

Liturgical Penitential Rites in the Stryatyn Trebnyk of 1606

The historical and theological aspects of the Kyivan ecclesiastical tradition after the Union of Brest in 1596 on the basis of the liturgical sources are investigated. The development of the liturgical Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the first “Ukrainian” printed Trebnyks is the main aim of the research. As a result, the two Penitential Rites from the Stryatyn Trebnyk of 1606 are thoroughly analyzed in comparison with other liturgical sources, both manuscript and printed. The influence of the South Slavonic liturgical tradition, represented by the printed Trebnyks of 16th century, on the Stryatyn Trebnyk is demonstrated. Both unique elements of the Kyivan tradition and fragments based on the Nomokanon of Pseudo-John the Faster are analyzed.

Keywords: Trebnyk, Stryatyn Trebnyk, liturgical rite, Rite of Confession, penitence, penance

Liturgical documents present the implementation of the belief of a certain ecclesiastical community on a practical level, that is, in its liturgical and prayer life. Therefore, they are a very important source for the study of doctrinal, theological and ecclesiological peculiarities of a local Church as well as national, cultural and linguistical aspects of a given nation, which constitutes the environment of composition of the liturgical document. The Stryatyn Trebnyk of 1606 is an important witness of the formation and self-perception of the new ecclesiastical community of the Kyivan tradition in the first decade after the Union of Brest (1596).

However, it should be stressed that there are no thorough studies of this Trebnyk, except general descriptions and references to it in the works of some bibliographers and historians, including Natalia Bondar, Roman Kyselov, Fedir Maksymenko, Irina Ozeryanskaya, Ihor Skochylas, Ilarion Svetsitsky, Jakym Zapasko and Iaroslav Isaievych. In the work by Piotr Hildebrandt, along with a description of the Trebnyk, some parts of the document were published, including the Preface, table of content and colophon. The Trebnyk was also rather neglected by theologians, however the works of Alexandr Almazov and Heinrich Bernard Kraienhorst should be noted, as they provide an analysis of the penitential Rites in the Trebnyk.

Therefore, this paper aims at a critical analysis of the liturgical penitential Rites in the Stryatyn Trebnyk and a thorough commentary on both their prayer and didactic components.

Source Description

The edition of the Stryatyn Trebnyk was initiated by Gedeon Balaban, the Orthodox bishop of Lviv and the exarch of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate

(1530–1607)¹. The Trebnyk was published in the printing house of his nephew Theodor Balaban (+1606) in a village Stryatyn (contemporary Western Ukraine) in 1606 by former apprentices of Symeon Budzyna. According to the colophon, the printing process started on July 22, 1605 and finished on September 19, 1606. The name of the editor is given as Theodore K. Iaroslav Isayevych points out that the majority of scholars identify him with Theodor Kasiyanovych, a teacher at the school of the Lviv Confraternity, nevertheless, Theodor from Rohatyn, the clerk of Gedeon Balaban, should be this person as well [3, p. 149]. The document was printed in quatio in black and red. It is the biggest printed Cyrillic Trebnyk (up to that time, 1606), comprising of 696 folia, including 681 numbered folia (foliation with Cyrillic numbers) and 15 unnumbered ones (8 at the beginning and 7 at the end of the book). The book is well decorated, including engravings of a decorated frame on the title page, Gedeon Balaban's arms, headpieces, tail-piece, initials. Pages are decorated with linear frames. It also contains a Preface and colophon.

It should be noted that so far, the Preface remains the main source of information regarding the history of composition of the Trebnyk. It informs us that the Trebnyk is a part of a larger project aiming at the publication of liturgical books where the first book was the Service Book (*Sluzhebnyk*) printed also in Stryatyn in 1604. The Didactic Gospel (*Uchytelnoye Yevanhelie*) published in Balaban's private printing house in Krylos (contemporary Western Ukraine) in 1606 was the third and last printed book of the project. Gedeon Balaban also planned to publish the Psalter². The edition of the Trebnyk was entrusted to Balaban by Kyivan Metropolitan Mykhailo Rahoza and Bishops gathered at one of the Synods of Brest-Litovsk held in 1590–1595³. Its edition was also supported and inspired by Meletios Pigas (1550–1601), the Alexandrian Patriarch and the *Locum Tenens* of the Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople. Gedeon Balaban affirms that this Trebnyk is based on the Greek Euchologion received from Meletios Pigas and represents the liturgical tradition of Mount Athos. The Stryatyn Trebnyk also contains some

¹ For the life and activity of Bishop Gedeon Balaban see, for instance, the works of Svetlana. Lukashova [1, p. 511–513] and Ihor Skochylias [2, p. 554–558].

² For more on this topic see for instance in work of V. Stasenko [4, p. 166].

³ There is no unanimity among scholars about the Synod and year when it happened due to the lack of evidence about the event. Therefore, all suggestions are hypothetical. Between 1590 and 1596, several Synods were held resulting in the Union of Brest in 1596. Gedeon Balaban was one of the initiators of the Union but finally rejected it. Consequently, the Synod of Brest in 1596 is terminus ante quem because Balaban remained an Orthodox bishop and majority of bishops, including the Metropolitan, became Uniates. Isaievych suggests, though without further argumentation, that the Synod of Brest in 1591 could have entrusted the edition of the Trebnyk to Gedeon Balaban because the book printing was on the agenda of the Synod that year [3, p. 147]. However, Eufimij Kryzhanovsky [5, p. 69] and Piotr Hildebrandt [6, p. 20] suggested the Synod of 1590, at which liturgical problems were discussed. Nevertheless, there is no mention of the Trebnyk in the Acts of the Synod [7].

elements of the local tradition, including the acceptance of apostates to Orthodoxy and consecration of the Holy Chrism [8, f. [2r]–[8v]].

From the linguistic analysis of Eufimij Kryzhanovsky, the 19th century Orthodox theologian, it follows that the author might have used some texts of various Cyrillic documents from different periods of time and different territories, including those of South Slavs [5, p. 72–74].

Gedeon Balaban requested the Greek Euchologion as a model for liturgical practice because after the analysis of different local, Wallachian, Moldovan and Serbian Trebnyks, a great diversity had been discovered among them [8, f. [3v]–[4v]]. Unfortunately, the original manuscript signed by Meletios Pigas [8, f. [4v]] is unknown to contemporary scholars⁴. It should also be noted that before the publication of this Trebnyk, the Bishop of Lviv initiated a discussion about its content at the eparchial Synod [8, f. [5v]]⁵.

Gedeon Balaban aimed to structure the Trebnyk to be as universal and practical as possible. Besides common services which accompanied Christians from birth till death (beginning with the naming of the child on the 8th day), it contains among other material solid block of prayers for various occasion⁶, monastic services and ecclesiastical canons [8, f. [7v]–[8r]], including the Penitential Nomokanon of Pseudo-Zonaras⁷.

⁴ It should be noted that Kryzhanovsky disagrees with the affirmation of the Trebnyk’s title that the book was translated from Greek and points out that the Greek Euchologion could be considered only as a guideline for the creation and compilation of the Stryatyn Trebnyk [5, pp. 73–74]. Kryzhanovsky’s affirmation might be correct. Nevertheless, his argumentation is not sufficient to reach the same conclusion.

⁵ There is no reliable information and historical evidences about the date of the Synod gathering and its acts. Based on the Trebnyk’s Preface, Skochylas points out that the Synod took place in 1606 but considers this date as terminus ante quem [9, p. LXV] because the printing of the Stryatyn Trebnyk was finished in September 19, 1606. However, the printing was started on July 22, 1605. Therefore, it might be more reliable to suggest that the content of the Trebnyk was discussed before the beginning of its printing rather than during this process. Book printing was quite expensive at that time and introducing even small changes could require additional expenditure.

⁶ In this block of prayers for various occasions there are also incorporated some penitential prayers, including the prayer for those who have bound themselves by a vow, the prayer for the absolution from every curse and the prayer for the cleansing from every defilement.

⁷ This Nomokanon is entitled as follows “*Ἐπιτάφια τῶν ἁγίων, ἡ ἐκθρόνων τῶν ἁγίων ὡς ἐκ θάνατον ἁγίων*” [8, f. 633r–678v]. For more about Balaban’s printing and the Trebnyk see, for instance the works of Bondar and Kyselov [10, p. 110, № 463], Isaievych [3, p. 147–154], Kameneva and Guseva [11, p. 15, № 16], Labyntsev [12, 26–27, № 21], Maksymenko [13, p. 38–39, № 205]; Ozeryanskaya [14], Petrov, Biriuk and Zolotar’ [15, p. 31–32, № 49], Stasenko [4, p. 165–173], Svetsitsky [16, p. 72, № 243], Zapasko and Isaievych [17, p. 12 and 38, № 69]. Worthy of note is the work of Hildebrandt, where along with a description of the Trebnyk some parts of the book were published, including the Preface, table of content and colophon [6, p. 12–33].

