

<https://doi.org/10.28925/2311-2425.2022.1897>

UDC 81'255:27-282-528.1/.8

TITLES OF LITURGICAL BOOKS AS THE PROBLEM OF CORRESPONDENCE IN RELIGIOUS TRANSLATION¹

Taras Shmiher

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

taras.shmiher@lnu.edu.ua

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4713-2882



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

The paper is aimed at presenting convergent and divergent features encoded in the titles of liturgical books of Eastern and Western Christianity. Titles of liturgical books seen as translation objects have revealed extremely vibrant and dynamic essence of some religious terms. All the conditions of the historical development and liturgical praxis put a translator in a very difficult position when a historical context plays a decisive role in interpreting the text and historical truth. The typical translator usually hesitates between choosing the domesticating or foreignising strategy. In the case of liturgical books, their option can cause wrong associations connected with the change of a target denomination. This is why the comparative table of books used during liturgies in the Roman and Byzantine Rites will be helpful for translators to understand the liturgical praxis of another denomination. The table was compiled and checked on the basis of the very liturgical books in original editions and in translations into English, Ukrainian, and Polish as well as on the basis of theological encyclopaedias and instructive sources. This correspondence is relevant not only for intercultural communication where a single denomination dominates over a nation's whole culture but also for interdenominational interpretation when in the same national community, readership is denominationally diverse and can generate the superficial interpretation of celebrants' and believers' liturgical practices.

Keywords: *liturgical books, religious translation, Roman Rite, Byzantine Rite*

Шмігер Т. Заголовки літургійних книг як проблема відповідності у релігійному перекладі

Стаття представляє збіжні й розбіжні ознаки, заcodedані у назвах богослужбових книг східного та західного християнства. Назви богослужбових книг, які розглядаються як предмет перекладу, розкрили надзвичайно яскраву та динамічну сутність деяких релігійних термінів. Усі умови історичного розвитку й

¹This publication is part of the project which was made possible through Scholarship Grant No. 52110864 from the International Visegrad Fund.

літургійної практики ставлять перекладача в дуже скрутне становище, коли історичний контекст відіграє вирішальну роль у тлумаченні тексту та історичної правди. Типовий перекладач зазвичай вагається між вибором стратегії одомашнення чи очуження. У випадку з богослужбовими книгами його вибір може викликати неправильні асоціації, пов'язані зі зміною цільової конфесії. Ось чому порівняльна таблиця книг, які використовуються під час літургій у римському та візантійському обрядах, буде корисною для перекладачів, щоб зрозуміти літургійну практику іншої конфесії. Таблицю складено та перевірено на основі самих богослужбових книг в оригінальних виданнях і в перекладах англійською, українською та польською мовами, а також на основі богословських енциклопедій та інструктивних джерел. Така відповідність актуальна не лише для міжкультурної комунікації, де одна конфесія домінує над усією культурою нації, а й для міжконфесійної інтерпретації, коли в одній національній спільноті читацька аудиторія є конфесійно різноманітною і може генерувати поверхневе тлумачення літургійних практик кліру і вірників.

***Ключові слова:** літургійні книги, релігійний переклад, римський обряд, візантійський обряд.*

Introduction

Everyone has heard an insightful observation that different words for the same concept in different languages actually mean different things: ‘butter’, ‘die Butter’, ‘le beurre’, ‘масло’, ‘masło’ were to denote the same everyday thing – butter, but in different cultures, even butter differs. So, different words for “butter” mean different things which exist only in specific cultures. The same is true in domain of denominational translations. In various denominations, bread used for the Holy Communion is different substance whose recipe is dogmatically and accurately described and strictly followed. One of the deepest controversies between the Orthodox and the Catholics is if it is acceptable to use unleavened bread.

Names of liturgical books belong to the translator’s false friends when the essence of these books look identical in different denominations, but there are so many tricky structural and dogmatic discrepancies that translators opt for transliterating their names, adding a lot of obscure words to the lexical stock of a language whose speakers do not practice a source-text denomination and do not understand their intricacies clearly. The aim of this paper is to analyse if it is potential to apply the general titles of liturgical books of the target religious culture or denomination for those from the source culture and denomination. This problem is relevant not only for intercultural communication where single denomination dominates over a nation’s whole culture but also for interdenominational interpretation when in the same national community, readership is

denominationally diverse and can generate the superficial interpretation of celebrants' and believers' liturgical practices.

