TARAS SHMIHER

LITURGICAL TRANSLATION IN UKRAINE AND POLAND:

A COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO TEXT, RELIGION AND CULTURE

НАУКОВЕ ТОВАРИСТВО
ІМ. ШЕВЧЕНКА

СЕРІЯ:
НАЦІОНАЛЬНА ПАМ'ЯТЬ
У ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВІ

ВИПУСК 4

ТАРАС ШМІГЕР

ЛІТУРГІЙНИЙ ПЕРЕКЛАД УКРАЇНИ ТА ПОЛЬЩІ: КОМПАРАТИВНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО ТЕКСТУ, РЕЛІГІЇ ТА КУЛЬТУРИ

TARAS SHMIHER

LITURGICAL TRANSLATION
IN UKRAINE AND POLAND:
A COMPARATIVE APPROACH
TO TEXT, RELIGION AND CULTURE

Lviv — 2024

Reviewers:
Prof. **Oleksandr Cherednychenko**
Prof. Archbishop **Ihor Isichenko**
Prof. **Magdalena Mitura**
Rev. Dr. hab. **Marek Blaza**

Шмігер Тарас

Ш 73   Літургійний переклад України та Польщі: компаративний підхід до тексту, релігії та культури / Тарас Шмігер. = Shmiher Taras. Liturgical translation in Ukraine and Poland: a comparative approach to text, religion and culture / Taras Shmiher. – Львів : ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2024. – 308 с.

ISBN 978-617-10-0851-9

The study lies at the intersection of translation studies, cultural history and theology and focuses on a comparative exploration of the liturgical translation of Ukraine and Poland through the prism of theoretical postulates, historical facts and textual criticism. The three sections of the book, which describe issues of theory, history and criticism of liturgical translation through the Ukrainian and Polish cultural contexts, create a well-balanced systematicity of this research.

Dedicated to Ukrainian Warriors
who helped the Ukrainian Sun to rise:
Their paid price is enormous;
the enemy's crimes are unpardonable.

Where are you now, oh torturers of nations?
Where is your Majesty; your power — where's it gone?
You will no longer have the quiet, sacred places
To lay unholy waste upon.

My nation is! My nation lives eternally!
And no one will destroy my nation's life!
It constantly grows young internally,
Its soul with tenderness and fury rife.

Vasyl Symonenko
translated by Andriy Chyrovskyi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Liturgical translation has received much less attention than biblical translation. Its origin defined this status: liturgical texts are mainly secondary to biblical prototexts, their phrasing and symbols. Although liturgical books have been revered with great piety, their presence and visibility in national cultures have been influenced by ecclesiastical rules on the use of languages, the dynamics of book writing and printing, and the challenges of nation-shaping and state-building. The progress made in considering religious translation as a specific field of translation studies has stimulated the extension of this field to include liturgical texts. In general, it is helpful to divide religious translation into three branches: biblical translation (or the translation of sacred texts of the highest authority, given the large amount of existing literature), liturgical translation (covering the linguistic, cultural and social issues of poetics and reception), and catechetical translation (sharing many theoretical issues with sci-tech translation). Liturgical literature is sometimes understood broadly: from the material of the Liturgy to catechism and religious instruction, i.e. prayers, the canon of the Mass, offices and so on [Brückner 1904:89]. However, this book focuses more specifically on euchographic and hymnographic texts, i.e. prayers and hymns, which can act with the same emotional and evangelising power. The cultural experience of this type of translation is illustrated by the ecclesiastical history of Ukraine and Poland, which are neighbouring countries but borderlands for Eastern and Western Christianity. In this book, we will confine ourselves to Orthodox and Catholic areas, even though the Protestant liturgical heritage is also fascinating from the viewpoint of genre, since, in some Protestant texts, it is even more challenging to draw the line between prayer and religious poetry.

The structure of the book mirrors the most obvious division of translation studies into theory, history and criticism. The first part deals with theoretical principles and ideas that are fundamental to liturgical translation and essential to the comparative study of liturgical traditions. It opens with the general idea of comparison in research and the ways in which it can be used to explore specific dimensions of religious histories and texts from the perspective of translation. The theoretical parameters for assessing a liturgical text are derived from the possibility of identifying the components of equivalence, understanding pitfalls of the status of languages, and appreciating the appropriation of paratextual features in liturgical practice. The chapter on the titles of liturgical books clarifies how the titles themselves can contribute to an understanding of liturgical translation and how they should be translated in today's publishing industry.

The second section offers insights into the cultural, literary and ecclesiastical history of Ukraine and Poland. Covering the period of a millennium, the study shows how different periods shaped different attitudes to and reception of liturgical texts and their role. Language was a crucial factor in the Middle Ages: the comprehensible Church Slavonic language stimulated the rise of Early Ukrainian literature, while Latin had no similar effect on Early Polish literature. Conversely, the advance of printing in the Catholic world had a positive effect on Polish religious writings, which were later copied in the Ukrainian Orthodox environment. For centuries, Ukrainians and Poles lived in the same countries: the conditions of the "long 19th century" made these nations stateless and helped them search for their identity through liturgical translations. The emergence of independent or semi-independent Ukrainian and Polish states created various – more, less or no favourable – milieus for the development of liturgical translation in the two countries or pushed its development beyond the borders of one country.

The third part demonstrates how different linguistic tools can be applied to interpret and assess the quality of the translation of specific liturgical features. The texts represent both the Byzantine

and Roman rites: the Office for the Dead (emotion terms in the Funeral Vigil and in "Dies irae"), the Creed (two versions and their interpolation of political history), the Byzantine Marian Hymn (feminist reading of religious texts) and the Roman Passiontide (Cognitive Poetics and the believer's perception).

This book is the outcome of the project which, was made possible through Scholarship Grant No. 52110864 from the International Visegrad Fund. The project was implemented at the Maria Curie-Sklodowska University (Lublin, Poland) from October 2021 to July 2022 under the supervision of Prof. Magdalena Mitura.

Several chapters of the book have already been published in previous editions:

1. Shmiher T. Comparative studies of history, religion and translation: three disciplines at one liturgical crossroads // Translation Studies in Ukraine as an Integral Part of the European Context. Bratislava: Veda, 2023. P. 123-130.

2. Shmiher T. Dogmatic equivalence: a key to liturgical translation? // Іноземна філологія. Львів, 2022. Вип. 135. С. 100-112.

3. Shmiher T. Musical dimensions of quality judgements in liturgical translation // Науковий часопис. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов / Нац. пед. ун-ту ім. М. П. Драгоманова. Київ, 2022. Вип. 23. С. 88-96.

4. Shmiher T. Titles of liturgical books as the problem of correspondence in religious translation // Studia Philologica. 2022. No. 18/19. P. 80-91.

5. Shmiher T. Liturgical Translation in Europe's Medieval East: Matters of Civilization and Textual Praxis // East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies. 2023. Vol. 10, no. 1. P. 137-154.

6. Shmiher T. Early modern time in the Ukrainian and Polish histories of liturgical translation // Kultúrne dejiny / Cultural History. 2022. Vol. 13, no. 2. P. 199-225.

7. Shmiher T. Rev. Henryk Paprocki's Contribution to Poland's Orthodox Translation // Translation Studies: Theory and Practice / Yerevan State University. Yerevan, 2022. Vol. 2 (1 (3)). P. 83-90.

8. Шмігер Т. Літургійний переклад України 1991-2021 рр. / Т. Шмігер // Індиктіон: Календар-альманах 2023. Б.м.: Святогорець, 2022. С. 94-103.

9. Shmiher T. Garden or branch: Feministic motifs in the translations of the Feast of the Nativity of the Mother of God // Вісник. Сер. Іноземна філологія / Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка. Київ, 2021. Вип. 53 (1). С. 74-78.

10. Shmiher T. Modest grief in the Office of the Dead: a case study of emotion terms in translations of the Orthodox funeral vigil // East European Journal of Psycholinguistics. 2022. Vol. 9 (1). P. 240-251.

11. Shmiher T. Ancient emotions and their translations into modern languages: Latin Office for the Dead in Modern English, Polish and Ukrainian // Antika v kontexte storočí / eds. A. I. Koželová a J. Drengubiak; Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Filozofická fakulta. Prešov, 2022. S. 194-210.

12. Shmiher T. Translating the Symbols of Triduum // Translation Studies: Theory and Practice / Yerevan State University. Yerevan, 2022. Vol. 2 (2 (4)). P. 39-47.

13. Shmiher T. The Creed for the Ukrainians and Poles: linguocultural histories of texts // Волинь філологічна: текст і контекст. Луцьк, 2022. № 33. С. 194-207.

14. Шмігер Т. Потреби критики літургійного перекладу в Україні // Голоси й відлуння античності. Donum natalicium Andreae Sodomorae: матеріали Всеукр. наук. конф. до 85-річчя проф. А. Содомори (Львів, 16 груд. 2022 р.). Львів: ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2023. С. 243-250.

I. THEORETICAL PREREQUISITES

1. Comparative studies of history, religion and translation: three disciplines meet at one liturgical crossroads

A Ukrainian apocrypha tells how man learned from nature by comparison. Abel had been lying dead and unburied for 30 years when Adam, grieving, observed that one dove had died and another had buried it. So, Adam buried Abel and stopped mourning [Апокріфи 1896:9]. This story, extracted from a seventeenth-century manuscript, may have recalled and reflected what cognitivists traced much later: a tremendous mental capacity for conceptual comparison and blending, which occurred 50,000 years ago, developed an unprecedented power to evolve and innovate [Fauconnier, Turner 2002:v]. This cognitive revolution drastically changed the historical dynamics of human progress and civilisation.

This chapter aims to reckon how comparative studies can advance the exploration of liturgical translation in the domains of translation theory and history.

Comparison and contrast

In linguistics, the view has been stabilised that comparison covers only similarities and is suitable for typological purposes [cf. Tötösy de Zepetnek 2006:352], whereas contrast studies both similarities and dissimilarities and thus fits the systematic description. When examining a particular language pair (or culture pair), it is possible to identify and interpret the convergent and divergent features of phenomenal systems.

The epistemological value of comparison is recognised as an essential tool for studying the discipline and its tendencies. So, comparative/contrastive studies are known in the humanities

and sciences. Comparison itself is viewed as an immanent part of cognition and a primary logical means of recognising the external world [Саидов 2006:1-2]. The need for classifications generates the ability to be more critical towards the objects compared and deepens the interpretation of these phenomena, their relations and statuses, as well as their viable and hierarchical systematicity.

In history, comparative studies trigger the debate about the disadvantages and limitations of the national focus: "To limit the subject of historical study within national boundaries is always to invite the charge of narrow perspective and historical nationalism" [Comparative 1997:3]. The perspective is generally not more comprehensive but more enlightening by revealing neglected, forgotten or assumed minor facts, which, conversely, are the smallest detail to complete the solid puzzle. In historical studies, even terms such as "nation" and "national" are often misinterpreted and misused, deliberately or accidentally. Convenient definitions of the word "nation" – such as "a relatively large group of people organized under a single, usually independent government; a country", "the territory occupied by such a group of people", "the government of a sovereign state", "a people who share common customs, origins, history, and frequently language; a nationality" [American 2018: 1173] – are rejected because it turns out that some historians see everything related to a "nation" through the lens of different historical and political concepts: "nation-state", which is, in fact, an extremely definitive formation, but it should not overshadow geographical, ethnic, linguistic associations that apply to research beyond modern times.

History studies can benefit from understanding the great contradiction: on the one hand, every history is unique and distinctive; on the other hand, it shares many common and universal civilisational features that constitute the human race. This contradiction does not elucidate issues that remain on the borderline between parochialism and cosmopolitanism. However, strictly epistemologically, it helps to combine uneven knowledge from different domains of research to demonstrate the fluidity and continuity of a unitary civilisation.

A number of comparative cultural studies [e.g. Chrisomalis 1993; Hodgson 1993; Dream 1999; Вульфсон 2003] have helped to shape visions of what researchers are welcome to explore in our civilisational history, and they can be interpolated onto the comparative viewpoints of translation practice:

1) stable correspondences are demonstrably efficient criteria for describing the material under study, although their stability needs to be studied in a dynamic way when different historical periods require different axiological categories for assessing reception;

2) in the existing system of the historical progress of nations, symmetrical and asymmetrical oppositions equally identify parameters for the juxtaposition of translation milieus and products, while asymmetries are even more thought-provoking for the search of the profound factors of civilisational progress;

3) acceptance can be seen as a value for identifying a specific set of historical phenomena whose status is temporarily canonised by a longer tradition or a shorter public appreciation;

4) all phenomena contain a culturally specific sense, but if the majority of the readership does not recognise the awareness of this sense, the imbalance of power in two traditions becomes an additional point of attention;

5) liminality and centrality are parameters that can explain how flexible and changeable power is in the dynamics of civilisational progress;

6) the object of research is the topoi of historical – in our case, religious – experience, the continuity of which is witnessed in the context of interregional cooperation and change.

Any comparison is not an end in itself without the limits set by other methods [Саидов 2006:8], and its goals are within the partial methods of a discipline. In translation studies, they strive to discover the multifacetedness of translation phenomena: their agents (personalities and institutions), their products (direct and indirect results), their targets (individual readers and reading communities), their modes of implementation (such as texts and paratexts, levels of introspection), their temporal limits

(effective here and now or in the medium and long term), their spatial locations (milieus and their hierarchies). James Holmes' map of translation studies will provide further ideas for partial comparative studies.

Comparing histories and societies

History is often confused with chronology (which is part of history) and interpreted as a collection of facts (which is only partly true). Summarising the studies of history in general and those of translation history in particular, researchers have identified the following theoretical lines of investigation

1) the nature of change: each translation is produced for a reason and has agents whose qualifications determine the textual changes of a translation and the linguopoetical fluctuations of the literary process; there are also different ways in which a translation influences its readership;

2) activity: who and how can participate in these trans-formations (gender, social or ethnic groups as creators; contro-versies between an individuality and a group):

3) teleology: this point helps to penetrate the asymmetry between the aim and the result of a specific translation;

4) prognostication: each text can generate transformations for some similar or dependent texts in spatial and temporal dimensions;

5) producers and consumers: in the social hierarchy, the role of translators can be an essential factor in shaping a literary canon, but they also transmit the values of their authorities to manipulate reading communities;

6) histotainment does not apply to this area of history, but the market may soon demand everything.

These parts of literary history can undoubtedly contribute to writing the history of a national literature, which includes original writings and translations, social categories, as well as lines of perception and reception.

The plurality of approaches and topics means that histories can be written and interpreted in various directions. One of these

directions is comparative, which is both a source and a goal of study since it is comparison that draws attention to neglected facts and makes us reflect on why differences have arisen during phenomenal progress in two different national traditions. From this perspective, this approach should be called "contrastive", but the term "comparative" still dominates.

Mark Bloch distinguishes two types of comparison for historical purposes [Hill, Hill, 1980:830]:

1) universal comparison (when the societies under study are separated by time and distance);

2) historical comparison (when the historian focuses on neighbouring and contemporary societies).

Liturgical traditions are better explored through the example of societies in contact with each other because the differences illuminate the dynamics of civilisational progress. The Ukrainian and Polish liturgical traditions are a suitable object of comparative research because, on the one hand, they represent the same geographical area – Central/Eastern Europe – and, on the other hand, they have inherited the opposite branches of Christianity – Eastern and Western. In a way, this comparison takes us back to a millennium-old discussion about "whose faith is better", but nowadays, scholars have no need to simplify this historical and theological complexity, and they have the opportunity to observe the dynamics of civilisation in order to build a larger picture later on. In Milan Kundera's ironic words [Kundera 1984:33], "the part of Europe situated geographically in the centre – culturally in the West and politically in the East" – is the focus of attention.

The prospects of the comparative history of liturgical translation can be structured according to the following areas or lines of research:

1) the Liturgy and the development of Language: the sacredness of a language is perceived as a cultural and theological value; a language was designed for liturgical and evangelistic purposes (Church Slavonic); liturgical texts need retranslations which reflect the current religious experience of a reading community;

2) the Liturgy and the development of Literature: religious writings replaced the system of a national literature in some periods of its development; they easily and quickly filled in for some genres of meditative poetry and prose;

3) the Liturgy and the development of Music: the rise of ecclesiastical chants impacted the advance of national musical cultures; singing and instrumental arrangements contribute to peculiar ways of religious hermeneutics, and they can generally be regarded as instances of intersemiotic translation;

4) the Liturgy and the development of Book Culture: the liturgical text had a high status in the system of national book-printing histories; the role of some liturgical book types (like prayer books) supported the dissemination of literacy;

5) the Liturgy and the development of Ideas: Christian lexis changed people's worldview; it helped them move from a physical mentality to more abstract forms; Christianity interacted with the elaboration of national Law and Aesthetics;

6) the Liturgy and the development of Social Mentality: historical, ethnic and national milieus were shaped around religious values; liturgical texts strengthened national identities via translation in imperial contexts and in circumstances of exile, minorities and newly independent countries.

The civilisational changes orchestrated by religious praxis reflect the supranational and interregional evolution of world-views, cultural practices and artistic forms. The unity of synchronic sections with diachronic excursuses ultimately reveals the beauty and richness of a nation's spiritual life, encoded in translation phenomena.

Comparing religions and texts

On average, religion is always connected or arranged in the Word or via the Word; it is, thus, practised in the text and via the text. The importance of the text for religious practices also means that this text has its identity, which is determined by its functionality, communicative efficiency, intertextuality and even ethnicity, along with sacredness. This is why, from the translation

perspective, the comparison of religions coincides successfully and fruitfully with the comparison of texts.

The identity of liturgical texts is constructed around their being the object of sympathetic responses and evangelical praxis. Its core lies in the interpretation of hymns and prayers as texts for spreading evangelisation and sharing sympathy. This factual symbiosis has shaped the unity that appeals to the classification of the functions of the liturgical text when historical and dogmatic informativeness, aesthetics, psychological intentionality and even magical aspirations are expected from the same text.

The rhetoric of prayers and hymns embraces the ways of managing Transcendence when the whole system looks like a triangle or a tripartite channel connecting God, the Self and the liturgical text. In all religious texts, immediacy, visual clarity and effective emotional appeal are linked to a typical verbality that is easily remembered and often reproduced by believers through their language. Language serves the foundation of Christian thought through the use of insightful rhetorical figures [e.g. Edwards 2017:57-60, 149-153 etc.] or ars oratoria bordering on music [Ślusarczyk 2009:192-195].

Religions can be imaged as spaces, memories, emotions, but all these visionary programmes are encoded in texts, which are welcome to be studied by applying the various methodologies of translation quality assessment. A dual cosmology or two-world model empowers most (or all) religions: this inspiration to see the "other world" permeates all levels of hierarchical ecclesiastical texts. At the lowest – intimate (individual) – level, liturgical texts help the believer to recognise his or her existence between here and eternity; at the highest – societal (public) – level, they reveal the eschatological value of entire institutions, such as the Warring Church on earth and the Triumphant Church in heaven. The most significant power of liturgical texts is that they translate great ideas for private use. All the methods of analysis fermented in cognitive and communicative linguistics [see more: Шмігер 2018:166-304] are applicable to uncover the intricate nexus of dogmatic truths and emotional states encoded in a single liturgical text.

History is usually interpreted in the two-stage mode: every religion has a prehistory, so Christian prehistory is paganism. Meanwhile, the collective experience of a reading community also has a history, but it is outside the focus of research. The cultural and axiological models of translation analysis borrowed from ethnography, postcolonial studies and sociology help to reveal the historical identity of liturgical texts [cf. Modnicka 2009:217-226]. Impressive but quite logical was the interpretation of Roman Catholic texts as symbols of Western hegemony. Historically, this is true when countries in Latin America or Asia are meant. It was not only the very religious ideas but also the musical decoration that provoked resistance and colonial associations. A similar case can easily be found in Eastern Orthodoxy. Several Slavonic Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches still use the Church Slavonic liturgy, pronounced according to the phonetic rules of the local vernacular. The Russian pronunciation outside Russia is an example of Moscow's hegemony: the Polish Orthodox Church uses the Russian recension of Church Slavonic in the territory that used to be part of the former Kyivan Metropolitanate, and accordingly, the Ukrainian recension and chants were practised. Meanwhile, the Slovak Orthodox Church and the Slovak Greek Catholic Church have retained the Kyivan liturgical heritage due to different historical circumstances.

In the history of knowledge, everything commences with empirical work and data collection. Further work on classifications is more experimental: descriptive observations are not always clear-cut, and fuzzy boundaries can create grey areas. For this reason, the isolation of the phenomena to be analysed is complemented by the non-isolation of their interpretation in comparative contexts. Comparison (albeit contrast is epistemologically a better term) is neither a replacement for the earlier "collection" – i.e. positivist – methodology nor a stage of the same paradigm, but offers an additional productive source of analytical knowledge that has different values at various stages of the investigation of historical – and not only – phenomena.

Like cultural history, ecclesiastical history deals with questions determined by its global context and the history

of the sacred world. These preliminary remarks suggest that supranational religious projections share recurrent patterns of religious translation. The history of translating the Bible and the Quran shows a similar shift in the acceptance of sacred texts in national languages. This state of affairs leads us to hypothesise that this process occurs at different speeds in all the Abrahamic religions, depending on the degree of discrepancy between sacred languages and contemporary vernaculars. Hypothetically, the same processes can be observed in other religions.

Traditionally, liturgical texts have become jewels of high culture, as great prayers and hymns are samples of the splendour of verbal worship. The beauty, reverence and inspiration given and received in liturgies transform believers and their worldview. For this reason, the liturgical word is so precious that all these features transform human senses and language. These originals continue to produce translations of new quality, and this is the greatest divine mystery, how religious poetry can be better understood and practised through interlingual comparison.

2. Liturgical translation in theory

2.1. Dogmatic equivalence as a key to liturgical translation

In the 20th century, the emergence of translation studies as an academic subject and the post-Vatican II liturgical changes created an opportunity to collect information and establish a fresh field of study: liturgical translation. Liturgical translators face complex challenges in interpreting religious texts due to the variety of linguistic and hermeneutic patterns, as well as the stylistic, poetic and musical parameters of the text [Огієнко 1922; Chupungco 1997; Taft 1998; Venturi 2001; Ґаладза 2017]. As a result, liturgical translation has become a part of ecclesiastical law and is discussed in official church documents [Kamińska 2015]. Meanwhile, researchers concentrate on how texts change and differ, but they pay less attention to how the words themselves transform due to the absence of thorough linguistic analysis tools

[e.g. Švagrovský 1999; Nováková 2010; Živčák 2017; cf. Остапчук 2017].

What theory is available, and what is needed?

The contemporary culture of publishing religious books in translation does not provide publicity for a translator's reflections, though the existing body of knowledge in this sphere would greatly benefit from such reflections and shared practices. Rarely do translators devote a small part of the preface to translation issues. Rarely do they write about translation principles, but instead, they dwell on the edition of the original, other translations, the aims of the translation, and so on. The translation principles applied are mentioned in passing, which helps to locate the text within the range of mainstream translation tendencies, but almost nothing is said about translation norms and strategies that other translators can be share in the future.

In 1922, Ivan Ohiyenko published his translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, to which he added a separate section of comments, including "Methods of translating liturgical books into Ukrainian" [Огієнко 1922]. He formulated the following principles of translation, which reveal the historical and cultural links between the original and the translation, the principles of reproducing stylistic functions and adhering to specific translation strategies, namely:

1) translating from the original, but taking into account the tradition established by the Church Slavonic biblical and liturgical literature (this principle is defined by the diverse liturgical practices in various Orthodox Churches, so the original is always a "surprising" point in Orthodox translation);

2) attention to the specific features of the text which is sung, spoken or recited in silence (this principle also implies the possible use of another language which is pronounced by a priest but not announced to the public, and this is important in defining the priority of translation of texts for official liturgical use);

3) taking into account the Jewish-Hellenistic poetics (biblical and liturgical texts are mostly poetic and poetic, and these features immensely shape the verbal beauty of the Liturgy);

4) avoiding one's amplifying exegesis (this principle places the translator in the hermeneutical tradition of the Church when the translator's licence is balanced by dogmatic accuracy);

5) comparing the liturgical language with the text of the New Testament (a translator has to remember the lexicon and formulae transferred directly from the Bible, and they should be the same as in the official translation of the Bible, otherwise believers will not decipher the direct contact and associations with the Bible);

6) employing the "high" style of the Ukrainian language, paying attention to its melodiousness, purity and accessibility for the general reader;

7) translating the Divine Liturgy into Ukrainian means commemorating Ukrainian saints, the Ukrainian Church, the Ukrainian authorities, as well as adding prayers and litanies that are national in content.

These principles apply to the translation of all liturgical texts. Although he did not use some basic translation terms (such as equivalence, translatability, etc.), he established three cornerstones of liturgical translation: semantics (including dogmatic exegesis), poetics (taking into account the specific poetics of each original text and the poetics of the expected target reception), and performability (including musical patterns and specific features of aural perception). Over time, Ohiyenko's views were only "supplemented" by other researchers but not radically changed: biblical phrases should be properly referenced and quoted in liturgical texts [Szymanek 1978]; liturgical translation should be doctrinally correct and free from ideological influences [Subardjo 2019: 23, 25]; liturgical poetics is realised in the multiplicity of translations and will always need a new interpretation and translation [Lash 1998; O'Loughlin 2019]; every translator has to solve the problem of the correlation between the poetics of the original languages and that of the target language [Ware 2000-2001; Ugolnik 2000-2001]; the sound and musical qualities of the text should also remain within the scope of the translator's attention [Bailey 2000–2001].

However, the person whose views are regularly referred to is Eugene Nida. In the 1960s, he built a very successful opposition between formal and dynamic equivalence, reflecting a form or content orientation. In the 1990s, he claimed that this dichotomy was outdated and needed to be reconstructed in the direction of functional equivalence, covering more communicative and cultural dimensions [Nida 1995]. This later motivation reached few liturgical translators, but in various milieus, the drawbacks of the simplistic dichotomy of form versus content were discussed [Chupungco 1997:389; Ґаладза 2017:353-354]. Keeping in mind the division of liturgical translation problems into three groups – semantic, poetic and performative, the researcher can easily attribute the profitability of verse translation for solving – or searching for solutions to – poetically based problems. Viewing liturgical texts as poetry opens the way to applying the rich literature in this domain to religious texts and deepens the insightful observations of liturgical translation criticism, which is desirable in all translators' routine work. The group of performative problems calls for inviting rhetoricians and musicologists (especially ethnomusicologists) to reconcile foreign and native speech melodies. The group of semantic problems focuses on the interpretative nexus of verbal signs, and the translator has to scrutinise the lexical, cultural, dogmatic and even grammatical information encoded in a sign.

At the heart of the debate on liturgical translation is the attitude to language as a means of disseminating information and, thus, evangelisation. Linguistic codes are the signs speakers exchange to convey their messages. This is why it is indispensable to remember that "each language has its own way of thinking and its unique network of signs" [Subardjo 2019:25]. A sign is valid when it is decoded and encoded by the speakers, otherwise it loses its validity. Some clergy underestimate the power of signs, believing that believers can – or should? – somehow know what is in the priest's sign, whereas the content of the believer's sign may be drastically different. The choice of wrongly attributed signs builds the wall of misunderstanding between the priest and the faithful, as well as the gap between the Gospels and the faithful.

