This is today, o child” follows (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [1v]). With this exhortation the confessor encourages the penitent to confess all sins and not hide any because of shame before confessor.

This is another, more extended redaction, of the exhortation “Today, O child” found in the South Slavonic *Trebnyks*⁴⁵ and the exhortation “O child, do not be ashamed of a human person, because we all are sinful” from the *Euchologium Slavonicum*.⁴⁶ In the exhortation “This is today, o child,” the confessor encourages the penitent to confess all sins and not hide some of them because of shame before confessor. There is no reason to hide any sin because God knows everything. The confessor ensures that a sincerely repentant sinner can receive forgiveness for all his sins.

In the other printed *Trebnyks* which we have also discussed, this exhortation concludes with the question about the corruption of confessant’s virginity. Instead, in the *Ostroh Trebnyk*, the priest is directed to ask the penitent two doctrinal questions. The first one is as follows: “Вѣроуєши ли въ ѿца и сѣна и сѣго дѣла [= Do you believe in the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit]?” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [2r]). In case of the positive answer, the penitent should say the *Creed*. The second question concerns the penitent’s orthodoxy and aims to eliminate any possibility of sinner being a heretic or guilty of doctrinal errors.⁴⁷ The beginning of the interrogation about the doctrinal question was a distinguishing characteristic of the Western penitential

⁴⁵ “нѣмъ чѣло” (*Goražde 1523*, f. [26v]); “нѣмъ чѣло” (*Târgoviște 1545*, f. [8v]); “нѣмъ чѣло [= And today, O child” (*Mileševa 1546*, f. [30v]); “нѣмъ чѣло” (*Venice 1540*, f. [3r]); “чѣло нѣмъ” (*Venice 1570*, f. [3r]).

⁴⁶ “Убо не смѣемъ лица члѣа. вси бо грѣшнии ѣсмы” (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 41v). *Euchologium Slavonicum* is the solid Cyrillic manuscript with above 480 preserved folia. The main corpus of the codex was composed in the 15th–16th centuries for the Kyivan metropolitan. It presents the lived liturgical tradition of the Kyivan Church at that time. For more about the *Euchologium Slavonicum* and its Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance, see Popelyasty, 2023, p. 59–91.

⁴⁷ “ѡмѣи ерѣжи коуоуа ерѣи , и ѡмѣи не поколебѣмо ехѣрѣжѣтъ вѣрѣ еѣма ехѣоуныа ѡпаче кѣа цѣкви , ?и бо ерѣтъ глагоуна еѣиетѣ [= Is he in some heresy and does he steadfastly maintain the faith of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. This is the origin of salvation] (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [2v]).

tradition at the end of the first millennium.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, such questions could be considered quite natural and logical in the Kyivan Orthodox context after the Union of Brest in 1596, where part of the Kyivan Church had accepted the Union with Rome and another part rejected it. It should be stressed again that the Prince Konstantyn-Vasyl of Ostroh, the owner of the Ostroh printing house, was one of the main opponents of the Union, and the Ostroh *Trebnik* 1606 was also one of the first printed Kyivan Orthodox *Trebniks*. Moreover, different Reformed communities were spread as well in this geographical area. Aleksandr Almazov points out that such kind of doctrinal questions are also present in some Slavonic manuscripts.⁴⁹

After the interrogation, there follows another exhortation “Behold, brother or child or master, angels are invisibly present” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [2v]). This exhortation is the same as “Behold, child, angels are invisibly present” from the *Euchologium Slavonicum*.⁵⁰ It invokes the penitent to sincere confession and avowal of all sins because all hidden and unconfessed sins will, in any case, be revealed to everyone at the Last Judgment, and sinners will be condemned. On the contrary, the repentant sinner arouses joy at Heaven and his confessed sins will be erased from the list by angels, who are witnesses of the confession.

The next rubric indicates that the priest should question the penitent without haste and thus inquire about each sin individually. This rubric introduces the list, ordered in the form of a question (questions) “How did you, son or daughter” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [3v]),⁵¹ which is concluded with the exhortation “I could say a lot to you” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [3v]). The first question is about the corruption of confessant’s virginity. This unit of questions is a slightly more extended version of the same-named unite given by the *Euchologium Slavonicum*, and the exhortation “I could say a lot to you” is the same as the one found in this manuscript *Euchologion*. This exhortation concludes all the aforementioned priestly invocations for the confession of all committed sins. The confessor affirms that he could continue to talk but,

⁴⁸ Cf. Popelyasty, 2018, p. 198.

⁴⁹ Almazov, 1995, p. 493.

⁵⁰ “Сї нїѣ їѣ пѣімоѣмѣ ѡгїлн нїѣнѣмо” (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 41v–42r).

⁵¹ It is worth noting that the list begins with the question about the corruption of chastity.

actually, he does not know the confessant's sins. Therefore, he appeals to the penitent to reveal his sins himself, because God knows them and accepts a repentant sinner. Consequently, it is possible to conclude that the confession of sins according to the *Ostroh Trebnyk* should be performed both via priestly interrogation and the penitent's personal confession of sins.

The confessional section concludes with the stereotypical formula of the all-embracing confession: "I confess to God and to His most pure Mother" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [4r]). The penitent directs his confession to God, to the Mother of God, to all the Saints, and to the priest. The sinner acknowledges that he confesses all his sins committed since Baptism up to the present moment. He intends to confess as fully as possible, including even those sins forgotten or committed unconsciously.

The text of this formula is closer to the South Slavonic printed *Trebnyks* (another variation) than to *Stryatyn Trebnyk*. The latter mentions angels (Heavenly Powers) on the list, between Theotokos and all the Saints. According to the preceding rubric, the penitent should repeat this formula after the minister "ѿ҃хѿ҃аѿ҃зѿ҃аѿ҃мѿ҃и [= with tears]" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [4r]). This rubric also emphasizes that priestly interrogation should be thorough, and the penitent's avowal of sins should be detailed.

c) The Post-confessional Section

After the above, the penitent should prostrate on the ground at the confessor's request⁵² and the later recites the following prayer "O Lord, our God, Who remitted the sins of Peter and the Harlot through their tears" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [4v]).

With this prayer, the confessor appeals to the three notable Gospel examples of forgiveness of sins – namely to Peter, the Harlot, and the Publican – and then asks the Lord to accept the confession of the penitent's sins and overlook all of them. The desired completeness of forgiveness is emphasized by enumerating and describing the possible ways in which sins may be committed, whether willingly or unwillingly,

⁵² There is no indication of the moment when the penitent should stand up in the text of the Rite of Confession.

by word, deed, or thought. The minister also states that God alone possesses the authority to forgive sins.

It can be noted that this prayer is also found in the Rite of the distribution of the Eucharist to a Sick person. This is the only confessional prayer in this Rite and is considered as the prayer of forgiveness (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 51 [2v]). However, it seems that this function is not attributed to this prayer in the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance. The preceding rubric gives only a general indication that the confessor “**МОЛИТѢ** [= prays]” for the penitent (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 23 [4v]). Only latter in the text do the rubrics indicate that prayers have as their aim for forgiveness or absolution of sins.

This prayer is present in all the other above-mentioned *Trebnys*. The distinctions found in them are very slight and mostly grammatical.

The next elements of the Rite two Scripture readings, specifically 1 Tim 1.15–17 and Mt 9.9–13, and then the Dismissal.⁵³ The Scripture readings appear for the first time in the Kyivan *Trebnys* of 1606. Between the Readings and the Dismissal, the Stryatyn Trebnyk includes a litany consisting of two petitions and a doxology [*Stryatyn 1606*, f. 147v–148r].

In line with the *Euchologium Slavonicum*, the post-confessional part is concluded with the estimation of the penitent's worthiness to receive the Eucharist and the enunciation of the forgiveness of sins in case of a positive answer, or in case of a negative one – the imposition of the penance and the postponing of the forgiveness till its fulfillment.

Nevertheless, unlike the *Euchologium Slavonicum* where both the minister and the penitent should estimate the worthiness of the latter for the reception of Holy Communion, according to the *Ostroh Trebnyk*, only the confessor should decide this matter.