Theoretical background

The main analytical tool is the informational analysis of the contents of liturgical books (Byzantine Daily Worship, 1969; Graduale triplex, 1979; Mszałrzymski, 1986; Liturgia godzin, 1982-1988; Divine Office, 2014; Molytvoslov, 2015), encyclopaedic entries (The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913–1914; Encyclopedia of Ukraine, 1985-2001; Encyklopedia katolicka, 1995-2014; Pravoslavna entsiklopediya, 2000; New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2003) and theological and instructive sources (Agenda, 1981; Harper, 1991; Тупык, 1992) in order to summarize the criteria and features of liturgical books types under various titles and in two main Christian denominations – Roman and Byzantine Rites.

According to one denomination and lingual culture, liturgical texts and books can be divided into four groups: lectionary, euchographic, hymnographic and homiletic (Pentkovskii, 2016; Puriaieva, 2018). It makes sense to verify if this division is still valid if two denominations are compared. The application of Catholic data can explain the later emergence of Protestant liturgical books.

The material of the study unites three languages – English, Ukrainian and Polish which can also show immediately what is the dominant strategy for translating titles into other languages: domestication or foreignization.

Results and Discussion

The sum of theoretical judgements, encyclopaedic taxonomies and existing translations has prepared the grounding for establishing the comparative and approximate correspondence of liturgical books in Orthodox and Catholic liturgical practices:

Table 1. Books Used during Liturgies in the Roman and Byzantine Rites

Roman Rite	Byzantine Rite
Lectionary texts	
Evangeliary / Gospel Book <i>Ukr.</i> Євангеліярій / Євангелістарій <i>Pol.</i> Ewangeliarz / Ewangelistarz	Gospel Lectionary / Evangelion <i>Ukr.</i> Богослужбове Євангеліє / <i>Pol.</i> Ewangeliarz

<p>Lectionary <i>Ukr.</i> Лекціонарій <i>Pol.</i> Lekcjonarz</p>	<p>Epistle Lectionary / Epistle Book <i>Ukr.</i> Апостол <i>Pol.</i> Apostoł</p> <p>Prophetologion <i>Ukr.</i> Паремійник <i>Pol.</i> Paremijnik</p>
<p>Psalter <i>Ukr.</i> Молитовний Псалтир <i>Pol.</i> Psalterz</p>	<p>Psalter <i>Ukr.</i> Молитовний Псалтир <i>Pol.</i> Psalterz</p>
Euchographic texts	
<p>Roman Missal <i>Ukr.</i> Римський Месал <i>Pol.</i> Mszałrzymski</p>	<p>Liturgicon <i>Ukr.</i> Літургікон / Служебник <i>Pol.</i> Służebnik</p>
<p>Pontifical <i>Ukr.</i> Понтифікал <i>Pol.</i> Pontyfikał</p>	<p>Archieratikon / Book of Pontifical Services <i>Ukr.</i> Архиратикон / Святительський служебник / Правильник <i>Pol.</i> Archijeratikon / Służebnik archierejskij</p>
<p>Ritual <i>Ukr.</i> Ритуал <i>Pol.</i> Rytuwał</p>	<p>Euchologion / Book of Needs <i>Ukr.</i> Требник <i>Pol.</i> Euchologion / Trebник</p>
<p>Prayer-Book <i>Ukr.</i> Молитовник / Молитвослов <i>Pol.</i> Modlitewnik</p>	<p>Prayer-Book <i>Ukr.</i> Молитовник / Молитвослов <i>Pol.</i> Modlitewnik</p>
<p>Breviary / Liturgy of the Hours / Divine Office <i>Ukr.</i> Бreviарій / Літургія годин <i>Pol.</i> Brewiarz / Liturgia godzin</p>	<p>Horologion / Canonical Hours <i>Ukr.</i> Часослов / Часловець <i>Pol.</i> Horologion</p>
Hymnographic texts	
	<p>Oktoechos <i>Ukr.</i> Октоїх <i>Pol.</i> Oktoechos / Oktoich</p> <p>Lenten Triodion</p>