Every language is also a historical formation. It is understood and appreciated in the same way – in a more or less similar way – in a particular place at a particular time. In English-language religious discourse, David Crystal has observed the radical change in forms of religious verbal expression over a reasonably short period: "A generation ago [in the early 1960s], liturgical linguistic norms in much of the English-speaking world involved a large number of low-level lexical and grammatical usages that were plainly idiosyncratic to this genre. ... Today [at the turn of the 1990s], many of the most distinctive features have gone, in the revised formal Christian liturgies. There is no doubt that modern liturgical styles use far fewer distinctive grammatical features" [Crystal 1990:122-123]. He notes somewhat archaic features of grammar, lexis and idioms such as "thou", "livest", "brethren", "whence", "praise be...", "he, having eaten, went", and so on. These features were not used outside religious and legal discourse, making liturgical speech quite peculiar. Nevertheless, their functionality was not very productive among the broad masses of the public, and this understanding determines other ways of searching for tools to express sacrum and profanum in a language while preserving concinnity with the original text.

Macro criterion and micro criteria

Liturgical translation criticism has a solid basis for in-depth textual study. However, analysts must deal with the most apparent textual discrepancy and error: omissions. Omissions are marginally permissible – not sanctioned, but tolerated – in interpretation; they are exceptionally rarely called "zero equivalence" in translation; they are generally regarded as a sign of the inferior quality of a translation and the very low competence of a translator. It is not clear why omissions are not so rare in liturgical texts [Malloy 2014:377; Pskit 2019:54-57]. The excessive liturgical creativity of priests can explain this fact. However, this case is simple from a theoretical point of view. More complicated is the qualitative assessment of a word, its meaning and function in the source and target texts.

It makes sense to place the so-called "dogmatic equivalence" at the centre of the assessment of the quality of liturgical translations and consider it a multi-component or multi-level phenomenon. What is important in liturgical translation is not "formal", "denotative", "stylistic", "pragmatic", "cultural", "cognitive", "associative" or similar equivalence, but "dogmatic" equivalence, which includes various semantic components that are essential for the relevant interpretation of a religious text. The translation analyst can identify several levels of such equivalence:

1) at the level of terms

2) at the level of lexical, cultural or theological interpretation;

3) at the level of grammatical interpretation;

4) at the level of phonetic prosody.

Terms should be understood in their broadest sense. In Catholic-Orthodox comparison, the terms "Virgin Mary" and "Theotokos" refer to the same person: Mary, the Mother of Jesus Christ. At the same time, they draw the faithful's attention to the dogmatic value of this name: the Catholics emphasise her chastity, while the Orthodox appeal to her status as the Mother of God, making her the Protectress of all Christians.

The question of common words used as terms is part of the terminological line of thought. "Bread"[1] and "wine" should be considered as terms because their ingredients and preparation are so strictly regulated that there is reason to be suspicious when we speak of the same object in different liturgical traditions. In reality, this is similar to the old discussion about denotative meaning: butter has different names in different languages, but its taste and consistency vary from country to country, so different names denote different objects.

In 16th-century catechisms, theologians were very careful with the dogmatic lexis: in the case of the Creed, they considered the term "σύμβολον" untranslatable and preferred the transliteration, otherwise they would have to write the whole phrase as the

---

[1] Bread was the subject of a special study by Thomas O'Loughlin [O'Loughlin 2004].

Confession of Faith [Корзо 2007:268]. The term itself meant a lot, from a sign to a text.

In the Ecumenical Prayer of the Melkite Greek Catholic Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, an invocation contains the lexeme "Orthodox": "Again, we pray for the blessed and ever to be remembered founders of this holy church (or monastery,) and for our **Orthodox** Fathers and brethren who have gone before us and who here or elsewhere have been laid to pious rest" [Byzantine 1969:272]. Both the Eastern and Western Churches use the terms "Orthodox" (dogmatically correct) and "Catholic" (universal, ecumenical), but in the general perception, these nuances are not well known or well remembered. It is even more true in the aural perception when the faithful pray, meditate and do not recognise the clear distinction of the nature of the Church of Christ but confuse it with the more frequently heard names of the earthly institutions in Constantinople/Istanbul and in Rome. This is why translators try some experiments. The relevant text in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Liturgy is the Insistent Litany with the following words: "We also pray for the people here present who await Your great and bountiful mercies, for those who have been kind to us, and for all **orthodox** Christians" [Архиєрейська 2012:65]. Avoiding capitalisation in the spelling of the word is a good option for a written text, but it is not perceived correctly in speech. Moreover, the lexeme is completely ambivalent in the Ukrainian text [Архиєрейська 2012:64], as no changes have been made here.

The lexical interpretation of any liturgical word will undeniably enter the realm of cultural and theological hermeneutics. The indispensable term of Christianity is "λόγος", most often quoted according to the Gospel of John (1:1). The "Greek-English Lexicon" by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott fixes 34 senses of this word in semantic groups of reckoning, calculation, relation, explanation, debate, oration, utterance, saying, subject, expression and the wisdom of God. The same complexity is found in G. W. H. Lampe's "Patristic Greek Lexicon", which points to the integral dominance of the spirit over verbal expression. Thus, the translation "In the beginning was the Word" could have sounded

like "In the beginning was Mind / the Idea". The theological choice, which has influenced all contemporary biblical and liturgical contexts, derives from the Vulgate. However, modern theologians see the sign of "the Word" much more broadly, encompassing the ideas of life and those of reason, conscience and prophecy [Commentary 1978:774]. This collection of rational and theological interpretations stimulates the search for a different and similarly semantically and dogmatically voluminous word, but the accepted theological tradition is already perfectly balanced and blocks further search. We only have to admit that in Christian history, a lot could have changed for the better if people had been taught to think more before believing and acting.

In the Ukrainian Christian space, i.e. the Orthodox and Greek Catholic liturgical traditions of Ukraine, there is a regular debate about the phrase "servant of God", whose Ukrainian equivalent is "раб Божий" (literally: a slave of God). The problem lies in the Old Greek formulation "δούλος του Θεού" where "δούλος" was "a born bondman" and experienced different kinds of relationships with his masters, as well as in the Church Slavonic heritage, where "рабъ" derives from "work" and means a servant who could be a prisoner, a serf, a slave, and also a subordinate subject doing the work of an employee and servant. In New Ukrainian, the difference between "раб" and "слуга" is similar to that between the English "slave" and "servant", where the former is "completely deprived of freedom and personal rights" (according to the Oxford English Dictionary). In theological parlance, the deprivation of freedom and choice can lead to the heretical concept that a Christian is not responsible for his or her sins so human salvation is God's will but not human choice or work. For this reason, voices are being raised in favour of the lexeme "слуга". Meanwhile, the Ukrainian clergy is not ready to change this status quo [e.g. Ґаладза 1998:39], though some support can be seen in the Ukrainian translations of the Bible (Romans 6:22). The "Orthodox"[2] translation uses the

---

[2] The Ukrainian Churches do not have an officially recognised translation: Ivan Ohiyenko was an Orthodox Metropolitan whose translation is preferred in

lexeme "раб" (slave): "А тепер, звільнившися від гріха й ставши **рабами Богові**, маєте плід ваш на освячення, а кінець життя вічне" (translated by Ivan Ohiyenko), while the "Greek Catholic" translations leave some room for experimentation: "Тепер же, звільнившися від гріха і ставши **слугами Богові**, маєте ваш плід на освячення, а кінець – життя вічне" (translated by Ivan Khomenko). The lexeme "слуга" (servant) gives more room for associations with the citizenship of God's people that is given to believers as a result of the Sacrament of Baptism.

The search for theological justification sometimes leads to over-interpretation. This is the case of the Greek phrase "εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων", whose Old Hebrew structure for denoting greatness has found its way into European languages: Latin "in sæcula sæculorum", English "into the ages of ages", Polish "przez wszystkie wieki wieków / na wieki wieków", Church Slavonic "во вѣки вѣковъ", etc. In the Ukrainian linguaculture, this phrase has two possible and well-accepted translation variants: "на віки віків" (taken from the Church Slavonic pattern) and "на віки вічнії" (shaped by Ukrainian poetics). The latter was used in some older religious texts, by classical Ukrainian authors (such as Hryhoriy Kvitka-Osnovyanenko, Ivan Nechui-Levytskyi), and it resembles the well-known Ukrainian poetic means such as "вольная воля" (literally: "free freedom"; as cited by Taras Shevchenko). The root of the debate over the choice between the two options is the foreignisation or domestication approach, and there is no need to invent an additional theological motivation for emphasising the meaning of eternity in the stable system of the target language (for the religious dimension, see [Ґаладза 2002-2004]).

The grammatical interpretation also had a dogmatic value. History knows the case of St Maximus the Greek, a monk, philosopher and translator active in Moscow in the 16th century.

Orthodox and Protestant congregations; Ivan Khomenko was a Greek Catholic priest whose translation is more commonly referred to as the "Roman Bible" in the Greek Catholic milieu. However, there is no prohibition on the use of other translations in the Churches.

Given the task of translating and correcting liturgical books, he substituted the Greek aorist tense for the Church Slavonic perfect tense and was accused of heresy: Moscow theologians claimed that the aorist denoted Christ's eternal nature, and the perfect tense signified the end of His Kingdom [Скаб 2020:427]. Fortunately, today, we do not use grammar for such exegetical judgments, but sometimes, the dogma rules grammar.

In the Sign of the Cross, the formula "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" has problems in finding the right shoulder for the part "Holy" and for the part "Spirit". This issue arose in the Polish translation. The Polish Catholic formula reads "W imię Ojca, i Syna, i **Ducha Świętego**" when "Duch" is on the left shoulder and "Święty" is on the right shoulder. This is the Roman pattern. The Byzantine pattern is reversed, and the Polish Orthodox formula reads "W imię Ojca, i Syna, i **Świętego Ducha**", violating Polish syntax. Surprisingly, the English translators did not change the grammar, but the symbolic marking of the shoulders: the same formula is used for Catholics and Orthodox, though in different liturgical traditions, a different shoulder marks the other part of the phrase.

The phonetic level can become a musical challenge for translators and musicologists. The main idea here is to push the melodies elaborated by the relevant chants (such as Gregorian chant in Western Christianity; or, more specifically, Ukrainian (Kyiv and Halych) chants for translation into other languages). However, the phonetic level is primarily theoretical, but the Ukrainian history of religious translation can illustrate even this kind of dogmatic equivalence. This is the spelling of the Sacrament of Baptism, which sounds more like the name of Christ: "хри́щення" instead of the more popular and regular "хре́щення". Although Ivan Ohiyenko does not accept this spelling as the standard, he followed the idea of his Protestant advisors-editors. From the viewpoint of Ukrainian pronunciation, the non-accentuated sounds [e] and [и] are pronounced identically. Only the written spelling and the nominal form clearly show the similarity between "Христос" and "хри́щення". This linguistic experiment is interesting from a

dogmatic standpoint, but it is instead an etymological coincidence that makes this fact exceptional.

Dogmatic equivalence even depends on the technical conditions of the search for the original. In translating the Orthodox Pentecostarion [Festal 1969], Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware revealed their translation technique: they translated from Greek but introduced some corrections according to the Church Slavonic text. In this way, the translation was supposed to represent two liturgical traditions – Greek and Russian – but it does not represent either since each tradition will find deviations from its liturgical praxis. Rationally, this approach is flawed since the translation produced does not correspond to a true original in any existing liturgical tradition and should hence be regarded as incorrect. On the other hand, the Church Slavonic text is also a misleading concept because different Orthodox liturgical traditions have different Church Slavonic Textus Recepti in the same language for their liturgical use.

The translation critic should be cautious to identify the very original since a single liturgical tradition can introduce numerous changes within a short time. A good example is the alternating or combined use of the words "rest" ("спокій") and "memory" ("пам'ять") in the Ukrainian Orthodox Office for the Dead:

– Ukraine, 1646: "ѡ рабѣ Божїимъ, Имарекъ: и блаженномъ покои єгѡ, Господу помолимсѧ" [Еухологіѡн 1646:1:[589]];

– Canada, 1954: "За раба Божого (*або:* рабу Божу), *ім'я,* і за **блаженний спокій** його, Господу помолімось!" [Евхологіон 1954:132];

– USA, 1963: "За незабутнього раба Божого (рабу Божу) *(ім'я)*, **за спокій і добру пам'ять** його (її) Господеві помолімось" [Требник 1963:68];

– USA, 1976: "За незабутнього раба Божого (рабу Божу, рабів Божих), за **спокій і блаженну пам'ять** його (її, їх) Господеві помолімось" [Требник 1976:136].

These changes reflect the vibrant life of religious communities and milieus: all the changes have been officially introduced and supposedly approved by the Synod of the Church. This

discrepancy is essential when translations are used in different denominations of the same liturgical group, and the whole text can be a translator's false friends.

Christian liturgical translation is a millennium old, but it was only in the 20th century that researchers began to include it in the scope of their academic interests. This inclusion is also explained by the development of translation studies itself, which simultaneously emerged as a discipline in its own right.

From the very beginning, the problems of translation, which translators and critics had to deal with, included lexical exactness, cultural accuracy, dogmatic correctness, poetic expressiveness and performative functionality. This set of linguistic and theological relationships has been experienced by every liturgical translator and considered by scholars. However, the difference between the attitudes of linguists (who bring into the discussion the question of the relationship between a sacred text and a reading community) and theologians (who recognise the authority of a sacred text at the expense of cultural historicity) could be observed. These tensions reflect the multifaceted nature of liturgical translation and demonstrate the inescapable need for new translations, even when previous translations are not bad.

At the core of translation activities is the value of dogmatic equivalence, which legitimises a translation for public use. At the same time, it can be seen as a complex linguistic phenomenon that benefits and contributes to both theological interpretation and linguistic understanding. Thus, dogmatic equivalence is a structural phenomenon that can be divided into different levels, components or dimensions. The nexus of translation problems must apply the approved solutions from sci-tech, poetry and literary translation. The most important principle to be duly acknowledged is that every translation is an act of creation and experimentation, and linguistic experiments can help design a dogmatic translation option in the future that will be readily accepted according to the dogmata of theologians and the sensations of believers.

2.2. Sacred languages, celebrants and laypeople

The sacred status of languages has always been a myth, invoked by various ecclesiastical and political authorities for various meritorious and despicable purposes. The Christian myth goes back to the act of Christ's crucifixion when the inscription in three languages was placed on the execution cross. The three languages were mentioned because they reflected the real linguistic landscape of Judea; the Jews spoke Hebrew; Latin was the official language of this Roman province; Greek retained a high status in Roman civilisation.

This myth is essentially anti-Biblical and anti-Christian. According to Mykhailo Kobryn, God bestowed on the apostles the gift of knowing other languages, but not the opposite gift of understanding Hebrew [Кобрин 2004:16]. Actually, this gift was meant to signal that the Church of Christ is not exclusive (oriented towards only one ethnic group) but inclusive (open to the whole world). This openness was fully implemented in Western Christianity after the Second Vatican Council, while in Eastern Christianity, these processes began much earlier.

The aim of this chapter is to reconsider the role and values of Latin and Church Slavonic as sacred languages for today's believers. It also demonstrates how contemporary believers can misinterpret a key sacred text.

Pros and cons of the sacredness of some languages

Before the Second Vatican Council, the Apostolic See sanctioned the use of three languages: Latin was the principal language, and Church Slavonic and Old Armenian were tolerated in some areas [Jougan 1928:28]. Liturgical manuals explain the importance of using Latin as the liturgical language [Jougan 1928:27-28], and their arguments can be treated as values that may have lost their value today:

1) the **unity** of the Church when any priest can celebrate the Liturgy in any part of the world. This statement is formally correct, but linguistically, Latin has the same ethnic variations as Church

Slavonic: each nation pronounces texts according to its native phonetics, and a priest from a different local liturgical community may have very distinctive formal signs of Otherness;

2) **gratitude** to Rome, from where the light of Christianity spread. If Ukraine accepted Christianity from Constantinople, it should celebrate the Liturgy in Greek, but nobody does. Besides, the New Testament was written in Greek, so it is logical to use Greek as a liturgical language to express gratitude to the Greek-speaking Orient;

3) the **permanence** of the faith, which is guaranteed by the dead status of Latin. Linguistically, this is only partially correct. Latin was a living language, and its semantic space (the system of meanings of all its words) was different at different stages of its development. When it fell into disuse at the expense of the Romance languages, the academia and the ecclesia maintained and developed Medieval Latin according to new needs and challenges. This history is entirely consistent with the history of Church Slavonic, which changed according to changing perceptions and theological specifications [cf. Огієнко 1921:4-7];

4) the **enhancement of the respect and beauty** of the Holy Sacraments, which remains at the level of very subjective perception and can lead to a further shift towards considering prayers as mysterious magical incantations that are not tolerated by the Church and have no evangelising power. This applies especially to Latin since a large number of European magical books contain only Latin incantations and charms, and these books have shaped a peculiar attitude towards Latin as a language of magic in various European cultures;

5) **communication with God**, when priests speak to God on behalf of the faithful and do not need the language of the faithful. This assertion is paradoxical since there is no factual evidence that God can speak Latin, but the gift of Pentecost means that God knows all languages. On the other hand, the value of common prayer is negated: if communication is quite exclusive, believers can stay at home and pray without going to church.

Rev. Włodzimierz Misijuk claims that 95% of Orthodox liturgical texts are literal quotations or paraphrases of biblical verses or their explanations [Misijuk 2009:358]. This corresponds to the fourfold interpretation of biblical texts: literal (as it is formally and historically written), moral (as it is aimed at the behaviour of believers), allegorical (as it is implied for faith) and anagogical (as it is used prophetically). All these functions are nullified if the average believer cannot interpret it at will because of the lack of in-depth knowledge of Church Slavonic or Latin.

Another argument in favour of Latin was that Latin was a developed and refined language, and its dead status ensured its stability, while national languages would require a lot of effort for elaboration and would be constantly changing [Kowalewski 1921:27]. As Latin was once a living language, it underwent all the processes that any living language has undergone or will undergo. Moreover, as we have seen above, the glorification of the dead and stable status has nothing to do with reality. Church Slavonic had more claim to this status because it was never a living language but always a written – and partly artificial – standard. So, the Roman Catholic Church had more reason to accept Church Slavonic as its liturgical language, but no one ever tried.

Translation is generally feared because of hypothetical mistranslations, which have been greatly exaggerated. Ivan Ohiyenko insisted on the contrary: Ukrainian is one of the Slavonic languages closest to Church Slavonic, and some Ukrainian dialects have preserved millennium-old features, so translations from Church Slavonic into New Ukrainian retain all those features for which we praise Church Slavonic [Огієнко 1921:24-25]. Unfortunately, this is not the case with Latin-Polish translations.

By and large, Church Slavonic is regarded as a museum object and part of the cultural heritage, and its preservation can be seen as part of the Church's policy of remembrance. Today, this balance between past and present is well defined, whereas a century ago, it overlapped with nation-shaping and state-building. In 1938, Viacheslav Bohdanovich reacted negatively to the attempts of the Ukrainians and the Belarusians to create their languages that

were closer to their spoken vernaculars but farther from Church Slavonic [Богдановичъ 1938:19-20, 25]. This invective reveals the author's poor knowledge of the millennia-old history of the Ukrainian language, whose New Ukrainian form as a system had been formed by the mid-18th century, and of the general history of languages, in which the processes of language formation are loosely dependent on the deliberate intentions of speaking communities. This was a hegemonic or imperialist statement in favour of the previous status quo in the Russian Empire, where Church Slavonic (actually its Russian recension) dominated in ecclesiastical life and supported the primacy of Russian in social life. This is why Mykhailo Kobryn, in 1935, explained in great detail how Church Slavonic was manipulatively used to cover up Ukrainophobia among the clergy and public figures [Кобрин 2004:115-119, 160-166]. Accusations of Latin as a language of Roman Catholic or Western hegemony are heard, and on the contrary, translations into vernacular languages mean both the acquisition and the alteration of the shared memory [cf. O'Loughlin 2012a:251-253]. In today's world, where liturgical traditions have mostly coincided with national states, the call to memorise Latin in the Liturgy is an act of working on heritage.

A further argument against the stability of the sacred status can be added from translation studies. Latin only became a fully-fledged liturgical language in the late 4th century, before which it had all the problems that any language has in the process of translating the entire corpus of liturgical books. Even in his translations, St Jerome allowed for some anachronisms, which are generally treated as translation errors; so, we cannot take the Latin text as the ideal truth [O'Loughlin 2012b:345-346]. The same questions must be asked about Church Slavonic texts, for in both cases, the absolute truth lies in the Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic originals.

Mentality changes

Historians have observed a significant shift in general and religious mentality during the Enlightenment when secular

rationality came to the fore in academic and cultural evaluation. Gradually, this led to a re-evaluation of stable and generally accepted ideas. The use of Latin was not so revered from the mid-19th century, partly because of the shift from Latin to German as a language of instruction in theological institutions. For instance, the provincial council of Vienna in 1858 sanctioned the use of German for teaching pastoral theology, homiletics and catechism; other provincial councils followed this example, and the number of subjects increased [Белей 1929:258]. Later, the Holy See had to intervene and encourage the use of Latin in the religious life of the faithful. However, as can be seen today, Latin is more a language of mystery than of catechisation.

A similar attitude to Church Slavonic emerged after the First World War when the rise of national republics and the growth of ethnic nationalism demanded more rights for national languages. The role of Church Slavonic was reconsidered from the standpoint of its ability to awaken human aesthetics and emotions, to stop them being "deaf to beauty and dumb to love" [Ковч 1932:5]. Blessed Omelian Kovch rightly resented the fact that the Pacific cannibals were converted to Catholicism by being made to learn the Lord's Prayer in their mother tongue, while the Ukrainians, who were a cultural nation, persisted in the mass self-deception of using an incomprehensible language for praying [Ковч 1932:3]. His resentment concealed the more profound truth that the desire to preserve the oldest forms of ritual was to help preserve the old forms of national life and state-building, where the struggle for supremacy meant changing the dominator, but not equal democratic participation in religious - and hence political - life.

Kovch emphasised the interdependence of understanding and perception. He illustrated the case of funerary texts that were aesthetically refined and ideologically enriched but remained beyond the appreciation and proper use of believers: such an inappropriate combination had no catechetical and psychic impact on a believer who attended a funeral but not a lecture on Church Slavonic [Ковч 1932:12]. This idea is reiterated a century later by Orthodox priests, who point out that a good understanding of

Church Slavonic can be formed during special language classes at school [Misijuk 2009:371]. In any case, the value of Church Slavonic became its anti-value or obstacle.

Once, Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's Poet-Prophet, remarked in his poem:

> Well, mere words, it seems…
> Words, the voice — and nothing more.
> The heart, however, races — it revives
> With hearing!.. To know, the
> Voice derives from God, and words
> Disperse among the people! (Translated by P. Fedynskyi)
> [Shevchenko 2013:252].

This importance of the connection between God and humans through language has a theological interpretation that God identifies Himself with humans, with each one of us, and thus shares and respects the gift of our native language [Misijuk 2009:367-368]. However, Church Slavonic did help to shape the specific religious and poetic style of the New Ukrainian language:

Все **упованіє** моє	O my shining Paradise,
На Тебе, мій пресвітлий раю,	All my hope I place in You,
На **милосердіє** Твоє,	And on Your mercy, Mother.
Все **упованіє** моє	O sacred power of the saints,
На Тебе, Мати, **возлагаю**.	Immaculate and Blessed!
[Шевченко 2003:311]	[Shevchenko 2013:252].

The lexemes "упованіє" and "возлагати" have different correspondences in today's speech: "надія" and "покладати". The word "милосердіє" is phonetically slightly modulated: "милосердя". The sum of lexical and phonetic features constitutes a specific pseudo-Church Slavonic flavour with a limited currency but is powerful in emotional expression.

Latin influenced Polish mainly in the domain of research, and this scientific style formed excellent samples of academic poetry:

> Jeślim **Autor** w czym zbłądził, choć ostrożny, raczy
> **Dyssymulować** Mądry, Nieuk nie obaczy.

W Druku też bez **errorów** nie iest Księga żadna:
Te mądremu poprawić, lub przebaczyć snadna.

<div style="text-align: right">[Chmielowski 1745:b2rev]</div>

If I, the Author, has erred in something, though being cautious,
Let the Wise One dissimulate, as the Ignoramus will not see.
In the Print, there is no book without errors, either:
The wise one must correct, or forgive easily. (My translation).

In this piece by Benedykt Chmielowski, three Latin words are obvious, and only one (autor) is now widely used. Yet, the use of Latin can create a sense of pompous style.

In both Ukrainian and Polish culture, there are a number of texts based on the macabre use of different languages. The satire of extreme verbosity, based on learned words in colloquial contexts, symbolises a certain desacralisation of sacred languages through laughter: if a word or phrase from a sacred language can provoke laughter or smile instead of piety and reverence, it is no longer sacred.

Grey zones of understanding sacred texts in sacred languages

In the Slavonic world, the issue of understanding Latin is straightforward: if one knows the language, one understands it; if one has never learnt it, their understanding is zero. The case of Church Slavonic is much more intricate: the common linguistic heritage of all the Slavs can play deceptive tricks on modern Ukrainians or Poles.

When the Church Slavonic language was being designed as a literary standard for all Slavs, their lifestyles and languages were much closer and similar than nowadays. During the last millennium, Slavonic nations built and developed their identity, culture, history, and they had to alter their languages. Church Slavonic varied within these linguistic communities as well, and today, researchers identify several variants of the Church Slavonic language: they are called recensions – the Old Bulgarian recension, the Middle Bulgarian recension, the Serbian recension, the Ukrainian recension, the Russian recension etc. The difference between Latin and Church Slavonic is that Latin was

a living language, and Church Slavonic was partially "artificial". After Latin disintegrated in local dialects, which developed into separate Romance languages, the understanding between them is complicated by a great amount of faux amis du traducteur. The same problem exists between Church Slavonic and modern Slavonic languages. The disruption between Church Slavonic and Ukrainian took place in the 15th century [Скаб 2020:538], and this fact encouraged the appearance of translations from Church Slavonic into Middle Ukrainian.

In New Ukrainian speakers' mentality, the perception of Church Slavonic has a lot of pitfalls. The most formal pitfall is the "melismatic quality of liturgical language" [Hughes 2003:37]: the Liturgy was written originally to be vocalized, and the tone and quality of the enunciation merge with the semantic values of the text, and they all shape the meanings which are conveyed. The phonetic misunderstanding of the Church Slavonic Liturgy of St John Chrysostom[3] is traced by modern Ukrainian speakers in a number of its fragments:

What is said	*What is heard*
входящих в онь (who enter it)	входящих в **вог**онь (who enter fire)
Воньмім (Let us be attentive)	В нь**ому** (In him/it)
безболізнени (peaceful)	безболісний (painless)
Імами ко Господу (We have [our hearts] to the Lord)	**Ідемо д**о Господ**а** (We go to the Lord)
Прийміте, ядіте (take, eat)	Прийміте, діт**и** (take, children)

The break between the spoken text and the written text diverts the worshipper's attention from the primary intention of the text itself, and the suggestive structure of the Liturgy is destroyed. Instead of delving into the depths of the liturgical expression, the faithful have to decipher the general content of the message, and a newly heard phrase distracts their attention from the previous one.