⁵³ “цѣлѣжъ прѣмѣѡрѣ, ѡтѣнѣшѡ хѣрѡвѣн . глѣбѣи нѣѣ, гѣн помѣлѡуи ѿ, гѣн блѣн . ѡѡпѡѡ, Хѣ ѣтѣнѣнн блѣѣ нѣшѣ [= Then “Wisdom!,” “More honorable than the cherubim,” “Glory: now and ever,” “Lord, have mercy,” thrice, “O Lord, give the blessing” and the Dismissal “[May] Christ our true God”] (*Ostroh 1606*, 24 [1v]–[2r]).

Similarly to the *Euchologium Slavonicum* the *Ostroh Trebnyk* also indicates that in case of the positive decision the minister should teach and instruct the penitent and forgive him with the similar formula “**ЧЛДО , ꙗꙋѡиѧѣ ѿѧ х҃ї б҃гѣ невидимѣмо , ѱл҃зѣ** [= O child, Christ God forgives you invisibly and I]” (*Ostroh 1606*, 24 [2r]).⁵⁴

Next, according to the rubric, the minister immediately says “*моли́твоу проща́нну* . Бже прѣстѣвни на дѣло ꙗко пѣска [= the forgiveness prayer: O God, Who through Nathan forgave David, the Prophet]” (*Ostroh 1606*, 24 [2r]).

The formula “O child, Christ God forgives you invisibly and I” is very short. This is the complete text. It clearly conveys the idea that the penitent receives forgiveness from both Jesus Christ and the priest. In other words, besides the affirmation of the Divine action, this text stresses that the confessor plays an active role in the fulfillment of the Sacrament of Repentance and that he is not merely a passive witness to God’s intervention and forgiveness. The priestly forgiveness expresses and confirms the Divine one. It is worth noting that some Kyivan Orthodox authors of the middle of the 17th century, including Sylvester Kosov (circa. 1600–1657) (Kosov, 1637, p. 26)⁵⁵ and Arsenii Zhelyborsky (1618–1662) (Zhelyborsky, 1642, f. 14v–15r)⁵⁶ claim this short formula or prayer-declaration to be the form of absolution.

In the prayer “O God, Who through Nathan forgave David, the Prophet,” the confessor appeals to notable Scriptural examples of sinners, taken from both the Old and New Testaments, who were forgiven because of their sincere repentance, taken from both the Old and New Testaments. These examples include King David, King Manasseh, the Apostle Peter, the Harlot, the Publican, and the Prodigal Son. The

⁵⁴ “Чѣло ѡ прощаніи тѣхъ христе невидимѣ мо. і азъ грѣшныи [= O child, Christ God forgives you invisibly and I, a sinner]” (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 46v).

⁵⁵ This copy is found in the collection of Collegium Historicum Library of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (sygn. Mf 6002; sygn. Std 12801). This copy is also available on the electronic resource of the Wielkopolska Digital Library <https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/show-content/publication/edition/51822?id=51822> [accessed January 24 2025].

⁵⁶ Arsenii Zhelyborsky edited Sylvester Kosov's *Didaskalia* with attribution of its authorship to himself. I refer to the copy found in the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum, Lviv, Ukraine (СДК 711, № 692)). Cf. Zapasko and Isaievych, 1981, p. 65, № 297 and № 300;

priest reassures the penitent that Jesus Christ will forgive all the sins he has confessed to the confessor before the Lord, because Jesus Christ Himself commanded the confession of sins to another person, and He is always faithful to His promise.

In the *Euchologium Slavonicum* the formula of forgiveness “O child, Christ God forgives you invisibly and I, a sinner” and the block of prayers for forgiveness or absolution are separated by the rubric regarding the confessant who is unworthy the reception of the Eucharist. It should be noticed that the *Euchologium Slavonicum* indicates two following but different prayers which are introduced by rubrics as prayers for the absolution, viz. “O Omnipotent Eternal God”⁵⁷ and “O Lord, Omnipotent God Almighty.”⁵⁸

In the *Ostroh Trebnyk* the instruction for confessors regarding penitents for whom the reception of the Eucharist should be postponed is placed only after the prayer mentioned above “O God, Who through Nathan forgave David, the Prophet.” A different version of this prayer is found in the *Euchologium Slavonicum* and the *Stryatyn Trebnyk*. This prayer is not present in the South Slavonic printed *Trebnyks*.

The imposition of the penance (“**ѡρίμα**” (*Ostroh 1606*, 24 [2v]); “**зѡповѣда**” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [1r])) should be according to the penitent’s ability, and the confessor should pay attention to not impose a penance that is too difficult. Then the priest should admonish the confessant to fulfill the penance with the exhortation “O child, may it not be difficult for you to repent” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 24 [3r]). This is a different version than the ones found in the South Slavonic *Trebnys*⁵⁹ and *Stryatyn 1606*.⁶⁰

The post-confessional exhortation aims at encouraging the penitent to fulfill the imposed penance, which implied an ecclesiastical expulsion and standing outside of

⁵⁷ “Всѣмогѣи вѣдѣный бѣже” (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 46v).

⁵⁸ “Г҃И Б҃Е ВСЕДЕРЖАТЕЛЮ ВСЕМОГ҃Н” (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 46v).

⁵⁹ “Υἱὸ οὐκ ὄνῃτι τῖσκο κλῆψοῦντις” (*Goražde 1523*, f. [27v]); “Υἱὸ οὐκ ὄνῃτι τῖσκο κλῆψοῦντις” (*Târgoviște 1545*, f. [9v]); “Υἱὸ οὐκ ὄνῃτι τῖσκο κλῆψοῦντις” (*Mileševa 1546*, f. [32r]); “Υἱὸ οὐκ ὄνῃτι τῖσκο κλῆψοῦντις” (*Venice 1540*, f. [4v]); “Υἱὸ οὐκ ὄνῃ τῖσκο κλῆψοῦντις” (revised version) (*Venice 1570*, f. [4v]).

⁶⁰ “Члѣо, неѣди ти тѣжко кѣншѣтисѧ” (*Stryatyn 1606*, f. 148r).

the church for forty days (it might refer to the period of Lent). Such penitential practice is justified as divinely established and transmitted by the Apostles and Fathers (no names are mentioned), with its goal being the cleansing of the penitent for the reception of the Eucharist. Through numerous examples from the Holy Scripture, the confessor also stimulates the penitent to different ascetic practice to improve his life and enter the Divine Kingdom at Jesus Christ's Second Coming.

d) Additional Prayers

The part of the *Trebnyk* dedicated to the Sacrament of the Repentance concludes with two prayers for absolution after the fulfillment of the penance. The first prayer begins with "Compassionate and merciful Lord, good Lover of mankind" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [1v]). The introductory rubric clarifies its intended purpose: it is "мѣтѣа рѣзѣрѣшѣти ѿповѣдника , ѿгдѣ коуічѣтѣа зѣповѣдѣа [= the prayer to absolve the confessant when he has fulfilled the penance" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [1r]). This is another version of the prayer "Compassionate good Lord, Lover of mankind" from the *Euchologium Slavonicum*.⁶¹

In this prayer, the minister refers to Divine Mercy and affirms that the Father sent His Son into this world to dissolve the recorded debt of human sins, free His people from their sinful bonds, and grant them liberation. Therefore, the priest prays that God also liberate the confessant from his bonds and grant him the ability to approach Him sinlessly and with a pure conscience.

The second prayer, "O Master, Lord Jesus Christ, Who commanded his disciples and Apostles to forgive men their sins" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [2r]), is, according to the rubric, "мѣтѣа ѿнаа прѣсѣтити ѿповѣдника [= another prayer to forgive the confessant]" (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [2r]). Nevertheless, Aleksandr Almazov, based on the content of the prayer, points out that this is the prayer for the posthumous absolution of a spiritual son (Almazov, 1995, p. 495).

⁶¹ "мѣтѣа рѣзѣрѣшѣти ѿповѣдника , ѿгдѣ коуічѣтѣа зѣповѣдѣа" (*Euchologium Slavonicum*, f. 47r).