<p>Gradual <i>Ukr.</i> Градуал <i>Pol.</i> Graduał</p>	<p><i>Ukr.</i> Посто́ваТріо́дь / Трипі́снецъ <i>Pol.</i> Triodionpostny</p> <p>Pentecostarion / Festal Triodion <i>Ukr.</i> Цві́тнаТріо́дь / Кві́тнаТріо́дь <i>Pol.</i> Triodion paschalny</p> <p>Menaion (pl. Menaia) <i>Ukr.</i> Мі́нея <i>Pol.</i> Minieja</p> <p>Hirmologion <i>Ukr.</i> Ірмо́логіон <i>Pol.</i> Hirmologion</p>
Homiletic texts	
<p>Martyrology <i>Ukr.</i> Мартиро́лог <i>Pol.</i> Martyrologium</p>	<p>Synaxarion / Synexarion <i>Ukr.</i> Синакса́р <i>Pol.</i> Synaksarion / Synaksariusz</p> <p>Homiliary Gospel <i>Ukr.</i> Учи́тельне Єванге́ліє <i>Pol.</i> Ewangelia uczytelna</p>

The matter of titling books is still more complicated in the historical perspective: the book with the same title had different contents in different historical periods. This refers first of all the very Liturgy and various euchographic and hymnographic collections. Liturgical reforms connected with changes of the order of the office and variable hymns in the Liturgy (the introduction of the Stoudite and Jerusalem typikons in the Eastern Church and the Trent and Second Vatican Councils in the Western Church). Thus, the very title signifies various essence, which is typically noted by liturgy historians, but remains absolutely unacknowledged by laics.

The first group of books used during the Liturgy is the very corpus of the Holy Scriptures. During the Liturgy, the celebrants recite the Gospels, the Epistles and the Psalms as well as the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The biblical texts are divided in separate pericopes recited during the whole liturgical year. The Roman Church gradually came to using one book containing all the extracted biblical texts used during the Liturgy: the Lectionary. The Orthodox Church keeps using the Gospel Lectionary, the Epistle Lectionary and the Prophetologion

separately as published books. In the historical perspective, the Psalters contained the Book of Psalms plus a number of votive prayers. This type of praying books was extremely popular. In Western cultures, it was used for learning how to read (in the Ukrainian tradition, this function is often associated with the Horologion); in Orthodox cultures, it was also read during funeral vigils. From the viewpoint of translation, the use of the specific titles of the book will directly indicate the denominational division which reflects the history of adjusting and facilitating liturgical praxis. No informational discrepancies (excluding the non-coincidence of some pericopes) exist between the biblical texts used both in Western and Eastern Christianity. What can be different is the basis of the translated Bibles. Various smaller denominations can accept a certain translation of the Bible as *textusreceptus*, and their liturgical books will contain the lexical stock of the very translation.

The second group of books is euchographic. Their main aim focuses on praying and requesting the Lord's blessing during the regular worshipping (the liturgies of the daily and yearly cycles) or special offices (like sacraments and blessings). The centre of liturgical life is the very Liturgy which had a long history as well as a wide geography. In the first millennium, the number of rites was much larger that cannot fit today's understanding of the Catholic-Orthodox division, and the very Liturgy has never been a stable millennia-long text. By the end of the first millennium AD, Orthodox liturgies had been shaped more or less as we know them know, and the Roman rite had dominated over others in the Roman Church. Nevertheless, the work of adjusting and amending the texts of the Liturgy has never stopped either in Eastern or Western Christianity. In the Roman Church, the major revisions were made as the aftermath of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) and the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Thus, the Roman liturgical tradition was last codified in 1970 with revisions in 1975 and 2002. The previously codified edition was approved in 1570 and last published in 1962, and as it was never cancelled officially, two Masses and two Missals ('Tridentine' and 'Vatican II') coexist formally, but not in the same extent. Two main forms of the Mass are the High Mass (solemn) and the Low Mass (regular). The Byzantine liturgy exists in four forms: the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom (the most commonly used on Sundays and weekdays), the Divine Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great (10 times a year), the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (on Wednesdays and Fridays during the Great Lent and on the first days of the week preceding Easter) and the Divine Liturgy of the Holy Apostle James (once a year, on his feast day).