---

[3] The text in Civil Cyrillic and its English translation are taken from [Icyce 1962].

Nevertheless, the problem of understanding arises even when an utterance sounds superficially comprehensible, such as "свишній мир" (peace from on high), "Тебе благословим" (we bless You [the Lord]), "Горі іміїм сердца" (let us lift our hearts). Translators have observed that the original text does not always explain much to a believer who is expected to decipher biblical quotations, think in theological coordinates, and quickly recognise symbols [Седакова 2017:10]. All ancient texts require profound commentaries, and the main canons of the Liturgy (Byzantine, Roman and many others) are monuments of the poetics of antiquity.

The rest of the misleading lexemes can be divided into three categories: conventionally undecipherable, decipherable because of knowledge of dialects or archaic norms, and the very "false friends" of the translator. The first group includes words and phrases such as "грядий" (who comes; although Ukrainian has preserved the verb "грясти (гряду)"), "ізрядно" (especially), "пріяхом" (we received), "доріносима ангельскими чиньми" (accompanied by the angels), "в воню благоуханія духовнаго" (as a fragrance of spiritual perfume), "рціте Богу" (say to God). In the latter case, the form "рціте" is not recognisably connected to its infinitive "ректи", which developed a different grammatical paradigm in New Ukrainian. In the phrase "спокланяємося і сославима" (together worship and glorify), the grammatical component of co-action, encoded in the prefix "с-/со-", is usually lost in perception.

A good knowledge of dialects and archaisms can help to understand the phrases "возвіщати заутра" (to proclaim at dawn); "с миром ізидем" (let us go in peace), "благоліпіє" (beauty; easily confused with "благодать" (grace)). The existence of the Russian language in the cultural space of Ukraine before 2022, as well as the new Ukrainian senses, cause the misinterpretation of utterances due to the misunderstanding of "false friends", i.e. words or even their separate senses, which are replaced by current semantic components:

	Misinterpretation	*Correct interpretation*
солжут Тебі	deceive You	bow to You
живот непостидни	shameless belly	blameless life
под державою Твоєю	by Your state	by Your might
попеченіє	alimony	earthly cares
блажити тя	satisfy you	bless you
соблюди нас	observe, respect us	preserve us

The idea of falsehood should be extended to include the situation where the general meaning is well understood, but the deep contextual meaning and theological reverberation are lacking. The part of the meaning of a word can be called a grey zone of its meaning, which is not diverted from the attention of a believer by another linguistic obstacle (from the present linguistic system in one's mentality), but it is not reached by their attention due to the incompetent command of the ancient language (especially its polysemantic richness). The phrase "предержащі власті" does not only imply "the present government" but also underlines strong and political power. In "оставленіє гріхов" (remission of sins), forgiveness is accompanied by "deliberately not seeing", "allowing" and "stopping", which emphasise the enormous mercy of God and even reveal His help in averting sins. The mysterious expression "благорастворенїє воздухов" is better understood not as "good weather" but as "weather promising a good harvest" (in the Ukrainian translations, the lexeme "поліття" is ideally used). The expression "Тебе поєм, Тебе благословим, Тебе благодарим", which is usually interpreted as "Lord, we praise You with songs, we bless You, we thank You", actually means "singing, chanting, hymning", and the questions such as " Am I entitled to bless God (invoke my divine favour upon Him)?" become irrelevant. Similarly, the synonymic verbal series "поюще, вопіюще, взивающе, глаголюще" is intended to contextualise praise and glorification. Its English translation "singing, crying aloud, raising voices, saying" as well as its Ukrainian interpretation

have problems with the second member "вопіюще" (crying aloud), which mainly refers to negative situations with tears, pain and sorrow and whose emotionally neutral semantic sense is overshadowed by negative experiences. In the Ukrainian translations, the variants "виголошуючи" or "викликуючи" are much more in keeping with the glorifying mood of the relevant part of the Liturgy.

The essential rivalry between the sacred languages and the vernaculars was resolved by the victory of the rational approach that the service was planned as a meaningful act and should remain so. Indeed, public worship has partly lost its significance as an evangelising act because of the availability of numerous printed catechetical sources. However, the suggestive mediation of one's moral behaviour, psychic states and future expectations depends to a great extent on informative triggers which will involve the cognitive contexts connected with God's salvation and the eschatological dimensions of the present age and earthly life. The rupture between the meaning of the Liturgy and ideas for rethinking everyday problems determines the secularisation and atheistic mood of the faithful.

In the history of liturgics, the Liturgy was viewed as a text expressing Otherness: the difference was between God and people, and it stimulated people to move towards God. Gradually, the archaisation of the once-accepted language (both Church Slavonic and Latin) and the secularisation of the everyday mentality moved the Liturgy beyond the circle of immediately needed commodities. The gap became so great that people resigned themselves to overcoming it. This state of art motivated the ecclesiastical authorities to search for a change of approach to make the Liturgy their Own. The sacred vocabulary built on the means of sacred languages has mostly lost its value as a style of extreme piety, gratitude and mystery, while the sacred vocabulary built on the means of everyday language and living vernaculars arouses emotions and feelings in today's believers, who appreciate above all the values of understanding and emotional receptivity.

The shift to living languages has shaped another value of liturgical texts, namely the value of the sense of communion that can only be ensured through complete and mutual understanding. In general, the Church has lost its fear of the different identities of different nations following the same liturgical tradition. It resembles the separation of ecclesiastical and political matters that Jesus Christ deserved: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:21). The native language is a means of successful evangelisation, and these are manipulations of mysterious phrases that can cause heresy and promote atheism.

2.3. Musical dimensions of quality judgements
in liturgical translation

In translation studies, musical problems were not a frequently considered topic, but they were addressed, too. Its scope remained within the limits of solving problems of poetic translation, where translators tried to reunite – and compromise – meaning and melody. These ideas were not always constructive for religious singing, but it is good to review how today's theory of musical translation is applicable to liturgical practice and how it can be used to assess translation quality.

The main principles of musical translation overlap significantly with poetic translation since its essence is the problem of transferring "beauty" – i.e. aesthetic categories of the poetics of a genre and a text – from the source culture to the target culture. Researchers have contributed to the study of musical rearrangement in translation [Apter, Herman 2016], the social function of music in interethnic relations [Susam-Saraeva 2015], the interpretive significance of music in translations [Desblache 2019].

Current theoretical views help to reassess the relations between liturgical practice and its musical realisation. The basic questions that need to be answered in the context of the retranslation of any liturgical text may be as follows:

1) What is a singable translation in liturgical praxis?

2) If the original represents the Other for target readers, is it the same in liturgical praxis?

3) Where is the space of a translator's individuality in liturgical translation?

4) Do different musical patterns evoke the same feeling for the same text?

5) What is the role of historicity in religious hymns?

6) Are there any "unimportant" words which can be omitted in translation?

7) Can liturgical verbal culture allow taboos, forbidden words and political correctness?

8) Is the liturgical melody an artefact of a national culture or a commodity of theological expansion?

9) Is the role of vocal music the same in the Byzantine and Roman Rites? If so, is it the same in originals and in translations?

Singability and melody

The singability of earlier liturgical texts did not typically depend on rhythm and rhyme, since the aesthetic power of these chants was created by melisma instead of strict syllable repetition. The combined prosody of language and text produced a unique melody favoured by the local liturgical tradition of a given language, but a new melody usually emerged in another local and linguistic liturgical tradition. This is why religious singers know many musical patterns of the same hymns (such as Byzantine/ Greek, Bulgarian, Ukrainian (Kyivan and that of Halychyna), Georgian, etc.). The Paschal Troparion itself is sung in different languages according to different melodies, and rarely is it sung in two languages according to the same musical score (although there are occasional attempts).

Historically, the text was first adapted to the original Greek melody, but isosyllabism is impossible to maintain in different languages. The Paschal Troparion can be divided into lines according to our contemporary idea of a stanza. This stanza will look like this:

Χριστὸς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν,	3 stresses	8 syllables
θανάτῳ θάνατον πατήσας,	3 stresses	9 syllables
καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι	3 stresses	9 syllables
ζωὴν χαρισάμενος!	2 stresses	7 syllables

The Greek pattern has a structure of 8+9+9+7 syllables (=33 syllables), with three accents per line and two accents in the last line. The number of syllables differs drastically between the Greek text and its translations:

Greek pattern	8+9+9+7=33 syllables
Church Slavonic pattern	8+6+6+5=25 syllables
Ukrainian pattern	7+6+5+5=23 syllables
Polish pattern	6+6+6+3=21 syllables
English pattern 1	6+6+7+4=23 syllables
English pattern 2	6+6+6+6=24 syllables

It is easier to compose a separate melody for the translations quoted, and a difference can be regulated melismatically, although it is surprising that the Polish text is the shortest.

The tonic system of versification triumphs in the Octoechos, where eight tones, composed by St John of Damascus and crystallised in the Middle Ages, help to interpret the meditative power of ecclesiastical hymns according to melodies whose essence is majestic (Tone 1), modest (Tone 2), tempestuous (Tone 3), combining joy and sadness (Tone 4), tranquillizing for atonement (Tone 5), generating attentiveness and mourning (Tone 6), asking for mercy (Tone 7) and glorifying (Tone 8). This system became the basis for the plainchant of Eastern Christianity and the Gregorian chant of Western Christianity. In translation, tonic versification allows for changes in the length of the melodic phrase by adding syllables. For this reason, melismatic singing and repetition are always good options when the original textual structure is less important.

So, what could save the situation in the translation of the Paschal Troparion is the number of accents if it were identical in all texts? However, this is not the case:

Greek pattern	3+3+3+2 stresses
Church Slavonic pattern	3+3+2+2 stresses
Ukrainian pattern	3+3+2+2 stresses
Polish pattern	3+3+2+1 stresses
English pattern 1	3+3+3+2 stresses
English pattern 2	3+3+2+3 stresses

Tonic singing fails because a lost stress stands for a few syllables in the structures of the translations, and in real time, it is an easily detectable audible sensation. In Ukrainian liturgical texts, the two-stress syntagma was well accepted, creating conditions for the emergence of a new melody.

To this day, in both the Western and Eastern Churches, religious melodies are mainly regulated in graduals and hirmologions. Thus, if the aim is to transfer the entire local liturgical tradition into another language, isosyllabic and equirhythmic issues play a role. From this perspective, the foreign-language listener will "hear" the implementation of the foreignisation strategy. The culture of ecclesiastical singing itself is seen as a cultural good of a particular church. It is popularised among believers who no longer speak the original language of that national or local liturgical tradition (such as the Orthodox and Greek Catholic diasporas in the USA and Canada who still wish to preserve the national traditions of their churches and liturgies).

The historical tradition of liturgical praxis shapes a new social attitude of a religious community in the dichotomy of "Own"–"Other". The overall mission of Christian evangelisers was to create an "Own" world (read: mentality) out of a myriad of ethnically "Other" worldviews. The musical history of the Liturgy provides enough data to draw quite contradictory conclusions: on the one hand, the centralised ecclesiastical authorities endeavoured to maintain the singular standard (the "typical edition" of the Gradual in Western Christianity); on the other hand, they could not control and limit the efforts directed at the faithful who were to popularise the Liturgy. In the social parameters, the inability to limit control led to the emergence of local chants (in Eastern Christianity). In individual parameters, it left enough space for

a unique and original perception of the Word of God and its translation into musical scores.

The Eastern hymns were favourably received in the Slavonic world, while in the Asian countries, there are facts of poor acquisition of Western hymns [Arrington 2021:2-3]. The musical problem even caused difficulties for the mission of evangelisation itself, as its primary Christian meaning was transformed in favour of Western hegemony. Introducing local musical melodies into Christian hymnography solved the reception problem. Conversely, Gregorian chant was sought to be preserved as an integral unity in translation. Attempts have been made to localise it, but the success is only partial: "The adaptation of Gregorian chant into common languages does not quite imply a local culture's unfettered control over the arrangement of translations, especially because the Catholic Church seeks to preserve the integrity of the chant" [Cho at al. 2021:13]. The approach of closely following the melodies of Gregorian chant means that the translator has to treat it as a poetic text rather than a strictly dogmatic piece. The experience of Polish translations of Roman Catholic hymns proves the inevitability of lexical substitutions and the play with synonyms [see more: Bodzioch 2015:57-67].

Historicism

Two fundamental principles of approximation and compensation, often associated with poetic translation and considered successful principles, can be rejected by theologians and liturgists. Any substitution can lead to heresy, which happened in the past. In the 4th century, the general philosophy of the liturgy changed: the eschatological focus on the future resurrection and salvation shifted to the historical focus of commemorating Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the Last Supper, crucifixion and resurrection. In this way, symbolism became narrative and didactic [Taft 2014:43]. Not only does the Liturgy bring hope, but it also teaches through historical examples.

In the earlier period of liturgical translation, domestication never played a major role. However, at the same time, it was

always present not only at the prosodic level but also at the lexical level. However, this presence is not overt but, on the contrary, hidden in the spheres of perceptual substitution. The lexeme "μνῆμα" is an example of hidden realities: on the one hand, it denotes very abstract "graves"; on the other hand, funeral rituals and things are highly conservative and genuine. Indeed, there is a great dissimilarity between Byzantine and Israeli "tombs": the numerous ideas of a coffin, a lot, and a place shape the originality of each national funeral culture.

For this reason, what the average listener thinks of as a coffin, a tomb, or a burial place is a dubious option. In Ancient Greek, the lexeme denoted both a burial place and a coffin, but in Patristic Greek, as well as in Church Slavonic and Polish, it is known as a tomb (a place with possible constructions above it). In Ukrainian, on the other hand, "гріб" denotes both a tomb and a coffin. Thus, although the Paschal Troparion refers to the dead, i.e. those in their graves, the luminous image of the deceased lying in coffins easily catches our eye and immediately evokes a number of additional associations. Replacing "гріб" with "могила" would not change the melody much, but the veneration of the particular ecclesiastical style prevents the use of a less dubious variant.

It is astonishing how different interpretations can emerge from how music is performed. The Last Judgement has been depicted in various ways, either to emphasise people's sins and deserved punishment (as in the Book of Zephaniah) or to emphasise God's mercy and give people more hope (as in the letters of the Apostle Paul). The sequence "Dies irae", whose first lines are taken from the verses of the Book of Zephaniah, is part of the Office for the Dead and some commemorative Masses. In the official Gregorian chant, it is sung in a sighing manner, giving the faithful an opportunity to reflect on their sinful behaviour on earth. The musical variations of the Requiem by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Giuseppe Verdi contain stormy fragments designed to frighten the faithful and exhaust their emotional strength. The main instrument of manipulation was not language but music. In Western Christianity, Latin existed to guarantee a

common basis and way of perception: "In sacred music, a long tradition of translation into Latin [was] controlled by the church establishment, which only changed in the 1960s. The texts were essentially intended as instruments of support for this liturgy" [Desblache 2019:184]. For this reason, Gregorian chant performs the official functions, while other variants are tolerated but not allowed to enter into liturgical use.

The generic names of hymns – such as antiphons, katabasias, responsories, and all the others – are also historical, and they used to denote a particular practice associated with a hymn: an antiphon was sung by two sections of the choir in alternation; a katabasia was sung when two sections of the choir were about to meet for a final hymn; a responsory was a refrain from the Scripture reading. The word "troparion" itself means a repeated hymn: the Paschal Troparion is sung three times and many times during the Liturgy and the festal season. Most of these meaningful names are just names of hymn genres, though it is difficult to call them "genres". In historical reconstructions of the Liturgy, these hymns expand their meaningful load, but these practices are exceptional and rare cases.

Liturgical reforms entail the revision of familiar and authoritative texts. In the sequence "Dies irae", the reform of the Second Vatican Council (1960s) replaced the generic term "sinful woman" with the proper name of Mary Magdalene. However, a translation for the Anglican Missal (1921) had omitted the proper name much earlier. This act of substitution may have been seen as a translation licence, but in the text of this religious authority and in the post-Vatican text, it is already a deliberate change of historical attitude with catechetical consequences (meaning the all-encompassing mercy of God).

Phonetic and semantic prosody

The musical sphere of liturgical translation is not free from subjectivist prejudices. In the private discussion about the choice between "віки віків" and "віки вічні", I have heard that the sound combination "чн" is not harmonious. Meanwhile, no one

questions whether the same combination in the phrase melody "вічная пам'ять" (equivalent to "requiem aeternam"; literally: "eternal memory") is harmonious or not. This judgement reveals the space of subjective intentions and manipulations.

The subjective aural capacities of the faithful motivated the ecclesiastical authorities to react in order to avoid heretical misjudgments: "In the fourteenth century and right through the Counter-Reformation period for instance, the Roman Catholic Church pushed for bans on vocal compositions that obscured the intelligibility of the words in sacred music. This led to a stricter polyphonic style, characterised by two or more voices singing simultaneously and epitomised by Roman Renaissance composer Palestrina's religious pieces" [Desblaces 2019:147]. Indeed, singing is an integral part of the participation in the Liturgy, but different combinations of musical voices contribute to the interpretation. The Orthodox prayer for the dead, "Αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη" ("Eternal Remembrance"), sounds more solemn and even fearful when sung by adult men, while the voices of young boys and women give it a less fatal tone.

The relationship between text and music in Slavonic hymn translation has not escaped the attention of researchers. Antonina Filonov Gove remarks: "This might be called the "semantic" or "expressive" relationship between music and text. It is a vast realm, in modern music encompassing such things as musical climaxes (crescendoes, high notes, large intervals, melismas, and the like) written to coincide with the high points of the text (key words or significant names, exclamations, words with strong affective properties, the resolution of suspense in a narrative, poetic images, etc.); or shifts to the minor mode coinciding with dolorous utterances; or staccato rhythms representing excitement; or strong downbeats – emotional force, and so forth" [Filonov Gove 1988:214]. This observation refers to the above-mentioned tonal system of the Octoechos but the amount of data is still daunting to make any suggestions about the actual implementation of the emotional power of songs. Thus, according to the Triodion, the Paschal Troparion is sung in Tone 5, which should evoke a

desire for atonement, while the Easter mood triggers much more majestic reverberations and interpretations.

The easiest way to judge the success of interlingual translation is the structural coincidence of the high points of the text and the scores. Otherwise, the reception is blurred by the typical folk or popular melodies for various emotionally interpreted motifs. This idea is reiterated by Filonov Gove, who states that "if it could be determined that matching musical formulae to textual meaning was a practice in the composition of Byzantine hymns and that such relationships were perceived by the Slavic translators, we would have the basis for yet another explanation regarding word-for-word translation of the Slavic hymns" [ibid.]. Today, this question is still unanswered, and it is logical to trace that foreign melodies were brought to be acquired, but gradually, they failed, and new local melodies began to serve the original emotional purpose.

From a theoretical standpoint, music as a mode of intersemiotic translation could be a thought-provoking topic for research. The sequence "Dies irae" is performed differently for ecclesiastical use and musical requiems: in the stanza "Rex tremendae majestatis", the initial "Rex" is repeated in Mozart's version, but not in Verdi's. The translation in which the first word is not a one-syllable word will not fit the musical pattern of one composer but will fit that of another.

Nowadays, all translation strategies depend on whether the translator wishes to preserve and transmit the practice of a particular local or national liturgical tradition. The fundamental purpose of evangelisation has receded since most believers who could ask for new translations are already Christians. The translator thus faces the problem of transmitting the aesthetic heritage of this liturgical tradition. From a cultural viewpoint, rhythmic patterns have become an inseparable part of national liturgical traditions, and they strengthen national presentations of the identity of Christian texts, which have moved from "Other" foreign literature to "Own" national heritage.

Melody is a valid point of consideration from the point of view of textual translation assessment. It can be regarded as a macro-

criterion, i.e. a very general focus of attention broken down into numerous minor points of comparison and contrast. In translation history, a hymn produced a melody, but its translation produced a new melody, which will produce a new textual form of a hymn if there is a desire to preserve the new melody. Musical history knows a lot of cases of similar situations: in Eastern Christianity, this is how local – or instead, national – hymns were produced and became a genuine part of the national culture; in Western Christianity, this is the case of professional music, where composers experiment with popular hymns, adding musical interpretations to the well-accepted textual association and extending it.

Historicism is another macro-criterion for evaluating liturgical texts. Sacred history is generally known, but it contains an immense amount of hidden theological and historical realia. The ethnomusical criterion for measuring the emotional power of melodies in the foreign original and the local translation sounds very good in theory, but it is easier for the practical critic to opt for a reliable structural criterion (the pattern of textual and musical high points).

Appendix: Texts of the Paschal Troparion

Χριστὸς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν,	3 stresses	8 syllables
θανάτῳ θάνατον πατήσας,	3 stresses	9 syllables
καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι	3 stresses	9 syllables
ζωὴν χαρισάμενος!	2 stresses	7 syllables
		8+9+9+7=33
Хрїстосъ воскресе изъ мертвыхъ,	3 stresses	8 syllables
Смертїю смерть поправъ,	3 stresses	6 syllables
и сущимъ во гробѣхъ	2 stresses	6 syllables
животъ даровавъ!	2 stresses	5 syllables
		8+6+6+5=25
Христос воскрес із мертвих,	3 stresses	7 syllables
смертю смерть подолав,	3 stresses	6 syllables
і тим, що в гробах,	2 stresses	5 syllables
життя дарував!	2 stresses	5 syllables
		7+6+5+5=23

Chrystus powstał z martwych,   3 stresses 6 syllables
śmiercią podeptał śmierć   3 stresses 6 syllables
i będącym w grobach   2 stresses 6 syllables
życie dał!   1 stress   3 syllables
                                            6+6+6+3=21

Christ is risen from the dead, 3 stresses 6 syllables
Trampling down death by death, 3 stresses 6 syllables
And upon those in the tombs   3 stresses 7 syllables
Bestowing life!   2 stresses 4 syllables
                                            6+6+7+4=23

Christ is risen from the dead, 3 stresses 6 syllables
Trampling down death by death, 3 stresses 6 syllables
And to those in the tombs   2 stresses 6 syllables
He is restoring life!   3 stresses 6 syllables
                                            6+6+6+6=24

3. Titles of liturgical books as the problem of correspondence: a comparative table

Everyone has heard the insightful observation that different words for the same concept in different languages actually mean different things: "butter", "die Butter", "le beurre", "масло", "masło" should mean the same everyday thing – butter, but in different cultures, even butter is different. So, different words for butter mean different things that exist only in certain cultures. The same is true in the area of religious translations. In various denominations, the bread used for Holy Communion is a different substance whose recipe is dogmatically and precisely described and strictly followed. One of the most profound controversies between Orthodox and Catholics is whether it is acceptable to use unleavened bread.

The names of liturgical books are among the translator's false friends when the essence of these books looks identical in different denominations. Yet, there are so many tricky structural and dogmatic discrepancies that translators choose

to transliterate their names, adding a lot of obscure words to the lexicon of a language whose speakers do not practise the denomination of the source text and do not clearly understand its intricacies. The aim of this chapter is to analyse whether it is possible to apply the common names of liturgical books of the target religious culture or denomination to those of the source culture and denomination. This problem is relevant not only to intercultural communication, where a single denomination dominates the whole culture of a nation but also to interdenominational interpretation, where, within the same national community, the readership is denominationally diverse and may produce a superficial interpretation of the liturgical practices of the celebrants and the faithful.

The main analytical tool is the informational analysis of the content of liturgical books [e.g. Byzantine 1969; Graduale 1979; Mszał 1986; Liturgia 1982-1988; Divine 2003; Молитвослов 1990], encyclopaedic entries [CE 1913–1914; EU 1985-2001; EK 1995-2014; ПЭ 2000-; NCE 2003] and theological and educational sources [Agenda 1981; Harper 1991; Типик 1992] in order to summarise the criteria and characteristics of types of liturgical books under various titles and in two main Christian denominations – the Roman and Byzantine Rites.

Depending on the denomination and lingual culture, liturgical texts and books can be divided into four groups: lectionary, euchographic, hymnographic and homiletic [Пентковский 2016; Пуряєва 2018]. It is advantageous to check whether this division is valid when comparing two denominations. Catholic data can explain the later appearance of Protestant liturgical books.

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

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

*The Comparative Table of the Books Used during Liturgies
in the Roman and Byzantine Rites*

Roman Rite	Byzantine Rite

Lectionary texts

Roman Rite	Byzantine Rite
Evangeliary / Gospel Book *Ukr.* Євангеліярій / Євангелістарій *Pol.* Ewangeliarz / Ewangelistarz	Gospel Lectionary / Evangelion *Ukr.* Богослужбове Євангеліє / *Pol.* Ewangeliarz
Lectionary *Ukr.* Лекціонарій *Pol.* Lekcjonarz	Epistle Lectionary / Epistle Book *Ukr.* Апостол *Pol.* Apostoł
	Prophetologion *Ukr.* Паремійник *Pol.* Paremijnik
Psalter *Ukr.* Молитовний Псалтир *Pol.* Psałterz	Psalter *Ukr.* Молитовний Псалтир *Pol.* Psałterz

Euchographic texts

Roman Rite	Byzantine Rite
Roman Missal *Ukr.* Римський Месал *Pol.* Mszał rzymski	Liturgicon *Ukr.* Літургікон / Служебник *Pol.* Służebnik
Pontifical *Ukr.* Понтифікал *Pol.* Pontyfikał	Archieratikon / Book of Pontifical Services *Ukr.* Архиєратикон / Святительский служебник / Правильник *Pol.* Archijeratikon / Służebnik archierejskij
Ritual *Ukr.* Ритуал *Pol.* Rytuał	Euchologion / Book of Needs *Ukr.* Требник *Pol.* Euchologion / Trebnik
Prayer Book *Ukr.* Молитовник / Молитвослов *Pol.* Modlitewnik	Prayer Book *Ukr.* Молитовник / Молитвослов *Pol.* Modlitewnik

Breviary / Liturgy of the Hours / Divine Office
Ukr. Бревіярій / Літургія годин
Pol. Brewiarz / Liturgia godzin

Horologion / Canonical Hours
Ukr. Часослов / Часловець
Pol. Horologion

Hymnographic texts

Octoechos
Ukr. Октоїх
Pol. Oktoechos / Oktoich

Lenten Triodion
Ukr. Постова Тріодь / Трипіснець
Pol. Triodion postny

Pentecostarion / Festal Triodion
Ukr. Цвітна Тріодь / Квітна Тріодь
Pol. Triodion paschalny

Menaion (pl. Menaia)
Ukr. Мінея
Pol. Minieja

Gradual
Ukr. Градуал
Pol. Graduał

Hirmologion
Ukr. Ірмологіон
Pol. Hirmologion

Homiletic texts

Martyrology
Ukr. Мартиролог
Pol. Martyrologium

Synaxarion / Synexarion
Ukr. Синаксар
Pol. Synaksarion / Synaksariusz

Homiliary Gospel
Ukr. Учительне Євангеліє
Pol. Ewangelia uczytelna

The issue of the titles of books is even more complicated from a historical perspective: books with the same title had different

contents in different historical periods. This situation applies first of all to the very Liturgy and various euchographic and hymnographic collections. The liturgical reforms connected with the changes in the order of the offices and the variable hymns in the Liturgy (the introduction of the Stoudite and Jerusalem Typikons in the Eastern Church or the Trent and Second Vatican Councils in the Western Church). Thus, the title itself signifies a different essence, which is typically noted by historians of the Liturgy but remains absolutely unacknowledged by the laity.