In this prayer, the confessor affirms that “*ѡмѣ недостоѣніи* [= and we unworthy]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [2r]), means priests have authority to forgive sins because Jesus Christ Himself commanded His disciples to do so. Therefore, he asks the Lord to forgive all of penitent’s sins committed during his lifetime, even those unconfessed because of folly (*вѣзвѣмѣ*) and forgetfulness (*завѣніи*) (*Ostroh 1606*, f. [o25 [2r)].⁶²

The Influence of the *Ostroh Trebnyk*: the Sacrament of Repentance

As indicated above, the Rite of Confession found in the *Ostroh Trebnyk* strongly influenced the penitential Rites found in the Kyivan Cyrillic printed *Trebnyks* of the first half of the 17th century (except the “Uniate” *Trebnyk* published in *Vilnius* in 1617–1618 and the *Trebnyk* published in Kyiv in 1646).⁶³ Nevertheless, among the subsequent eight editions of a *Trebnyk* after 1606 only *Lviv 1645* follows the *Ostroh Trebnyk* in full.⁶⁴ All other editions of a *Trebnyk* tend to shorten the textual part of the Rite of Confession and make it more compact.

In particular, the didactic component of the Rite gradually vanishes. In the “Orthodox” Rite of the first edition of the *Trebnyk* in Vilnius (*Vilno 1617*), there are no exhortations present (“This is today, O Child,” “Behold, brother or child or master, angels are invisibly present” and “I could say a lot to you”), questions (two doctrinal questions and “How did you, son or daughter”), and the *Creed* found in the confessional part of *Ostroh 1606*.

⁶² For more on the Rite of the sacramental confession in the *Ostroh Trebnyk*, also see Almazov, 1995, p. 492–496. It should be noted that three additional penitential prayers are included in the group of prayers for various occasions, viz. the prayer for those who have bound themselves by a vow “*Бже сѣрашнѣи , ѡтѣко лѣнѣи , сѣлнѣи ѡмѣ*” [= O God, the fearful and Lover of mankind, strong and compassionate]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 57 [2v]–[3v]); the prayer for the absolution from every curse “*Вѣко ѡи бже вѣдѣжнѣи , ѡже сѣснѣи рѣи рѣи ѡтѣкомѣ сѣнѣи ѡи*” [= O Master, Lord, God Almighty, Who descended into the world for the salvation of humankind]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 57 [3v]–[4r]); and the prayer for the cleansing from all defilement “*Гѣи бже ѡи , ѡи ѡи бже*” [= O Lord, our God, who alone are good and the lover of mankind]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 57 [4r]–58 [1v]).

⁶³ Cf. Almazov, 1995, p. 232; 496.

⁶⁴ It should be noted that there are some minor differences between *Ostroh 1606* and *Lviv 1645*. Given the limits, I will focus on the most important differences and peculiarities in the Rites of Confession found in *Lviv 1645*, as well as in the other *Trebnyks* published after 1606.

Moreover, next editions in Vilnius and in Vievis as well as in *Lviv 1644* also omit the post-confessional exhortation “O child, may it not be difficult for you to repent.” In other words, *Vilno 1624*, *Evje 1638*, *Evje 1641* and *Lviv 1644* contain no confessional or post-confessional exhortations, nor do they include confessional questions or the *Creed*. Rubrics only indicate that the pre-confessional and post-confessional exhortations are placed in Additions to the *Trebnyks*, and that one should refer to the table of content to find them. It should be noted that only *Vilno 1621* contains these Additions, which are inserted, as mentioned above, as an additional part to the main text without its own foliation. The *Teaching before* and the *Teaching after the Confession*, and the *Questions for the Confession* are incorporated into Additions to *Vilno 1621*.

The *Teaching before the Confession* in *Vilno 1621* is grounded on the confessional exhortations and questions found, for example, in *Ostroh 1606*, and presents their main ideas in a very elaborated way. The post-confessional exhortation is an adapted translation of “O child, may it not be difficult for you to repent.” There is no mentioning of the 40 days penitential period (the traditional one) in the exhortation. Instead, its introduction emphasizes that the penance concludes confessant’s repentance and avowal of sins. Moreover, the result of penance depends on penitent’s willingness and urgency for its fulfillment.

At the beginning of the *Questions for the Confession*, it is assumed that the penitent should himself confess his sins. Nevertheless, the confessor affirms that he would question the sinner. The reasons for this inquiry are to help the confessant not to forget some sins as well as avoiding not confessing some of them because the penitent may be ignorant that they are mortal sins. In other words, the confessor should help the penitent to make a full and complete confession of his sins.

In line with the confessional part of *Ostroh 1606* the first question is the doctrinal question, and it is related to the sinner’s Orthodoxy. In other words, the confessor should inquire whether the penitent believes and follows the doctrinal teaching of the contemporary Eastern Orthodox Church. In case of a positive response, the confessant should also say the *Creed*. Then questions about his possible

heterodoxy also follow, including whether the sinner was a member of heretical groups or participated in their meetings, and read their books. Then the long list of sins related to different aspects of life follows, including the keeping of fasting and holy days, violations regarding other people, and different sexual sins. Concerning the latter, there is a warning for the confessor not to ask these questions in such a way as to actually teach the penitent how to sin. The confessor is also allowed to ask his own questions.

The *Questions for the Confession* also contains instructions and recommendations for the confessor. Once the inquiry is completed, the priest should exhort the penitent not to sin again and teach how to avoid sins. The minister then forgives the sinner and imposes the penance according to the penitent's ability. Furthermore, the approach of the decreasing of penance and its imposition moderated according to the ability of the confessant, should be specially applied to individuals in certain positions, including soldiers, craftsmen, and students of ecclesiastical disciplines as well as those in need and deeply repentant sinners. This approach is explained by the aim of the penance, which is meant to support the improvement of the penitent and not to cause him to change for the worse. The priest then admonishes the confessant to fulfill the imposed penance.

The *Questions for the Confession* are also arranged in the context of the liturgical Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance. There is a general indication in the text that after the questioning, there follows the all-embracing acknowledgment of sins “I confess to God and to His most pure Mother” and other prayers. The *Questions* conclude with information regarding the estimation of the penitent worthiness for reception of the Eucharist. In case of the positive response the confessor should forgive the sinner and, in case of the negative response, impose the penance. Then in both cases the minister should admonish the penitent either to a worthy reception of Holy Communion or to the fulfillment of the penance.

This indication of the imposition of the penance for the second time could be considered as related only to exceptional cases when the absolution was postponed. The usual order of confession involves the avowal of sins, their

absolution/forgiveness and the imposition of penance. It seems that the older practice of the forgiveness of the sinner only after his fulfillment of the penance was not in use in the Kyivan Church in the first half of the 17th century. Minor differences in the rubric before the last two prayers (for final absolution and forgiveness) of the Rite may indicate this. In particular, the confessor says these prayers after the completing of the penance by the penitent according to sources like *Ostroh 1606*,⁶⁵ *Vilno 1617*,⁶⁶ *Cimpulung 1635*⁶⁷ and *Lviv 1645*.⁶⁸ However, according to *Vilno 1624*,⁶⁹ *Evje 1638*,⁷⁰ *Evje 1641*⁷¹ and *Lviv 1644*⁷² it follows that the minister says these prayers after completing his post-confessional exhortation.

It seems that in the first part of the 17th century, printers already considered the term “З’побѣдѣ” as teaching and exhortation, not as penance. Another term with the same meaning “penance,” that is побѣдѣ, become more widespread and replaced the term З’побѣдѣ.⁷³ The latter term likely remained in official documents with their own history as liturgical texts are.

It seems that more frequent Confession led to the disappearance of the didactic components from the Rite. There was no reason for a regular repetition of these exhortations several times for the same penitent. Thus, exhortations were likely spontaneous. Nevertheless, contrary to *Ostroh 1606* and in line with *Stryatyn 1606*,

⁶⁵ “мѣлѣтъ ѿзбѣжѣшѣти исповѣданнѣ, ѿгнѣ скончѣтъ зѣповѣтъ [= The prayer to absolve the confessant when he has fulfilled the penance]” (*Ostroh 1606*, f. 25 [1r]).