The Rite for One Who Wants to Confess [His Sins] at the Beginning⁸

The Stryatyn *Trebnyk* contains two Rites of Confession entitled “**ЧИНЪ БЫВАЕМЫ** **Ō ēgla ktò xómetzъ vъ načalъ nъpovѣdatиcя.** [= The Rite to Perform when Someone Wants to Confess [his sins] at the Beginning]” [8, f. 123r]⁹ and “**НЪ ОЪ НЪPOBѢДАНІЮ** **ВЛКО ПОДОКЛѢТЪ ПРІИМАТИ ХОТЯЩАГО ПОКЛѢТИCЯ, НЪ НЪPOBѢДАТИ ЕКОЛЪ ГРѢХЪ** [= Rite of Confession. How to Receive One who Wants to Repent and Confess His Sins]” [8, f. 139v]. They are placed on folia 123r–139r and 139v–154r respectively between the Rite of Holy Unction and the Order of Holy Communion.

The first Rite of Confession is started with a priestly exhortation, which should be said outside of the temple: “**ЧЛДО МОЕ ХОТЯЩЕ ОВНОВИТИCЯ ЧТНЫ** **Ū** **ПОКЛѢНИИ**” [= O my child, who wants to be renewed by Honorable Repentance]” [8, f. 123r]. It should be noted that the practice of the beginning of the Rite of the Confession outside of a church is recorded in the first known Slavonic Glagolitic Euchologion Sinaiticum (from the 11th century). Nevertheless, this practice is lacking in other Slavonic Euchologia. The exhortation of the Stryatyn *Trebnyk* integrates two exhortations from the Euchologion Sinaiticum into one text, viz. “**ЧЛДО. НРНЕ ОВНОВИТИ CЯ ХОЩЕШИ** [= Today, o child, you want to be renewed]” and “**СЛЫШИ ЧЛДО** [= Listen, a child]” [21, f. 66v [178]–67v [187]]¹⁰ (with certain linguistic differences). The exhortation contains two main ideas, namely, the invocation of the sinner to repentance and instruction in the rudiments of faith.

Firstly, the priest emphasizes that God desires and waits for the sinner’s repentance. Sacramental Confession is considered as the renewing of the sinner, his rediscovering of the lost fatherland and rejoining God’s sonship. With regard to sinners who died without repentance the text suggests a very severe attitude. They should be treated as non-Christians because of such an indifferent attitude to personal salvation. This means that such a person “**НЕ ВѢРОВАЕТЪ КРѢЩЕНІЮ,**” **НИ ВЪ СТОУНУ ТРІЦѢ** [= Does not believe in Baptism and in the Holy Trinity]” [8, f. 1234v]. In other words, this person does not believe in and live a new life in God and with God. Moreover, such a sinner should be deprived of a funeral ceremony presided over by a priest and of the acceptance of offerings for Divine Services for his soul in a church¹².

⁸ For the explanation of the meaning of this title see below.

⁹ This and subsequent translations are mine unless otherwise indicated. The structure of the Rite was presented in Church Slavonic by Almazov [18, 2.1.9] and in German with analysis by H. B. Kraienhorst [19, p. 204–205]; for a critical analysis of the Rite, see also in Almazov [20, c. 8–9].

¹⁰ The Euchologion Sinaiticum is cited according to Rajko Nahtigal’s edition [21]. The original Euchologium Sinaiticum foliation is indicated in square brackets, and the pagination of Nahtigal’s edition is given without them. Here the system of r[ecto] and v[erso] is used for indication of foliation. Thus, the system of a and b used by some scholars, in particular by Nahtigal, is adapted.

¹¹ The word word “**ВСКРЕШЕНІЮ** [= resurrection]” is used in the Euchologium Sinaiticum [21, f. 66v [179]].

¹² “**ДЛ НА ТЛКОВЫ** **Ū** **НЕ ПОДОКЛѢТЪ ПРІВѢНИ ОВЛѢЩІCЯ, НИ ПРИНОШЕНІИ ВЪ ЦРКВѢ ЗЛ НИГО ПРИНОСИТИ**” [8, f. 123v].

The second doctrinal part presents the belief in the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation of the Divine Word, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the Last Judgment, Baptism in the name of Three Divine Persons in order to be saved. The exhortation concludes with an affirmation that post-baptismal sins are cleansed through repentance and confession to God who ordered the realization of this mission to the priests on His behalf. After the priest has finished the exhortation, the penitent should enter into the temple. His inner repentance should be expressed externally, that is, he should enter “съ стꙋрꙋхомъ, ѿ смиренїемъ. ѿ съгнѣнама рꙋкꙋма [= with fear and humility and with folded arms]” [8, f. 124v]¹³. Then he should make three prostrations¹⁴ at the priest’s request “поклонїса Бꙋꙋ къ нѣмоꙋ же прїеѣгнуоꙋа ѿи [= Make a bow before God to whom you have come]” [8, f. 124v]. While making the prostrations the penitent should repeat after the confessor an acknowledgment of his own sinfulness and ask divine forgiveness “Бѣ оꙋцѣсти мꙋа грѣшнаго ѿ помꙋдꙋ мꙋа. Гѣ съгрѣшїхъ помꙋдꙋ мꙋа. Безъ числꙋ съгрѣшїхъ помꙋдоꙋ мꙋа, ѿ протї мꙋа [= O God, cleanse me, a sinner, and have mercy on me; O Lord, I have sinned, have mercy on me; I have sinned countless times have mercy on me and forgive me]” [8, f. 125r].

Then the priest prepares the usual place for confession, that is he puts the Gospel and the cross on the analogion before the Altar¹⁵, and the sinner puts his head and hands on the Gospel. Then the confessor begins the usual opening prayers¹⁶, and proceeds with three Psalms, in particular 6¹⁷, 31¹⁸ and 50; Creed and penitential troparia¹⁹: “Объѣтїа ѿца [= The embrace of the Father]”, “Въплзѣвѣнїи кꙋ въпадꙋхъ [= I fell among robbers]”, “Слава [= Glory]”, “Слезы мѣн дꙋаждꙋ Бѣ [= Give me tears, O God]”, “ѿ нїчꙋ [= Now and ever]”, “ѿзъ дꙋбо стꙋла Бѣцꙋ [= I, the Virgin,

¹³ Several terms are used for the identification of the confessant in “the Rite to Perform when Someone Wants to Confess [his sins] at the Beginning”, including “кто хꙋщїтꙋ въ налꙋчїѣ ѿповѣдꙋетїса [= someone who wants to confess [his sins] at the beginning]” [8, f. 123r]; “хꙋтꙋа кꙋаѣтїса [= the one who wants to repent]” [8, f. 125r]; “кꙋаѣтїса [= the repented]” [8, f. 128v]; ѿнокъ [= a monk] [8, f. 130r].

¹⁴ Kraienhorst explains that these should be “Prostrationen bis zur Erde [= prostrations to the ground]” [19, p. 204]. However, there is only a general indication for making prostrations in the text without any specification.

¹⁵ The ambiguity of the Church Slavonic term “ѿлтарь” should be noted. It could mean both an Altar and a Sanctuary. However, from the perspective of church architecture it follows that these two notions are related, (that is the penitent, who is outside of the Sanctuary, makes prostrations before the Altar placed inside of the Sanctuary. Moreover, he should be separated from the Sanctuary by an Iconostasis.

¹⁶ “Блꙋвїнꙋ Бꙋꙋ нашꙋ. таже трїтоє. прѣта прѣоꙋцѣ. ѿче нашꙋ. ꙗко твоє єѣтꙋ црꙋтво. Гѣ помꙋдоꙋ ѿ прїиꙋдѣте поклонїса гꙋꙋ [= “Blessed is our God”, then the Trisagion”, “Trinity Most Holy”, “Our Father”, “For Yours is the kingdom”, “Lord, have mercy” 12 [times], “Come, let us worship” thrice] [8, f. 125r].

¹⁷ There is an indication in the text of the Rite that the full text of Ps. 6 can be found on folia 141 [8, f. 125r].

¹⁸ The full text of the Psalm.

¹⁹ Penitential troparia should be sung on Tone 1 [8, f. 126v].

Holy Theotokos” [8, f. 126v–127r]. These troparia are a poetic retelling of Gospel parables. In particular, the first troparion presents a sinner as a person longing for the Father’s embrace just like the repentant Prodigal Son²⁰. In the second troparion the sinner begs Jesus Christ for healing from sinful wounds like the man who fell among thieves²¹. The third troparion compares the sinner to the repentant Sinful Woman²². The last one is a Theotokion, that is an appeal to Mary, the Mother of God [Cf. 19, p. 206].

After the troparia, the rubric prescribes that the priest should say the prayer “Ὁ **ΣΕΒΣΤΕ** [= for himself]” [8, f. 127r]²³ “Шлѣдѣмъ ѿ милостивыи Бѣ. ѿспытаѣмъ срѣца ѿ оутрѣмы [= Compassionate and Merciful God, You try the hearts and minds]” [8, f. 127r]. This prayer can be considered as another textual version and contextual redaction of the similar prayer from the baptismal service “Блгоутрѣбный ѿ млтвныи Бѣ. ѿспытаѣмъ срѣца ѿ оутрѣмы [= Compassionate and Merciful God, You try the hearts and minds]” [8, f. 25v–26v]²⁴, but here it is more elaborated and adapted to the Sacrament of Repentance.