The first group of books used during the Liturgy is the 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 into separate pericopes, recited throughout the liturgical year. The Roman Church gradually came to use a single book containing all the selected biblical texts used during the Liturgy: the Lectionary. The Orthodox Church continues using the Lectionary of the Gospels, the Lectionary of the Epistles and the Lectionary of the Prophets separately as published books. Historically, the Psalter contained the Book of Psalms and a series of votive prayers. This type of liturgical books was very popular. In Western cultures, they were used for learning to read (in the Ukrainian tradition, this function is often associated with the Horologion); in Orthodox cultures, they were also read during funeral vigils. From the viewpoint of translation, the use of the specific titles of the books will directly indicate the denominational division, which reflects the history of adaptation and facilitation of liturgical practice. No informational discrepancies (apart from the non-coincidence of some pericopes) exist between the biblical texts used in both Western and Eastern Christianity. What may differ is the basis of the translated Bibles. Various smaller denominations may accept a particular translation of the Bible as their textus receptus, and their liturgical books will contain the vocabulary of that translation.

The second group of books is euchographic. Their primary purpose is to pray and implore the Lord's blessing during regular worship (the liturgies of the daily and yearly cycles) or special

offices (like sacraments and blessings). At the centre of liturgical life is the liturgy, which has a long history and a vast geography. In the first millennium, the number of rites was much more numerous than it would fit into today's understanding of the Catholic-Orthodox division, and the liturgy has never been a stable text for thousands of years. By the end of the first millennium AD, the Orthodox liturgies were more or less shaped as we know them now, and the Roman Rite was dominant over others in the Roman Church. Nevertheless, the work of adapting and modifying the texts of the Liturgy has never ceased in either Eastern or Western Christianity. In the Roman Church, the most significant revisions were made after 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 previous codified edition was approved in 1570 and last published in 1962. As it has never been officially cancelled, two Masses and two Missals ("Tridentine" and "Vatican II") formally coexist, but not to the same extent. The two main forms of the Mass are the High Mass (solemn) and the Low Mass (ordinary). The Byzantine liturgy exists in four forms: the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom (most commonly used on Sundays and weekdays), the Divine Liturgy of St Basil the Great (10 times a year), the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (on Wednesdays and Fridays during Great Lent and the first days of the week before Easter) and the Divine Liturgy of the Holy Apostle James (once a year, on his feast day). All these texts make up the Liturgicon, i.e. the book of these liturgies in Byzantine liturgical practice. A liturgicon can be called a missal, and this explanation is quite popular among Anglophones since both books celebrate the Eucharist.

Knowing the main informational discrepancies between these books of two rites (while they have the same function), we must also note the translation practices of domestication in Slavonic liturgical traditions. While the original Greek term is usually naturalised on the basis of the key Slavonic root term (thus the liturgy name "Служба Божа" determined the title "Служебник"), Anglophone translators mostly prefer the original Greek title, even

when the translations are not from Greek but from Church Slavonic or another 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 that is not universal but belongs to historical geography.

Liturgical offices are divided into two groups: those performed by a priest (baptism, marriage, funeral, etc.) and those performed by a bishop alone ((like the consecration of Holy Chrism and the sacraments of Holy Orders). Previously, 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 as series: the offices are published as separate books. Thus, the actual Byzantine book Archieratikon has no direct counterpart in the Roman Rite. Another interesting question is whether applying the term "pontifical" to the Byzantine offices is possible. One case dates back to 1716 when the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Monastery of Suprasl published "Понтифікал си єст Служебник святителскій" containing the episcopal offices of the Eastern Church [Понтифікал 1716]. The English language, however, allows the use of "pontifical" as that of a bishop, but without the reference to the Roman papacy [OED 1989:12:97]. It should also be remembered 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 most direct correspondence in all traditions: it collects prayers according to the dogmata of a specific denomination. Occasionally, the term "молитвослов" is applied to prayer books, and this may mean that it also includes some litanies and offices. Large and thick prayer books may 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.

The Breviary is a further example of genre confusion. The Breviary itself means a collection of prayers and hymns. That is why the boundary between euchographic and hymnographic

texts is blurred, as well as between the actual 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 collected in several books, used even more by precentors and singers than by laics:

1) the Horologion consists of the prayers used in daily worship and refers to the 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 of the liturgical cycle has a specific tone or mode, i.e. a specific troparion, kontakion and other hymns; in all, eight tones alternate throughout the year);

3) the Menaion consists of the special prayers and hymns for the fixed feasts of the Church, i.e. according to the yearly liturgical cycle;

4) the Triodion contains the 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 greater. 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 voluminous collection which may exist in different editions:

1) the Monthly Menaion consists of 12 volumes comprising the services for each month;

2) the Menaion of Holy Days is abridged and contains services for major holidays;

3) the General Menaion contains services in honour of particular groups of saints and beati, as well as for particular holidays.

Both divisions are well accepted in the canonical practice of the Orthodox Churches. Beyond this practice, there are a number of different titles and books covering the same hymns. At the

same time, one title has departed from its original hymnographic function: the Menaion for Daily Reading ("мінея-четья") already belongs to hagiography and corresponds to the Roman Martyrology.

The number of hymns in the Roman Rite is also colossal, counting all the antiphons, responsories, propers, graduals and other chants. After the radical reform of the Second Vatican Council, they were rearranged and incorporated into the newly structured matrix of the liturgical year. The book in which all these chants are collected is called the Liturgy of Hours (or the Canonical Hours) instead of the former official title "Breviary". The difference between the two titles lies in the selection and structure of the hymnal corpus. Another peculiarity of this book – like the Byzantine hymnal books – is that it is addressed primarily to celebrants, precentors and monks (also, but not especially, to the laity). Thus, this book is both euchographic and hymnographic.

Purely hymnographic is the Gradual, which combines all the earlier hymnals (antiphonaries, responsorials, kyriales and other hymnaries). It used to denote the most important plainchant sung by the choir at Mass, but now it contains all the texts and music. The direct correspondence in the Orthodox tradition is the Hirmologion, which contains all the hymns and prayers to be sung, as well as musical notations for them. In the Ukrainian Church, the paraliturgical hymnal with texts and notes for popular religious singing is sometimes called the "Богогласник" ("Bohohlasnyk") in honour of its first edition in 1790 [Богогласникъ 1790].

Homiletical texts are customarily grouped as a particular genre within liturgical literature. In the Ukrainian Church, homiliary gospels propagated the knowledge of the Scriptures in the vernacular, which boosted the nation-forming abilities and ambitions of the stateless people. Yet, the essential book for homilies in both rites is the collection of didactic parts from the lives and works of saints. After the schism of 1054, the divergence between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches was drastic, though

the pre-1054 Christian heritage is remembered and venerated with equal respect in the liturgical books of both rites.

Another similarity between the two rites is the need for liturgical manuals to help organise the daily and yearly cycles of liturgical worship. This instructional genre, which also incorporates and explains the use of the above-mentioned liturgical texts, can be considered a separate genre. However, it is manifested only in a single book: the Typikon for the Orthodox and the Agenda for the Catholics.

The titles of liturgical books, seen as objects of translation, have revealed an extremely lively and dynamic essence of some religious concepts and terms. All the conditions of historical development and liturgical practice place the translator in a tough position when the historical context plays a decisive role in interpreting the text and the historical truth. A book with the same title has different contents depending on the historical period, as in the case of the Gradual before and after the Second Vatican Council. Also, the Psalter refers to a different set of prayers and offices in various manuscript and even printed editions.

The frequent changes in liturgical texts mean that these texts are alive and that today's readers can interpret them correctly. So, the translator is not working with a distant ancient text but with a text that represents the reality of at least the last century. Both the Roman and Byzantine Rites periodically introduced changes in the liturgical texts, but the Roman reforms are better known because they were systematic and extensive. This conclusion is all the more important for authors of historical novels: we easily superimpose our contemporary views and visions on millennia-old phenomena whose core was the same, but a large number of details changed.

The Roman Church has experienced two major reformations: the Council of Trent and the Second Vatican Council. The Kyivan Church also experienced reforms, such as those connected with the changes in 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 spiritual intimate life, which affects religious poetry. This can cause difficulty in interpreting allusions, as the translator should refer to the liturgical text which was valid in a certain period.

The aftermath of the liturgical reform also influences the perception of the languages of the texts, such as Latin and Church Slavonic. Although it is an additional argument to consider them as "living languages" and "ours", the semantic space of these languages can never reflect today's reality. It is a false approach to see these languages through today's mentality. The systems of these languages are distorted. Hence, translations into national languages, of which the 20th century is rich, are a reliable bridge to understand and feel the essence of Christian dogmata.

The question is how to solve the problem of denominational perception. It is not possible in general. Looking at the table above, a believer of one rite can feel how different the other rite is and how little we know about it. The use of Latin and Greek terms is helpful because it creates a boundary of alienation, and the faithful do not bring in their associations. The purely denominational difference is between the Agenda and the Typikon: they have the same teaching function in applying liturgical texts, and the books are translated in the way known because of their historically denominational nature. Our reality, however, is characterised by an immense diversity of Christian denominations, and it will always be misleading to use the same term and too complicated to adopt a new one each time.

Another conclusion is drawn for the taxonomy of liturgical books and their genres. Nowadays (unlike before the 20th century), 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 supposed to contain everything and make life easier for the faithful. For this reason, this grouping can be an additional obstacle to helping a layperson interpret its essence and functionality correctly.

II. HISTORY AND PRAXIS

1. 10th-15th centuries: Europe's medieval East
in matters of ecclesiastical civilization and textual praxis

The medieval Polish and Ukrainian states were converted to Christianity at about the same time: the Duchy of Poland (also known as Civitas Schinesghe) in 966 and Rus (also known as Kyivan Rus) in 988. Nonetheless, the outcome of these major events was different for the two countries in terms of cultural development. The influence on the establishment of national literatures, the popularisation of literacy, the raising of cultural mentality was different in *Slavia Orthodoxa* and *Slavia Catholica*.

Christianity brought literacy to the Slavonic lands and stimulated the development of national literatures. The early Bulgarian, Serbian, Czech and Ukrainian literatures depended heavily on religious translations, of which liturgical texts were an integral part (for a list of some existing texts see [Огієнко 1929; Сводный каталог 1984; Inwentarz 2012]). The oldest sample of Glagolitic writing is the 10th-century "Kyiv Missal" (or "Kyiv Glagolitic Folios") from Moravia, which testifies to the existence of liturgical translations among Western Slavs. The recipient language was Old Church Slavonic, and this manuscript must have been one of many other liturgical books of the Roman Rite.

Old Church Slavonic (also known as Old Bulgarian) was a language easily perceived and understood among the Slavs, but it stimulated the development of other Slavonic languages and literatures where it was used as a language of the Church. In Ukrainian territory, it immediately began to take on a local form and was transformed into the independent written standard of the state. From the 10th to the 18th century, the written language developed parallel with the vernacular. The Old Ukrainian written

form (up to the 13th century) heavily depended on Church Slavonic. More vernacular elements appeared in Middle Ukrainian written language (14th to 18th centuries).

Latin played a similar role in the Polish area. It paralleled the development of the Polish language until the 18th century. Latin also contributed to Polish literature, a large part of which (both poetry as well as literary and non-literary prose) was written in Latin. Despite the close contact between the two languages and the borrowing of numerous terms from Latin, Polish was not so much stimulated by the use of Latin. This partly explains why religious translation, with various stages of linguistic orientation and experimentation, was abundant and well-known in medieval Ukraine but not in medieval Poland.

Repertoires of liturgical literature

The earliest mentions of liturgical translations in the Slavonic world are recorded in the 9th-century Lives of SS Cyril-Constantine and Methodius, Byzantine Christian missionaries to the Moravians, who are also honoured as the "Apostles to the Slavs". "The Life of Constantine" reads: "As soon as all the church offices were accepted [translated], he [Cyril-Constantine] taught them Matins and the Hours, Vespers and Compline, and the Liturgy" [Kantor 1983:69]. "The Life of Methodius" refers to the same subjects: "Deriving threefold joy therefrom, we considered the matter and decided to send to your lands our son Methodius, an Orthodox man accomplished in mind, whom we consecrated with his disciples in order to teach, as you requested, and to explain fully in your language the Scriptures and holy Mass, that is, the liturgy, as well as Baptism according to the entire Church Office, just as Constantine the Philosopher had begun through the grace of God and the prayers of Saint Clement" or "For previously he had translated with the Philosopher [Cyril-Constantine] only the Psalter, the Gospel together with the "Apostolos", and selected church liturgies. And then he translated the "Nomocanon", that is, the Rule of the Law, and the Books of the Fathers" [Kantor 1983:69, 125].

These quotations support the view that the translated Liturgy is to be understood as a unity of all the liturgical books necessary for yearly and occasional worship.

The liturgical life itself was not unified in this form, which was stabilised several centuries later and is now entirely accepted. Various liturgies were spread and celebrated in Christendom. Since Moravia had experienced contacts with the Roman Church, St Cyril was able to adapt the Greek translation of the Latin Mass, called the Liturgy of St Peter, to the Church Slavonic language, but he also propagated the Byzantine liturgy [Dostál 1965:77-84]. The Archbishopric of Moravia used the Slavonic liturgy for a very short time, and it might have even reached southern Poland. Unfortunately, Pope Stephen V prohibited using the Slavonic liturgy in 885 (after the death of St Methodius). The ban was repeated in 968, and the appeal for permission was rejected in 1080. The repeated ban means that the Slavonic liturgy survived somewhere in a clandestine state, but there were no favourable conditions for the liturgical translation of the Roman Rite, and Latin was the only dominant language in use.

After the disciples of St Methodius were exiled from Moravia, they came to Bulgaria, where they settled and produced the first fully Byzantine corpus of liturgical books in Old Church Slavonic. Among them was St Clement of Ohrid, who is credited with translating the Pentecostarion. The Bulgarian Archbishopric legitimised the use of Old Church Slavonic as a liturgical language, and this liturgical legacy was later transferred northwards – to the Kyivan State of Rus at the turn of the 11th century that was called "the first South Slavonic influence". St Clement's corpus of liturgical books contained all the four groups of books: lectionary texts (Gospel, Epistle Book, Psalter, Prophetologion); hymnographic texts (Menaion, Lenten Triodion, Pentecostarion, Octoechos); euchographic texts (Liturgicon, Euchologion); homiletic texts [Пентковский 2016:58-59 ff]. The originals of these translations were Greek, though rare translations from Latin and Old High German can still be traced [Пентковский 2016:60], testifying to the initially unstable liturgical canon within a single ecclesiastical

institution and the creative influences of other liturgical traditions, especially those of Jerusalem, Palestine, southern Italy and western Byzantium.

Illustrious is the year 1037 in the history of Ukrainian religious translation, as described in the "Primary Chronicle": "He [Grand Prince Yaroslav the Wise of Kyiv] assembled many scribes, and translated from Greek into Slavic. He wrote and collected many books through which true believers are instructed and enjoy religious education" [RPC 1953:137]. The chronicler emphasised the importance of this translation enterprise, which meant that the translations were part of a large-scale programme of the translation, re-translation and localisation of specific texts for the benefit of the Church and the State. Under the entry for the year 1051, the Chronicle [RPC 1953:142] mentions the monastic and cathedral rule of the Studion, which replaced the earlier rule of Constantinople. The Rule of the Studion (edited by the Ecumenical Patriarch Alexios Stoudites) remained in force until the 15th century when the Rule of Jerusalem replaced it. All these replacements were followed by modifying – retranslating and editing – the existing liturgical texts according to the newly accepted demands of liturgical life. By the mid-11th century, the Festal Menaion had already been stabilised, but the General Menaion was expanded beyond the Greek original and even began to include hymns of local origin. The liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great had not been unified by the late 11th century, and in medieval Ukrainian liturgical praxis, some texts of the essential liturgies were used from earlier times, especially under the influence of Western Bulgarian prototexts. When the texts of the liturgies were revised in Constantinople, this influenced the need for their retranslation in Ukraine [Афанасьева 2015:276-279]. Moreover, the 12th and early 13th centuries were productive for specifically local liturgical activities.

The repertoire of the earliest manuscripts [Каталог 2014] reveals the then presence of all the liturgical genres of the corpus that we know today. It also contains translations of texts from the Western Church, which means that Kyivan Christianity was always open to all traditions of Christendom. Translations of hagiographic

and euchographic writings are among the oldest monuments of early Ukrainian literature [ІУЛ 2014:114-116].

The "second South Slavonic influence" was a result of the social, cultural and political conditions after the Mongol invasions in the mid-13th century, which prompted a very active churchly life in the 14th century: the rise and fall of the Metropolitanates of Halych and of Lithuania; the split of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv between the Great Duchy of Lithuania and the Great Duchy of Moscow; the appointment of metropolitans who were of Bulgarian and Greek origin. These changes and the ecclesiastical reforms in Constantinople stimulated the reorganisation of liturgical life throughout the East Slavonic territory and reactivated contacts with the South Slavs. The influence is mainly associated with the orthographic and linguistic reform of St Evtimiy of Tarnovo, which included the correction of translated texts.

St Evtimiy of Tarnovo and Cyprian Tsamblak, who was Metropolitan of Kyiv at the turn of the 15th century, were literalists who typically translated morpheme by morpheme and paid attention to a word's structure and the primary sense of the Greek root [Афанасьева 2015:282]. Still, they introduced some lexical changes related to the denotation of critical theological concepts, and in this way, their translations differ from those produced in the Athonite monasteries.

During the 13th and 14th centuries in the Kyivan Metropolitanate, liturgies in Old Bulgarian versions of various earlier Greek texts coexisted, even preserving some ancient prayers from southern Italian liturgies that are not found in the then Greek euchologia [Афанасьева 2015:283]. Cyprian reformed liturgical practice, so the corrected versions of the liturgies after the late 14th century are identical to the Greek euchologia. New services prepared in the Great Church "Hagia Sophia" in Constantinople were translated and distributed in new Church Slavonic variants. The complete list of reformed texts encompasses those of the Liturgicon, Euchologion, Psalter, Horologion and Synaxarion with troparia and kontakia (the analysis of all liturgical changes is in: [Мансветовъ 1882]), though it took a long time for the whole Church to accept them.

The late medieval period of Polish history does not record the strong social authority of the Polish language as a fundamental value for the existence of the state and the salvation of the people. The echoes of the mission of SS Cyril and Methodius must have reached Poland, and some historians argue for the coexistence of the liturgy in Latin and Church Slavonic [Koziara 2018:21 ff; cf. Mironowicz 2013]. The lack of written sources makes it difficult to identify the characteristics of the facts that contributed to ecclesiastical history and religious translation at that time, though the repeated appearance of churches and monasteries, as well as a large number of Church Slavonic ecclesiastical terms, testify to a relatively well-established religious life.

The first official recognition of Polish liturgical translation occurred in 1248 when the Synod of Wrocław decreed that "Pater noster" and "Credo" should be pronounced in Polish during Mass [Średniowieczna pieśń 1980:xiii]. This decree was a reaction to German expansion, which was seen as a danger to the Church and the nation. A similar decision was taken at the Synod of Łęczyca in 1285 and reaffirmed in 1287. This attitude also opened the way for the creation of Polish religious songs and the increased use of religious translations in public life. In the late 13th century, in the convent of the Poor Clare in Stary Sącz, some prayers were announced in Polish: before leaving the church, St Kinga prayed ten psalms in the vernacular and added a prayer for the good of the Universal Church [Średniowieczna pieśń 1980:xiv].

Although liturgical translation in medieval Poland did not enjoy the official support of the state as in Bulgaria or Ukraine, paraliturgical songwriting stimulated the expansion of singing practices during the Mass and other religious ceremonies. It is not surprising that liturgical tropes were sung not only in Latin but also partly in Polish. The sources were part of Latin hymns, which came into Polish not only in the original versions but also through German and Czech translations. The 1365 gradual from Płock Cathedral records four tropes [Michałowska 2011:829-831]: 1) "Chrystus z martwych wstał" is the translation of Stanza 3 of the Czech hymn "Buoh všemohuci", written according to the melody

of the German hymn "Christ ist erstanden" and later translated into Latin as "Deus omnipotens a morte resurgens" [Michałowska 2011:464; cf. Woronczak 1952:362-363]; 2) "Przez twe święte zmartwychwstanie" is a translation from the trope group "Salve, fiesta dies" via Czech [Michałowska 2011:727]; 3) "Przez twe święte wskrzeszenie" is thought to be a translation of the Czech hymn "Pro tvé svaté vzkřiesenie" [ibid. 4) "Krystus z martwych wstał je" is the translation of Stanza 3 of the Czech trope "Buoh všemohuci".

In the 14th and 15th centuries, there appeared two Polish translations of the trope "Surrexit Christus hodie", two translations of the Latin sequence "Mittit ad virginem" (originally written in England or France in the 12th century), translations of the Latin sequence "Grates nunc omnes". In the 16th century, Polish literature acquired via translation St Thomas of Aquinas's sequence "Lauda Sion salvatorem", the Easter sequence "Victimae paschali laudes" (written in Germany in the 11th century) and the Pentecost sequence "Veni Sancte Spiritus".

Another source of liturgical translation is the liturgical drama of the late 14th century. Mystery plays contained Latin antiphons and responsories and were supposedly followed by free Polish translations – sung or recited – as in the 1377 "ludus paschalis" staged in Kazimierz (now part of Kraków) [Lewański 1981:141, 147]. This practice was in the mainstream of the creation of paraliturgical songs, which were at first even included in the liturgy but later excluded from it.

The Marian hymn and antiphon "Salve Regina" was a very popular prayer, and 20 translated versions have survived from the 14th and 15th centuries. The version from the 1435 hymnal of Jan of Przeworsk was translated from Czech. In private prayer books, some prayers may also have been in Polish, such as the translation of the hymn "Ave Maria" in the late 15th-century Nawojka Prayer Book.

Finally, the translation scene was entered by the Polish-speaking masses, albeit on a private rather than a national level. The general number of medieval translations of the Mass canon

is seven [Sczaniecki 1962:116 passim]. They date from the first half of the 15th century. These were translations "pro domo sua": they served the private needs of clerics learning the Latin text of the Mass. For this purpose, before the 14th century, there may have been similar texts in the form of glosses, which were finally transformed into a coherent and extremely literal text. Nevertheless, the translations fulfilled their primary function of teaching the Mass to future clergy. Interestingly, one of the earliest translations, the 1424 manuscript, was written in Lviv, then the capital of the "Kingdom of Rus" (the Principality of Halych and Volyn), already incorporated into the "Polish Crown". The Roman Catholic archdiocese in Ukrainian territory was founded in Halych only in 1375 and moved to Lviv in 1412. This was because Catholic life was just beginning in Lviv, and translations such as the 1424 manuscript were particularly helpful to the clergy.

Occasionally, some biblical translations contributed to the translation of other high-authority religious texts. The brightest example is the St Florian Psalter (between the late 14th and early 15th centuries), whose scribes incorporated the Latin, Polish and German texts of the Creed of St Athanasius into Psalm 118 [Psałterz 1939:77-280, 387-388].

Paths to translation principles

Medieval translation theory in the Slavonic world developed indirectly under the influence of translation ideas circulating in antiquity. The manuscript culture imposed physical limitations on disseminating and exchanging translation views. Still, the paucity of theoretical judgments on translation praxis in medieval Ukraine and Poland can be explained by the simple fact that manuscripts discussing or mentioning translation issues may not have survived. The better-known judgments are those of Balkan – mainly Bulgarian – writers (St Cyril the Philosopher in the 9th century, St John the Exarch and Chernorizets Hrabar at the turn of the 10th century, and Constantine of Kostenets at the turn of the 15th century). The Balkan views included those recorded in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite [Шмігер 2018:31]. The Western Slavs, who bordered the territory of the Roman

Church, may have known the translation views of SS Jerome and Augustine.

Traditionally, today's translation historians overlook how well the medieval theory of translation was developed. The 9th-century Macedonian Folio, attributed to St Cyril, contains a deep understanding of interlingual asymmetry and an emphasis on the cultural interpretation of textual symbols. The shining example is the story of the birth of Jesus Christ: the masculine Greek noun "ἀστήρ" is rendered as the feminine Slavonic noun "звѣзда", and the symbolic meaning of an angel, typically perceived as male, is lost. Another fact is that scribes used a term for designing the concept of equivalence: "истовъ" [see more: Шмігер 2018:32]. These ideas were brought to Ukraine along with religious literature as a result of two South Slavonic influences and were used creatively by scribes. The alleged similarity of ideas in various national schools makes it possible to assume that these ideas could also be known in Poland due to the proximity to the territories where major translation projects were realised. However, the absence of translations into Old Polish at the turn of the second millennium shows that translation discussions were not very vigorous there at that time.

Another way of revealing the medieval perception of translation is to look at the lexical networks describing translation activities. The Old Ukrainian lexical network of the 11th to 13th centuries contains nine lexemes describing translation activities:

Old Ukrainian Lexeme	Origin	Meaning
прекладати, прѣкладати прѣложити, преложити	Slavonic	translate
тълмачити, толмачити	Turkic	interpret
тълковати, тлъковати, тълъковати	Celtic	explain
прѣводъ	Slavonic	translation
тълкъ, толкъ	Celtic	interpretation
тълкованиє, тлъкованиє, толкованиє	Celtic	explanation
тълкарь	Celtic	interpreter
тълмачь, толмачь	Turkic	

The different etymological origins of the terms reflect the active intercultural communication of medieval Ukrainians with neighbouring linguistic communities. Moreover, the coexistence of the terms suggests that interpreting could have been considered a separate and dominant activity, distinct from translation. The Turkic derivatives are puzzling because they repeat the system of terms, and this is likely a sign of active cooperation with Turkic nomadic nations. The objectives of the translation activities had two main vectors, focusing on interpreting and religious translation, thus representing two natures of translation: oral and written. Meanwhile, what constitutes quality in translation is also fuzzy: accurate phrasing, meaningful essence or more expansive interpretative space.

Middle Ukrainian documents of the 14th and 15th centuries are scarce, so two recorded lexemes cannot represent the natural richness of translational life in this region, where the whole "city of translators" – *Tovmach* (now *Tlumach* in the Ivano-Frankivsk region; both names mean "interpreter") – exists, supposedly in honour of the guild of translators and interpreters [Шмігер 2018:33].

Early Middle Ukrainian Lexeme	Meaning
преложити	translate, interpret
толъмачъ	translator, interpreter

Similarly, the poor network of Old Polish translation terms in the 14th and 15th centuries does not represent all the needs and necessities of translation life in medieval Poland:

Old Polish Lexeme	Meaning
Tłumacz, Tolmacz, Tułmacz	interpreter/translator
Tłumaczka	female interpreter/translator
Tłumaczyć	interpret from one language into another
Przykładanie	giving a pattern, comparison or translation, interpretation

The Old Polish texts do not use derivatives based on Latin "interpreto" and "transfero", and the interlingual synonym or

"translator's false friend" "przekład" means postponement, whereas in the cognate Ukrainian language, it is translation. It is also interesting that Polish written sources record female interpreters, whose professional status was often ignored and neglected.