All these texts constitute the Liturgicon, i.e. the book of these liturgies in the Byzantine liturgical praxis. A liturgicon can be called a missal, and this explanation is rather popular among Anglophone speakers, as the both books do celebrate the Eucharist.

Knowing the main informational discrepancies between these books of two rites but one function, we have also to note translation practices of domestication in Slavonic liturgical traditions. While the Greek original term is usually naturalized on the basis of the key Slavonic-root term (thus, the liturgy name “Служба Божя” determined the title “Служебник”), Anglophone translators mostly prefer original Greek title, even when the translations are not from Greek but from Church Slavonic or any other Slavonic language. This policy helps to preserve the historical memory of the ecclesiological tradition and to partially prevent non-Byzantine Anglophone believers from imposing Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian views on something which is not universal, but belongs to historical geography.

Liturgical offices are divided into two groups: those performed by a priest (baptism, wedding, funeral etc.) and those only performed by a bishop (like the consecration of holy chrism and the sacraments of holy orders). Earlier, the first group was published in the Roman Ritual or the Byzantine Euchologion; the second group, in the Roman Pontifical or the Byzantine Archieratikon. After the Second Vatican Council, the Pontifical and the Ritual exist like series: the offices are published as separate books. Thus, the real Byzantine book Archieratikon does not have a direct corresponding book in the Roman Rite. Another interesting issue is if it is possible apply the term “Pontifical” to the Byzantine offices. One case is dated back to 1716 when the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic monastery in Suprasl published “Понтифікалсиєст Служебник святителскій” containing the bishop’s offices of the Eastern Church (Pontyfikal, 1716). The English language, however, allows the usage of ‘pontifical’ as the that of a bishop but without the reference to the Roman papacy (OED, 1989:12, 97). Besides, one should remember that the title of the primate of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and All Africa is “Pope and Patriarch”.

The Prayer-Book is the easiest correspondent in all traditions: it collects prayers according to the dogmas of a certain denomination. Occasionally, the term “МОЛИТВОСЛОВ” is applied to prayer-books, and it may mean that it also includes some litanies and offices. Large and thick prayer-books can also contain the Divine

Liturgy of St John Chrysostom and the Office for the Dead, so the practical difference between “*молитовник*” and “*молитвослов*” is removed.

More genre stir is faced in breviaries. The Breviary itself signifies the collection of prayers and hymns. This is why the boundary between euchographic and hymnographic texts is blurred, and blurred is it between the very liturgical books from the viewpoint of their historical development and publishing practices.

In Byzantine monasticism (which influenced the liturgical life of parishes), the daily and yearly cycles of prayers and hymns are gathered in several books which are even more used by precentors and singers than laics: 1) the Horologion consists of the prayers used in daily church services and refers to changing liturgical hymns or chants (troparia, kontakia) according to the daily liturgical cycle; 2) the Octoechos contains hymns for matins, vespers, and the Divine Liturgy according to the weekly liturgical cycle (each week in the liturgical cycle has a specific tone or mode, i.e. a specific troparion, kontakion and other hymns; all in all, eight tones alternate throughout the year); 3) the Menaion consists of the special prayers and hymns for the fixed church holidays, i.e. according to the yearly liturgical cycle; 4) the Triodion contains three-ode canons sung on ten Sundays before Easter and on all the other days of Lent and the Easter period. The actual number of books is even larger. The hymns of the Triodion were divided into those for the period before Easter (the Lenten Triodion) and those for Eastertide (the Pentecostarion or Festal Triodion). Similarly, the Menaion is a very bulky collection which may exist in different editions: the Monthly Menaion comprises 12 volumes encompassing the services for each month; the Menaion of Holy Days is abridged and contains services for major holidays; the General Menaion covers services honouring particular groups of saints and beati as well as for particular holidays. The both divisions are well-accepted in the canonical praxis of Orthodox Churches. Beyond this praxis, there are a number of different titles and books covering the same hymns. Simultaneously, one title deviated from the original hymnographic function: the Menaion for Daily Reading (Ukr. “*мінея-четья*”) already belongs to hagiography and corresponds to the Roman Martyrology.