The prayer has two groups of petitions: one is for the confessor, the other – for the sinner. The internal orientation of this prayer is clearly expressed in other Trebnyks, for instance in the Kyiv Trebnyk of 1646, where the preceding rubric indicates that it is “[М]лтва ѿ Іерѣя Тайноу глѣмаѣ ѿ себѣ ѿ ѿ канцнхъѣѣ [= the prayer said secretly by the priest for himself and for the penitents] [24, p. 340].

In the first group of petitions the priest asks the Omniscient God to cleanse him of all his filthiness and to sanctify him so that he may perform the sacrament uncondemned. He also asks for some specific faculties required for the administration of the Sacrament of Repentance, viz. “слово премѣдрости. оумъ разумнѣ. [...] блгѣтъ блдѣжнїѣѣ лхѣвъѣ [= the word of wisdom and an intelligent mind; [...] the grace of discerning spirits]” [8, f. 128r], as well as general petitions, which include receiving divine power, strengthening for its administration and to form Jesus Christ in his members. In other words that Jesus Christ can act in the confessor and through him.

In the second group of petitions, the priest asks God for the penitent who desires birth or rather rebirth “ѿповѣданїемъ, ѿ покланїѣѣ ѿ [= through confession and repentance]” [8, f. 128r], to preserve him in true faith so that he may be a true member of the Church, to open his ear to be able to hear the confessor’s words, to confess his sins and receive their remission, as well as to improve in good, etc.

When the priest has finished the prayer the penitent should make three prostrations with the following words “Бѣ млтвнѣѣ вѣдѣнїѣѣ гдѣшномуу [= God, be merci-

²⁰ Lk 15, 11–32.

²¹ Lk 10, 30–37. Kraienhorst mistakenly defines it as “den Schächer am Kreuz (Lk 23, 39–43)” [19, p. 204].

²² Lk 7, 36–50.

²³ Several terms are used for the identification of the minister in “the Rite to Perform when Someone Wants to Confess [his sins] at the Beginning,” including “лхѣвникъ [= a Spiritual [Father]]” [8, f. 123r]; “пѣпѣѣ [= a priest]” [8, f. 124v]; оцѣѣ лхѣвнїѣѣ [= a Spiritual Father] [8, f. 130r].

²⁴ According to the classification of Miguel Arranz, this baptismal prayer is [B5:1] [22, c. 328–330; 23, c. 481–482]. See also the work of Kraienhorst [19, p. 204].

ful to me a sinner]” [8, f. 129r], and say the all-embracing acknowledgment of his sinfulness with extended hands “**Исповѣданъ тебе ГИ БѢ НБЮ И ЗЕМЛИ ВСА ТАННА СРЦА МОГО** [= I confess to you, Lord, God of heaven and earth, everything that is in the secrecy of my heart]” [8, f. 129r]. This acknowledgment can be considered as another linguistic version of the text from the Didascalia Patrum in the Ustjug Kormčaja (the 13th – the early 14th centuries)²⁵.

Then the priest exclaims “**Гю помолитъ** [= Let us pray to the Lord]” [8, f. 129r] and says the prayer “**СМЪ ПРВЧНМЪ ВЛКО ГИ. СЪТВОРИМЪ ТЛКА ПО ОБРАЗУ СВОМОУ, И ПОДОБИЮ** [= You who are, Eternal Master, Lord, who created man after Your image and likeness]” [8, f. 129 r]. The same prayer is also found in the Baptismal Service, particularly in the 4th prayer of exorcisms in the block of prayers for the making of a catechumen [8, f. 20r–21r]²⁶. Both prayers (from the Baptismal and Penitential Services) belong to different redactions and seem to derive from different sources. The author of the Trebnyk did not strive to bring them into accord with each of other. Miguel Arranz attributes the prayer from the Baptismal Service to Basil the Great [22, p. 328].

The anamnetic part of the prayer recalls that God granted “**вѣсть животѣ вѣчнаго** [= power of eternal life]” to human beings and did not abandon them after the Fall. Moreover, the Incarnation of Jesus Christ brought salvation to the world. Therefore, the priest asks God to change the life of the sinner from evil to good, to enable him to understand the truth of the Gospel, to give him a guardian angel, to protect him from any cunning of the devil, and make him a good member of the Church so that he could enter the Divine Kingdom after his righteous and sinless life.

Indeed, highlighting the parallels of this prayer and the previous one with the Sacrament of Baptism clearly presents sacramental Confession as a new birth of a Christian after the death of sin.

This prayer is followed by the extended all-embracing monastic acknowledgment of sinfulness “**Прости мѧ ѡчи стѣи** [= Forgive me, Holy Father]” [8, f. 130r],

²⁵ “**исповѣданъ ти са ги бѢ нбю и землі вса тѧже въ таннѣ срца моего** [= I confess to you, Lord, God of heaven and earth, everything that is in the secrecy of my heart]” [25, f. 86v]. According to Arranz’s classification this expression belongs to the group “[K91]: introductory stereotypical formulas of all-embracing confession”, in particular [K91:4] [26, c. 93, 315]. It is worth noting that the Didascalia Patrum is a part of the Nomokanon of pseudo-John the Faster, which is one of the oldest Greek penitential Nomokanon. The Ustjug Kormčaja (the parchment manuscript created in the 13th – the early 14th centuries) contains the first preserved Slavonic translation of the Nomokanon of pseudo-John the Faster. For more about the Nomokanon of pseudo-John the Faster see, Van de Pavard F. [27] and Popelyasty V. [28, c. 158–164].

²⁶ It is worth noting that this prayer is divided into two prayers in the catechumenal rite, both of them are preceded by the priestly exclamation “Let us pray to the Lord.” The second one begins after priestly breathing on the forehead, mouth, and breast of the person with the words “**ИЖДИ ѡ НИГО ВСАКА ЛОКАВИ И НЕЧІСТЫИ ДУХЪ** [= Drive from him every evil and unclean spirit]” [8, f. 20v]. According to the classification of Arranz, this baptismal prayer is [B3] [22, c. 328–330]. See also Kraienhorst [19, p. 205 and 139–144].

entitled “*Πνευματικὴ δέησις κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντον ἡνοκωμῶν* [= Confession of monks to a Spiritual Father]” [8, f. 130r]. It contains two long lists of sins and presents the penitent’s desires to confess all his sins, the admission of himself as the worst sinner, and asking forgiveness from both God and the spiritual father.

The Rite is concluded with a long confessor’s prayer for forgiveness (six and half folia) “*Вѣко вѣко въсѣхъ сн҃а г҃и҃телею, ꙗко душамъ нашимъ* [= Master, Master, the Author of all, the Savior of our souls]” [8, f. 133r]. The rubric indicates that this prayer is “*ᾠ δόξαναго ѿца прощеніе* [= the forgiveness from the Spiritual Father]”, but the headers and the table of content point out that this is “*мѡл . ѡр҃кшала ѿ архоника* [= the prayer of absolution from the Spiritual [Father]]” [8, f. 133r–139r]²⁷ and only one header indicates that this is “the prayer of forgiveness from the Spiritual [Father]” (*мѡл . прашала ѿ архоника*) [8, f. 137v–138r].

This prayer is not found in Greek sources, but is present in the Slavonic liturgical tradition. According to Almazov, the Cyrillic manuscript *Sluzhebnyk* of South Slavonic origin, dated to the 15th century (from the Moscow Synodal library, № 307) contains this prayer (in a somewhat different version)²⁸. Nevertheless, the scholar points out that this prayer is found only in the *Stryatyn Trebnyk* and the aforementioned manuscript. It is not an original composition but a compilation of various texts, including certain parts of the prayers “O Lord [...] Who remitted sins of Peter and the Whore through their tears”, “O Lord [...] Who gave forgiveness of the sins to David who was repenting” and “O Lord [...] Who entrusted the key of Your Kingdom to Peter, Your Supreme Apostle” [20, p. 231].

Overall, the priest asks God for the penitent’s cleansing, absolution and forgiveness of all his possible sins and transgressions, including even different ecclesiastical penalties and heresies (a very extended all-embracing lists of sins is incorporated). The confessor also begs for healing of the penitent’s body and soul, correction of his life so that he may become worthy of receiving Holy Communion and entering the Heavenly Kingdom in future, etc.

According to Almazov, the aforementioned Rite is not the Rite of Confession per se, but the Rite of the renewing of Confession (*ponovlenie*) after the fulfilment of the penalty by a monk before the Eucharist. Therefore, the scholar explains that the ambiguous term “*въ началѣ* [= at the beginning]”, which is used in the title, should be considered as “in obedience,” that is, in monastic life [20, p. 8–9]. Consequently, the title of the Rite should be translated as follows “The Rite to Perform when Some Monk Wants to Confess [His Sins]”. It should be mentioned that this Rite is lacking in other printed *Trebnyks* [cf. 20, p. 8].

²⁷ It should be noted that the one header indicates “*ἡσποτικὴ ᾠ δόξανα* [= the confession by the Spiritual [Father]]” instead of “*мѡл . ѡр҃кшала ѿ архоника* [= the prayer of absolution by the Spiritual [Father]]”. It might be considered rather as typographical error. [8, f. 134v–135r; 8, f., the table of content, [2r]].

²⁸ Almazov published the text of the prayer from the aforementioned *Sluzhebnyk* in Russian letters [18, 2.3.47; cf. 19, p. 205].