The proof that the medieval culture of translation was well developed at that time but remains unknown today is the very translations whose quality is highly appreciated: "The liturgical texts disclose also the fact that the new literary language was adequate for the enormous task of expressing Greek theological and philosophical terminology in terms which would conform to the spirit and the structure of the new literary idiom. The liturgical texts presented the greatest difficulty for the translators. They were composed in poetic language, often according to a metrical system. It was especially difficult to translate the religious songs in a manner which would appeal to the faithful who would be present at the services, but we are justified in saying that the translators achieved this" [Dostál 1965:72]. Modern Slavists pay most attention to the system of religious terms and the melodic structure. They also reiterate the two-fold approach to the translation of various religious texts: literal translation and equirhythmic translation.

Literal or word-for-word translation was applied to all four types of religious texts (lectionary, euchographic, hymnographic, homiletic). However, the application of this principle to the translation of hymnographic texts caused changes in the number of syllables forming verses in a stanza and violated the rhythmic structure of the Greek original: as a result, the melody of the Greek original could not be used in the translation [Пентковский 2016:74-75]. This is why equirhythmic translation was popular for rendering one-stanza texts, which helped preserve the rhythmic structure and melody of the Greek original. From the historical perspective, paraphrased metrical translations were replaced by literal translations as early as the 10th century [Krivko 2011:738]. The emphasis on the literalness of translations was also a reaction to numerous deviations from the originals, though these

deviations contributed to the emergence of independent national literary traditions in the region.

The structural organisation of hymnographic poetry was the focus of Polish translators, who had to deal with rendering the original rhyme and rhythm since melody was the key to preserving the fluency of a ceremony when two languages were to interact. These translation enterprises brought a new impetus to literary development, especially for religious poetry, which moved from a sentence verse (difficult for choral performance) to syllabism, which merged text and music [Woronczak 1952:367]. This approach is very similar to the problems faced by medieval Ukrainian translators. However, the limited use of Polish prevented the translation of large texts and forced the translators to rethink the semantic, cultural and theological asymmetries in detail.

Character of early religious translations

In medieval Ukraine, scribes followed the Ciceronian dichotomy of word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation types. Belles-lettres and academic treatises were texts of lesser authority, and they were granted the right of a translator's licence and free artistic treatment of a text. In contrast to literary and scientific translations, the translations of liturgical texts (prayers, hymns, sermons of St Gregory of Nazianzus) as well as the translations of John the Exarch of Bulgaria were extremely literal: a Greek text was rendered into Church Slavonic word by word, copying the syntactical order and constructions of the Greek original [Мещерский 1958:75-76]. At the same time, this does not mean that this kind of translation ruined the text type of liturgical hymns. In general, the Slavonic reception of Byzantine hymns was aimed at preserving the genre form and the precise meanings of Greek words while deviating from the verse recitation: unlike Greek and South Slavonic hymns compiled according to a specific poetic meter and acrostic, Old Ukrainian hymns – translated and original – were based on rhythmic oration without acrostic [Джиджора 2018:11-12].

This partially contradictory and somewhat conciliatory sum of general judgements does not provide a definitive answer about

the typical quality of religious translations. Antonín Dostál even questions the nature of the rendered text, if it is really a translation or a mere adaptation: "the authors of the Slavonic texts may have not only translated but also adapted the Greek original for Slavic consumption" [Dostál 1965:72]. The key term is "consumption", which allows us to think about all the numerous parameters of textual reception and perception in intercultural communication. The more criteria the analyst can develop to assess translations, the more informative and insightful the analysis will appear. The definitions of adaptation in translation studies are so numerous that this plurality creates a great deal of vagueness and indecision (see highlights of the theoretical discussions in [HTS 2010:1:3-6]).

The more recent terms "appropriation" and "localisation" may assist in better describing and classifying early translations. Although the problem of translatorship may overlap with that of authorship, in early Ukrainian literature, collective authorship was dominant, and each scribe could and did contribute to the generating chain of the existence of a text. Similarly, in medieval manuscript culture, the issue of the collective translator is even more relevant in the search for the ideal translated text. The necessity to adapt the Greek originals to the new milieu appeared at the time of the birth of the very Slavonic Liturgy, as testified by the Kyiv Glagolitic Folios [Dostál 1965:86]. Sometimes, a translator became an original author by "plagiarising" one text in order to create another. This is the case of the Service for the Translation of the Relics of St Bartholomew the Apostle, which was allegedly composed by Joseph the Hymnographer in Byzantium, then translated into Old Church Slavonic, and later adapted into the Service for the Translation of the Relics of St Nicholas of Myra [Темчин 2014]. St Cyril of Turiv included a sticheron from the Litany of the 4th Sunday after Easter in his "Homily on the Paralytic": the sticheron became a literary source for the writer, who developed its ideas and partly created an adaptive translation [Шумило 2016]. Krassimir Stantchev summarises that all the translated texts can be divided into three categories: 1) translations proper (without interfering with the structure and imagery of the original);

2) compilations (borrowing texts from other original and translated texts); 3) adaptations (e.g. specification of a general service into a service on the feast day of a specific saint; generalisation of a service on the feast day of a specific saint into a general service; adaptation of a service on the feast day of one saint into a service on the feast day of another saint) [Станчев 2017:46].

Dostál claims that "subsequent studies have shown that very often the translators did rearrange the Greek texts in a more or less original and independent fashion", but the quality of these translations was not compromised:

"The quality of the Old Church Slavonic texts has been analyzed many times, and it has been repeatedly confirmed that the Slavic version represents a highly artistic text, a poetic text fit for recitation and exegesis as the basis of Christian doctrine. In this case Constantine almost literally translated the original text. [...] Nevertheless, even this text was to some degree adapted. First of all, he adjusted the text of all four Gospels linguistically (the linguistic differences which can be found in the Greek version between the Gospels disappeared in the Church Slavonic text). The direct speech of the text was respected: the spoken language with its simple turns and metaphors is reflected in the arrangement of the translation into sections and in its dialogue, which is so frequent in the Gospels. This Slavic text had in its original form some words borrowed from the Greek and Slavicized. However, this fact should not be understood as meaning that the vocabulary of the Slavic language was insufficient to convey the meaning of the text, for other quite varied and demanding texts translated into Slavic show, on the contrary, great lexical richness. These foreign words, probably, were quite familiar to Byzantine Slavs (as, for instance, *vlasvimisati, skandalisati,* etc.). In newer transcripts these Grecisms decrease because to Western Slavs and in other non-Byzantine areas these Byzantine words were unknown. It is surprising that the first Slavic version of the Gospel is of such high quality from the point of view of the translation itself, the textual arrangement, and the artistic form." [Dostál 1965:72].

There are no two identical languages, so lexical and semantic asymmetry stimulates the development of target languages, which is no exception in Slavonic cultural contexts (see the influence of Christian vocabulary on the medieval Ukrainian worldview in [Шмігер 2018:168-170, 189-191]). At the same time, the appreciation of Old Church Slavonic means the high level of this language, which could reproduce all the semantic and stylistic features of the Greek originals. In addition, a good translation of biblical texts influenced how liturgical texts used biblical extracts and followed their lexis. Another question that can contribute to understanding translation quality in this period is the state of linguistic knowledge. The translations of Flavius Josephus's "Jewish War" that circulated in Rus testify that medieval Ukrainian translators had an excellent knowledge of both Old Greek and Byzantine dialects and even introduced them into the texts of their translations [Мещерский 1958:71 ff]. A good knowledge of a source language is an essential prerequisite for producing a good translation.

In the historical dynamics, the equirhythmic translation was a bridge to the formation of national liturgical traditions. At first, translations were equirhythmic, preserving the Greek melody. Later, literal translations (word-for-word translations) were more faithful to the Greek originals, but singing required the modification of the original Greek melody, and local singing traditions of the Liturgy developed [Пентковский 2016:76]. Eventually, the equirhythmic translations based on the Greek melody fell into disuse.

Isosyllabism (the identical number of syllables in verse fragments) has become a successful criterion for evaluating translations, as it is the fundamental feature for preserving the original rhythmic construction and thus reproducing the original melody. Isosyllabism is a syntactic phenomenon, and the addition of an understanding of other syntactic and morphological phenomena serves as a solid basis for interpreting a text through the prism of grammatical semantics. This analytical tool is profoundly exemplified by Roman Krivko [Krivko 2011:718-741],

who shows how a target text is a continuation of the original literary and stylistic tradition and what new metrical requirements were placed before the translators just before the religious translation entered the Ukrainian cultural space.

It was only sometimes possible to preserve the exact pattern of Byzantine melody in translation. Earlier Bulgarian translators emphasised the exact preservation of the original melody and interfered with the target text, while later Ukrainian translators modified Byzantine melodic patterns according to the Slavonic text, which usually contained more syllables than the Greek original [Кристианс 2008:47]. The melody of the target text as a criterion for translation evaluation is not often addressed in religious translation research, though the continuous work on elaborating local chants began during the first steps of acquiring the Liturgy.

Even though Polish sources for analysis are much scarcer and that some translations reached Polish recipients via Czech translations, the preliminary criteria for assessing the quality of early Polish translations of hymns have been explored [Woronczak 1952: 366, 367, 369, 373]. Indeed, translations were of varying quality, as religious poetry actively developed aesthetic forms of spiritual expression. Some translations are not translations proper but free paraphrases that even a poetic text could have been rendered in the prosaic form. The Polish language of these translations showed various levels of elaboration, and it was enriched with new imagery and poetic expressions that later formulated higher standards for subsequent generations of translators. Rhyming (feminine rhyme) and syllabism (following the precise poetics of the original) are essential features for preserving the melody of a source text. Unfortunately, semantic ambiguity is also sometimes observed in translations.

However, Christianity stimulated the development of national literatures in a different dynamic. Comparing the origins of Ukrainian and Polish literatures, it becomes clear that original literature in the vernacular appeared much earlier in Ukraine (early 11th century: e.g. homiletic and panegyric writings by Hilarion of Kyiv) than in Poland (late 13th century; "Bogurodzica" and "The

Holy Cross Homilies"), though initially both Greek (in Ukraine) and Latin (in Poland) were also languages of original writings [for more see: ІУЛ 2014, Vol. 1; Michałowska 1999:39, 44]. The reason for this may lie in the dominance of religious languages: Latin was known and understood by a much smaller number of Poles than Old Church Slavonic by Ukrainians. Moreover, the older versions of the Slavonic languages were – conventionally – more mutually intelligible than today's language variants, and poetic forms in Old Church Slavonic inspired verbal activities in other Slavonic languages.

The asymmetry in the adoption of Christianity in Ukraine and Poland has many and varied causes. First, the societies were differently prepared for the new religion: while the Ukrainians tried to combine their own and borrowed religious traditions, leading to a "dual faith", i.e. syncretic folk Orthodoxy, the Poles were uncomfortable with conversion to Christianity, leading to resistance in the form of pagan rebellions in the 1030s. Second, language was a tool for making the acquisition of the Christian heritage easier (in the Ukrainian context) or more complicated (in the Polish context) in the short term. Old Church Slavonic was accessible and understandable to all Slavs, though Latin became more axiologically valuable in the long term. Third, a rite was not the most crucial point in stimulating the development of national cultures. In the early period, the liturgies themselves were unstable and varied, and the texts of the Eastern and Western Churches were translated into Church Slavonic.

The phenomenon of retranslation is well illustrated in medieval Ukraine: liturgical reforms in the Mother Byzantine Church were immediately reflected in new translations within the Slavonic churches. Various layers coexisted in the texts used, opening the way to the unintentional or intentional localisation of translations from the South Slavs or the production of one's own. In Poland, multiple translations of the same prayers were private attempts, testifying to an inner demand for such translations on the individual level, which could become a public matter under favourable conditions.

Ukrainian translators accepted the literal approach to translating hymnographic texts, which was equal to the paraphrase approach. On the contrary, the literal approach was already a newer and more subtle approach that could incorporate isosyllabic features of the Greek original, and the same can be said of the early Polish translators. Although the number of particular manuscripts does not allow us to speak of translation theory per se, the textual praxis reveals the differentiation of principles for biblical and liturgical translation. Even though translation activities were more dynamic in Bulgaria and Ukraine than in Poland, the ideas of translation as a value and its axiological criteria were probably known and, where applicable, shared.

Translations of religious poetry formed the basis for epic and lyric poetry. They also opened the door to expanding the expressive poetics common to the entire European literary civilisation. The use of the ecclesiastical languages – Latin and Church Slavonic – inspired the different speeds of progress in national cultures. Church Slavonic had more potential to contribute to local cultures and to promote mutual understanding among the Slavonic states in the Middle Ages.

2. 16th-18th centuries:
Early modern time in Ukrainian and Polish histories

When the Great Duchy of Lithuania rose to power in the mid-13th century, it occupied most of what is now Eastern Europe. Most of the Ukrainian territories became its part. The Kingdom of Poland annexed the smaller part of western Ukraine after the fall of the Kingdom of Halychyna and Volyn. Two powers – Poland and Lithuania – began to drift together by signing a series of unions. The Union of Lublin of 1569 formed a new entity – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which lasted until 1795. These political movements also affected the religious life of the local population. The most drastic changes took place in Lithuania, which, under the influence of the occupied, highly civilised Ukrainian territories,

moved from paganism to Eastern Christianity (Orthodoxy) but later, under the influence of the union with Poland, returned to Western Christianity (Roman Catholicism). The turbulent political life influenced the development of liturgical praxis among institutions and believers who recognised their faith as part of their identity.

Texts and public recognition

In the hierarchy of religious texts, liturgical texts are subordinate to the Bible, and it is clear that biblical translation initiated book printing in the countries that followed this fine Renaissance invention. However, liturgical texts were among the first printed books, as in Poland and Ukraine.

In 1475, in Wrocław (now Poland, then part of the Hungarian Crown), Caspar Elyan, a canon of Wrocław Cathedral, published the Synodal Statutes, the first book printed in Poland. It was published in Latin, but the prayers – the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary and the Apostles' Creed – were in German and Polish [Synodalia statuta 1475:f. 13-14]. The publicity given to the German and Polish translations reflected the main languages used by the Catholic faithful in Silesia.

As of 1491, in Kraków, the then capital of the Polish Crown, which had incorporated a number of Ukrainian lands, the first books were published by Schweipolt Fiol, a Franconian expatriate, beginning the history of Ukrainian book printing: these were four Orthodox hymnals – the Lenten Triodion [Трьпѣснець 1491], the Pentecostarion [Тріодь 1491], the Horologion [Часословець 1491] and the Octoechos [Октоїх 1491]. These Church Slavonic editions used the Precarpathian manuscripts and contained a lot of Ukrainian vernacular elements. They ushered in a new era of liturgical translation in Ukraine.

Another liturgical edition was the first printed book of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and inaugurated Lithuanian and Belarusian book printing. In 1522, in Vilnius, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which included most of the Ukrainian territories and all of the Belarusian lands, Frantsisk Skoryna

published the so-called collection "Little Traveller's Book" [Мала 1522]. It contains several liturgical texts written in Church Slavonic and accompanied by his preface in Ruthenian (bookish Middle Ukrainian) with a large number of Belarusian linguistic features: the Psalter, the Horologion, eight akathists, ten canons (eight canons are paired with eight akathists), propers of daily offices for each weekday and the calendar.

Printing overlapped with various debates on using the vernacular under the influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Translation projects paralleled major events in ecclesiastical life in Ukraine and Poland, which coexisted in one state – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – after the Union of Lublin in 1569.

The first major project, which failed, was the creation of the Polish national Church in the 1550s. One of the principal demands was the request to allow the use of the Polish language in the Mass, as the Bulgarians were allowed to do [Historia 1974:1:2:67]. The Apostolic See rejected this request, and this act halted the initiative of massive liturgical translation into Polish. In 1564, the Archbishop of Lviv, Paweł Tarło, commissioned the Polish translation of the Agenda, and the Polish humanist Jan of Trzciana made a manuscript translation (which has survived to the present day), but the implicit ban of the Council of Trent interrupted its publication [Historia 1974:1:2:119]. Even one of the most educated Polish theologians of the time, Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius, protested against praying and worshipping in the vernacular, though his arguments were quite controversial and inappropriate [Hozjusz 1562:131v-134v]. In 1577, the Polish church authorities finally accepted the Tridentine reformed liturgical books, which were all in Latin, and the first Polish-language translation of the Mass was published two centuries later.

The establishment of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, where Roman Catholicism dominated, initiated difficult times of persecution and even cooperation between Orthodox and Protestant believers. The difficulties also stimulated some promising results. In the early 16th century, Orthodox book

printing was concentrated in two cities: Vilnius and Kyiv. Their main products were liturgical books. Naturally, all these books were translations, and their language was Church Slavonic, which gradually acquired its local colour, later called Church Slavonic of Ukrainian recension. The two Orthodox milieus of Vilnius and Kyiv had opposite views: Vilnius monks insisted on the dominance of the Church Slavonic variant in all liturgical contexts, while Kyiv monks tried to experiment with the incorporation of the Ukrainian vernacular into liturgical practice [Титовъ 1918:10-12]. This is why the large-scale project of revising and retranslating liturgical books in Kyiv from the 1610s to the 1640s had a prosperous outcome: the Horologion [Часословъ 1616], the Hymnal [Анθологіон 1619], the Lenten Triodion [Тріωдіон 1627], the Liturgicon [Леітγргіаріон 1629], the Pentecostarion [Тріωдіон 1631], the Euchologion [Еυхологіωн 1646]. The translators and publishers – Yelysei Pletenetskyi, Zakhariya Kopystenskyi, Pamvo Berynda, Taras Zemka, St Petro Mohyla – used the Greek originals, corrected the Church Slavonic versions and regularly applied Middle Ukrainian. These editions were so authoritative that they were later republished many times in various cities during the 17th and 18th centuries. After a series of disastrous acts against the Kyivan Metropolitanate, caused by its transfer from the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the jurisdiction of the Muscovite Patriarchate in 1686, local liturgical praxis in Ukraine, including its translation activities, finally ceased in 1721 when it was allowed to print books only according to the Muscovite spelling and content.

The union of the Roman (Catholic) and Kyivan (Orthodox) Churches, which took place at Berestia in 1596 but was later not accepted by the entire Orthodox clergy, created a new separate entity: the Uniate Church, now known as the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. This church retained and used the Orthodox Liturgy and books. Some local or borrowed practices began to be codified 150 years later. It was initially a political project aimed at further assimilation of the Ukrainians, i.e. incorporating them into Polish culture and Roman Catholicism. This church was open to some Catholic influences, like the office of the "read" liturgy

(Missa Lecta, Low Mass), which was borrowed from the Roman Missal and published in some Greek Catholic liturgical books [Леітоургікон 1733; Леітоvрґіаріонъ 1755]. However, these editions were never officially approved and remained relatively private editions [Соловій 1964:77, 88].

The grand event in the life of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church was the Council of Zamostia in 1720, where the Church discussed its local liturgical practices and the need to revise liturgical texts according to the Greek originals. They appealed to the Apostolic See to control and censor their liturgical books. In 1754, the new edition of the Greek Euchologion, supervised and promulgated by Pope Benedict XIV [Εὐχολόγιον 1754], was published after revision according to the best Greek texts and became a standard edition for further Church Slavonic translations. It influenced two editions of the Euchologion published in Pochayiv in 1778 and 1788 [Соловій 1964:91], and Archbishop Herakliy Lisovskyi commissioned the Church Slavonic translation of the 1754 Greek Euchologion to his vicar general, Yuriy Turkevych, who did it in 1788-1790 [Соловій 1964:93], but it was never published due to new turbulent historical conditions.

Prayer books and their book types

In the history of book writing and printing, prayer books, intended to be a collection of prayer forms for private devotion, could also be service books containing liturgical formularies for public worship. Their varieties combined liturgical and paraliturgical texts, prayer and poetry, verbal composition and singing. Typologically, Polish prayer books are usually divided into two main genres: "liber precum" was a collection of private prayers, and "liber horarum" contained a central text, the Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Aimed at the laity, they tended to use the vernacular to a greater extent. The various prayer books constituted an authentic mass literature of the time, as each collection of prayers was republished many times. In general, they also contributed seriously to devotional and meditative literature. Gradually, they came together in editions known as "hortuli". The

"Hortulus" takes its name from the publication "Hortulus animae": it was written in Latin in the late 15th century, immediately translated into German and other languages, and republished quite frequently for several centuries. Its immense popularity was because it was a collection of medieval prayer books, containing the Hours and new offices along with a large number of prayers for various needs and those used during preparation for confession and the Eucharist [Borkowska 1988:63].

The first Polish-language "Hortulus" (and the first Polish-language prayer book) was published in Lublin in 1513 as a result of the efforts of Biernat of Lublin under the title "Raj duszny" [Raj 2006]. The source text for this edition was "Antidotarius animae" (1485 or a later edition) by Nicolaus Salicetus (pseudonym of Nicolaus Wydenbosch / Weydenbosch), but it was supplemented with other prayers popular in Poland. The first edition is said to have contained 160 sheets, but it was enlarged and adapted in subsequent editions.

"Harfa duchowna" by Marcin Laterna (first edition 1585) was another bestseller among prayer books. Marcin Laterna, a Jesuit and a native of Drohobych, compiled a selection of prayers from the Bible, the Holy Fathers, the Roman Missal, the Breviary and the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary, adding an extended catechetical section and his reflections and meditations [Cieślak 2000:31-37]. It corresponded to the requirements of the Council of Trent but also included some texts from earlier hortuli. Laterna's translations of church hymns and songs are considered to be of great poetic talent. It is not surprising that it was actively republished (dozens of times) in the 16th and 17th centuries and replaced the popularity of "Raj duszny".

Not so popular was the prayer book "Tarcza duchowna" (alternative Polish translation: "Szczyt duszny"), translated from the Latin collection "Clipeus spiritualis" and published in Kraków in 1533 or 1534 [Tarcza 2016]. However, this prayer book had another Polish translation, recorded in the 1528 manuscript known as Olbracht Gasztołd's Prayer Book [Modlitewnik Gasztołda 2015:16 ff]. Thus, the multiple translations of the same

euchographic collection was an undeniable fact in the history of Polish translation. Additionally, it is necessary to acknowledge the continuation of the production of Polish-language manuscripts of translated prayer books, which was not rare in the 16th century [Modlitewnik Gasztołda 2015:39-40].

The turn of the 17th century witnessed the emergence of "thematic" prayer books. Piotr Skarga (Pawęski), having gained experience in compiling the prayer book "Gospodarstwo domowe" (Kraków, 1601, 1606), prepared a special prayer book for soldiers under the title "Żołnierskie nabożeństwo" (Kraków, 1606, 1618 and many other later editions). Writings by Jacob Pontanus (Spanmüller) were translated by Stanisław Grochowski (Kraków, 1608, 1615) and aimed at nuns [Bednarz 1964:206 ff]. The catalogues of Polish old and rare books provide further references to books for praying to Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Blessed Virgin Mary, various saints and for various occasions.

In the Ukrainian liturgical tradition, uniform prayer books appeared much later than in Poland. The principal prayer books in monasteries and among the laity were the Psalter (with various prayers and offices) and the Horologion, which were distributed in the form of manuscripts and printed books: in the second half of the 16th century, these were the editions of the Psalter in Zabludiv (1570), Vilnius (1576, 1586, 1591-1592, 1593, 1595, 1596, ca. 1600), Ostroh (1598) as well as those of the Horologion in Zabludiv (1570), Vilnius (ca. 1574-1576, 1596, 1597), Ostroh (1598). The language of these translation editions was Church Slavonic, which was more or less accepted by the faithful as "our" language, though they did not fully understand it. It also took on local characteristics in terms of phonetics and semantics. Most of the editions were published in Vilnius, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which at that time had incorporated a large number of Ukrainian and Belarusian ethnic territories. Thus, it is not surprising that the metropolis published books for the province.

Although prayers were known and even original prayers were composed much earlier, like those of St Cyril of Turiv, the new type of prayer book appeared in the late 16th century. Stefan Zyzaniy

(Kukil-Tustanovskyi) compiled a prayer book, the contents of which were not known before: it included the prayers of the daily cycle and the weekly cycle (by St Cyril of Turiv), as well as prayers for confession and the Eucharist [Юдин 2015:319-321]. It was a ca. 240-folio codex entitled "Daily Prayers", published several times (Vilnius, 1595, 1596, 1601; Vievis, 1611, 1615). The timing and contents of this prayer book reveal that it was influenced and stimulated by the rich culture of publishing Polish prayer books in other parts of the same country – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Stefan Zyzaniy's initiative was fruitful, as not only did some new editions of his prayer book appear, but gradually, more books for monastic and private worship were published [cf. Юдин 2015; Юдин 2017]. The pioneering editions were "Molytovnyk: Prayer Book" (Ostroh, 1606; Kyiv, 1628-1632, 1634; Lviv, 1642), "Antholohion" (Vilnius, 1613; Kyiv, 1619, 1636; Lviv, 1632, 1638, 1643), "Poluustav" (Vilnius, 1613; Chorna, 1629; Kyiv, 1643), "Akathists" (Kyiv, 1625, 1929, Lviv, 1634) and many others. All these publications contributed to the mass literature of the period and helped shape the readers' religious mentality.

Musical culture and sources for liturgical translations

The collapse of efforts to introduce the vernacular into Roman Catholic liturgical practice virtually determined the cessation of similar large-scale attempts for two centuries. This aftermath of the Council of Trent did not, however, affect the advance of vernacular church singing among the Polish faithful. The tendency to sing religious songs, including translated ones, was strengthened by the Reformation and the Protestants, who published a lot of hymnals [Sinka 1983:258]. Gradually, religious songs became part of printed prayer books in 1585 [ibid]. When Baltazar Opec compiled, translated and published his literary and religious work "Żywot Pana Jezu Krysta" ("Life of the Lord Jesus Christ", 1522), the second edition in the same year (but from another printer: Jan Haller) contained 17 religious songs, and this supplement added the features of a prayer book and hymnal to the original work

[Chlebowski 1905:407]. Finally, the Synod of Wrocław decreed in 1592 that a number of religious songs could be sung at Mass "in vernacula lingua", either after the homily instead of the gradual or at other places [Historia 1974:1:2:365]. Some sequences were sung in both languages by alternating stanzas.

Poetic Polish developed considerably in the 16th century, and its "golden age" is particularly marked by translations of biblical and liturgical texts. Jan Kochanowski translated the Psalms so successfully that they were still being sung and republished in Polish missals 400 years after their publication. They were the texts for Mikołaj Gomółka's composition of his "Melodies for the Polish Psalter" (1580) in which he used Gregorian and Protestant melodies for the four-part unaccompanied mixed choir [Historia 1974:1:2:126].

Stanisław Grochowski was among those who contributed to the enrichment of the literary standard and repertoire of Polish religious songs. He translated a lot of hymns from the Roman Breviary in 1598 [Hymny 1598] and later republished them in the enlarged editions of 1599 and 1608. In all, he translated about 140 hymns, which shaped liturgical Polish as a specific type of Polish speech. His work was continued in the collection of his translations "Rytmy łacińskie" ("Latin Rhythms"), published in 1606 [Wichowa 2003:240 ff], and in "Himny o Męce Panskiey" ("Hymns of the Passion of Christ", 1611). His contributions make it possible to speak of him as a translator of liturgical poetry.