⁶⁶ «Шлѣтка ꙗзꙋѣшнѣи исповѣньна, ѿгꙋлꙋ скончаѣтъ ꙗзꙋовѣꙋа [= The prayer to absolve the confessant when he has fulfilled the penance]» (*Vilno 1617-Lv.* f. f. [46r]).

⁶⁷ «П по скончаѣніи злобѣди, ѿзѣшлетъ Исповѣдника, мѣткою сѣи [= And after completion of the penance [the priest] absolves the confessant with this prayer” (*Cimpulung 1635*, f. 46v).

⁶⁸ «Πῶς τὰ ῥά ζῶντες ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς, ἔργα ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς, ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς [= The prayer to absolve the confessant when he has fulfilled the penance]» (*Lviv 1645*, f. 71v).

⁶⁹ «Піконникъ зѣповѣтъ мѣткою ѿздрѣшасѣть, Піновѣтникъ [= And after completing of the precept [the priest] absolves the confessant with the prayer» (*Vilno 1624*, f. 61r). This text is missing in *Vilno 1621*.

⁷⁰ ἸΚΟΝΗΝΤΕΣ ΖΗΝΟΝΤΕΣ ΜΕΤΕΝ ΠΑΡΑΨΑΛΙΤΕ, ΠΝΟΝΤΕΣ ΗΝΙΚΑ [= And after completing of the precept [the priest] absolves the confessant with the prayer” (*Evye* 1638, f. 96r).

⁷¹ «Πικρονίκα ζάποκτλ μλτβον ραζαρτχλίετ. Πίποκτλίνσπαροα» [= And after completing of the precept [the priest] absolves the confessant with the prayer” (*Eyfe* 1641, f. 87r).

⁷² «Посконѣиѣ зѣповѣѣ молѣтвенъ ꙗзыкъ шлѣиѣ, ꙗпоѣѣ ѡчиꙗгоꙗ» [= And after completing of the precept [the priest] absolves the confessant with the prayer" (*Lviv 1644*, f. 87r)].

⁷³ See, for instance the *Questions for the Confession* written in 'Prosta mova,' that is contemporary vulgar language in *Vilno 1621*, Additions, f. [33r]–[34r]

subsequent *Trebnyks* incorporated full texts of Psalms (not only first words), except Ps 50, which was most likely a practical adaptation.

The Rite of Confession found in *Cimpulung 1635* contains its own peculiarities. It combines elements of both liturgical traditions *Ostroh 1606* (including Vilnius editions) and the South Slavonic tradition (including *Stryatyn 1606*). It is worth noting that *Târgoviște 1545* was also printed in Romania. In general, *Cimpulung 1635*’s liturgical Rite follows the liturgical line of *Ostroh 1606*, while the didactic components of the confessional part are grounded on the South Slavonic tradition. In line with *Ostroh 1606*, in the absolution part, after the forgiveness prayer “O God, Who through Nathan forgave David, the Prophet,”⁷⁴ in *Cimpulung 1635* there is the rubric regarding the imposition of penance when the penitent is unworthy for reception of the Eucharist and the exhortation “O child, may it not be difficult for you to repent” (*Cimpulung 1635*, f. 45r). The text of this exhortation is rather closer to the South Slavonic version than to *Ostroh 1606*. Then the instruction “It is not good to give the penance against sin but as much as he would wish to keep” (*Cimpulung 1635*, f. 46v) with its preceded rubric follows. This is the short redaction of the instruction. The question regarding unworthy reception of Communion, as well as, rules for depriving one of the Eucharist and fasting discipline, are omitted. Similarly to the tradition of *Ostroh 1606*, the Rite of Confession in *Cimpulung 1635* is concluded with two prayers of absolution and forgiveness “Compassionate and merciful Lord, good Lover of mankind” (*Cimpulung 1635*, f. 47v) and “Master, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who commanded his disciples and Apostles to forgive men their sins” (*Cimpulung 1635*, f. 47v).

Conclusion

Book printing became a significant factor in the process towards uniform liturgical services within the same Church or ecclesiastical tradition. Nevertheless, it did not stop this process.

⁷⁴ *Cimpulung 1635*, f. 44v. There is the mistake in the foliation in the text. Number 44 indicated instead of 42, and 42 is placed where 44 should be.

The liturgical Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance found in the South Slavonic *Trebnyks* strongly influenced the liturgy of Confession in Kyivan Christianity in the first half of the 17th century, including the first printed Stryatyn *Trebnyk* 1606 and Ostroh *Trebnyk* 1606. There was also a dependence on the Rites from later *Trebnyks* (*Vilno* 1617; *Vilno* 1621; *Vilno* 1624; *Cimpulung* 1635; *Evje* 1638; *Evje* 1641; *Lviv* 1644; *Lviv* 1645). Editors themselves felt free to introduce themselves new components into the Rite, as seen in *Cimpulung* 1635's Rite, which combines elements from both *Stryatyn* 1606 and *Ostroh* 1606.

Trebnyks represent well-structured and dynamic Rites of the Sacrament of Repentance with clear instructions regarding the place where the Sacrament is to be performed and the conduct of both the confessor and the penitent. They offer a clear dynamic in order to make the Rite shorter and more compact.

The church is the usual place for the Confession according to *Trebnyks*. However, the tradition of *Ostroh* 1606 also allows for confessions to be heard in some other silent places without providing an explanation for the reason for this change. The Confession is typically to take place in front of the Altar-Sanctuary, where the Holy Gospel and Cross (the Gospel and Cross according to the tradition of South Slavonic *Trebnyks* and the Stryatyn *Trebnyks*) are placed on the analogion, and the penitent puts his hands and head on the Gospel.

The priest is the minister of the Sacrament of Repentance according to the Slavonic tradition. *Trebnyks* make no difference whether he is a monk or a non-monastic priest.

According to all Rites in *Trebnyks* the penitent should enter the church with fear and humility and folded arms, and make three bowing followed by a penitential formula (the text exists in different redactions). The structure of the pre-confessional part is the same in all discussed *Trebnyks* and their Rites of Confession: four Psalms (50, 4, 6, 12) and three prayers (in different redactions or variations).

Ostroh 1606 presents a different line of development to the other printed *Trebnyks*, namely the South Slavonic and *Stryatyn* 1606. While it follows the same structure in the pre-confessional section, it differs elsewhere from them. Among the

most substantial distinctions are the incorporation of two doctrinal questions and the *Creed* in the confessional part. It also contains different exhortations and a more extended list of sins.

Similarly to *Stryatyn 1606*, there are the same Scripture readings in *Ostroh 1606* but no litany. The latter *Trebnyk* also contains the clearly elaborated absolution part. In line with the *Euchologium Slavonicum*, it includes consideration of the penitent worthiness to receive the Eucharist. In case of the positive response, the confessor absolves the penitent with the declarative formula “O child, Christ God forgives you invisibly and I” and the prayer “O God, Who through Nathan forgave David, the Prophet” (the first post-confessional prayer in the *Euchologium Slavonicum*). In case of a negative response, the priest imposes the penance on the penitent and exhorts him to its fulfillment.

The Rite of Confession in *Ostroh 1606* also concludes with two prayers (different from those in *Stryatyn 1606*), which are considered prayers for absolution after the completion of the penance (Cf. Almazov, 1995, p. 492–496).

The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance found in the following editions of the Orthodox *Trebnyks* in Kyivan Christianity is based on *Ostroh 1606*’s Rite of Confession. These Rites (except *Lviv 1645*, which follows *Ostroh 1606* in full) demonstrate a clear tendency to make the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance shorter and more compact. The Rite consists mainly of prayer components, and almost all didactic elements, including exhortations and a list of questions, have disappeared. More frequent confession could be the reason for shortening the Rite of Confession.

This article also opens new avenues for further investigations into the development of the penitential liturgy and theology in the Kyivan tradition, its interplay with other Christian traditions, including Byzantine, Muscovite, and Latin, and their liturgical and doctrinal sources. Further studies are needed on both the printed and manuscript sources of the Kyivan tradition.