Rite of Confession. How to Receive One who Wants to Repent and Confess His Sins

The usual Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the Stryatyn Trebnyk is very condensed and well structured. It might be divided into four parts, containing pre-confessional, confessional, post-confessional and an additional group of prayers.

The pre-confessional part is quite similar to the South Slavonic printed Trebnyks of the 16th century²⁹. There are only some small differences between them. In line with the South Slavonic Trebnyks the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the Stryatyn Trebnyk begins with the presentation of the posture of the penitent when he is entering the temple, his meeting with the confessor and description of a place of the confession.

The opening rubric indicates that the sinner should enter the temple “*съ стръхомъ ѿ смѣрѣніѣмъ, ѿ съгвѣніѣмъ рѣкѣмъ* [= with fear and humility and with folded arms]” [8, f. 139v], which might be considered as an external expression of his repentance. The Stryatyn Trebnyk, like other South Slavonic Trebnyks, mentions a church as a place of Confession. The Ostroh Trebnyk indicates that the confessor may also take the penitent to some “*мѣсто безмольвѣное* [= silent place]” [37, f. 22 [3r]]³⁰, though no explanation is given for changing the place of confession.

Then, according to the Stryatyn Trebnyk, the penitent³¹ should make three prostrations to the ground “*пѣ стѣмъ ѡлтаремъ* [= before the Holy Altar]”³² on the priest’s

²⁹ The first Cyrillic Trebnyk (Molytvennyk or Euchologion) was printed by hieromonk Macarius in the Cetinje printing house of Djuradj (Đurađ) Crnojević (contemporary Montenegro) in 1495. Nevertheless, the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance as well as the Rites of the other Sacraments (with the exception of the Holy Orders) are not present in the Cetinje Trebnyk [29]. The dating of the South Slavonic printings is according to Evgenij. Nemirovskij [30]. Contemporary scholarship knows five Cyrillic Trebnyks from the 16th century, published in Goražde in 1523 (contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina) [31], Venice in above 1540 [32], Târgoviște in 1545 (contemporary Romania) [33], Mileševa in 1546 [34] and in Venice in 1570 [35]. For more about the Rite of Confession in the 16th century South Slavonic printed Trebnyks, see Popelyasty [36].

³⁰ The article is based on two copies of the Trebnyk preserved in the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum in Lviv (the library code: СДК 188, № 185 and СДК 189, № 186). Both copies are damaged. Later museum numerations made with pencil indicates actual folia in copies, which do not coincide with each other evidently. Therefore, I refer to the original signatures written in Church Slavonic numerals, indicated here in Arabic numerals. Consequently, the first number is the number of the signature and a number in square brackets indicates unnumbered folio including folio where the signature is marked.

³¹ The “Rite of Confession. How to Receive One who Wants to Repent and Confess His Sins” includes several terms for the identification of the penitent, including *хотѣи поклѣтисѣ, ѿ ѿповѣдѣннѣ своѣхъ грѣхѣмъ* [= the one who wants to repent and confess his sins]” [8, f. 139v]; “*хотѣи клѣтисѣ* [= the one who wants to repent]” [8, f. 139v]; *кѣнѣннѣ* [= the repented] [8, f. 144r]; *дѣтѣмъ чѣдо* [= the spiritual child]” [8, f. 145r]; *ѿповѣдѣннѣ* [= the confessant] [8, f. 148r]; *ѿповѣдѣннѣ* [= the one who is confessing]” [8, f. 152r].

³² Most probably the adjective “holy” means here “Altar” and not “Sanctuary”.

request “поклонієа Боу до зємлѣ кѣ нємоу же прєвѣгнуоуѣ єси [= Make a bow to the ground before God to Whom you have come]” [8, f. 139v]. This is the first time in the printed Cyrillic Trebnyk that the type of prostration is indicated by the confessor³³. In the Ostroh Trebnyk such a specification is prescribed by a following rubric [37, f. 22 [3r]], while in the South Slavonic printed Trebnyks it is not mentioned at all. The penitent should also acknowledge his sinfulness and ask divine forgiveness repeating after the priest the following formula “Гѣ съгрѣшихъ, помлоуи мѣ, ѡ прости мѣ Гѣ създалъ єси мѣ, ѡ прости мѣ Гѣ кѣиша єси мѣ, ѡ прости мѣ Гѣ кѣиша єси мѣ, ѡ прости мѣ Гѣ вєзчислѣ съгрѣшихъ, помлоуи мѣ, ѡ прости мѣ [= Lord, I have sinned. Have mercy on me and forgive me; O Lord accept me who repent, have mercy on me and forgive me; O Lord, Who created me, forgive me; O Lord, I have sinned countless times. Have mercy on me and forgive me]” [8, f. 139v–140r]. This text might be considered as another redaction of the Ostroh Trebnyk’s formula³⁴. The South Slavonic Trebnyks contain a shorter formula “Lord, I have sinned against you, have mercy on me”³⁵.

Then the preparation of the place of confession follows. In line with the South Slavonic Trebnyks the priest puts the Gospel and the cross on the special table (analogion) in front of a Sanctuary and the penitent lays his hands and head on the Gospel and remains in this position till the moment of interrogation. It should be noted that there is no mention of the cross in the Ostroh Trebnyk [37, f. 22 [3v]].

Then the priest recites the usual opening prayers “Блѣнѣ Бѣ нѣшѣ. трѣгоі прѣла трѣоце по ѡче нѣшѣ. ѡко трѣоі єстѣ црѣтѣво Гѣ помлоуи [ѣ]. вѣ прѣидѣте поклонієа. ѣ” [= “Blessed is our God”, the Trisagion, “Trinity Most Holy”, after “Our Father”, “For Yours is the kingdom”; “Lord, have mercy” 12 [times], “Come, let us worship” thrice]” [8, f. 140r] followed by Psalms 50³⁶ and 4, and the prayer “Гѣ Бѣ спєніа нѣшиго [= O Lord, God of our salvation]” [8, f. 141r]³⁷, then Psalm 6 and the prayer “Влѣко Гѣ Бѣ нѣшѣ, прѣзвѣлѣи прѣбѣнникѣ вѣ стѣнѣю [= O Master, Lord our God, Who

³³ For the identification of the confessor in the “Rite of Confession. How to Receive One who Wants to Repent and Confess his Sins” several terms are used: “пѣпѣ [= a priest]” [8, f. 139v]; “цѣлѣбникѣ [= a priest]” [8, f. 144r]; “отѣцѣ дѣховникѣ [= a Spiritual Father] [8, f. 145r]; “дѣховникѣ [= a Spiritual [Father]] [8, f. 152r].

³⁴ “Съгрѣши Гѣ прости мѣ, прѣимѣ мѣ Гѣ кѣиша єси ѡпомѣди мѣ. Гѣ ѡцѣстѣма грѣшнаго, създалъ єси мѣ Гѣ ѡпомѣди мѣ. вєзчислѣ Гѣ съгрѣшихъ, прости мѣ ѡмѣни трѣбого рѣди стѣго [= I have sinned, O Lord, forgive me; O Lord, accept me who repent and have mercy on me; O 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]” [37, f. 22 [3r]–22 [3v]].

³⁵ “Гѣ съгрѣшихѣти помлоуѣми” [31, f. [24v]]; “Гѣ съгрѣшихѣти помлоуѣми” [34, f. [28v]]. There is a slight difference in the Venetian printings, viz.: “Lord, I have sinned, have mercy on me” “Гѣ съгрѣшихъ помлоуѣми” [32, f. [1r]]; “Гѣ съгрѣшихѣ помлоуѣми” [35, f. [1r]]. According to the Venice 1570 edition the penitent should himself say the aforementioned expression and not repeat it after the priest. There is also an indication that this is a common practice [35, f. [1r]].

³⁶ Only the first words of the Psalm are indicated.

³⁷ According to the rubric, the prayer should be said aloud. According to Arranz’s classification, the prayer belongs to the group “[K1]: priestly prayers over those who are doing penitence,” in particular [K1:3a] [26, p. 38, 93, 101].

calls the righteous to holiness]” [8, f. 142r]³⁸ follow. The minister concludes the pre-confessional part with reciting Psalm 12³⁹ and the prayer “Г҃и Г҃е сп҃сїтелю нашъ. ѿже прѣ Окомъ твоимъ надѣаномъ [= O Lord, God our Savior, Who, through Your Prophet Nathan]” [8, f. 143v]⁴⁰.

In the first prayer, the priest addresses God and recalls His mercifulness, His Incarnation for the sake of human salvation, and His desire for the conversion of the sinner and not his death. Thus, the confessor asks God to give to the sinner “ѡтвръжѣнно мѣсто покаїніа [= a place of thorough penitence]” [8, f. 141r], forgiveness of all his trespasses committed willingly and unwillingly, and finally for the connection and uniting of the penitent to the Church. Miguel Arranz points out that the prayer instructs how to do penitence, which should last for a certain time [26, p. 54].

In the second prayer, the confessor prays that God, Who desires the growth of righteous men in holiness and the conversion of sinners, may accept the repentance of the penitent, forgive him all his sins and dirtiness (“скверны”) [8, f. 142v] and keep him safe from sinful inclinations, especially corporal ones. The confessor also begs for the cleansing of the penitent’s conscience and for his strengthening in fulfillment of the divine commandments that he may become worthy of receiving Holy Communion. The final aim of the penitent’s conversion is his inheritance of the Heavenly Kingdom.