Liturgical translations were a vital element of hymnals. The first believers to introduce hymns in Polish into their public religious practice were the Protestants in Toruń in 1530 and Kraków in 1540. Gradually, Protestant hymnals (e.g. for Evangelical Protestants, Czech Brethren, Calvinists) appeared, containing translations from Latin, German and Czech [Chlebowski 1905:408-420; Sinka 1983:258]:

1547 – compiled and translated by Jan Seklucjan;

1554 – by Walenty of Brzozów;

1559 – by Bartłomiej Groicki and by Ignacy Oliwiński;

1569 – by Maciej Wierzbięta;

1578 – by Piotr Artomiusz Krzesichleb;
1580 – by Stanisław Sudrowski;
1596 – by Krzysztof Kraiński;
1598 – by Maciej Rybiński and many other editions.

The emergence of the Catholic hymnal as a separate book type dates back to the early 17th century. It contained main and additional hymns for the Mass and performed the catechetical function among the faithful. Although the book entitled "Pieśni nabożne" ("Religious Songs") was published in 1621, its greatly expanded edition of 1627 is considered the first fully-fledged hymnal of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland [Wydra 2012:330]. It was so popular that 25 editions were published between 1621 and 1800. The hymnal contains Polish translations and some Latin originals, divided into eight groups of hymns – for Advent, Christmas, the Passion of Christ, Easter, the Holy Spirit, Corpus Christi, the Psalms of David and a group of miscellaneous hymns.

It may seem surprising, but translated hymnals offered some space for the individual creativity of a litterateur, both as a translator and as an original author. This is the case of Stanisław Serafin Jagodyński, who translated and composed his religious poetry [Garnczarski 2018]. His hymnal had two editions in 1638 and 1695, which testify to the good reception of his writings. When a new reform of the Roman Breviary and religious singing was undertaken by Pope Urban VIII in 1643, it created a demand for new translations, and Jan Białobocki translated 140 hymns from the revised edition and published them in 1648 [Gruchała 2013:71-75]. The hymns were translated and completed in 1646 but published in 1648. Thus, this translation shows how great the desire was to quickly make new hymns available to the Polish people and how important this type of translation was still considered for national progress.

In 1696, the earliest known booklet "Sposób spiewania pol-skiego na mszach świętych w kościołach katolickich" ("The Way of Polish Singing at Holy Mass in Catholic Churches") was published in Toruń (republished in 1700). Its content was not large: all the hymns sung by the faithful at Mass, along with a short catechism

[Mańkowski 1932]. Its significance lies in the fact that it was the first official edition of the Mass in Polish (at least in part), as the back of the title page contains the local bishop's approval. This book shows how the Polish singing of the Mass was established in Silesia, again for reasons of resisting the power of the Protestant movement of praying in the vernacular.

The sequences were so famous that the Council of Trent had to intervene in this type of musical creativity and strictly minimised the number of officially sung sequences to four (the fifth was added later). Most sequences in the Polish Church were of foreign origin, but all of them were written in Latin (about one-fifth of five hundred sequences are recognised as being of Polish origin), and this dominance stimulated their translation into Polish. Indeed, the official use of sequences motivated the higher frequency of their translation into Polish. That is why the statistics of translation of sequences are as follows [acc. to: Strawa-Iracka 2011:106-115]:

Sequences approved for use by the Council of Trent

Dies irae	A lot of translations from the 15th century on
Lauda Sion Salvatorem	Three translations in the 16th and 17th centuries
Veni Sancte Spiritus	Five translations in the 15th-17th centuries and the sixth one in the 20th century
Victimae paschali laudes	Four translations in the 16th and 17th centuries and the fifth one in the 20th century

Sequences out of use after the Council of Trent

Benedicta semper sancta sit Trinitas	One translation from the 16th century
Congaudent Angelorum chori	One translation from the 16th century
Festa Christi omnis christianitas	A famous sequence, but never translated into Polish
Grates nunc omnes	Six translations in the 16th-18th centuries
Mittit ad Virginem	A lot of translations from the 15th century on
Psallat Ecclesia	One translation from the 16th century
Rex omnipotens	One translation from the 16th century

Although the sequences were not used officially, they were republished in numerous editions long after their first publication. An outstanding contribution to the translation of the sequences was provided by Grochowski, who rendered several hymns for the first and last time. The Roman Catholic sequences also influenced Eastern Christians through the Greek Catholic Church: "Dies irae" was translated into Church Slavonic and included in some manuscripts of the 17th century.

From the viewpoint of liturgical and paraliturgical singing, Orthodox books are not numerous. The nature of this scarcity lies more profoundly in the history of the Byzantine and Roman Liturgies. When Ukraine was converted to Christianity in the late 10th century, the Byzantine Liturgy had reached the peak of its development: that is why by the 16th century, all translation solutions had been offered, debated and stabilised in the form of traditional Kyivan and Halych chants. The Roman Liturgy began to develop actively in the period, overlapping with the time after Poland's adoption of Christianity in the 10th century. All musical forms and texts composed in other Roman Catholic countries but in Latin were immediately transferred to Poland, where they had to be accepted and absorbed. This situation made Polish musical culture very dynamic. In addition, a great impulse came later from the Protestants, who propagated singing at Mass in the vernacular. Although Protestants were also present in the Ukrainian religious scene, their influence did not antagonise the traditional Orthodox culture.

It is true, too, that book printing reached this area relatively late: the first Hirmologion was published in Lviv in 1700 [Ірмолой 1700]. It was the first music book among the Slavs of the Byzantine Rite. However, the Kyivan Metropolitanate succeeded in forming its musical school: in the late 16th century, it introduced an original musical notation (Kyivan notation) and created a single type of book of church chant. It was typically called the Hirmologion, but it differed from similar Byzantine and medieval Ukrainian books of the same title. "Earlier" hirmologions contained only the irmoi, arranged according to the eight tones of Byzantine chant. The

Ukrainian Hirmologions of the late 16th to mid-19th centuries had more elaborate structures, incorporating the regular canticles of the All-Night Vigil and the Divine Service; the Sunday tones of the Octoechos, the Prosomoion Stichera and the hymns from the Festal Menaion.

Liturgical editions

The period from the 16th to the 18th century is not so brilliant for liturgical translation if we mean that existing translations should have become part of liturgical praxis. This never happened in Poland; it happened partially in Ukraine if one looks at the revisions of Church Slavonic texts in Orthodox liturgical practice, but it was still local Church Slavonic but not Middle Ukrainian. The most fruitful achievements were connected with book printing, where well-revised texts were needed and supplied and where the demand for liturgical and paraliturgical hymnals dictated the supply.

At this time, some translations still existed as manuscripts. Such was the fate of the Office for the Dead, part of which was written in the 1520 manuscript [Brückner 1904:3:98-99]. This text was based on earlier translations, but its scribe introduced some revisions.

The only significant achievement of Polish liturgical translation can be the Polish-language act of Holy Communion during the Mass. It appeared in the Lviv manuscript translation of 1564, but the practice of using the native language subsequently became established and spread at the turn of the 17th century [Sczaniecki 2009:83-84].

This success was not very significant. The first Agenda, with some Polish and German formulae, was published in 1514: it facilitated the process of performing a sacramental ceremony (baptism and marriage) for lay people who did not know Latin [Agenda 1514]. This edition also contained two versions of the so-called "Story of Pope Urban" (in Polish and German). It describes the death of the sinful pope and contains three prayers which are translations in the Polish-German juxtaposition, but they may

have had a common Latin original, as in the popular editions of the 14th-century "Ars moriendi". The 1591 edition of the Agenda compiled by Hieronim Powodowski, which became the standard edition for several decades [Agenda 1591; and later reeditions], followed the same pattern of including native-language formulae to be pronounced by the faithful.

The Roman Missal was promulgated in 1570 and approved at the Gniezno Provincial Synod in Piotrków in 1577. It was not translated into Polish, but the explanatory editions performed this function. The archpresbyter of Kraków, Hieronym Powodowski, published a description of the liturgy which can be regarded as a substitute for his translation [Powodowski 1604]: the Mass is explained in detail, and the Latin phrases of the priest are quoted alongside the Polish translations. However, it was supplemented by another book, "Church Prayers", which contained prayers for the yearly cycle of worship, for the veneration of saints on their feast days and various votives [Modlitwy 1606]. These prayers are constitutive and changing parts of the Mass, so this edition was a significant contribution to the reception of the euchographic texts of the Mass in Polish.

In 1614, Pope Paul V promulgated the official Roman Ritual to serve as the standard edition for other local rituals. The Polish Ritual was approved by the Synod in Piotrków in 1621 and finally published in 1631 [Ritvale 1631; and later reeditions]. The scope of the translations is somewhat limited: phrases when the faithful are called upon to proclaim their declarations are given in Latin, Polish and German. In later editions, such as the Vilnius one, Lithuanian is quoted as well.

Jakub Wujek, a prominent figure in Polish biblical translation, also contributed to the growth of theological and liturgical translation. After translating a number of catechetical writings, he also contributed to the development of Polish religious poetry. The main text is the Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary [Officivm 1598; and later reeditions], which served as both euchographic and poetic literature. Researchers hypothesised that Wujek could also have contributed to another similar edition, i.e. the Hours of

Holy Feasts [Godzinki 1582], but this statement is not reasonable [Kuźmina 2004:204]. In any case, Wujek's personality truly unites all branches of religious translation, and this testifies to the realised need to have all texts in a native language for ecclesiastical purposes.

Wujek's translation was part of the popularisation of the Marian cult. It is not a surprise that "The Little Office of the Immaculate Conception", written in the late 15th century but promulgated only in 1615, was translated into Polish very quickly by a Jesuit priest in 1616 or 1617 [Bednarz 1964:204]. However, the general impression is that the creatively fruitful 16th and early 17th centuries created a matrix for book production which reprinted the known texts but did not generate new translation enterprises.

Orthodox liturgical printing, which developed in Vilnius, was proud of some serious publications such as the Octoechos (1582) and the Euchologion (c.1598). A lot changed in the 17th century due to the efforts of eminent personalities – Hedeon Balaban, Bishop of Lviv, and St Petro Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv.

The clergy had noticed discrepancies and deviations in the existing texts, and Metropolitan Mykhailo Rohoza decreed the necessity of correcting liturgical books. Hedeon Balaban took the main initiative: he contacted St Meletius Pegas, Patriarch of Alexandria and locum tenens of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, who sent the Greek Liturgicon and Euchologion and blessed them for publication. The two editions that appeared as a result of this collaboration were the 1604 Liturgicon [Служебник 1604] and the 1606 Euchologion [Требник 1606], published in the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic in the town of Striatyn.

These two editions defined the principles of further editing and translating activities [Власовський 1998:2:232]:

1) the textus receptus was Greek, especially in the high-quality Venetian editions;

2) this text was compared with the extant Old Slavonic manuscripts that reflected the liturgical praxis of Ukraine.

Thus, if certain Ukrainian rites and prayers were not found in the Greek liturgical books (i.e. they were not translations but actual originals) but did not contradict the practice of the Greek Church, they remained in the liturgical practice of the Ukrainian Church. This approach required a great deal of effort from Ukrainian translators and editors, but it ensured the stable advancement and preservation of the Ukrainian liturgical tradition.

The new standards were followed by republishing and patterning in printing shops of Kyiv, Lviv, Ostroh and other Ukrainian cities. The printing shop of the Kyiv Caves Monastery gradually evolved into the most important centre of Ukrainian intellectual and religious life. The first substantial editions of this printing shop were the Horologion [Часословъ 1616] and the Mineon [Анθологіон 1619].

All these positive and promising projects were undertaken when the Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchy was persecuted and remained on the verge of extinction due to the aggressive and delegitimising actions of the Polish government. In 1620, Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, helped restore the entire hierarchy of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, which was able to continue its existence as an independent institution. It is evident how liturgical translations appeared as dissident acts of self-preservation and legitimisation for the Ukrainian Church and the Ukrainian nation.

The interim successes of the Orthodox clergy in political and social matters intensified their work in publishing new – or newly edited and corrected – translations of liturgical books. At this time, the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic was shaped and codified by Meletiy Smotrytskyi. It has remained in this form until today, as the historical events of the 18th and later centuries limited the popularity and use of this linguistic variant.

The Kyivan circle of theologians and translators included such eminent figures as Yelysei Pletenetskyi, Zakhariya Kopystenskyi, Pamvo Berynda and others. The key figure was Petro Mohyla, a Ukrainian religious leader of Moldovan origin, excellent writer and outstanding theologian. In the sphere of liturgical translation,

his major contributions are the 1629 and 1639 editions of the Liturgicon [Леітургіаріон 1629] and the 1646 edition of the Euchologion [Еухологіωн 1646]. The Euchologion is a voluminous edition of about 1500 pages, containing 129 offices and rubrics of Orthodox liturgical practice. Nevertheless, 17 offices were translated from the Roman Ritual [Власовський 1998:2:236]. This fact indicates how the Ukrainian Church understood its place in the world of rivalry between Eastern and Western Christianity: it remembered its baptism from "one holy universal Apostolic Church" and remained open to all the constructive achievements of both branches of Christianity.

The bridge between Orthodoxy and Polish society was built by the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Order of St Basil the Great. The Superior General of the Order, Rev. Dr. Pakhomiy Ohilevych, prepared a fundamental description of the Orthodox liturgy for Roman Catholic readers [Ecphonemata 1671]. The book consisted of two parts. The textual part – "Ecphonemata" – consisted of the Liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great, published in Church Slavonic (but in Latin characters) and in Polish translation. The second part – "Harmonia" – was academic and discussed the differences between the Byzantine and Roman liturgies. The book became such an important asset to the Church that the "Ecphonemata" was reprinted several times during two centuries (Kraków, 1685; Pochayiv, 1784; Peremyshl, 1831, 1842).

Non-liturgical books with liturgical texts

Liturgical texts appeared in editions not directly belonging to the genre of liturgical writings. Catechisms fit better into the paradigm of theological writings because not only was their primary focus on theological thinking, but their main tool was theological terminology, which enriched the conceptual matrix of a national language and shaped its academic style in the epoch when Latin was overwhelmingly dominant in all academic fields.

The earliest Polish texts containing catechism prayers (Our Lord, Hail Mary, Apostles' Creed, as well as the Decalogue and other commandments) in Polish translation date back to the 15th

century and are preserved in manuscripts [e.g. Bernacki 1910]. The first Polish-language catechisms – in today's sense of the term – appeared in the 1540s in the Protestant milieu. Mikołaj Rej translated and adapted the catechism of Urbanus Rhegius and published it twice in 1543 and 1549 [Catechismus 1910; Kuźmina 2002:74-75]. This catechism uses the divided articles of the Polish translation of the Apostles' Creed as title quotations for further explanation. Meanwhile, Jan Seklucjan published the complete texts of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer in Polish translations [Seklucian 1549:8-9v].

The first Catholic catechism was written and published by Benedykt Herbest [Herbest 1566]. His catechism had a question-answer form in chapters corresponding to the articles of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary. For this reason, the articles of these prayers were quoted in Polish and then explained. This approach was followed in many later editions[4], even those that followed the official Roman edition of 1566 [such as Katechizm 1568]. Another Catholic catechism was published a year later by Marcin Białobrzeski, who, in his preface, published the Polish translations of eight symbols of faith – of St Hilary, St Basil, St Ambrose, St Augustine, St Jerome, St Gregory of Nazianzus, St Gregory the Great and the Nicean Creed [Białobrzeski 1567:[6v-9v]].

In the Orthodox cultural space, the situation was very similar[5]. Protestant and Catholic editions influenced Orthodox catechisms. Lavrentiy Zyzaniy, a native of Lviv Region, published his Large Catechism in Moscow circa 1627, in which he cited the Church Slavonic translations of both the Apostles' Creed [Зизаній 1627:[30-30v]] and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed [Зизаній 1627:[31v-32]]. The publication of the Apostles' Creed shows that the text, which is mainly considered Roman Catholic, was circulating among Orthodox theologians who shared the common

---

[4] For an analysis of the catechisms published in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, see [Kuźmina 2002].

[5] For the study of all the catechisms published in this region, see [Корзо 2007].

early Christian heritage⁶. The Middle Ukrainian edition of St Petro Mohyla's Catechism of 1645 [Могила 1645] followed the principle of divided presentation: the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed is divided into articles, and each article is quoted in Church Slavonic and then explained in Middle Ukrainian. In a way, the explanations also serve as translations since they at least provide the necessary terms.

Polemical literature, which lies between academic and political writings, provided some samples of liturgical translation as well. The translation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed into Middle Ukrainian was published as early as 1620 in Zakhariya Kopystenskyi's polemical theological treatise "Book on the True Faith and the Holy Apostolic Church" [Копистенський 1620:165-167]. An incomplete Polish-language paraphrase of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed appeared in Chapter 10 "Catechism of the Eastern Church" of Meletiy Smotrytskyi's "Threnos", a Ukrainian Orthodox polemical work written in Polish and published in 1610 [Смотрицький 2015:498, 500, 516].

Jan Seklucian's Catechism devotes its first chapter to the teaching of reading and writing [Seklucian 1549:4-5v]. This strange amalgamation reveals a more perplexing puzzle: medieval primers were, first and foremost, prayer books. Their function as children's first reading books is explained by the fact that every child learnt to read in Latin or Church Slavonic because their goal of becoming a clerk also required them to know and recite the Office and the Psalms by heart. Such a practical approach was characteristic of similar editions in the broader European context. Some Polish primers remained under the influence of the Protestant catechetical tradition [for a detailed analysis, see: Korzo 2015]. The republished prayers were both biblical (the Our Lord, the Hail Mary, some psalms) and liturgical (the Creed, prayers to the Holy Spirit). The first known edition is Stanisław Zaborowski's rules for

---

⁶ The Kyivan Metropolitanate recognised the Apostles' Creed and used it in its catechetical practices, while the Moscow Metropolitanate rejected it completely [Корзо 2016:21-26].

writing and reading in 1514 or 1515, which also included principal prayers [Zaborowski 1514-151:19-20]. The same inclusion of biblical and liturgical prayers is observed in Ukrainian editions of the late 16th century: Ivan Fedorovych published one edition of primers in Lviv [Федорович 1574] and two in Ostroh [Федорович 1578а; Федорович 1578b], and Lavrentiy Zyzaniy composed his very abridged primer in Vilnius [Зизаній 1596]. As in the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, the Kyivan Metropolitanate accepted the Creed of St Athanasius, which was repeatedly republished in primers and horologions [Корзо 2016:27]. The first publication of the Creed of St Athanasius is the 1618 edition in Vievis [Букварь 1618:33v-38], which also contains the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed [Букварь 1618:32-33v] and the Creeds of SS Ambrose and Augustine [Букварь 1618:38-40]. Hypothetically, Rev. Meletiy Smotrytskyi, the author of the first textbook of the Church Slavonic language (in the Ukrainian recension, 1619), participated in preparing this primer.

Interestingly, prayers were also published in Polish-German phrasebooks and other textbooks for learning foreign languages [Korzo 2015:174], which were popular publications, the first of which appeared in 1522 or 1523. All these educational editions with a set of religious texts were eagerly republished and recomposed in the 17th and 18th centuries.

18th century: Epoch of (Non)-Enlightenment

The Age of Enlightenment is not characterised by brilliant events or reforms in liturgical life. It was rather sluggish after the waves of the Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation had brought a series of innovations that had to be challenged and accepted. When the new equilibrium was finally found, the printing press spread knowledge more widely, and new translations appeared in response to new demands.

Printers republished older texts and supplied a large number of prayer books and hymnals. The typical Polish reader had access to prayer books, hymnals and catechisms, and sometimes these editions were of such a hybrid nature that it is difficult to classify

them strictly: the most popular edition was a prayer book with religious songs. An average prayer book consisted of two parts: the first part contained prayers from the liturgical year; the second part was intended for private use and could be divided into three chapters containing prayers related to sacraments (for successful marriage and baptism, for a child), everyday life (various occasions and even those for good weather) and historical events (experienced by the whole national community) [Marcinkowska-Malara 2018:8]. This type of book satisfied all the needs of the faithful.

In comparison, Roman Catholic priests had few texts available in Polish translations. A rare exception was the bilingual – Latin and Polish – edition of the Offices for Lent of 1701 [Officivm 1701], though it was a bulky volume. Another exciting edition from the viewpoint of theology and translation is the collection of Jan Witkowski [Witkowski 1730]. The year 1780 is a unique one, as it brought two serious books for academic reasons and secular co-celebrants: first, a translation of the Missal compiled by the German Capuchin Martin of Cochem [Mszał 1780], which included the Canon and alternate parts for feasts as well as other prayers; second, a two-volume manual of the Roman Liturgy and Sacraments [Ceremonie 1780], which also included the Byzantine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom. In the following year, 1781, the Holy Cross Parish Church in Warsaw published the offices celebrated in that church, along with prayers of the daily, weekly and yearly cycles, as well as some religious songs [Nabożeństwo 1781]. These editions, republished several times, formed a lively part of the liturgical translations, but they did not have the high status of official use and fulfilled a purely educational function. Even in this capacity, they set a new standard for translation, which was to be maintained throughout the 19th century.

Polish-language Orthodox translation as a separate branch of liturgical translation began only in the 18th century. After the first successful attempt with Ohilevych's "Ecphonemata", new projects were undertaken in the middle of the century, linked to the activities of the Basilians. In 1743, the monastery of Supraśl

published the bilingual – Church Slavonic and Polish – edition of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Wykład 1743], which was republished several times in Supraśl and Lviv, thus mapping already important centres of Greek Catholicism in Eastern Europe. In 1762, Pochayiv Monastery published the Akathist to the Theotokos in Church Slavonic (but in Roman characters) and in Latin translation [Hymn 1762]: this translation increased the number of readers of this text since it included all those who could read Latin. In 1764, Vilnius Monastery published the Polish translation of the Akathist and Paraklesis to the Theotokos [Akatist 1764], based on the translations of the Greek Catholic Archbishop of Durrës, Giuseppe Schirò, an Arbëreshë (Italian Albanian) theologian and translator of the Office for the Theotokos from Greek into Latin. Among other less important but popular liturgical texts are the Latin translations of Church Slavonic pieces, such as the Akathist to Jesus Christ [Flos 1756], or the Polish ones, such as the Akathist to St Onuphrius [Nabożeństwo 1785], Ivan Yakiv Susha's Akathist to St Yosafat Kuntsevych (albeit translated from Latin) [Nabożeństwo 1783]. The repertoire of Orthodox literature in Polish slowly expanded. The bilingual – Church Slavonic and Polish – edition of "Rożne nabożenstwo" ("Various Prayers") was a prayer book consisting of five parts: morning and evening prayers, Akathists to Jesus Christ and to the Annunciation, Paraklesis [Rożne 1791]. Its publication (and subsequent republications) marked the appearance of the Polish-speaking Orthodox community on the religious scene of the Commonwealth since the book was intended for private use, and thus, the demand for this type of book was already relatively high.

The 18th century in Ukrainian history cannot be called a period of enlightenment but rather the path to colonial existence, especially after a series of failed attempts at national struggle (the Poltava catastrophe of 1709, the liquidation of the Cossack Hetmanate in 1764, the introduction of the Russian administrative-judicial system in 1782). The language and practice of the Kyivan liturgical tradition were subordinated to the Russian Orthodox Church. Although the process of eradicating the Kyivan

Christian heritage in the territories annexed by Russia took almost a century (1689-1800) and was implemented through censorship of book printing and abrupt changes in local liturgical practices [Власовський 1998:3:54-62], it also aimed at the elimination of Ukrainian national identity and resulted in a slowdown of liturgical translation activities.

On the other hand, the printing shops of Pochayiv and Univ monasteries, which remained on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, expanded their capacities. In the 18th century, they published 103 and 13 editions of liturgical books, respectively. They published books in Church Slavonic of Ukrainian recension, Polish and Latin, so their main function was to preserve the Kyivan identity in liturgical books. The printing shops operating in the Commonwealth preserved the Kyivan printing tradition, which became the foundation of Ukrainian Greek Catholic liturgical practice.

Liturgical and paraliturgical singing remained an essential part of religious life in both nations. The collection of religious songs "Bohohlasnyk" [Богогласникъ 1790] was the first printed edition of its kind among the Ukrainians and all Eastern Slavs. It contained paraliturgical songs in three languages, sometimes used during the liturgy. The collection of religious songs by Franciszek Karpiński, who published a collection of religious songs (original and translated) in 1792 [Karpiński 1792], is highly appreciated: it corresponded to the demands of the Enlightenment by preserving the calm mode and dogmatic correctness [Sinka 1983:266]. Although these editions can be viewed as those that summarised the best poetic achievements of the previous epoch, they also ushered in a new stage of religious singing and – even more broadly – liturgical translation, which had to function under new historical conditions, i.e. Romanticism, technological revolutions and imperial existence.

Vernacular perception and translation praxis

Translations are not always in line with the theoretical judgements of other intellectuals on the same subject. One

of the reasons for this was the peculiarities of writing about translation and the circulation of written and printed books among translators. Another reason was the very level of theoretical observations and the need for their collection. In the 16th century, scholars from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth must have had access to ancient and Renaissance sources such as Horace's "De arte poetica liber", Cicero's "De optimo genere oratorum", St Jerome's "De optimo genere interpretandi" and Leonardo Bruno's "De interpretatione recta" [Wichowa 2003:238-239]. The in-depth understanding of translation problems did not mean sufficient freedom for translators to experiment with language and search for more successful means of verbal expression.

It was Jan Kochanowski who established a certain standard for the translation of biblical poetry, which also affected liturgical texts. In line with Renaissance decorative techniques, he used verbal means that many might not have preferred: he introduced numerous amplifications by extending semantic prosody and grammatical constructions, adding explanatory words and epithets [Wilkoń 2004:133-135, 169]. All these features created a bridge to the emotional sphere of the reader-believer, and in this way, God became more "humanised" and closer to the understanding and perception of the reading community.

One of the most prolific Polish translators, Stanisław Grochowski, referred to the strategy known in Orthodox translation: a translator is to render a liturgical text according to a particular melody. The requirements for a liturgical translator were quite complicated for any translator, as he had to preserve the meaning (read: theological dogmaticity and verbal expression) of the original and its isosyllabism for the readers so that they could use the very text for signing [Wichowa 2003:239]. Unfortunately, he did not follow up on this observation, and every new translator had to search for new, unique solutions to minor textual discrepancies.

A typical addressee of Church Slavonic translations was everyone in the community: from the layman to the metropolitan. The Ukrainian vernacular slowly entered the solemn liturgical

ceremony through the sacramental formulae of the laity and the paraliturgical songs used during the liturgy. This situation continued into the early modern period. A typical addressee of Polish translations changed. When Jan Białobocki translated breviary hymns, he addressed them to nuns, knowing that priests would not need his translations for private use and that these texts would not be allowed in public ceremonies [Gruchała 2013:76]. This was true in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the reading community slowly changed during the Enlightenment: at first, it was influenced by the well-accepted culture of religious singing, and later, "academic" translations contributed to the expansion of the repertoire of religious texts in Polish.