In the Roman Rite, the number of hymns is colossal as well, counting all antiphones, responsories, propers, graduals and other chants. After the radical reform of the Second Vatican Council, they were reshuffled and included into newly-structured matrix of the liturgical year. The book which gathered all these chants is entitled the Liturgy of Hours (or the Canonical Hours) instead of the

former official title “Breviary”. The difference between two titles lies in the selection and structure of the hymnal corpus. Another specific feature of this book – like Byzantine hymnographic books – is that it is oriented mainly at celebrants, precentors and monastics (for the laity as well, but not especially). Thus, this book is both euchographic and hymnographic, too.

Purely hymnographic is the Gradual which united all former hymnals (antiphonaries / antiphonals, responsorials, kyriales and other hymnaries). It used to denote the most important plain-song chant sung by the choir at the Mass, but now it contains all the texts and the music. The direct correspondent in the Orthodox tradition is the Hirmologion which contains all the hymns and prayers that are to be sung as well as musical notations to them. In the Ukrainian Church, the paraliturgical hymnal with texts and notes for popular religious singing was sometimes called the “Bohohlasnyk” in honour of its first edition in 1790 (Bohohlasnyk, 1790).

Homiletic texts are habitually grouped as a special genre within liturgical literature. In the Ukrainian Church, homiliary gospels propagated the knowledge of the Scriptures via the vernacular that boosted the nation-shaping abilities and ambitions of the stateless people. Yet, the basic book for homilies in both Rites is the collection of didactic parts from the lives and works of saints. After the 1054 Schism, the divergence between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches has gone a drastic way, though the pre-1054 Christian heritage is remembered and venerated in the liturgical books of both Rites with equal respect.

One more similarity between the two Rites is the necessity of liturgical handbooks, which could help to make order with the daily and yearly cycles of liturgical worshiping. This instructive genre, also containing and explaining the usage of the above-mentioned liturgical texts, can be regarded as a separate one. However, it is manifested only in a single book: the Typikon for the Orthodox and the Agenda for the Catholics.

Conclusions

Titles of liturgical books seen as translation objects have revealed extremely vibrant and dynamic essence of some religious terms. All the conditions of the historical development and liturgical praxis put a translator in a very difficult position when a historical context plays a decisive role in interpreting the text and historical truth. A book of the same title has a different content which depends on

the historical period, like the Gradual before and after the Second Vatican Council. Or, the Psalter denotes a different set of prayers and offices in various manuscripts and even printed editions.

The frequent changes in liturgical texts mean that these texts are alive, and today's readership can interpret them correctly. So, the translator does not work with a time-distant ancient text, but with the text representing the reality of the last century at least. Changes in liturgical texts were introduced periodically both in the Roman and Byzantine Rites, but the Roman reforms are better known because of their systematic nature and large scale. This conclusion is more important for authors writing historical novels: we easily overlap our contemporary views and visions on millennium-old phenomena whose core was the same, but a huge number of details have changed.

The Roman Church witnessed two major reforming borderlines: the Council of Trent and the Second Vatican Council. The Kyivan Church saw reforms as well, like those ones connected with the changes of the Rites of Order and the activities of Metropolitan Cyprian Tsamblak and Metropolitan Petro Mohyla. In reality, adjustment never stops, but liturgical life is tightly connected with spiritually intimate life which impact on religious poetry. This may cause trouble for interpreting allusions as the translator should refer to the liturgical text which was valid in a specific period.

The aftermath of liturgical reform also influences the perception of the texts' languages like Latin and Church Slavonic. Although it gives an additional argument to consider them 'living languages' and 'ours', the semantic space of these languages can never reflect today's reality. This is a false approach to see those languages via today's mentality. The systems of these languages are distorted. Thus, translations into vernacular languages which the 20th century is abundant with are a very reliable bridge to really understanding and sensing the essence of Christian dogmas.