According to Arranz, the prayer describes the last two (the 4th and the 5th) of four (five) stages in the ancient penitential practice: praying by penitents outside the temple; then, being in the temple only during the Liturgy of Word; later, kneeling and staying during the Liturgy of the Faithful, and finally, the reception of the Eucharist (the 5th stage) [26, p. 56].

In the third prayer, the confessor, at first, appeals to God’s mercy and refers to two Old Testament penitential examples, in particular God’s forgiveness of the sins of David and Manasseh after their repentance. Similarly, the priest asks God to accept the penitent and forgive his sins, like the two kings. The confessor also highlights and recalls that the Lord Himself has ordered to forgive others many times⁴¹, and that He is the God of all sinners who repent.

Arranz suggests that this prayer indicated the beginning of the fulfillment of the ancient practice of the public penitence. During the long period of the penance, the penitent was excluded from the participation in communal prayers and from the reception of the Holy Eucharist [26, c. 43]. It should be noted that there is a shift in addressees of the prayer: at the beginning the prayer is directed to God the Father and later, with references to the Gospels, it appeals to Jesus Christ. This can be explained by a lat-

³⁸ According to the classification of Miguel Arranz, the prayer belongs to the group “[K1]: priestly prayers over those who are doing penitence”, in particular [K1:4] [26, p. 38, 93, 101–102].

³⁹ It is worthy noticing that there are given the full texts of Psalms 4, 6, 12 in the Stryatyn Trebnyk.

⁴⁰ According to the classification of Arranz, the prayer belongs to the group “[K1]: priestly prayers over those who are doing penitence,” in particular [K1:1b]. [26, p. 38, 93, 102].

⁴¹ Rephrasing Mt 18:21–22 the prayer indicates that it should be done “седедесѣтъ седмерицею [= seventy times seven]” [8, f. 143v].

ter addition to a more ancient first part of the prayer [38, p. 44]. Nevertheless, from a theological point of view, the prayer emphasizes the continuity of God's mercy towards a human person. It is the same God who forgave in the Old Testament, who promised forgiveness in the New Testament and who forgives a concrete sinner today.

There are the two main redactions of this prayer. Arranz dates the earliest written sources containing this prayer to the 8th and the 11th centuries respectively. The oldest and the simplest redaction of the prayer is found, for instance in the *Codex Barbarianus graecus 366* (the South Italian Greek manuscript, the 8th century) and in the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* [26, p. 42–44], and can be dated to the 4th–5th centuries [26, p. 90]⁴².

All the aforementioned three prayers are also known in the tradition of Greek Euchologia. They can also be found in the pre-confessional part of the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance in the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* as well as in the printed South Slavonic Trebnyks and the Ostroh Trebnyk. Though they have certain linguistic and intertextual differences, as they are derived from different contexts, the structure of the pre-confessional part in the all these Trebnyks is the same. More solid differences are between printed Trebnyks and the written *Euchologium Sinaiticum*. The manuscript contains additional prayer at the beginning of the part. There is also a discrepancy with regard to Psalms between the documents. The *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, prescribes Psalms 4, 12, 24, and 37 [21, f. 208 [72r]–230 [77r]] and the printed Trebnyks – Psalms 50, 4, 6, and 12.

The confessional part of the Stryatyn Trebnyk is in line with the South Slavonic Trebnyks (but with the tradition which preceded the Venetian Trebnyk 1570). It starts with the confessor's raising of the sinner and questioning him “*и възпрашаетъ его сълюбкоу, и ти́хоречію и смиреніемъ* [= and questions him with love and in meekness and with humility]” [8, f. 144r]. Then instruction for the confessor “*и възпрашаетъ его* [= and [the confessor] question him [the penitent]]” [8, f. 144r] follows, explaining how to exhort the penitent to reveal all his sins and overcome shame in confessing them before the priest. Afterwards there is the exhortation “*Пі́к члдо* [= Today, O child]” [8, f. 144r], concluded with the question about the corruption of the penitent's virginity “*исповѣждь ми члдо [...] како и си дѣтво своє раздррушилъ* [= Confess me everything, O child, [...] how did you destroy your chastity?]” [8, f. 144v]. The similar instruction for the confessor and question about the corruption of the penitent's virginity are found in the *Didascalia Patrum* [25, f. 86v and 87r respectively].

Next there is the second instruction for the confessor “*Достойнъ оубо ѿцѣмъ дхѡвнымъ* [= Spiritual Fathers, should]” [8, f. 145r] follows. The confessor should not be ashamed to question the penitent even about different sexual sins, including

⁴² On the basis of the structure and content of this prayer both Almazov [20, c. 174] and Arranz [26, c. 90] suggest that it was composed before the 6th century. However, Almazov seems to be mistaken in his referring to the Rite of Confession, wrongly attributed to John the Faster, the Patriarch of Constantinople (582–595), for the dating of the prayer [20, c. 174–175]. We do not have any extant sources earlier than the *Codex Barbarianus graecus 366*.

incest and bestiality. Otherwise the confessant might hide some sin and not confess it because of shame.

The confessional part concludes with the all-embracing stereotypical formula of confession “**Ποικιλῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ** [= I confess to God and His Most Pure Mother]” [8, f. 146r], which the penitent repeats after the priest. By this formula the confessant indicates that God, the Theotokos, the angels, all the saints and the confessor are witnesses of his confession. In other words, he confesses his sins before all of them. The confessant also declares his intention to make his confession as full and as detailed as possible. He also declares his will for repentance with God’s help and asks the priest concerning forgiveness.

It is worth noting that such all-embracing confession of personal sinfulness of different types and redactions are found in other liturgical documents, including the Euchologium Sinaiticum [21, f. 68r [189].], the Euchologium Slavonicum [40, f. 44r] and printed Trebnyks.

As in the already mentioned printed Trebnyks, the post-confessional part in the Stryatyn Trebnyk begins with the penitent’s prostration, which he makes on the confessor’s request. According to the Ostroh Trebnyk, when the priest says the following prayer, the penitent should prostrate [37, f. 51 [2v]]. Then the minister says loudly the prayer “**Τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς πετρίων, ἡμεῖς πόρνης ἐλάμναις ἡμεῖς ὀφθαλμῶν** [= O Lord, our God, Who remitted the sins of Peter and the Whore through tears]” [8, f. 146v], then he reads the two Scripture readings (the same as in the Ostroh Trebnyk: 1 Tim 1,15–17 and Mt 9,9–13⁴³), followed by the litany⁴⁴ and the block of the Dismissal⁴⁵.

In the aforementioned prayer “O Lord, our God, Who remitted the sins of Peter and the Whore through their tears” the confessor appeals to three Gospel examples of forgiveness of sins, namely to Peter, the Whore and the Publican, asking the Lord to accept likewise the confession of the penitent’s sins and overlook all of them, which were committed willingly and unwillingly, “**ῥήματι ἢ ἔργῳ, ἢ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ** [= by word, either deed or in thought]” [8, f. 146v].

The earliest Greek witnesses to the prayer are dated to the 8th century [26, p. 44]. The prayer is present in both the earliest Greek and Slavonic manuscripts, in particular the Codex Barbarianus graecus 366 [39, p. 190 and 408, N 202; cf. 26, p. 44] and the Euchologium Sinaiticum (but in different linguistic versions) [21, f. 77r [230]–77r [232]; cf. 26, p. 102]. This prayer belongs to the post-confessional part in the latter one and also in the printed Trebnyks. The prayer was originally composed, as Arranz

⁴³ There are slight linguistic differences between the Ostroh Trebnyk and the Stryatyn Trebnyk in the texts of the prayer “O Lord, our God, Who remitted the sins of Peter and the Whore through their tears” and Scripture readings.

⁴⁴ The Litany consists of two petitions and a doxology. The first petition is a general request for God’s mercy. The second petition asks forgiveness of the penitent’s sins. There is an indication in the text that “Lord, have mercy” should be recited 50 times after the second petition and nothing is mentioned after the first petition [8, f. 147v–148r].

⁴⁵ “**ποσιμῶν, ἡμεῖς ἁγίων καὶ τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ** [= Then “More honorable than the cherubim,” “Glory: now and ever,” and the Dismissal]” [8, f. 148r].

suggests, for private repentance without the fulfillment of an official confession of sins. Such confession of sins was only practiced in monastic communities [26, p. 46].

According to Arranz, such prayers are not prayers of priestly absolution or forgiveness. It seems, as the scholar suggests, that the main duties of the confessor were the hearing of the avowal of sins and imposition of the penance. In fact, the minister had to determine the length of the period that the penitent should be deprived of Holy Communion [26, p. 90] along with the fulfillment of certain ascetic practices, for instance, fasting, prayers, etc.