During this period, Polish and Ukrainian communities experimented with languages. Polish liturgical translators contributed to refining the lexicon and the idiomatic, semantic and syntactic features of cultural Polish [e.g. Wilkoń 2004:169 ff]. Ukrainian translators focused more on forming the Ukrainian recension of the Church Slavonic language, which also included the discussion of aesthetic values in the text [cf. Шмігер 2018:41-44, 49-53]. In any case, all the theoretical debates and linguistic inventions stimulated the further expansion of Polish and Ukrainian linguistic plurality, which determined the rise of these nations' poetry in the form of religious genres.

The period under discussion covers more than three centuries, most of which were marked by the existence of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which integrated ethnic Polish, Ukrainian, Belarusian and Lithuanian territories. The coexistence of these nations gave rise to a number of political, social and ecclesiastical projects, which also had consequences for the progress of liturgical translation in the Polish and Ukrainian ecclesiastical traditions.

Obviously, the coexistence of different confessional and ethnic communities in one state stimulates the exchange of cultural ideas and makes them more aware of the other communities. In liturgical life, it is easy to see how, in the 16th century, the communities themselves did not penetrate each other. The love

for using and compiling prayer books is the only phenomenon that the Orthodox began to apply after following the behaviour of the Roman Catholics.

The 18th century, usually considered the Age of Enlightenment, was the time when the Polish community began to learn more about the Byzantine Rite in the Kyivan form via translations. Conversely, no Ukrainian or Church Slavonic translation of the Roman Catholic liturgy has been recorded in history. The Church Slavonic translation of the "Dies irae" sequence is an exception that reinforces the rule.

It seems that the Reformation influenced Polish liturgical translation both positively and negatively: firstly, positively because hymns and catechisms in Polish worked very well; secondly, negatively because Latin began to be seen as a language protecting against heresy, and this predisposition did not allow priests to serve the liturgy in vernacular languages. At the same time, the Reformation does not seem to have directly impacted Orthodox liturgical translation.

The Polish-speaking Orthodox/Greek Catholic community was finally organised in the late 18th century as the number of Polish translations of Byzantine liturgical texts increased. This fact shows how the religious and ethnic balance changed: for most of the Commonwealth's history, different religious communities followed their faith and language and did not mix. The Polish-speaking Orthodox/Greek Catholic community became a blurred zone of ethnic assimilation, though the partitions of the Commonwealth drastically reshaped the map of Eastern Europe, and new historical conditions created new challenges and demands for liturgical translation.

3. Long 19th century:
stateless nations and translations

In the histories of the Ukrainian and Polish nations, the "long 19th century" was the period between the collapse of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the beginning of the First World War. During that time, both nations were divided between empires: the Ukrainians lived in two empires (the larger part in the Russian Empire and the rest in the Austrian or later Austro-Hungarian Empire); the Poles were divided between three empires: the Russian Empire, the Austrian (Austro-Hungarian) Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia (later the German Empire). These historical conditions caused the two nations to search for a new identity in a changing world. One of the aspects of their social life was the status of their languages.

At the turn of the 19th century, Polish lost its power as a very privileged official language, but its positions in developing national mentality and academia were quite strong. Ukraine found itself in a surprisingly similar situation to Norway, which was looking for its official language at that time and hesitated between two options: developing the peasant vernacular to higher standards of verbal expression or "Norwegising" the elaborate Danish language. The choice to "Norwegise" Danish cannot be considered a successful one because the vitality of the living vernacular showed its power but under the auspices of their independent state, Norwegian intellectuals could afford this debate and experiment. Ukrainian writers did not have the opportunity to debate this issue, though they faced the choice of continuing to use the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic, or developing the Ukrainian vernacular, or moving to other languages (Russian, German, and even Polish and Hungarian). Gradually, writers stopped writing in Church Slavonic, bookish Middle Ukrainian and began to elaborate the literary standard of New Ukrainian, which replaced Middle Ukrainian in the mid-18th century.

Editions and societal response

The technical progress of the 19th century promoted an even greater number of prayer books, but the main tendencies maintained the same status quo: the high-status texts of the Liturgy remained in the sacred languages, i.e. Latin or Church Slavonic. Additional devotions, paraliturgical songs and homilies gradually shifted to the national languages, and this shift was very much welcomed by the laity for the simplest reason: they lacked the public use of their languages, and some liturgical space provided this opportunity.

The Roman See did not support even bilingual editions, though they were the best means of liturgical catechisation. One of the first bilingual missals in Europe was a five-volume French-Latin edition "Messel romain, selon le règlement du Concile de Trente" by a Parisian priest, Rev. Joseph de Voisin, in 1660. Although it carried the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Paris, it was condemned by an assembly of French clergymen and by Pope Alexander VII and remained on the "Index of Forbidden Books" until 1897 [Commentary 2011:47]. This attitude explains why the translation of liturgical books was slow and complicated, and it was not until the late 19th century that this attitude changed.

Despite all the prohibitions, the 19th century is the time of the approach to the complete translation of the Missal. Some books contained more or less detailed explanations of the parts of the Mass and accompanied them with "ecclesiastical" prayers, as in the Book of Devotions by the German Bishop Johann Aloys Schneider [Książka 1811], or with bilingual Latin-Polish quotations, as in the Holy Mass Explained by Rev. Johann Evarist Schmid [Schmid 1841]. These two editions were even translations from German, so Latin was not the main source language for the translators; technically, they may have been intermediate translations.

In 1836, further parts of the Missal were published in the prayer book compiled by Klementyna Hoffmanowa [Książka 1836]. The Ordinary of the Mass was completely translated and published in parallel with the prayers for the faithful: in this way, the faithful could follow the Latin-speaking priest and understand

him completely, or follow him and pray with additional prayers in Polish, as was the general practice. Hoffmanowa, a writer and translator, was an exceptional figure in Polish literature: she was the first Polish woman to earn her living through professional writing. She deserves to be called a feminist because of her activities (even the prayer book is called the Book of Devotions for Women, even though it was not the first book with this title [cf. Książka 1827]), and it may have been used to trick the censors into granting official permission. She was called the "Mother of the Great Emigration" because she went into exile in Paris after the November Uprising of 1830-1831: there, she prepared or completed the prayer book, the first edition of which was published anonymously in Kraków.

When the Primate of Poland, Archbishop Marcin Dunin Sulgostowski, prepared his Book of Devotions [Książka 1842], the book automatically received the highest status of veneration. It was republished several times, and there are many editions in two formats – for men and for women – with some prayers (for fiancés and fiancées, fathers and mothers) slightly modified to reflect the believer's identity better. It included the detailed translation-explanation of the Mass, but no other missal offices were provided. Meanwhile, the New Book of Devotions for Polish Women, compiled by another Polish activist and writer, Paulina Krakowowa (albeit the first edition was anonymous [Nowa 1843]), contained the exact translation of the Ordinary of the Mass, as well as hymns and prayers for other feasts.

It seems that Hoffmanowa's and Krakowowa's approach of including some changing parts of the Missal prepared the ground for the publication of the complete Polish – de facto bilingual, Latin-Polish – Missal, which finally took place in 1844-1845 [Roczne 1844–1845]. This four-volume edition was published in the German part of divided Poland and was the first complete Polish-Latin missal. Physically, it was published in Berlin, but it contained the sanction of the Bishop of Chełmno and later the confirmation of the Primate of Poland, the Archbishop of Gniezno and Poznań, Metropolitan Leon Przyłuski. In this translation, Holy Week and the translator's name are missing. After comparing

the content and language [Grochocki 1952], Rev. Józef Grochocki identified the gap in the 1859 Vilnius edition of "Great and Holy Week according to the Rite of the Roman Catholic Church", which was actually the second edition of the 1843 publication with the same title [Wielki 1843]. The difference between the two editions is twofold: on the one hand, there are some minor and rare editorial changes; on the other hand, the second edition also contains some orders for priests. The 1843 edition can be considered the fifth volume of the 1844-1845 Missal. Moreover, this Missal contains several sacraments, so it is also a Ritual. The publication of all these books could help to spiritually unite Poles from two empires – Russian and German. The translator of this magnificent project was Rev. Szymon Marcin Kozłowski (1819-1899), a native of Lithuania, who carried it out at a very young age. He was later ordained Bishop of Lutsk, Zhytomyr and Kamyanets-Podilskyi in Ukraine (1883-1891) and Archbishop of Mohilev in Belarus (1891-1899). In 1892, he came into conflict with the Russian government because of his opposition to introducing Russian into additional devotions. Judging by his translations, it is clear that he was trying to resist the Russification of the Poles through his Polish translations.

Another translation was a voluminous Polish-Latin edition of the Roman Missal for the Use of the Faithful [Mszał 1874], which incorporated the sanction granted by the Church but made no mention of the translator or translators. Thus, this central book was recommended for reading and using by a wider public. As for other liturgical books, they were not translated or published under their typical names. For instance, the Ritual was not translated, but some translated orders were known from Hoffmanowa's prayer book and Kozłowski's missal. A separate Latin-Polish edition of the Orders for the Consecration of the Cemetery, the First Stone, the Church, the Bells, the Altar and the Holy Mass [Obrzędy 1859] was prepared by Rev. Jakub Szkiłłądź because of the construction of a new church on the Roman Catholic cemetery in St Petersburg (later the Visitation Church). The collection of funerary rites was published relatively late, in 1910 [Nabożeństwo 1910], and its

purpose was to serve as a manual for a better understanding of the rites but not to replace the actual Latin rites. The Breviary was published as a "Little Breviary" for the Franciscan tertiaries [Jezus 1868; Nowy 1885; Nowy 1886; Brewijarzyk 1887]: the Third Order means the participation of laymen, and understandably, they asked to have such a book in their native language.

Although Latin was losing its high status in Europe during the 19th century due to the emergence of other languages with a privileged status (such as the official language: German or Russian for Poles and Ukrainians), it still retained certain positions in the religious sphere. This linguistic landscape is evident in various religious manuals, where the main text was written in Polish, but the prayers were given in Latin [e.g. Nowowiejśki 1886:15-17, 190-191]. The permissive policy of the Church authorities determines the inertia of religious life.

The Russian imperial government interfered in the religious life of the subjugated nations, imposing the policy of Russification and conversion to Russian Orthodoxy. In addition to direct persecution of the Roman Catholic Church and the liquidation of the Greek Catholic Church, it even attempted to interfere with Roman Catholic liturgical practice. A special governmental effort was made to publish in Vilnius the Russian translations of the extensive Prayer Book (1869), the Lectionary (1869), the Ritual (1869 and 1870) and some religious songs (1870) [Sipovič 1973:17]. Undoubtedly, the ultimate goal was to replace Polish and Latin with Russian everywhere in church life, but the Russian government still lacked the power to change the language of the Mass. The Ritual was translated in a specifically "anti-Polish" way: all Polish texts were translated into Russian; Lithuanian and Latvian parts were transliterated into Russian Cyrillic; French and German texts remained unchanged [Ważynski 1872:79-80]. Not surprisingly, this translation was boycotted and even publicly burned.

In 1870, the Imperial Decree allowed the use of Russian for catechisation and additional devotions [Ważynski 1872:64], but such "permissions" were often seen and meant as imperatives at lower levels of administration: this decree effectively sanctioned

the Russification of church life wherever possible. Finally, in 1877, the Apostolic See intervened and expressed its indirect support for Polish-language practices and the restriction of the unauthorised use of other languages [Sipovič 1973:26]. This decision helped the Poles to maintain their practice, but other ethnic groups (Germans, Lithuanians, Latvians, Belarusians) were faced with the difficult choice of whether to favour Russian or Polish at the expense of their mother tongue.

Ukrainian cultural life in the 19th century centred on new original writings and translations from contemporary European literatures. Religious life in Ukraine, where Church Slavonic was the main liturgical language, and the official languages were involved in paraliturgical practices, was stable from the perspective of textual or linguistic reforms during the first half of the century. Gradually, intellectuals started arguing for the need for a much broader presence of the Ukrainian language (actually, its New Ukrainian literary standard). Ukrainian entered the homilies [Шах 1961:84-90] and began to compete with Polish, German, Latin (in the Austrian Empire) and Russian (in the Russian Empire).

Attempts to introduce the Ukrainian language into liturgical practice encountered a lot of obstacles. In the early 19th century in Halychyna (which was part of the Austrian Empire), the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Metropolitan Mykhailo Levytskyi appealed to the Austrian authorities for the use of Ukrainian in catechisms and liturgical books, but the authority recommended translating them into Polish or publishing them in Roman characters [Пуряєва 2016]. In the mid-19th century, the manuscript of the translated prayer book by Vasyl Didoshak was condemned to burning by the conservative censorship of the same church [ibid]. In the Russian Empire, the Orthodox Ukrainians finally achieved some modest successes after the 1905 revolution: it was mainly the public use of Ukrainian-language Gospel readings and sermons [cf. Ковальчук 2011], but no serious Ukrainian liturgical projects could be expected in the Russian autocratic regime.

The first serious struggle for public recognition of New Ukrainian as a liturgical language was triggered by the publication

of Ukrainian prayer books by Ivan Puliui, who had degrees in theology and physics. Although he contributed much more to science (in fact, he developed the use of X-rays for medical imaging and improved the light bulb), he also cared deeply about Ukrainian religious translation and is famous for publishing the first Ukrainian-language prayer books and completing the first full Ukrainian translation of the Bible (which he translated in collaboration with Panteleimon Kulish and Ivan Nechui-Levytskyi). Puliui published a concise pamphlet with prayers and some catechetical information in 1869 [Молитвослов 1869] and an extended prayer book in 1871 [Молитовник 1871]. The manuscript of the prayer book was severely criticised by the Greek Catholic censor and even sentenced to destruction because of the introduction of the Ukrainian language [Пулюй 1871:2-3]. The Lviv "Moscophiles", who were ethically Ukrainian but supported the pro-Russian orientation, the artificial literary standard called "Yazychiye" and the etymological spelling rules, distorted the idea of loyalty to traditions and obstructed the use of the vernacular at the slightest expense of Church Slavonic. They argued that the Ukrainian language was not yet developed for such translations and that the translation of prayers into Ukrainian would break the link with existing Ukrainian literature [Пулюй 1871:3-4]. Puliui responded with academic arguments and legal reasons [Пулюй 1871:4-15], and his pamphlet reply to the ecclesiastical accusations was a model of translation criticism. Ultimately, the prayer book was published without ecclesiastical approval and "financed by the public".

The 1871 Prayer Book contained daily prayers, catechetical information, miscellaneous prayers, confessional and Eucharistic prayers, akathists, the Church Slavonic text of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, eight religious songs and the calendar. This collection served most of the needs of the faithful. From the standpoint of today's publishing practice, the only text that can be considered missing is the Office for the Dead since it was a text that was often referred to. Perhaps the translator considered it part of the Euchologion and did not want to disturb public worship.

The Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was not translated in Puliui's Prayer Book. Instead, he offered prayers that could be used during the liturgy itself. A few prayers were translations of fragments of the liturgy, but most of them were prayers that did not come from the text of the liturgy. In fact, Puliui followed the practice of Polish prayer books, which offered prayers in Polish for use during the Latin Mass. The Ukrainian translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was not discussed, except for some exceptions [Пуряєва 2017:175-176]. The status of Church Slavonic remained unchanged for another century.

Although Puliui lost a personal battle: due to the lack of official ecclesiastical permission, his translation did not become a very popular edition, like other editions of this genre, and he donated the rest of the circulation to the educational and cultural society network "Prosvita", his prayer book was positively accepted by Ukrainian intellectuals in both empires [Пуряєва 2016:134-135]. It is this book that prompted the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church to sanction Ukrainian as a language of private worship.

The breakthrough came in 1878 when a Ukrainian-language prayer book was approved by Metropolitan Yosyf Sembratovych of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church [Народный 1878]. Its title was "A Laic Ruthenian [Ukrainian] Prayer Book" and it involved the efforts of Rev. Dr. (later Metropolitan) Sylvestr Sembratovych (translation from Church Slavonic and Italian), Rev. Oleksiy Sliusarchuk (translation of the Daily Prayers and the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom), Dr. Omelian Ohonovskyi (linguistic editing) and Rev. Oleksandr Stefanovych (preparation for publication). It was published in three versions: the full version, the abridged version and the children's version. In this way, it was targeted at different strata of Ukrainian society. It is crucial because it contains the first translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, which paved the way for its public use. Although it was still celebrated in Church Slavonic, the existence of the Ukrainian text changed the social value of the liturgy and helped to interpret the Church as a national institution.

The 1904 edition of the Extended Psalter seems to be the publication of the 1889 translation by Oleksiy Sliusarchuk

[Псалтыря 1904]. It has two approvals (1889 and 1900), and it can be considered the second official enterprise within the Church, which was already an event in ecclesiastical life. Although the emphasis was on explaning the Psalms (published in Church Slavonic and Ukrainian and followed by a more extended interpretation), the Psalter is divided into kathismata with additional prayers. All the additional prayers and troparia were also translated into Ukrainian. The reviewer of the pre-printed part of the Psalter claimed that pre-orders were extremely low, and the translator tried to publish the first part in order to stimulate further interest [Рецензія 1902:76]. This attitude shows the reluctance of the (predominantly rustic) Ukrainian community of Halychyna, whose religious mentality was quite selective – rigid or open – in accepting certain religious text types and printing genres.

One of the well-founded fears of Ukrainian Greek Catholic intellectuals was the "Latinisation" of their Rite, i.e. the introduction of Roman Catholic practices into Greek Catholic liturgical use. The Way of the Cross is a popular Catholic devotion that originated in the Franciscan milieu and spread worldwide, leading to various adaptations. If the classical devotion contains 14 stations, different architectural ensembles on calvaries could have more chapels and thus require additional texts for more stations. One of the first Ukrainian editions of this type of devotion was published in Peremyshl in 1902 [Дорога 1902]: it does not contain any reference to the original (if there was a specific one), but it is a visible adaptation of similar texts in Polish, and one of the strongest features of its evangelical power is the use of the Ukrainian language (albeit written according to the complicated etymological orthography).

In exile (emigration), church communities had to deal with the language issues of the non-native environment and were more receptive to liturgical translations in their native language. Although "the Ukrainianness of the Ukrainians was not understood by the Presbyterian/United churches and was regarded as detrimental to the necessary quick Canadianization process" [Russin 1999:3], the actual religious life provided some space for

vernacular practices. Ivan Bodrug, the initiator of the (Ukrainian) Independent Greek Church (1903), which was later incorporated into the Presbyterian Church of Canada (1913), published the very little Liturgicon [Служебник 1910], which continued the Ukrainian Greek Catholic practice of publishing liturgical books: high-status texts were in Church Slavonic (the altered and abridged text of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, principal prayers and troparia) but some prayers, Matins and Vespers, and the Rite of Baptism were in Ukrainian. Surprisingly, this edition shows strong liturgical links with the Ukrainian Byzantine liturgical tradition, even though the compiler was presented as a minister of the Ukrainian Presbyterian Church. Similarly, the Ukrainian Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession, founded in 1925 in Ivano-Frankivsk (Ukraine), built its identity on the reform of the Byzantine Rite and opposition to the introduction of Latin into the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church.

A similar experience is shared by the Polish National Catholic Church, based in the United States and founded by Polish Americans in 1897. Stimulated by contradictions with the mainly ethnic Irish and German bishops, it retained the Roman Catholic heritage and propagated the liturgical use of Polish. Another Polish church that switched to Polish (on 24 December 1907) but retained the Roman Catholic heritage was the Old Catholic Mariavite Church, founded in Płock (Poland) in 1906 (though its liturgical books were published a little later [Mszał 1924; Rytuał 1926]).

In general, when comparing the publishing capacity and production of Polish and Ukrainian prayer books, it is easy to see that, in absolute terms, the Poles had their religious needs more or less satisfactorily met in Polish, while the same needs were unsatisfactory for the Ukrainians. This condition is partly explained by the state of biblical translations: the complete Bible in Polish had already existed in the 16th century, and the Ukrainians had to rely on the complete Bible in Ukrainian, which was only made available to a wider public at the turn of the 20th century. This situation explains why the Polish liturgical translation had a good basis for development, and the Ukrainian liturgical translation faced additional difficulties. The Ukrainians were not

fortunate enough to have in their native language such extensive prayer books as "A Golden (Little) Altar of Fragrant Incense" [e.g. Złoty 1812], "A Roman Catholic Little Altar" [Ołtarzyk 1846] or "A Polish Little Altar" [Ołtarzyk 1838]. There were also interesting Polish translations of prayer books written in other languages: for instance, the original prayer book compiled by the German theologian Johann Michael Hauber was translated from German and published as a seven-volume edition [Nabożeństwo 1834].

Music as translation

Musical matters are treated differently in the Eastern and Western Churches. Instrumental music is cherished in the Roman Catholic Church, while it is forbidden in the Orthodox Church, which has developed a high culture of choral singing. However, both liturgical traditions revere their melodies, which first appeared in the original and later reappeared in translations. The original melodies, which can be understood both as initial melodies and as melodies of the source text, cause a lot of trouble for translators, who face the dilemma of either mosaicking the original pattern with target-language means or modifying the original melody according to the design of the target text [Łaś 1968:267]. The second option left enough room for the creativity of composers who wrote their music for religious texts, but this meant a break from the musical liturgical tradition. The Orthodox Churches partially experienced this rupture and developed their national chants. The golden age of Italian Renaissance music influenced the transformation of religious music and later influenced musical practices – instrumental and vocal – in the Western and Eastern Churches. Nevertheless, from the late 18th century to the mid-20th century, a third option emerged in the Roman Church: additional "Mass songs" were sung by the faithful in the vernacular, either simultaneously and in parallel with the Latin parts of the Mass, which were pronounced by the priest, or in addition to and alternating with the Latin parts.

These paraliturgical hymns, called "Polish Masses", can be considered translations since their themes were supposed to be

relevant to the semantic contexts of the parts of the Mass. They appeared at the end of the Enlightenment: the prayer book of 1781 contained two Polish Masses – "Zacznijcie usta nasze chwalić Pana swego" and "Z pokorą upadamy przed Tobą Boże" [Nabożeństwo 1781]. In 1803, Fabian Cichorski published two Polish Masses: "Zacznijcie usta nasze…" and "Tu przed Tobą czyni Panie lud grzechów wyznanie" [Sinka 1983:266]. It became so popular that Rev. Michał Mioduszewski (1787-1868), himself a composer and collector of religious folk songs, published the hymnal "Śpiewnik kościelny" ("A Book of Ecclesiastical Songs" [Śpiewnik 1838–1854]), which contained 24 Polish Masses for the worship of the Lord's feasts, the Virgin Mary, saints, special devotions and the dead. The texts were written by outstanding Polish poets such as Franciszek Wężyk (1785-1862), Kazimierz Brodziński (1791-1835) and Alojzy Feliński (1771-1820, deeply connected with Ukraine, where he was born and died). New texts required new melodies, composed by Wacław Raszek (c. 1765-1848), Franciszek Lessel (1780-1838) and others. These texts thus became a purely Polish literary phenomenon within the framework of the Roman Catholic Liturgy.

The original music of composers who did not change the accepted liturgical texts can be considered intersemiotic translation, even though text and music (instrumental and choral) are usually performed simultaneously. The decadence of the musical school and new historical values stimulated religious singers and composers to search for new sources of inspiration. These sources were the same for Ukraine and Poland, as well as their forms of Eastern and Western Christianity.

The first source was Italian opera music, whose Neapolitan style focused primarily on vocal virtuosity without careful attention to the liturgical text [Przybylski 2006:21]. This influence was already evident in Eastern European religious music in the 18th century, especially in the compositions of the Polish composers Jacek Szczurowski (nicknamed Hyacinthus and Roxolanus; supposedly of Ukrainian origin, 1716 - after 1773), Mateusz Zwierzchowski (c. 1713-1768), Marcin Józef Żebrowski (c. 1710-1792?) and the Ukrainian composers Maksym Berezovskyi (1745-1777), Dmytro

Bortnianskyi (1751-1825). The style of elegant performance transformed the further development of national religious music.

The second source was folk rhythms for dancing and singing. They entered sacred music as early as the late 18th century, as seen in the compositions of the Polish composer Jan Wański (1756 - c. 1830) and the Ukrainian composer Artem Vedel (1767-1808). Romanticism also created a favourable environment for the broader introduction of folk music and values into religious contexts [Przybylski 2006:24]. The musical heritage of Józef Elsner (1769-1854), Karol Kurpiński (1785-1857), as well as Mykhailo Verbytskyi (1815-1870), Kyrylo Stetsenko (1882-1922) successfully implemented the folk melodies of their homelands and masterfully manifested their ethnicity.

It is interesting to see how leading composers approached sacred music. Stanisław Moniuszko (1819-1872) and Mykola Lysenko (1842-1912) are often credited with establishing national musical traditions during the Polish and Ukrainian national revivals. Moniuszko created 11 compositions, such as litanies and masses, for Latin and Polish texts: Latin Mass, Latin and Polish Funeral Mass, Polish Piotrowin Mass, Litanies of Ostra Brama. Polish authors wrote the Polish texts, so the composer designed the score directly according to Polish phonoaesthetics. Lysenko's contribution is smaller: the Cherubic Hymn, the chant "Пречистая Діво" ("Immaculate Virgin"), the chant "Хресним древом" (" By the Cross Tree"), the Christmas kontakion "Діва днесь пресущественного раждаєт" ("Today the Virgin gives birth to the Preexistent One"), the religious concerto "Камо пойду од лиця Твоєго, Господи" ("Where shall I go from Thy face, O Lord? ") and the spiritual hymn "Боже великий, єдиний" (Prayer for Ukraine) [Засадна, Черсак 2021:195]. The authority of these composers strengthened the performance of religious music at secular meetings and salons.

By the turn of the 20th century, numerous original melodic designs by Polish and Ukrainian composers, as well as reharmonisations of old melodies from the Kyivan musical heritage had formed a rich corpus of "intersemiotic translations", which has continued to expand ever since.

Religious songs were more of a popular literary genre, so hymnals attempted to combine both the existing literary heritage and newer original and folk songs. Some of the texts were written earlier, but the melodies were written only in the 19th century. The translations into Polish were mainly from Latin, even though there are cases of translations from German and French [Bodzioch 2014:125-129]. The most important hymnals were compiled by Paweł Rzymski (in Warsaw), Maciej Dembiński (Poznań), Edward Tupalski (Vilnius), Mamert Herburtt (Vilnius), Wawrzyniec Grabski (Gniezno), Leonard Solecki (Lviv), Jan Siedlecki (Kraków), Józef Surzyński (Poznań) and Aleksandr Waszkiewicz (Vilnius). Most of them were published several times, but the absolute record is held by Siedlecki's hymnal, the first edition of which appeared in 1876 [Śpiewniczek 1876], was later enlarged and republished, and the latest edition is the 41st edition in 2015.