1. Алмазов А. (1894). *Тайная исповѣдь въ Православной восточной Церкви: Опытъ внѣшней исторіи*. Одесса: Типо-литография Штаба Одесскаго Военнаго Округа. Т. 1: *Общій устав совершения исповеди*, 596 + IV с. (репринт Москва: Паломник, 1995).

2. Andreev A. (2022). The Ruthenian Editions of the Slavonic Sluzhebnik and Trebnik. Part 2: The Trebniki Printed in Vilnius before 1650. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 88, 131–150.

3. Атаманенко В. (2019). Наливайко Дем'ян (Даміан) (* 50-ті рр. XVI ст. – † 1627). *Острозька Академія: історія та сучасність культурно-освітнього осередку. Енциклопедичне видання*. Острог: Національний університет “Острозька академія,” 360–363.

4. Атаманенко В. (2010–2011). Наливайко Дем'ян (Даміан) (* 50-ті рр. XVI ст. – † 1627). *Острозька Академія XVI–XVII ст. Енциклопедія*. Острог: Національний університет “Острозька академія,” 254–257.

5. Быкова Т. (1972). *Каталог изданий острожской типографии и трех передвижных типографий*. Санкт-Петербург: Государственная публичная библиотека им. М.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина.

6. Bianu I., Hodoș N. (1903) *Bibliografia românească veche (1508–1830)*, vol. 1: 1508–1716. Bucharest: J. V. Soces.

7. Бондар Н. (2008). Доробок Острозького культурного видавничого осередку в фондах Національної бібліотеки України імені В. І. Вернадського. *Наукові записки Національного університету “Острозька академія”: Історичні науки*, 13, 393–412.

8. Бондар Н., Кисельов Р. (2008). *Кириличні стародруки 15-17 ст. у Національній бібліотеці України імені В. І. Вернадського: Каталог*. Київ: НБУВ, 232.

9. Бондар Н., Ковальський М. (2019). “Требник” (Острог, 1606). *Острозька Академія: історія та сучасність культурно-освітнього осередку. Енциклопедичне видання*. Острог: Національний університет “Острозька академія,” 570–572.

10. Бондар Н., Ковальський М. (2010–2011). “Требник” (Острог, 1606). *Острозька Академія XVI–XVII ст. Енциклопедія*. Острог: Національний університет “Острозька академія,” 437–438.

11. Бондарчук Я. (2015). *Історія Острозької академії: Навчальний посібник*. Острог: Національний університет “Острозька академія,” 547.

24. Каратаев И. (1883). *Описание славяно-русских книг напечатанных кирилловскими буквами*. Т. 1: сь 1491 по 1652 г. Санкт-Петербург: Типография императорской академии наук, 554.

25. Косов С. (1637). Дідаскалія: яльбо нѣўка которагѡ пѣрвѣй Пз
ꙋчѣтъ свѣщениикомъ Подавала Ѡсемѣ сѧкрамѣнтѧхъ Яколи Тѣиныхъ:
На снбѣ Помѣстномъ в Бѣгопасіеюмъ Грѣхѣ Могиливѣ. Рокѣ
Бжого, ꙗѧ лѣ. Мѣл Октѣ, ии Днѣ, ѣ Правояны: ѡПрекелѣнаго егѣ
Мѣти: Господина Оцѣ Силѣстра Косова Еппа Мѣтїславского,
Ѡршѣкского и Могилевского Потѣмъ прѣтогѣжъ в Дрѣкъ подѣла.
Кутѣин: Типографія Монастиря.

26. Колосовська О., Гацкова С. (2000). *Каталог кириличних стародруків Львівської наукової бібліотеки ім. В. Стефаника Національної академії наук України*. Т. 3: Видання друкарень Львова: Михайла Сльозки, Арсенія Желиборського, Йосифа Шумлянського, монастиря св. Юра. Львів: Національна Академія наук України і Львівська наукова бібліотека ім. В. Стефаника, 164[3].

27. Кралу́к П. М., Па́січник І.Д., Яку́бович М.М. (2014). Острозька Академія в філософській культурі України. Острог: Національний університет “Острозька академія,” 481.

28. Лабынцев Ю. (1982). *В помощь составителям сводного каталога старопечатных изданий кирилловского и глаголического шрифтов: Методические рекомендации: Славянская кирилловская печатная книжность XV – первой четверти XVII в.* Москва: Государственная библиотека СССР им. В. И. Ленина, 64.

29. Лукьяненко В. (1979). *Издания кириллической печати XVI–XVII вв. (1494–1688 гг.) для южных славян и румын: Каталог книг из собрания Государственной публичной библиотеки им. М. Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина*. Санкт-Петербург: Государственная публичная библиотека им. М.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина, 186.

30. Максименко Ф. (1975). *Кириличні стародруки українських друкарень, що зберігаються у львівських збірках (1574-1800): Зведений каталог*. Львів: Вища школа, 126.

31. Meyendorff P. (1985). The Liturgical Reforms of Peter Moghila: A New Look. *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 29, 101–114.

32. Миловидов А.И. (1908). Старопечатныя славяно-русскія изданія, вышедшія изъ западно-русскихъ типографій XVI–XVIII вв. *Чтенія въ Императорскомъ обществѣ Исторіи и Древностей Россійскихъ при Московскомъ Университетѣ*, т. 224. Москва: Типография штаба московскаго военнаго округа, 1–27.

33. Миловидов А.И. (1908). *Описание славяно-русскихъ старопечатныхъ книгъ Виленской публичной библиотеки (1491–1800 гг.)*. Вильна: Типография А. Г. Сыркина, 160.

34. Мицько І. (1990). *Острозька слов'яно-греко-латинська академія (1576-1636)*. Київ: Наукова думка, 190.

35. Мицько І. (1995). Острозька слов'яно-греко-латинська академія. *Острозька давнина: Дослідження і матеріали*, I, 13–23.

36. [Молитвеник або требник]. (1495). Цетинь: Друкарня Джураджа Черноєвича, 1495, 312 арк.?

37. [Молитвеник або требник]. (1523). Горажде: Друкарня Божицара Любавича, 1523, 296 арк.

38. **Шолѣтъвникъ**. (близько 1540). Венеція: Друкарня Божицара Вуковича, 280 арк.

39. **Шѣтъ**. (1545). Тирговіште: Друкарня Дмитрія Любавича, 289 арк.

40. [Молитвеник або требник]. (1546). Мілешево: Монастирська друкарня, 364 арк.

41. **Шолѣтъвникъ**. (1570). Венеція: Друкарня Єроліма Загуровича, 282 арк.

42. **Шолѣтовникъ ѿмѣа въсебѣ црковнаа послѣдованіа. ѿсѣмъхъ апла прѣже. потожѣ ѿсѣмъхъ ѿго нѣснхъ ѿцъ, въразлічнхъ временіхъ преданнхъ**. (1606). Острог: Острозька друкарня, 256 арк.

43. **Шлѣтъвникъ ѿли трѣбникъ Шзъ Грѣческаго ѿзъмла на словѣнскій прѣвѣдѣннй ѿ ѿзсѣдованнй**. (1606). Стратин: Теодор Юрієвич Балабан, 696 арк.

44. **Шолѣтъвникъ, ѿли трѣбникъ. ѿмѣа въсебѣ црковнаа послѣдованіа. ѿ сѣмъхъ апла прѣже, Потомже ѿсѣмъ, ѿгонѣснхъ ѿцъ, въразлічнхъ временіхъ преданнхъ. Шзъ Грѣческаго ѿзъмла, на словѣнскій прѣвѣдѣннй, ѿистинно ѿзсѣдованнй**. (1617–1618). Вільнюс: Друкарня Братська, 329 арк.

45. “Nalyvaiko, Demian,” *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CN%5CA%5CNalyvaikoDemian.htm> [accessed January 17 2025].

46. Немировский Е. (2005). *Начало книгопечатания у южных славян. Ч. 2: Издания первой черногорской типографии*, История славянского кирилловского книгопечатания XV – начала XVII века, 2. Москва: Наука, 541.