The question is how to resolve the problem of denominational perception. It does not look that it is generally possible. Seeing the above table, a believer of one Rite can feel how different the other Rite is and how little we know about it. The usage of Latin and Greek terms is helpful as it creates the border of foreignization, and the believer do not involve their own associations. The purely denominational difference is between the Agenda and the Typikon: sharing the same instructive function with the application of liturgical texts, the books are translated in the way known because of their historically denominational nature. However, our reality

knows an immense diversity of Christian denominations, and it will be always misleading to use the similar term and too complicated to adopt a new term each time.

One more conclusion is drawn for the taxonomy of liturgical books and their genres. Nowadays (contrary to the pre-20th-century time), it is efficient to group liturgical texts, but not liturgical books. The Liturgy of Hours is typically a four-volume edition because this single book is to embrace everything and make believers' life easier. This is why this grouping can evoke extra obstacle to helping a layperson interpret its essence and functionality correctly.

REFERENCES

1. *Agenda liturgiczna Diecezji Opolskiej: nabożeństwa, poświecenia i błogosławieństwa (1981)*, oprac. zbior. Diecezjalnej Komisji Liturgicznej (H. J. Sobeczko, red.), Opole: Wyd-wo Św. Krzyża.
2. *Byzantine Daily Worship: With Byzantine Breviary, the Three Liturgies, Propers of the Day and Various Offices (1969)* (Most Rev. Joseph Raya and José De Vinck, comp. and Trans.), Melkite Greek-Catholic Church, Allendale, N.J.: Alleluia Press.
3. *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, (Vols. 1-15. and Index). (1913–1914). (Ch. G. Herbermann et al., Eds.). Special Edition under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus Catholic Truth Committee. New York: The Encyclopedia Press.
4. *Divine Office of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite: Horologion – Octoechos– Triodion – Menaion*. (2014). Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church. Stamford, CT.
5. *Encyklopedia katolicka: w 20 t.* (1995-2014), Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Lublin.
6. *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (Vols. 1-5, Map and Gazetteer, Index and Errata). (1985-2001). The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian studies, The Shevchenko Scientific Society (Sarcelles, France), The Canadian Foundation for Ukrainian studies. Toronto: University of Toronto press.
7. *Graduale triplex*. (1979). Solesmes: Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Solesmes.
8. Harper J. (1991). *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: a Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
9. *Liturgia godzin: codzienna modlitwa Ludu Bożego* (w 4 t.) (1982-1988). Poznań: Pallottinum.
10. *Mszal rzymski dla diecezji polskich* (1986). Poznań: Pallottinum.
11. *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (Vols. 1-15). (2003). The Catholic University of America (2nd ed.). Detroit et al.: Gale. Thompson Learning.
12. *The Oxford English Dictionary*: (Vols. 1-20). (1989). (2nd ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
13. *Bohohlasnyk*. (1790). Pochayiv: Drukarnia Uspenskoho monastyria. (in Ukrainian)
14. *Molytvoslov: Chasoslov – Octoyih – Triod – Mineya*. (2015). Zhovkva: Misioner. (in Ukrainian)

15. Pentkovskii, A.M. (2016). Slavianskoe bogoslužhenie vizantiyskogo obriada i korpus slavianskykh bogoslužhebnykh knig v kontse IX – pervoy polovine X vekov. *Slověne*, 2, 54–120. (in Russian)

16. *Pontyfikal si est sluzhebnyk sviatitelskii so derzhashch v sebe pochinu Sviatyia Vostochnyia tserkvi Liturgiyu sviatitelskuyu, osviashchenie antimissovs mira sviatogo, postanovleniye v vsiachiny eireysjiya i prochaya.* (1716). Suprasl: Druk. Blagovishch. monastyria. (in Old Church Slavic)

17. Puriaieva N. (2018). Ukrainska mova v liturhiinii praktytsi ukrainskykh tserkov. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk. Serii: Filolohiia*, 42, 128–146. (in Ukrainian.)

18. *Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediya.* (2000). Moskva: tserk.-nauch. tsentr “Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediya”. (in Russian)

19. *Турок Української Католицької Церкви.* (1992). (per. z tserkovnoslov. / ukl. o. Isydor Dolnytskyi). Rym: Vyd-vo. Vasyliian. (in Ukrainian)

Дата надходження статті до редакції: 16.01.2022.

Прийнято до друку: 30.01.2022