Next (after the Dismissal) there are the post-confessional exhortation “**Ψάλο, ηεβόρη τῆ παλαιο κἀνσιουγῆσα** [= O child, may it not be difficult for you to repent]” [8, f. 148r]⁴⁶; the rubric⁴⁷ and the instruction about the imposition of the penance “**Πε ποδωάετῶ ζάποβεῖδα δλάτῆ προτήεβῶ γρεῖχοῦ, ηὸ ἔζε ηεβόλιητῶ εὐχρηνήτῆ** [= The penance should be given not against sin but as much as one wish to preserve]” [8, f. 150v]. The importance of the proposed approach to the imposition of penance is emphasized by a marginal note “**ζῶη** [= Keep in mind]” on the left margin, in front of the words “**Πε ποδωάετῶ** [= It’s not fit?]” [8, f. 150v].⁴⁸ The texts of the instruction in the Stryatyn Trebnyk and the South Slavonic Trebnyks (with the exception of the Venetian Trebnyk of 1570) contain only small differences, mostly grammatical.

The post-confessional exhortation aims at encouraging the penitent to fulfill the imposed penance which implied an ecclesiastic expulsion and standing outside of the church for forty days [8, f. 148r]. Such a practice is justified as divinely established and transmitted by the Apostles and Fathers, its aim being the cleansing of the penitent for the reception of Holy Communion. By numerous examples from the Holy Scriptures the priest also stimulates the sinner to different ascetic practices and growth in spiritual virtues during the time of penance in order to help the sinner to improve his life and enter the Divine Kingdom after Jesus Christ’s Second Coming.

Such an exhortation is found in all the aforementioned Slavonic liturgical documents. The Euchologium Sinaiticum prescribes that the penance should last a certain short period of time (“**мало времѧ**”) [21, f. 69r [195]], while all printed Trebnyks clearly indicate 40 days [31, f. [27v]; 32, f. [4v]; 33, f. [9v]; 34, f. [32r]; 35, f. [4v]; 37, f. 24 [3r]⁴⁹]. It seems, they refer to the period of Lent.

The instruction about the imposition of a penance clearly indicates that the confessor should impose a penance on the penitent as heavy as the sinner is able to fulfil⁵⁰.

⁴⁶ The version of the exhortation is closer to the text in the South Slavonic Trebnyks than to that in the Ostroh Trebnyk. The Venetian Trebnyk of 1570 is an exception.

⁴⁷ “**ἡποσίμῶ δλάτῆ ἰμδῶ ζάποβεῖδα ἔλίκω μόζετῆ χρηνήτῆ** [= And after those he [the priest] will give him [the penitent] the penance as much as he is able to keep]” [Stryatyn 1606, 150v].

⁴⁸ Stryatyn 1606, 150v.

⁴⁹ It should be noted that there is a substantial difference between Ostroh Trebnyk and Stryatyn Trebnyk in their confessional and post-confessional parts.

⁵⁰ “**ἡποσίμῶ δλάτῆ ἰμδῶ ζάποβεῖδα ἔλίκω μόζετῆ χρηνήτῆ** [= and after those he [the priest] will give him [the penitent] the penance as much as he is able to keep]” [8, f. 150v]. This instruction is lacking in the Ostroh Trebnyk.

The rubric and the instruction itself are based on the Nomokanon of pseudo-John the Faster, in particular on the Didascalia Patrum, repeating and rephrasing) certain ideas (even whole blocks of text) regarding the imposition of the penance.

The distinction between the rubric and the instruction should be noted. The imposing of the penance is determined by the penitent’s ability according to the rubric and by his wish according to the instruction. Only the Venetian Trebnyk of 1570 harmonizes the demands of both of them.

This distinction can be explained by the text of the Didascalia Patrum, where the same terminological duality is present. The confessor should ask the penitent “*по можшии храниши заповѣди* [= what kind of command are you able to keep?]” [25, f. 88v; cf. 27, p. 212]. Nevertheless, he should impose the penance according to the penitent’s wish [25, f. 88v–89r; cf. 27, p. 212 and 241–242]. Though there is a difference between terms, both texts present the idea that the penitent can choose one of two ways of fasting while he fulfills the penance.

According to the instruction in the Trebnyk, the minister, imposing the penance, should have a personal approach to the penitent and pay attention to his individual peculiarities, for instance his age and spiritual level. The heavy penance should be imposed upon one who committed a small number of sins but who takes care about his spiritual growth. Such an approach would help him to obtain not only the forgiveness of sins [cf. 25, f. 89r] but also a reward from the Lord for his efforts (“*вѣнѣцъ нечлѣннѣй* [= imperishable crown]” [8, f. 151; cf. 25, f. 89r])⁵¹.

The text of the instruction about the imposition of a penance (discussed above) also contains a short list of sins related to the abortion and contraception about which the confessor should interrogate penitents of both sexes. For the imposition of the penance, the minister should also consider the age of the penitent (under the age of thirty or over), the type of sin (according to nature or against it), the number of sins and the duration of the sinful state. The instruction points out that the gravest sin is unworthy receiving of Holy Communion. Therefore, the penitent should be questioned about such a case as well [cf. 25, f. 90v–91v]. The instruction concludes with guidelines regarding the fasting rules, based on the first way of the fasting regime of the Didascalia Patrum. Contrary to the Ustjug Kormčaja and in line with the Greek versions, they suggest three days of fasting (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) instead of two days (Wednesday and Friday) [cf. 25, f. 94r–94v]. The Stryatyn Trebnyk (as well as in the South Slavonic printed Trebnyks) has a stricter attitude to the fasting regime than the Didascalia Patrum. For instance, the Trebnyks (except the Venetian Trebnyk of 1570) prescribe that on the fasting days penitents should eat only once a day, and all Trebnyks allow only fish and no meat for religious feasts, while in the Didascalia Patrum there are no limitations on food on those days.

⁵¹ This recommendation about the imposition of a difficult penance on sinners, who committed a small number of sins, is not present in the Venetian Trebnyk of 1570. Nevertheless, it also emphasizes the personal approach to the confessant. The Trebnyk strongly recommends that confessors neither impose difficult penances on penitents nor refuse them (penitents) confession [35, f. 6r].

Unlike the South Slavonic Trebnyks⁵², the Rite of Confession in the Stryatyn Trebnyk concludes with two prayers of absolution and the final Dismissal (the second time)⁵³. The prayers are as follows “**Бѣ** прѡстѣвѣи на дѣлаи ѡ дѣла [= God, Who through Nathan forgave David]” [8, f. 153r]⁵⁴ which is preceded by the exclamation “Let us pray to the Lord,” and the prayer “**Блгоуѣробне Гї** блгїи ѡ члколнїемї [= Compassionate Lord, good and Lover of mankind]” [8, f. 153v]⁵⁵. The introductory rubric to the first prayer clearly indicates its purpose: “**Млтва** рѣзрѣшїти ѡсповѣдника глма ѡ рѣшїти [= The prayer to absolve the confessor said by the Spiritual [Father]]” [8, f. 152v]⁵⁶. The rubric before the second prayer repeats the same idea, viz. “**млтва**, рѣрѣгл подобла тоѡже [= the second prayer similar to that]” [8, f. 153v].

The first post-confessional prayer consists of two parts. The first, anamnetic, part contains a list of biblical characters who received forgiveness of sins through their repentance, in particular King David, Apostle Peter, the Whore, the Publican and the Prodigal Son. The minister also recalls the order of the Lord: “**ѡсповѣднїте** дрѡуѣ дрѡуѣ члрѣшїїа [= Confess to one another [your] transgressions]” [8, f. 153r]. Consequently, he asks God, who is always faithful to His promise, for forgiveness of all the sins of the community. The second part of the prayer affirms that Jesus Christ Himself will forgive the penitent everything he has confessed to the confessor before the Lord and the sinner will be saved on the day of His Judgment.

According to Arranz, this type of prayers was initially used by non-ordained monks to assure the sinner of God’s forgiveness of sins. This type of prayers is declarative, viz. prayers that declare the reception of forgiveness of sins for penitents, after their usage by an ordained confessor. [26, p. 70–75]. Like the post-confessional

⁵² The five concluding prayers in the South Slavonic Trebnyks are the following: the prayer for receiving of the Eucharist “May the most merciful Lord have mercy on you;” two prayers for absolution after the completing of the penance “O Omnipotent Eternal God” and “O Lord Almighty, Omnipotent Compassionate God” (different from the Stryatyn Trebnyk); the prayer without title “O Lord Jesus Christ, Almighty God;” and the prayer for Adelphopoiesis [brother-making] “O Lord, our God, Who has granted us everything for [our] salvation”.

⁵³ “**ѡпѡустѣ** [= the Dismissal]” [8, f. 154r].

⁵⁴ We find a similar prayer with slight differences in the Euchologium Slavonicum (the first post-confessional prayer) and in the Ostroh Trebnyk. According to the classification of Arranz the prayer belongs to the group “[K4]: formulae of desire (or declaration) for divine forgiveness said by the Spiritual [Father] (often not ordained),” in particular K4:3 [26, pp. 38; 93; 322–323; cf. 19, p., 216].

⁵⁵ This is another version of the prayer “Compassionate and merciful Lord, good Lover of mankind” in the Ostroh Trebnyk and the prayer “Compassionate good Lord, Lover of mankind” from the Euchologium Slavonicum with a different final doxology. A similar prayer to the “Compassionate Lord, good and Lover of mankind” with the same final doxology “**ѡко** млтнїк ѡ члколнїк **Бѣ** ѡи” [8, f. 154r] is classified by Arranz as the prayer belonging to the group [J] “Absolution from canonical bounds,” in particular [J1:1a] [26, pp. 381; 382–383; cf. 19, p., 217].