47. Nemirovskij E. (1996). *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift. V. 1: Inkunabeln*, Bibliotheca bibliographica Aureliana 140. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 296.

48. Петров С., Бирюк Я., Золотарь Т. (1958). *Славянские книги кирилловской печати XV-XVIII вв.: Описание книг, хранящихся в*

Государственной публичной библиотеке УССР. Киев: Академия Наук Украинской ССР, 263.

49. Попелястий В.М. (2015/2016). Богослов'я святого таїнства покаяння: східний православний погляд (друга половина XVI – перша половина XVII століть. *Наукові записки УКУ*. Т. 5. Богослов'я. Вип. 2. Львів: УКУ, 224–258.

50. Попелястий В.М. (2018). Номоканон Івана Посника у його слов'янській редакції. *У пошуках джерел катедрального та монашого богослужіння*. Ad Fontes Liturgicos 8. Львів: УКУ, 2018, 157–198.

51. Попелястий В.М. (2020). Таїнство Покаяння в традиції південно-слов'янських друкованих требників XVI століття. *Наукові записки УКУ*. Т. 12. Богослов'я. Вип. 7. Львів: УКУ, 107–134.

52. Popelyastyu V. (2020). Liturgical Penitential Rites in the Stryatyn Trebnyk of 1606. *Науковий щорічник “Історія релігій в Україні,”* 30, 84–104.

53. Popelyastyu V. (2023). The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the *Euchologium Slavonicum*, Borg. Ill. 15: Liturgical and Theological Analysis.” *Liturgický život ako prameň terapie skrze pokánie: Zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie GTF PU v Prešove 24.–25.10.2023*. Ad Fontes Liturgicos 14. Presov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Gréckokatolícka teologická fakulta, 59–91.

54. Raes A. (1935). Le Rituel Ruthène depuis l'Union de Brest.” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 1.1–2, 361–392.

55. Сахаров И. (1849). *Обозрѣніе славяно-русской бібліографіи*. Т. 1.2. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии Наук, 184.

56. Свенціцкий І. (1908). *Каталогъ книгъ церковно-славянскої печати*. Жовква: Печатня оо. Василіан, 213.

57. Требникъ, Сѣрѣчь. Молитовникъ. Имѣай в себѣ Црковнаа послѣдованіа, Іеріемъ подокѣвшаа. ѿ сѣмъхъ Аплъ прѣде, пото ѿ сѣмъхъ ѿ Бгѣноснѣхъ ѿцъ во рѣлнчнѣхъ врѣменѣхъ предѣннаа. Здѣ Пѣрвое нзображеннѣй, ѿ нѣкѣомн нѣжнѣмн (ѿ ѣже во ѿглавлѣніи) вѣрѣшнѣй. (1621). Вільнюс: Друкарня Братська, 312 арк.

58. Требникъ Сѣрѣчь. Молитовникъ: имѣай в себѣ Црковнаа послѣдованіа, Іеріемъ подокѣвшаа. ѿ сѣмъхъ Аплъ прѣде пото ѿ сѣмъхъ ѿ Бгѣноснѣхъ ѿцъ въ рѣлнчнѣхъ врѣменѣхъ предѣннаа. По вѣторѣ нзображеннѣй, ѿ нѣкѣомн нѣжнѣмн, (ѿ ннхъ же во ѿглавлѣніи) вѣрѣшнѣй (1624). Вільнюс: Друкарня Братська, 186 арк.

59. Требникъ Сѣрѣчь. Молитовникъ. Имѣай [в?]себѣ Црковнаа послѣдованіа, Іеріемъ подокѣвшаа. Нзображеніа прѣвѣе. (1635). Кимпулунг: Друкарня Матея Басараба.

60. *Требник сиріч Молитовник. Імій в собі Церковная послідованія, ієрєєм подобающая. От святых апостол прежде, потом от святых і богоносних отец в различных временах преданая. По третє изображенний, і нікоіми нужными, о них же в оглавленіі, возвращенний.* (1638). Вієвіс: Друкарня Братська, 314 арк.

61. Трієникъ Сіръчъ. Моли́товни: ѿ мѣѣй в' себѣ Цр́ковнаа послѣдованіа, І́ріємъ подобіушаа. **Ѹ** стѣхъ **А**плъ прѣде, пото ѿ стѣхъ ѿ Бгонѡсныхъ **Ѹ**цъ въ рзлнчнхъ врѣменехъ прѣданаа. По чѣкѣте ѿзображѣнный, ѿ нѣконми нѣжными, (ѡнихже во ѡглавлѣніи) возршѣнный. (1641). Вієвіс: Друкарня Братська, 1641, прибл. 268 арк.

62. Трѣхнікъ Сѣрѣчь, Моли́товникъ *Имѣай* в себѣ Цр́ковнаа послѣдованіа, *Ирѣшмъ* подокáвшаа. *Ѹ* стѣмъ *Аплъ* прѣжде, *Потомъ* же *вѣтѣхъ* ѿ *Бг҃оно́снѣхъ* *вѣщъ*, в *разлі́чнѣхъ* *врѣменехъ* *прѣданаа*. Къ *німъ* же *прѣданы* *сѣтъ* *Мл́твы* *нѣкѣа* *Потрѣбныа*. *Прѣдмова* при *Шлѣвѣ*, ѿ *Кл́заніа* на *Пб҃гребѣ*. (1644). Львів: Друкарня Михайла Сльозки, 287 арк.

63. Ундольский В. (1871). *Хронологическій указатель славяно-русских книг церковной печати съ 1491-го по 1864-й г. В. I: Очеркъ славяно-русской библиографіи.* (1871). Москва: Типография Грачова, 387.

64. Шманько Т. (2019). Київський *Требник* 1646 року: передумови і обставини створення. *Studia o kulturze cerkiewnej w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*. Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 45–68.

65. Wawryk M. (1967). De S. Hieromartyre Josaphat Promotore formulae absolutionis in Ecclesia Rutheno-Ucraina. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 33, 583–603.

66. Ясіноський А. (2017). Амбівалентність перекладу богословського тексту: (Приклад *Синтагматіона про сім Святих Тайн* Гаріїла Севіра, 1603). *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*, 7, 73–80.

References

1. Almazov A. (1894). *Tainaia ispoved v Pravoslavoi vostocnoi Tserkvi: Opyt vneshnei istorii*. Odessa: Tipo-litografia Shtaba Voiennogo Okroga. T. 1: *Obshchii ustav sovershenia ispovedi*, 596 + IV s. (reprint Moskva: Palomnik, 1995) (in Russian).
2. Andreev A. (2022). The Ruthenian Editions of the Slavonic Sluzhebnik and Trebnik. Part 2: The Trebniki Printed in Vilnius before 1650. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 88, 131–150.
3. Atamanenko V. (2019). Nalyvaiko Demian (Damian) (* 50-ti rr. XVI st. – † 1627). *Ostrozka Akademia: istoria ta suchasnist kulturno-osvitnioho osередku. Entsyklopedychne vydannia*. Ostroh: Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka Akademia,” 360–363 (in Ukrainian).

4. Atamanenko V. (2010–2011). Nalyvaiko Demian (Damian) (* 50-ti rr. XVI st. – † 1627). *Ostrozka Akademia XVI–XVII st.* Ostroh: Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka Akademia,” 254–257 (in Ukrainian).
5. Bykova T. (1972). *Katalog izdaniï ostrozhskoi tipografii i trekh peredvizhnykh tipografii.* Sankt-Peterburg: Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka im. M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina (in Russian).
6. Bianu I., Hodoș N. (1903) *Bibliografia românească veche (1508–1830)*, vol. 1: 1508–1716. Bucharest: J. V. Socec.
7. Bondar N. (2008). Dorobok Ostrozkoho kulturnoho vydavnychoho oseredku v fondakh Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu “Ostrozka Akademia”: Istorychni nauky*, 13, 393–412 (in Ukrainian).
8. Bondar N., Kyselov R. (2008). *Kyrylychni starodruky 15–17 st. u Natsionalnii bibliotetsi Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho: Kataloh.* Kyiv: NBUV, 232 (in Ukrainian).
9. Bondar N., Kovalsky M. (2019). “Trebnik” (Ostroh, 1606). *Ostrozka Akademia: istoria ta suchasnist kulturno-osvitniioho oseredku. Entsyklopedychne vydannia.* Ostroh: Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka Akademia,” 570–572 (in Ukrainian).
10. Bondar N., Kovalsky M. (2010–2011). “Trebnik” (Ostroh, 1606). *Ostrozka Akademia XVI–XVII st. Entsyklopedia.* Ostroh: Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka Akademia,” 437–438 (in Ukrainian).
11. Bondarchuk Ya. (2015). *Istoria Ostrozkoi akademii: Navchalnyi posibnyk.* Ostroh: Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka Akademia,” 547 (in Ukrainian).
12. Voznesenskii A., Nikolaev N. (2019). *Katalog belorusskikh izdaniï kirillovskoho shrifta XVI–XVIII vekov iz sobrania otdela redkikh knig Rossiiskoi Natsyonalnoi Biblioteki: Vypusk 2: 1601–1654 gg.* Sankt-Peterburg: Rossiiskaia natsionalnaia biblioteka, 224 (in Russian).
13. Galenchanka G. (1986). *Kniga Belarusi 1517–1917: Zvodny katalog.* Minsk: “Belarускаia Savetskаia Entsyklopedia” imia Petrusia Brouki (in Russian).
14. Deletant D. Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Seventeenth Century. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 60.4 (1982), 481–499; 61.4 (1983), 481–511.
15. Estreicher K., Estreicher, S. (1936). *Bibliografia Polska. Część III: Druki stuleci XV–XVIII, w układzie alfabetycznym.* T. 31. Krakow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
16. *Euchologium Slavonicum.* (XV–XVI ст.) Borgio-Illiricum 15.
17. *Eukhologion sy iest Molytvoslov. ily Trebnik. Imiiai v sebi tserkovnaia razlichnaia poslidovania ot sviatykh Apostol prezhdē, potomzhe ot sviatykh i Bohonosnykh otets, v razlychnykh vremenakh predanaia.* (1645). Lviv: Drykarnia Arsenia Zhelyborskoho, 356 apk (in Church Slavonic).
18. *Eukhologion albo Molytvoslov. ily Trebnik. Imiiai v sebi Tserkovnaia razlichnaia Poslidovania Iiereom podobaiuschaia. Ot sviatykh Apostol prezhdē, potomzhe ot sviatykh i Bohonosnykh Otets v razlychnykh vremenakh predanaia. Nyni zhe blahosloveniem ipoveleniem, Iasne Prevelebnoho v Bozi ieho Mylosty Otsa Petra*

Mohyly Mytropolyta Kievskaho, i procheie (1646). Kyiv: Drukarnia Lavry (in Church Slavonic).

19. Zapasko Ya. (1966). Oformlennia knyh ostrozkoï drukarni v pislia fedorivsky period. *Polihrafia i vydavnycha sprava*, 2, 179–187 (in Ukrainian).

20. Zapasko Ya., Isaievych Ya. (1981). *Pamiatky knyzhnoho mystetstva: Kataloh starodrukiv, vydanykh na Ukraini*. Kn. 1: (1574–1700). Lviv: Vyscha shkola, 136 (in Ukrainian).

21. Zhelyborskyi A. (1642). *O Tainakh Tserkovnykh. v pospolytosti. Za blahosloveniem i podaniem Boholiubyvoho Arsenia Zaleyborskoho, Epyskopa Lvovskoho Halytskoho i Kamiantsa Podolskoho*. Lviv: Drukarnia Bratska (in Church Slavonic).

22. Żurawińska Z. and Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew Z. (2004). *Katalog druków cyrylickich XV–XVIII wieku w zbiorach Biblioteki Narodowej*. Warsaw: Biblioteka Narodowa, 362 (in Polish).

23. Isaievych Ya. (2002). *Ukrainske knyhovydannia: Vytoky, rozvytok, problem*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 515 (in Ukrainian).

24. Karataev I. (1883). *Opisanie slaviano-russkikh knig napechatannykh kirillovskimi bukvami*. T. 1: s 1491 po 1652 g. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografia imperatorskoï akademii nauk, 554 (in Russian).

25. Kolosovska O., Hatskova S. (2000). *Kataloh kyrylychnykh starodrukiv Lvivskoiï naukovoï biblioteki im. V. Stefanyka Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy*, т. 3: *Vydannia drukaren Lvova: Mykhaila Slozky, Arsenia Zhelyborskoho, Iosyfa Shumlianskoho, monastyria sv. Yura*. Lviv: Natsionalna Akademia nauk Ukrainy i Lvivska naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka, 164[3] (in Ukrainian).

26. Kosov S. (1637). *Didaskalia: albo nauka kotoraiasia perviy Iz ust Sviaschennykom Podavala Osemy Sakramentakh Albohy Tainakh: Na synodi Pomistnom v Bohospasaiemom Gradi Mohylevi. Roku Bozheho, 1637. Misiatsa Oktoubra, 18 Dnia, od Pravovanyh: otPrevelebnaho ieho Mylosty: Hospodyna Ottsa Sylvestra Kosova Epyskopa Mstyslavskoho, Orshavskoho i Mohylevskoho Potom preztotozh v Druk podana*. Kutein: Typografia Monastyrya (in Church Slavonic).

27. Kraliuk P.M., Pasichnyk I.D., Yakubovych M.M. (2014). *Ostrozka Akademia v filosofskii kulturi Ukrainy*. Ostroh: Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka Akademia,” 481 (in Ukrainian).

28. Labyntsev Yu. (1982). *V pomosch sostaviteliu svodnoho kataloga staropechatnykh izdaniï kirillovskoho i glagolicheskogo shriftiv: Metodicheskie rekomendatsii: Slavianskaia kirillovskia pechatnaia knizhnost XV – pervoi chetverti XVII v*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka SSSR im. V.I. Lenina 64 (in Russian).

29. Lukianenko V. (1979). *Izdania kirillicheskoï pechati XVI–XVII vv. (1494–1688 гг.) dlia yuzhnykh slovian i rumyn: Katalog knig iz sobrania Gosudarstvennoi publichnoi biblioteki im. M.E. Saltykova-Schedrina*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka im. M.E. Saltykova-Schedrina, 186 (in Russian).

30. Maksymenko F. (1975). *Kyrylychni starodruky ukrainskykh drukaren, scho zberihaiutssia u lvivskykh zbirkakh (1574-1800): Zvedenyi katalog*. Lviv: Vyscha shkola, 126 (in Ukrainian).

31. Meyendorff P. (1985). The Liturgical Reforms of Peter Moghila: A New Look. *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 29, 101–114.

32. Milovidov A.I. (1908). Staropechatnyia slaviano-russkia izdania, vyshedshia iz zapadno-russkikh tipografii XVI–XVIII vv. *Chtenia v Imperatorskom obschestve Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom Universiteti*, т. 224. Moskva: Tipografia shtaba moskovskogo voennogo okruga, 1–27 (in Russian).

33. Milovidov A.I. (1908). *Opisanie slaviano-russkikh staropechatnykh knig Vilenskoi publichnoi biblioteki (1491–1800 gg.)*. Vilna: Tipografia A.G. Syrkina, 160 (in Russian).

34. Mytsko I. (1990). *Ostrozka sloviano-hreko-latynska akademii (1576-1636)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 190 (in Ukrainian).

35. Mytsko I. (1995). Ostrozka sloviano-hreko-latynska akademii. *Ostrozka davnyia: Doslidzhennia i materialy*, 1, 13–23 (in Ukrainian).

36. [Molytvenyk abo trebnyk]. (1495). Tsetyn: Drukarnia Dzhurdzha Chernoiievycha, 1495, 312 apk. (in Church Slavonic).

37. [Molytvenyk abo trebnyk]. (1523). Gorazhde: Drukarnia Bozhidara Ljubavycha, 1523, 296 apk (in Church Slavonic).

38. *Molytovnyk*. (blyzko 1540). Venetsia: Drukarnia Bozhidara Vukovycha, 280 apk (in Church Slavonic).