⁵⁶ This prayer is preceded by the priestly exclamation “**Гѡу** помолїтѣ [= Let us pray to the Lord]” [8, f. 152v].

prayer (with some differences), it is present in the Slavonic liturgical tradition, particularly in the Didascalia Patrum where it is the only prayer besides Psalms 50 and 69 [25, f. 86v–89r], in the Euchologium Slavonicum (the first post-confessional prayer) and in the Ostroh Trebnyk.

The anamnestic part of the second post-confessional prayer indicates that the Heavenly Father sent His Son into this world to dissolve the recorded debt of human sins and release His people from the bonds of sin and proclaim their liberation. Therefore, the priest also prays that God liberate the penitent from the bonds of sin and enable him always to come to Him “и съ дръзновѣніе ѿ ѿчѣтоу съвѣстїю просїти ѿ тебе бога тѣмъ мѣти [= and with daring and pure conscious asks Your great mercy]” [8, f. 153v–154r].

This is another version of the prayer “Compassionate and merciful Lord, good Lover of mankind” in the Ostroh Trebnyk [37, f. 25 [1v]] and “Compassionate good Lord, Lover of mankind” from the Euchologium Slavonicum [40, f. 47r] with its own final doxology, which is different from the other two Trebnyks⁵⁷. The second prayer is also lacking in the South Slavonic Trebnyks.

Conclusion

From what has been discussed so far, it follows that the Stryatyn Trebnyks of 1606 contains two well-structured penitential Rites. Both of them were to be performed in a church. The first Rite begins with a priestly exhortation (outside of a temple) “O my Child, who wants to be renewed by Honorable Repentance”. Then after entering the temple, the penitent makes three prostrations repeating after the confessor an acknowledgment of personal sinfulness and asking God’s mercy. Next, the priest begins by reciting the usual opening prayers, three Psalms (6, 31 and 50), penitential troparia and the prayer for himself “Compassionate and merciful God, You try the hearts and minds”. Then there are three prostrations of the penitent with the Publican’s prayer “God, be merciful to me a sinner”, his all-embracing acknowledgment of personal sinfulness with extended hands “I confess to you, Lord, God of heaven and earth, everything that are in the secrecy of my heart”, then the prayer “You who are, Eternal Master, Lord, who created man after Your image and likeness”, and the all-embracing monastic acknowledgment of sinfulness “Forgive me, Holy Father”. The Rite is concluded with the priestly prayer “Master, Master, the Author of all, the Savior of our souls”.

It seems that this Rite belongs to monastic practice and it was performed by a monk after his completion of an imposed penalty (which might last for a certain period of time) before the reception of the Holy Eucharist. Therefore, it might not be considered as the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance *per se*. Such a Rite or even a similar one is not found in any other liturgical documents.

⁵⁷ The similar prayer to the “Compassionate Lord, good and Lover of mankind” with same final glorification “ѿко мѣтївъ ѿ чѣкоуѣнїѣ бѣ ѿи” [8, 154r] is classified by Arranz as the prayer belonging to the group [J] “Absolution from canonical bounds,” in particular [J1:1a] [26, p. 381; 382–383; see also 19, p. 217].

Contrary to the first Rite, the second Rite is a clearly a sacramental Rite of Confession. It also begins with three the penitent's prostrations, acknowledgment of personal sinfulness and begging of God's mercy. After this the penitent puts his hand and head on the Holy Gospel which is placed on the analogion before the Altar. The priest also recites the usual opening prayers. Then follow the pre-confessional block of four Psalms (50, 4, 6 and 12) and three prayers ("O Lord, God of our salvation", "O Master, Lord our God, Who calls the righteous to holiness" and "O Lord, God our Savior, Who, through Your Prophet Nathan"). Next, the minister raises up the penitent and questions him about his sins. This confessional part also contains two instructions for interrogation of penitents, the priestly exhortation "Today, O child" and the all-embracing stereotypical formula of confession. Having completed his confession of sins, the penitent makes a prostration and the priest says the prayer "O Lord, our God, Who remitted the sins of Peter and the Whore through their tears". The Scripture readings, the litany, the Dismissal and the exhortation "O child, may it not be difficult for you to repent" follow. Then the confessor imposes a penance on the confessant. The Rite is completed with two prayers of absolution ("May God, Who through Nathan forgave David," "Compassionate Lord, good and Lover of mankind") and the Dismissal.

The indication given in the text of the Rite of the Sacrament of Repentance for the second and final Dismissal might be a reason to suggest that the Rite was considered as one entity from the penitent's entrance into the church till the final Dismissal. Thus, the Rite of Confession consists of four parts: pre-confessional prayers, the confession of sins, the imposition of penance with accompanying exhortations, instructions, prayers and readings, and finally, the absolution of sins. It appears that the penance to be undertaken was normally fulfilled after the Rite of Confession. The presence of the first Dismissal, mentioning the forty days' expulsion and long penances in the text might be remnants of the earlier penitential tradition, which was not in use anymore in that area. Consequently, the Stryatyn Trebnyk contains a more compact Rite of Confession in comparison to the South Slavonic Trebnyks. For instance, there are only two prayers for absolution in the Stryatyn Rite instead of five in the South Slavonic documents (the prayer for the receiving of the Eucharist, two or three prayers for the absolution after the completion of the penance and specifically South Slavonic prayer for Adelphopoiesis [brother-making]).

The second penitential Rite in the Stryatyn Trebnyks testifies to a strong South Slavonic influence. Nevertheless, it also contains elements of another approach based on the Kyivan liturgical tradition, including Scripture readings and the prayers of absolution [cf. 45, pp. 231–232].

1. Лукашова С. Геден // Православная Энциклопедия. 2005. № 10. С. 511–513.

2. Сковчиас І. Галицька (Львівська) єпархія XII–XVIII століть: організаційна структура та правовий статус. Львів: УКУ, 2010. XXIV+832 с.+16 с. кольор. іл.

3. Ісаєвич Я. Українське книговидання: Витоки, розвиток, проблеми. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2002. 515 с.

4. Стасенко В. Проблемні питання історії початку українського кириличного друкарства // Початки українського друкарства. Львів: Центр Європи, 2000. С. 63–184.
5. Крыжановский Е. Заботы объ исправленіи требника въ южно-русской митрополіи, до изданія Требника Петра Могилы // Собрание сочиненій. Киев: Кульженко С. В., 1890. С. 67–86.
6. Гильтебрандт П. Балабанъ Гедеоень (и его три книги: Служебникъ, Требникъ, Учительное Евангеліе) // Памятники полемиической литературы въ Западной Руси. Санкт-Петербург: Сенатская типография, 1903. С. 3–48. (Русская Историческая Библиотека; Т. 19; Кн. 3).
7. № 22. Ноябрь 1589 and 20 Июня 1590. Окружная грамота Константинопольскаго патріарха Іереміи Кіевскому митрополиту Михаилу, Литовско-Русскимъ епископамъ, духовенству и мірянамъ, о уничтоженіи обычаевъ приносить въ церковь мяса и пироги, для освященія въ праздники Рождества Христова и св. Пасхи, также святить день Пятницы вмѣсто дня воскресного, и Соборная грамота, о томъ же. // Акты относящіяся къ исторіи Западной Росіи собранные и изданные Археографическою Коммиссіею. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Эдуарда Праца, 1851. Т. 4. С. 29–31.
8. *Шлѣтъвѣнникъ или требникъ Пѣзъ Грѣчскаго ѧзыка на словѣнскій превѣдний ѧ ѧзѣмѣдованный. Стратин: Тодор Юрѣвич Балбан, 1606. 696 арк.*
9. Скочиляс І. Собори Львівської епархії XVI–XVIII століть. Львів: УКУ, 2006. VXLIV+462 с. (Собори Київської Церкви; 1).
10. Бондар Н., Кисельов Р. Кириличні стародруки 15–17 ст. у Національній бібліотеці України імені В. І. Вернадського: каталог. Київ: НБУВ, 2008. 232 с.
11. Каменева Т., Гусева А. Украинские книги кирилловской печати XVI–XVIII вв.: каталог изданий, хранящихся в Государственной библиотеке СССР им. В. И. Ленина. Москва: Государственная библиотека СССР им. В. И. Ленина, 1976. Т. 1: 1574 г. I половина XVII в. 447 с.
12. Лабынцев Ю. Славянская кирилловская печатная книжность XV – первой четверти XVII в. Москва: Государственная библиотека СССР им. В. И. Ленина, 1982. 64 с. (В помощь составителям сводного каталога старопечатных изданий кирилловского и глаголического шрифтов: методические рекомендации).
13. Максименко Ф. Кириличні стародруки українських друкарень, що зберігаються у львівських збірках (1574–1800): звезд. кат. Львів: Вища школа, 1975. 126 с.
14. Озерянская И. Требник 1606 г. в собрании Одесского историко-краеведческого музея // Вісник Одеського Історико-Краєзнавчого Музею. 2005. № 1. URL: <http://www.history.odessa.ua/publication1/stat05.htm>.
15. Петров С., Бирюк Я., Золотарь Т. Славянские книги кирилловской печати XV–XVIII вв.: описание книг, хранящихся в Государственной публичной библиотеке УССР. Киев: Академия Наук Украинской ССР, 1958. 263 с.
16. Свенціцький І. Каталогъ книгъ церковно-славянской печати. Жовква: Печатня оо. Василіан, 1908. 213 с.
17. Запаско Я., Ісаевич Я. Пам’ятки книжкового мистецтва: кат. стародруків, виданих на Україні. Львів: Вища школа, 1981. Кн. 1: (1574–1700). 136 с.
18. Алмазовъ А. Тайная исповѣдь въ Православной восточной Церкви: Опытъ внѣшней исторіи. Одесса: Типо-литография Штаба Одесскаго Военнаго Округа, 1894. Т. 3: Приложенія. IV+296+89+XVII+IV с. (Репринт. Москва: Паломник, 1995).
19. Kraienhorst H. B. Buss- und Beichtordnungen des griechischen Euchologions und des slawischen Trebniks in ihrer Entwicklung zwischen Osten und Westen. Wuerzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 2003. 586 p. (Das östliche Christentum. Neue Folge; Vol. 51).