39. *Molytovnyk*. (1545). Tyrgovishte: Drukarnia Lmytria Ljubavycha, 289 apk (in Church Slavonic).

40. [Molytvenyk abo trebnyk]. (1546). Mileshevo: Monastryska drukarnia, 364 apk (in Church Slavonic).

41. *Molytovnyk*. (1570). Venetsia: Drukarnia Jerolima Zahurovych, 282 apk (in Church Slavonic).

42. *Molytovnyk imia vsebi tserkovnaia poslidovania. otsviatykh apostol prezhe. Potomzhe otsviatykh ibohonosnykh otets, v razlichnykh vremenakh predannia*. (1606). Ostroh: Ostrozka drukarnia, 256 apk (in Church Slavonic).

43. *Molytvenyk ily trebnyk Iz Hrecheskaho iazyka na slovenskii prevedenyi i izslidovanyi*. (1606). Stryatyn: Teodor Yuriiievych Balaban, 696 apk (in Church Slavonic).

44. *Molytvenyk, ily trebnyk. Imiiai vsebi tserkovnaia poslidovania ot sviatykh Apostol prezhe, Potomzhe otsviatykh, ibohonosnykh otec, vralychnykh vremenakh predannia. Iz Hrecheskaho iazyka, naslovenskii prevedenyi, iistynno izslidovanyi*. (1617–1618). Vilnius: Drukarnia Bratska, 329 apk (in Church Slavonic).

45. Nemirovskij E. (2005). *Nachalo knigopechataniia u yuzhnykh slavian*. Ch. 2: *Izdania pervoi chernogorskoii tipografii*. Istorii slavianskogo kirillovskogo knigopechatania XV – nachala XVII veka, 2. Moskva: Nauka, 541 (in Russian).

46. Nemirovskij E. (1996). *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. V. 1: *Inkunabeln*. Bibliotheca bibliographica Aureliana 140. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 296.

47. “Nalyvaiko, Demian,” *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CN%5CA%5CNalyvaikoDemian.htm> [accessed January 17 2025].
48. Petrov S., Biriuk Ya., Zaolotar T. (1958). *Slavianskie knigi kirillovskoi pechati XV–XVIII vv.: Opisanie knig, khraniaschikhsia v Gosudarstviennoi publichnoi biblioteke USSR*. Kiev: Akademia Nauk Ukrainskoi SSR., 263 (in Russian).
49. Popelyasty V.M. (2015/2016). Bohoslovia sviatoho tainstva pokaiannia: skhidnyi pravoslavnyi pohliad (druha polovyna XVI – persha polovyna XVII stolit. stolit'. *Naukovi zapysky UCU*. T. 5. *Bohoslovia*. Vyp. 2. Lviv: UCU: UKY, 224–258 (in Ukrainian).
50. Popelyasty V.M. (2018). Nomokanon Ivana Posnyka u ioho slovianskii tradytsii. *U poshukakh dzherel katedralnnoho bohosluzhinnia*. Ad Fontes Liturgicos 8. Lviv: UCU, 2018, 157–198.
51. Popelyasty V.M. (2020). Tainstvo Pokaiannia v tradytsii pivdenno-slovianskykh drukovanykh trebnikiv XVI stolittia. *Naukovi zapysky UCU*. T. 12. *Bohoslovia*. Vyp. 7. Lviv: UCU, 107–134 (in Ukrainian).
52. Popelyasty V. (2020). Liturgical Penitential Rites in the Stryatyn *Trebnik* of 1606. *Naukovyi schorichnyk “Istoria religii v Ukraini,”* 30, 84–104.
53. Popelyasty V. (2023). The Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the *Euchologium Slavonicum*, Borg. Ill. 15: Liturgical and Theological Analysis.” *Liturgický život ako prameň terapie skrze pokánie: Zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie GTF PU v Prešove 24.–25.10.2023*. Ad Fontes Liturgicos 14. Presov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Gréckokatolícka teologická fakulta, 59–91.
54. Raes A. (1935). Le Rituel Ruthène depuis l’Union de Brest.” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 1.1–2, 361–392.
55. Sakharov I. (1849). *Obozrenie slaviano-russkoi bibliografii*. T. 1.2., Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 184 (in Russian).
56. Svetsitsky I. (1908). *Kataloh knyh tserkovno-slavianskoi pechati*. Zhovkva: Pechatnia oo. Vasylian, 213 (in Ukrainian).
57. *Trebnik, Syrich, Molytovnyk. Imiiai v sebi Tserkovnaia poslidovania, Iereem podobaiuschaia. ot Sviatykh Apostol prezhde, potom ot sviatykh i Bohonosnykh Otets vo razlychnykh vremenakh predannaia. zde Pervoie izobrazhennyi, i nikoimy nuzhnymy (o ikhzhe vo ohlavlenii) vozraschennyi*. (1621). Vilnius: Drukarnia Bratska, 312 apк (in Church Slavonic).
58. *Trebnik Syrich. Molytovnyk: imiiai vsebi Tserkovnaia poslidovania, Iereem podobaiuschaia. Ot sviatykh Apostol prezhde potom ot sviatykh i Bohonosnykh Otets v razlychnykh vremenakh predanaia. Po vtoroie izobrazhennyi, i nikoimy nuzhnymy, (onykhzhe vo ohlavlenii) vozraschennyi*. (1624). Vilnius: Drukarnia Bratska, 186 apк (in Church Slavonic).
59. *Trebnik Syrich. Molytovnyk. Imiiai vsebi Tserkovnaia poslidovania, Iereem podobaiuschaia. Izobrazysia previe*. (1635). Kypmupulnh: Drukarnia Mateia Basaraba (in Church Slavonic).

60. *Trebnyk syrich Molytovnyk. Imiaiai v sei Tserkovnaia poslidovaniia, iereiam podobaiuschaia. Ot sviatykh apostol prezhde, potom ot sviatykh i bohonosnykh otets v razlychnykh vremenakh predanaia. Po trete izobrazhennyi, i nikoimy nuzhny, o nykh zhe v ohlavlennii, vozraschennyi.* (1638). Vievis: Drukarnia Bratska, 314 apк (in Church-Slavonic).

61. *Trebnyk Syrich. Molytovnyk: i miiai v sebi Tserkovnaia poslidovania, Iereem podobaiuschaia. Ot sviatykh Apostol prezhde potom ot sviatykh i Bohonosnykh Otets v razlychnykh vremenakh predanaia. Po chetverte izobrazhennyi, i nikoimy nuzhny, (onykhzhe vo ohlavlennii) vozraschennyi.* (1641). Vievis: Drukarnia Bratska, prybl. 268 apк (in Church-Slavonic).

62. *Trebnyk Syrich. Molytovnyk Imiai v sebi Tserkovnaia poslidovania, Iereem podobaiuschaia. Ot sviatykh Apostol prezhde, Potomzhe otsviatykh i Bohonosnykh Otets, v razlychnykh vremenakh predanaia. K nymzhe prydney sut Molytvy nikiia Potrebnia. Predmova pry Shliubi, i Kazanie na Pohrebi.* (1644). Lviv: Drukarnia Mykhaila Slizky, 287 apк (in Church-Slavonic).

63. Undolsky, V. (1871). *Khronologicheskii ukazatel slaviano-russkikh knig tserkovnoi pečati s 1491-go po 1864-y g. V. I: Ocherk slaviano-russkoi bibliografii.* (1871). Moskva: Tpografia Grachova, 387 (in Russian).

64. Shmanko T. (2019). Kyivskyi Trebyk 1646 roku: peredumovy i obstavyny stvorennia. *Studia o kulturze cerkiewnej w dawnej Rzechypospolitej.* Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 45–68 (in Ukrainian).

65. Wawryk M. (1967). De S. Hieromartyre Josaphat Promotore formulae absolutionis in Ecclesia Rutheno-Ucraina. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 33, 583–603.

66. Yasinovskyi, A. (2017). Ambivalentnist bohoslovskoho tekstu: (Pryklad Syntahmationa pro sim Sviatykh Tain Havryila Sevira, 1603). *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*, 7, 73–80 (in Ukrainian).