20. Алмазовъ А. Тайная исповѣдь въ Православной восточной Церкви: Опытъ внѣшней исторіи. Одесса: Типо-литографія Штаба Одесскаго Военнаго Округа, 1894. Т. 2: Специальные уставы, отдѣльныя молитвословія и церковно-гражданскія постановленія, относящіяся къ исповѣди. IV+454 с. (Репринт. Москва: Паломник, 1995).

21. Nahtigal R. Euchologium Sinaiticum: Starocerkvenoslovanski Glagolski Spomenik Ljubljana: Učiteljska Tiskarna, 1942. Vol. 2: Tekst s komentarjem: S prilogo posnetka prvega lista odlomka Sinajskega služebnyka. LXXII+423 с.+2 ill.

22. Арранц М. Избранные сочинения по литургике. Рим; Москва: Папский Восточный Институт и Институт философии, теологии и истории св. Фомы, 2003. Т. 1: Таинства Византийскаго Евхология. 605 с.

23. Арранц М. Избранные сочинения по литургике. Рим; Москва: Папский Восточный Институт и Институт философии, теологии и истории св. Фомы, 2006. Т. 5: Введение в таинства Византийскаго традици. 567 с.

24. **ЄУХОЛОГІЄН ѿбо МОЛІТВОСЛОВЪ, ѿи ТРЕБНИКЪ. П' мѣлн ѿ Свѣтѣ Црковнаа рзлѣчнаа Послѣдованіа Іерѿмѣя подобанцаа. Єѿ стѣхъ ѿплѣ прѣжѣ, потѣомѣе ѿ стѣхъ ѿ Бѣгѣноснѣ ѿщѣа ѿ рзлѣчныхъ врѣменахъ преданнаа. Пнѣ же блвннѣи ѿ повелннѣ ѿ Іанѣ Превлѣ: ѿ Бѣгѣ: ѿ: Мл: Гнѣ: Єѿца Пѣтра Могаѣлѣ Мнѣ рополѣмѣ Кѣвскаа, П прѣд. Киѣв: Друкарня Печерської Лаври, 1646. 1529 с.**

25. [Didascalia Patrum чи Вчення Отців] / Устюжській кормчій. – кінець XIII–початок XIV ст. // Російська державна бібліотека. Ф. 256 № 230. Арк. 85v–95v.

26. Арранц М. Избранные сочинения по литургике. Рим; Москва: Папский Восточный Институт и Институт философии, теологии и истории св. Фомы, 2003. Т. 2: Таинства Византийскаго Традици. 670 с.

27. Van de Paverd F. The Kanonarium by John, Monk and Deacon, and Didascalia Patrum. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2006. 317 p. (Kanonika; Vol. 12).

28. Попелястий В. Номоканон Івана Посника у його слов'янській редакції // У пошуках джерел катедрального та монашого богослужіння. Львів: УКУ, 2018. С. 158–164. (Ad Fontes Liturgicos; Т. 8).

29. [Молитвеник або требник]. Цетинь: Друкарня Джураджа Черноєвича, 1495. 312 арк.

30. Немировский Е. Славянские издания кирилловскаго (церковнославянскаго) шрифта 1491–2000: Инвентарь сохранившихся экземпляров и указатель литературы. Москва: Знак, 2009. Т. 1: 1491–1550. 582 с.

31. [Молитвеник або требник]. Горажде: Друкарня Божицара Любавича, 1523. 296 арк.

32. Молиітвѣ-никъ. Венеція: Друкарня Божицара Вуковича, близько 1540. 280 арк.

33. [Молиітвѣ-никъ]. Тирговіште: Друкарня Дмитрія Любавича, 1545. 289 арк.

34. [Молитвеник або требник]. Мілешево: Монастирська друкарня, 1546. 364 арк.

35. Молиітвѣ-никъ. Венеція: Друкарня Єроліма Загуровича, 1570. 282 арк.

36. Попелястий В. Таїнство Покаяння в традиції південно-слов'янських друкованих требників XVI століття // Наукові записки Українського католицького університету. Львів: УКУ, 2020. (Богослов'я; Вип. 7) (in press).

37. **Молиітвѣ-никъ ѿ мѣлн вѣсѣѣ црковнаа послѣдованіа. ѿ стѣхъ ѿплѣ прѣжѣ. потѣомѣе ѿ стѣхъ ѿ бѣгѣноснѣ ѿщѣа, вѣ рзлѣчныхъ врѣменахъ преданнаа** Острог: Острозька друкарня. 1606. 191 арк.

38. Арранц М. Избранные сочинения по литургике. Рим; Москва: Папский Восточный Институт и Институт философии, теологии и истории св. Фомы, 2003. Т. 3: Евхология Константинополя в начале XI века и Песенное последование по требнику митрополита Киприана. 674 с.

39. Евхологий Барберини гр. 336: Издание, предисловие и примечания Е. Велковской, С. Паренти. Омск: Голованов, 2011. 508 с.

40. Словянський евхологійон (Euchologium Slavonicum). – XV–XVI ст. – Borgio-Iliricum 15.

41. Сабат П. Важливий рукопис для дослідження святительських богослужень Київської Церкви XV–XVI ст. // Богословія. 2010. № 71. С. 43–56.

42. Сабат П. Унікальність рукописного Київського требника (XV – поч. XVI ст.) Апостольської ватиканської бібліотеки з фонду Борджіо-ілліріко № 15 для історії рукописної спадщини Київської Русі // Українське релігієзнавство. 2011. № 59. С. 44–54.

43. Сабат П. Требник митрополита Київського Ісидора (1433–1458) – живе джерело пізнання літургійного життя Київської Церкви // У пошуках джерел катедрального та монашого богослужіння. Львів: УКУ, 2018. С. 114–137. (Ad Fontes Liturgicos; Т. 8).

44. Ваврик М. Цінний пам'ятник обрядовості Київської митрополії XV–XVI ст. // Записки ЧСВВ (10). Рим: оо. Василіани, 1963. С. 391–460. (MS Cardinalis Isidori (1463–1963)).

45. Алмазовъ А. Тайная исповѣдь въ Православной восточной Церкви: Опытъ внѣшней исторіи. Одесса: Типо-литографія Штаба Одесскаго Военнаго Округа, 1894. Т. 1: Общий устав совершения исповеди. 596+IV с. (Репринт. Москва: Паломник, 1995).

SUMMARY

Попелястий Василь

Літургійні покайні обряди у Стратинському требнику 1606 р.

Фокусом статті є дослідження історичних та богословських особливостей Київського християнства після укладення Берестейської Унії у 1596 р. на основі свідчень тогочасних літургійних джерел. Основною метою праці є дослідження та аналіз літургійного обряду Таїнства Покаяння у перших “українських” друкованих требниках, зокрема у Стратинському требникові 1606 р., в котрому містяться два літургійні покайні обряди. Тексти цих покайних обрядів було ретельно вивчено та проаналізовано у порівнянні з іншими літургійними джерелами, як рукописними, так і друкованими. Серед проаналізованих слов'янських рукописних джерел слід зокрема зауважити наступні: Синайський евхологійон (Euchologium Sinaiticum) (глаголичний рукопис XI століття) та Слов'янський евхологійон (Euchologium Slavonicum, Borg. ill. 15), створений у XV–XVI ст. для вжитку Київських Митрополитів. Серед друкованих джерел до уваги брались требники видані у Горажде 1523 р., Тирговіште 1545 р., Мілешеві 1546 р., та два венеційські видання бл. 1540 та 1570 рр., а також требник, виданий в Острозі 1606 р. Як наслідок, було вивчено та представлено вплив південно-слов'янських требників XVI ст. на обряд Таїнства Покаяння у Стратинському требнику. Також досліджено як власні унікальні елементи, так і фрагменти, основані на “Номоканоні” псевдо-Івана Посника, зокрема у його частині відомій під назвою “Didascalia Patrum чи Вчення Отців”. Слід зауважити, що “Номоканон” псевдо-Івана Посника є найдавнішим Візантійським пенітенціалом, який мав також значний вплив і на слов'ян. Найдавніший його переклад слов'янською мовою, поміщений в “Устюжській кормчій” (XIII (?) – початку XIV ст.).

Ключові слова: требник, Стратинський требник, літургійний обряд, сповідь, покайня, покута