The value of Polish hymnals for preserving the Polish identity is apparent and confirmed [see, for instance, Urban 1958; Ruman 2015]. It is doubtful whether Ukrainian religious songbooks were equally crucial for the preservation of Ukrainian identity, though they did contribute to it to some extent. The songbooks contained songs in both Church Slavonic and dialectal Ukrainian [e.g. Зборникъ 1898; Пѣсенникъ 1913], and they enhanced the Ukrainians' religious identity more than their ethnic and national one. On the contrary, the prayer books and hymnals published in the Roman script (according to the Hungarian, Polish or later Slovak spelling rules) preserved the religious identity of the Ukrainians but promoted their ethnic and national assimilation, which became even more aggressive after the First World War, when some Eastern European nations won the chance to build their national states (at the expense of national minorities). The Ukrainian Greek Catholics in Transcarpathia were in a deadlock when the Hungarian government and communities sought the liturgical use of Hungarian in 1866, 1868, 1880-1885, 1898, 1912 and were opposed by the Roman See [Волошин 1959:19-25]. Avhustyn Voloshyn's statement that the Church Slavonic language helped the Ukrainians to preserve their Ukrainian identity under

these conditions makes sense, but at this stage, it was already too weak an argument for practical life in the following period of state chauvinism.

The religious mentality is highly conservative, and the dynamics of its changes are not mainly evolutionary but revolutionary: if it reacts to radical catastrophic events, it can change quickly and in the "right" way. Otherwise, it stagnates, unwilling to accept the changes that are visibly beneficial now and will be recognised as fundamentally necessary in a few decades. The liturgical history of the 19th century was a period of evolutionary changes: they were slow, the majority of fellow citizens did not support them, and the results could have been more abundant. The tumultuous events of the 20th century brought tough challenges, which resulted in rich liturgical translation products.

The protection of the native language was carried out by various means, and liturgical translations played their role, but they belonged to the group of literary translations, original writings, literary criticism and academic papers. Therefore, the claim of the protective function of liturgical translation in the 19th century is partially valid for the Poles and slightly relevant for the Ukrainians due to the rich availability of other Polish publications and the corresponding poverty of general Ukrainian sources.

The greater number of Polish translations in the 19th century shaped the necessity and possibility of re-translating or even editing some religious texts at the turn of the 20th century. Liturgical translation proved to be more productive for the Poles than the Ukrainians, who concentrated their efforts on the more favourable opportunities after the First World War. The different dynamics of these two liturgical translation traditions show how unequal initial conditions determined the asymmetrical development of comparatively stable societies. It also shows that liturgical translation, as a complex process serving the needs of the Church, could not develop very rapidly in the 19th century due to numerous ecclesiastical restraints and a moderately passive societal response.

4. Turbulent 20th century and afterwards:
ecclesiastical independencies, exile, prospects

4.1. Turbulences and Tranquillity
of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland

Poland's 20th-century political history has been more tumultuous than its ecclesiastical history. This state is partly explained by the fact that the "own" state better protects the "own" identity, even if the political regime promotes strange, anti-national narratives or visions. The socialist regime did much less damage to Poland, its identity and religious life than it did to Ukraine, whose sovereignty was absorbed into the amorphous and Russia-centred Soviet Union. Even in the Polish People's Republic (1944/1952-1989), the Church as a social institution had some real power.

In ecclesiastical history, two events were of paramount importance: the proclamation of the autocephaly of the Polish Orthodox Church in the 1920s and the repercussions of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. In the Roman Catholic tradition, the Vatican Council inadvertently created a myth about translation: the Vatican Council did not allow the use of national languages in the Liturgy until 1963, and there was nothing before that. Historically, this myth fails in two respects: firstly, some private but censored and published translations had appeared much earlier; secondly, it was not the 1963 Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy that started the process of translating the Liturgy into the vernacular, but it officially finalised the decision and launched the new stage of liturgical translation activities. These activities had already been encouraged by the encyclical "Mediator Dei" of 1948, which opened the debate on using vernacular translations of biblical texts and hymns in the Liturgy [Grochocki 1952:359-360].

The silent road from WWI to Vatican II
Roman Catholic life in Poland did not experience cardinal challenges during and after the First World War: it was tranquil, in

contrast to Polish Orthodoxy, which received official ecclesiastical independence (autocephaly) and was busy constructing its own identity and establishing relations with the new Polish state (restored in 1918). This calm meant that the dynamics of liturgical publications corresponded to the stabilised progress of religious printing. The types of liturgical books remained the same, and some translations appeared periodically following newer and better editions, translators' personal contributions and the general progress of the Polish language.

In the time between the World Wars, some Polish journalists regularly wrote about the persecution of the Polish language in liturgical use in ethnically heterogeneous communities (especially German-Polish communities in Silesia). This statement attracts the particular attention of a liturgical historian who firmly and correctly believes that Polish entered the Liturgy in Poland after the 1960s. That is why it is so essential to understand what is meant by the expression "Polish in the liturgical services" in the 1920s-1930s. Sources are scarce, and this situation leads to the stereotypical misconception that there was nothing in Polish before the Second Vatican Council. A revealing description was given by a Ukrainian Greek Catholic priest, Blessed Omelian Kovch, who reflected on the importance of the vernacular in the liturgy and admired the extent of Polish in Polish liturgical practice [Ковч 1932:7-13]:

1) daily prayers were in Polish (underlining the importance of private worship for the general religious life of society);

2) the Mass was celebrated in Latin, but Latin was over-shadowed by organ music and, more importantly, the service contained many texts in Polish (hymns, litanies, homilies, the Gospels), which minimised the general power of Latin in the Mass.

This presence of Polish in liturgical practice created a vision of the legal use of the vernacular, though much changed only three decades later.

Since the Roman See did not allow or sanction the official translation of the Missal, its translated titles were modified in some countries: "Weekday Missal", "Sunday Missal", "Missal for the Faithful", "Short Missal", but their purpose remained the

same: to provide liturgical texts in the vernacular for the Roman Catholic faithful. The Poles called such a translation a "mszalik" ("a small missal"). It could be monolingual (Polish only) or bilingual (Latin-Polish). Although the title itself is documented before the First World War for a more or less ordinary translation of the Missal [Mszalik 1858; Mszalik 1871; Mały 1912], this book genre entered the religious scene in the 1920s and designated a large number of explained and mostly very abridged missals for the faithful, especially children and young people [cf. Lewandowicz-Nosal 2019]. At the same time, several complete translations were available for Polish readers (along with numerous new editions):

1925 – The Missal prepared by Aleksander Żychliński and published in Poznań [Mszał 1925];

1925 – "A Christian life in the rites of the Church: a liturgical prayer book" by Kazimierz Thullie and published in Lviv [Życie 1925];

1932 – The Daily Missal with Vespers for Sundays and Feasts compiled in French by Gaspar Lefebvre, translated into Polish by Stefan Świetlicki and Henryk Nowacki and published in Bruges (Belgium) [Mszał 1932];

1934 – The "Small Missal" compiled by Stanisław Tworkowski and published in Warsaw [Ciebie 1934];

1935 – The Missal prepared by Gerard Szmyd and published in Lviv [Mszał 1935b];

1935 – The Sunday and Festal Missal prepared by Michał Kordel and published in Kraków [Mszał 1935a];

1937 – The Missal supervised by Michał Kordel and published in Turnhout (Belgium) [Mszał 1937];

1938 – The Sunday and Festal Missal prepared by Józef Wojtukiewicz and published in Vilnius [Mszał 1938];

1940 – "My Sunday Missal" compiled by Joseph Steadman, translated into Polish by Alexander Syski and published in Brooklyn [Mój 1940];

1942 – The Missal combined after those of Żychliński and of Lefebvre and published in London [Mszał 1942];

1947 – The Missal prepared by Rudolf Tomanek and published posthumously in Katowice [Mszał 1947; Mszalik 1948; Mszał 1957]

1949 – The Sunday and Festal Missal prepared by Stanisław Wójcik and published in Wrocław [Mszalik 1949];

1954 – The Sunday and Festal Missal prepared by Jan Wierusz-Kowalski and published in Warsaw [Mszał 1954];

1959 – The Sunday Missal prepared by Fathers Benedictines from Tyniec Abbey and published in Turin [Mszał 1959];

1963 – The Sunday Missal prepared by Fathers Benedictines from Tyniec Abbey and published in Warsaw [Mszał 1963];

1968 and 1970 – The Sunday Missal prepared by Fathers Benedictines from Tyniec Abbey and published in Paris [Mszał 1968].

Although the quality of the translations varied [cf. Sitarz 1955], they fulfilled their function of providing the Poles with the liturgical texts in their mother tongue, and the variety of translation losses and gains was explained by the translators' goodwill and their lack of expertise, as they were alone in searching for clues to solve translation problems and shape the Polish liturgical language. The variety of places where these translations were published and republished deserves closer attention, as it shows how various Polish religious communities participated in the religious life of their homeland, even in areas where they were ethnic minorities or emigrants.

The missals of the late 1960s contained some reformed parts after the Second Vatican Council [Małaczyński 1987:51], and hence, they were a fair substitute for future translations until the 1980s. Even the practice of publishing "small missals" for the faithful continued, as it was a very successful means of making communication between the faithful and the priest more fruitful in evangelisation and understanding the Liturgy.

No major revolutionary hymnal was published, even though editing is sometimes revolutionary. Rev. Wendelin Świerczek edited the hymnal of Rev. Jan Siedlecki several times in the 1920s and 1950s, adding new songs and melodies by contemporary religious composers. Indeed, after Świerczek's additions, this hymnal can rightly be called "the Siedlecki-Świerczek songbook". However, this title was not the only one in the scene of musical and religious

publications, but it was treated as a standard edition. Other musical and liturgical translations or interpretations developed according to their dynamics, formed in previous times and bore rich fruits [cf. Dąbek 1994:342-343, 346-348; Mrowiec 1981]. New successful attempts at liturgical interpretation were made by the choral composer Wacław Gieburowski [Śpiewnik 1919] and the translator Tadeusz Karyłowski [Hymny 1932].

Gradually, the religious mentality of the Roman Catholic clergy changed after the Second World War, when the faithful longed to use new translations of the Psalms in liturgical practice. The reaction of the clergy was not very welcoming, as they believed that the "school language" of new translations would ruin the semantic harmony of the existing text of the Holy Mass [Gliński 1948:102] or that translated texts were not liturgical [quoted in: Rak 1958:551]. Nevertheless, the Polish clergy carefully observed what was happening in other Roman Catholic countries: in 1948, the French-Latin Ritual came into force in France, and many parts of the Sacraments were in French [Sczaniecki 1950:160]; the general debate about the celebration of the bilingual Mass was going on in various countries [Wierusz-Kowalski 1952:83]; translation activities were undertaken in a large number of countries [e.g. Małaczyński 1958a:169, 171; Naróg 1959:102, 105].

Latin typical editions and Polish official translations

The main credit for reforming the Roman Catholic liturgical books belongs to the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), though a series of cardinal liturgical and textual reforms took place in the 1950s (especially in the ceremonies of Holy Week). The call for a unified translation of the Order of Mass echoed throughout the Roman Catholic world, and in 1958, the first official Polish translation was approved by the Liturgical Commission of the Polish Roman Catholic Episcopate for private use among the faithful and public use in the Church [Przekład 1958]. Soon after, on 7 July 1961, the Holy See granted a privilege permitting the extended use of Polish in the Mass [Język 1961]. The Polish Episcopate issued the Instruction on how this privilege was to

be implemented [Instrukcja 1961]: it was a division of which parts of the Mass were to remain in Latin, which parts were to be celebrated in Polish, and which small parts were to remain in Greek.

When the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy ("Sacrosanctum Concilium") was promulgated by Pope Paul VI, it definitively established not only the permission of liturgical translations into national languages but also allowed the introduction of some locally adapted but traditional textual variations into the main text of the liturgical offices. As the clergy is predominantly an extremely conservative and traditionalist community, Polish priests both welcomed this reform and were reluctant to implement all of its provisions immediately [Sobeczko 2001:132-135]. This ambivalence between the patriotic longing for the liturgical use of the mother tongue and the "professional" fear of novelty (possibly equated with heresy) is characteristic of many ecclesiastical communities.

In the milieu of ecclesiastical academia, a series of papers were devoted to the revision of existing translations and the improvement of their quality [e.g. Małaczyński 1958b; Szymanek 1969; Pisarzak 1979; Chmiel 1985; Pskit 2017; cf. Łaś 1966; Małaczyński 1975]. The translation criticism of liturgical editions revealed various aspects of religious intercultural communication and prompted priests to express their opinions on theoretical issues. A cornerstone of the theory of liturgical translation, published among theological papers and decrees, was the Instruction on the Translation of Liturgical Texts ("Comme le prévoit"), approved on 25 January 1969 by the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy [Instrukcja 1971]. The vision of liturgical translation as a tripartite process points to the message, the audience, and the style as the main points of reference for constructing a complicated grading scale of acceptable and desirable translation solutions. Translated into Polish, this text became the primary guide for Polish translators and translation analysts until 2001, when it was replaced by "Liturgiam Authenticam". More and more topics were added to

the debates on the translation of liturgical books: the competence and responsibility of a translator [Świerzawski 1978b:69-70]; the religious style in translation [Sroka 1978]; the interpretation of the original and translated texts [Pieronek 1978:91-94]; the role of translations for evangelisation [Świerzawski 1978a]; melodic harmonisation in translations [Bodzioch 2015; Nowak 2017:239-346]. The evolution of Polish translation studies and linguistics has also contributed positively to forming new quality standards in liturgical translation.

Religious life in post-war Poland had to be unified after the territorial and demographic changes. Different Rituals contained different Polish formulae and variants in dioceses, though the scope of the translated Ritual was quite limited (in fact, it was never fully translated, but some of its fragments were used in Polish [cf. Wianek 1904; Święcenia 1916; Obrzędy 1931; Wianek 1945]). That is why the truly codifying function of the new Ritual was topical, and the Polish clergy worked on this book during the 1950s. The result was the bilingual Latin-Polish edition of the selected rites from the Roman Ritual [Collectio 1963; cf. Małaczyński 1963]. Although the book achieved the highest level of ecclesiastical acceptance, it was unlucky because, in the following years, the Vatican reforms dissolved the traditional forms of the Roman Pontifical and Roman Ritual and reorganised them into a series of separately published rites. Moreover, the rites themselves were changed or so-called "renewed" according to the decrees of the Vatican Council. This was the main reason for publishing separate rites: since reforming the entire liturgical books would have taken much longer, the completed rites were published and promulgated separately. This practice made it possible to begin the process of translation into the vernacular before the final book of rites was adopted and approved. These editions were called "editio typica" (typical edition), which was a standard to follow.

The following table shows the time span between the publication of a Latin typical edition and its official Polish translation:

Liturgical book	*Latin edition*	*First Polish translation*
The Order of Baptism of Children	1969	1972 [Obrzędy 1972]
The Order of Celebrating Matrimony	1969	1974 [Obrzędy 1974b]
The Order of Funeral	1969	1977 [Obrzędy 1977]
The Order of Consecration of Virgins	1970	2001 [Obrzędy 2001a]
The Order of Blessing of Abbots and Abbesses	1971	⸺
The Order of Blessing of the Oil of the Catechumens and the Sick and Chrism	1971	1986 [Mszał 1986:119-125; Obrzędy 2016]
The Order of Adult Baptism	1972	1988 [Obrzędy 1988]
The Order of Confirmation	1972	1974 [Obrzędy 1974a; Obrzędy 1975]
The Order of the Anointing of the Sick and their Pastoral Care	1972	1978 [Sakramenty 1978]
The Orders for the Institutions of Readers and Acolytes. The Orders for Admission to Candidacy for Ordination as Deacons and Priests	1972	2014 [Obrzędy 2014]
The Sacred Communion and the Worship of the Eucharistic Mysteries outside the Mass	1973	1985 [Komunia 1985]
The Order of Penance	1974	1981 [Obrzędy 1981]
The Order of Religious Profession	1975	2015 [Obrzęd 2015]
The Order of Consecration of the Church and Altar	1978	[Obrzędy 2001b]

The Order of Crowning an Image of the Blessed Virgin Mary	1981	2004 [Obrzęd 2004]
Ceremonial of Bishops	1984	2013 [Ceremoniał 2013]
Orders for Blessings	1984	1994 [Obrzędy 1994]
The Orders of the Ordination of a Bishop, of Priests and of Deacons	1990 Rev. ed.	1999 [Obrzędy 1999]
Exorcisms and Certain Supplications	1999	2002 [Egzorcyzmy 2002]

Some rites were translated very soon, and the reason for this speed was the ready availability of existing translations, which might have helped, and the great demand for such translations. As it took time to prepare the new forms of all the rites, it is possible to calculate how long the Roman Catholic nations would have had to wait for the typical edition of the complete liturgical book to appear in official print. Even though the texts were not extremely voluminous, their translation took years because the Polish Liturgical Commission was highly scrupulous.

Scrupulousness costs time, but it also saves translation effort. The post-Vatican Roman Missal was promulgated three times: in 1970, 1975 and 2002 (plus some corrected typical editions, especially in 2008) [cf. Małaczyński 1985:325; Hładki 2020:84]. Thus, when the Roman Catholic Ukrainians managed to start translating the Missal, their original was the third modified typical edition. The Polish translators produced two major editions: the first Polish translation was made after the second typical edition [Mszał 1986]. The second Polish edition seems to be based on the latest Latin text [Mszał 2009], though the term "2nd edition" is misleading: it is the enlarged and amended translation of the original 1975 Roman Missal. Incidentally, the Holy See decreed that all vernacular missals should contain the Latin section bound in the same book [Cichy 1978]. The Polish edition follows this rule.

A more fundamental project was the translation of the Roman Breviary, which was reformed into the book entitled "The Liturgy of Hours" and promulgated in 1971. Although two English translations were published as early as 1974 and 1975, the work of this magnitude usually takes a decade [Małaczyński 1985:326, 329-330]. For various reasons, the Polish edition was delayed and obstructed, and it was finally published between 1982 and 1988 in four volumes [Liturgia 1982-1988], which are very accurate translations of the Latin originals (with slight deviations from the Latin Responsories of Matins and Vespers [Sobeczko 1990:88]).

In the history of Polish liturgical translation, the 20th century is the time of individual searches (i.e. individual translation projects and publications) and the time of the official programme (after the Vatican Council, when the Polish Church had to follow the regulations and instructions of the Holy See). It is difficult to say which period was more productive. The multiplicity of translations leaves room for creativity, and individuality was indeed present in liturgical translations. The official programme erased the individuality of the translators but provided the clergy and the faithful with the entire corpus of liturgical texts in Polish. This achievement seemed impossible, unattainable, inaccessible to the generations of Polish priests before the Second Vatican Council.

The dynamics of book printing suggest that the peak of translation and publishing activity precedes the period of slowdown and even stagnation. The most recent peak of Polish liturgical translation corresponds to the years 1968-2015. Translators did not depend much on favourable or unfavourable conditions, and sometimes, they had to act against them (such as the socialist regime or the economic crisis of the early 1990s). As a result, the process of producing liturgical translations appears stable to the untrained eye. What happens next, however, is unknown. New editions will satisfy the demand of readers. The time has come for the translation of the Simple Gradual, promulgated in 1968 and amended in 1975. The translation of the third revised edition of the Roman Missal is awaited, too.

4.2. Polish Orthodox translation

Religious pluralism and tolerance are not only rooted in shared ethical views and practices. Patterns of political and social ethos can strongly influence the life of texts or books, but texts and books can also strongly impose these patterns.

This chapter aims to clarify the position of a religious translator as a subject of religious translation and as an object of cultural and historical processes. The setting is Poland, a predominantly Roman Catholic country. Throughout Poland's Christian history, Orthodox communities have tended to play a subordinate role in the dominant political and religious narrative, though their ethnic calls have also stimulated interesting projects in liturgical translation.

Background from translation history

Liturgical translation for the Orthodox faithful in Poland dates mainly from the 19th century when some sporadic attempts were made during Poland's incorporation into the Russian Empire, where Russian Orthodoxy "reigned". In 1823, the Warsaw censor allowed the publication of the Rite of the Blessing of Water on the Feast of the Epiphany [Obrządek 1823]. This small book does not contain a preface or any other information about the publisher, the number of copies printed, or any possible translations of other rites. The title page says that it is a translation from Russian, even though it is mainly from Church Slavonic.

When A. N. Muravyov published his best-selling collection "Letters on Worship in the Eastern Catholic Church" (1836), he did not imagine that he would also contribute to Polish Orthodox translation. Parts of his collections were translated by Emilia Jarocka (though K. Estreicher claimed it was Prof. Feliks Jarocki) and published as two separate Polish-language manuals: "A Description of the Holy Mass Celebrated by a Bishop of the Eastern Catholic Church" (1841) [Muravjov 1841] and "An Explanation of the Holy Mass Celebrated by a Priest of the Eastern Catholic Church" (1850) [Muravjov 1850]. The titles are misleading: the

author did not mean any Greek Catholic Church, which is part of the universal Roman Catholic Church. References to the Most Holy Governing Synod [Muravjov 1850:42, 54] clarify that this is the Mass of the Russian Orthodox Church. The contents of the books are the retelling of the canon of the Mass, while the prayers and hymns are quoted in Polish translations and in Church Slavonic originals (albeit written in Roman characters).

The proclamation of Polish independence (1918) changed social and political conditions for religious translation. After the annexation of Ukrainian and Belarusian territories, Poland was inhabited by many Ukrainians and Belarusians, whose presence stimulated the establishment of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church (1924). The existence of the independent Polish Orthodox Church helped its authorities to reconsider the use of languages in the Liturgy. The Ukrainians chose to introduce their national language into the Liturgy and achieved some promising results. The most prominent contributor was Ivan Ohiyenko, an exiled minister of the Ukrainian National Republic and a professor at Warsaw University. He formulated the theory of liturgical translation and translated the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, Vespers and Matins, the Pentecost Service and a prayer book (all in 1922), the Easter Canon (1927), the Office for the Dead (1935). Although he translated into Ukrainian and for Ukrainians, the scope and preparation of these translations prompted the Polish Orthodox Church to supplement its Church Slavonic services with some Polish-language editions. The first was a Polish-language Orthodox Prayer Book for the general public [Modlitewnik 1927]. The next edition was a manual of prayers for schoolchildren [Modlitwa 1931]. Several hymns were translated in the Handbook for Teaching the Orthodox Faith [Nauka 1932] (republished 1934, 1938). Finally, in 1936, the fundamental liturgical text of Eastern Christianity was published: the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Święta liturgia 1936]. It was paralleled by the translation of the Office for the Dead [Pannichida 1936]. A special edition of the Prayer Book for Orthodox Soldiers appeared in 1937 [Przyjaciel 1937] (2nd

edition 1939). Metropolitan Dionysiy Valedynsky blessed and approved these translations for official use.

The onset of the active period of Orthodox translation in Poland was interrupted by the Second World War. After the collapse of the Polish state, Polish Orthodox soldiers served in army formations worldwide. Liturgical translations travelled with the soldiers, and a Polish Orthodox prayer was published in the Kenyan city of Nairobi [Modlitewnik 1944]. It summarised the translation activities of Rev. Michał Bożerianow, a Belarusian priest who ministered to Orthodox soldiers in Polish battalions. After that, it was only the philological translation by Prof. Witold Klinger, revised by Serafin Korczak-Michalewski in 1963: the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Liturgia 1963]. Thus, the achievements of Polish Orthodox liturgical translation were somewhat limited when Henryk Paprocki came on the scene.

Personality and principles

Rev. Prof. Henryk Paprocki (b. 1946) is a Polish Orthodox priest, graduate of the Catholic University in Lublin (1972), Doctor of Theology (1978, St Serge Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris) and a very active member of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church. He is a speaker of Polish and has a good knowledge of Old Greek, Church Slavonic, French and Russian.

The principles used by Paprocki in his translations are briefly discussed by Paprocki himself in the 2012 review article [Paprocki 2012]. Despite their brevity, they are exact, encompassing all facets of liturgical translation and posing deep methodological questions that every liturgical translator should address. The principles can be summarised in the following statements:

1) Every translation is made from the Greek original. Sometimes, it is necessary to refer to the Church Slavonic text, which may contain local dogmatic differences or expressive deviations from the original Greek prototext. In addition, a translator should be very careful with the Church Slavonic text, which is full of interlingual homonyms that easily distort the message of a textual fragment.

2) The Greek text is poetic, and its aesthetics are founded on an intricate and sophisticated vocabulary, as well as an imaginative syntax, although it remains a piece of poetry in its aims and scope of influence.

3) Every translator should keep in mind the biblical lexicon, which is the origin of later liturgical expressions, and in the pincers of two variants, the option of biblical origin is inevitably decisive.

4) Religious terms are present in religious texts of various genres. Terms of Eastern Christianity and Greek origin already function in the Polish linguistic space, but they are not comprehensible to the general public and require more descriptive paraphrases. This calls for revising and introducing new terms into Polish Orthodox discourse instead of traditional loan words.

The only point that remained undiscussed was the perception of Orthodox texts by Catholic believers and their mental substitution of Orthodox phenomena for Catholic ones when the terms are identical in both traditions.

Interestingly, however, all the Byzantine liturgical books have been completely translated into only one Western European language: French, which may also help other translators search for relevant translation strategies. Paprocki translates from originals, though in religious practice, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between an original and an actual translation. Most Orthodox liturgical texts came from Byzantium in the Greek language, though local churches modified them according to their needs and dogmatic visions. Thus, today's texts in Church Slavonic but from different churches may differ or contradict each other. This is a pitfall in assessing the quality of translations: analysts must remember a translator's affiliation with a liturgical tradition and correctly identify the original. Rev. Paprocki worked with the Greek-language originals, although, when necessary, he opted for the variant accepted in the Church Slavonic texts, which are used in the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church and remain identical to those of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Translations and their reception

The translations by Rev. Henryk Paprocki since 1974 constitute a well-thought-out programme of presenting the writings of Eastern Christianity to the Polish-speaking people, even though it looks like a one-person enterprise. It began with the translation of all the liturgies connected with the text of St John Chrysostom, namely: liturgical prayers from the liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great and the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts [Jan 1974:7-151]. It was published by the Academy of Catholic Theology, but both the Western and Eastern Churches accept Patristic writings, so the connection between the translator and the publisher is not surprising.

A similar collection was published in 1988 under the title "Mystic Supper: Eucharistic Anaphoras of the Christian Orient" [Wieczerza 1988]: Paprocki collected and translated various liturgical anaphoras of three types – Alexandrian, Antiochian and Eastern Syriac – which influenced Coptic, Ethiopian, Byzantine, Antiochian, Maronite, Armenian and some other liturgical traditions. This scholarly edition of translations, with an in-depth introduction and commentary, opened up the heritage of Eastern Christianity to Polish readers.

The cult of the Virgin Mary is powerful in Poland. From a religious perspective, it includes the composition of hymns and the study of Marian poetry. The latter aspect resulted in a fundamental multi-volume edition "Texts on the Mother of God", dedicated to Marian writings in different rites, to which Paprocki also contributed: for the volume "Orthodoxy" he translated the Office of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Office of the Dormition of the Theotokos, as well as Symeon the Logothete's Canon of the Crucifixion of Our Lord and the Lamentation of the Most Holy Theotokos [Teksty 1991:1:17-52] and the Office of the Entry of the Theotokos into the Temple and the Rite of the Burial of the Most Holy Theotokos [Teksty 1991:2:7-50]; for the volume "Pre-Chalcedonian Churches", he prepared anaforas in honour of the Theotokos from the Ethiopian and Armenian Churches [Teksty 1995:27-36, 137-144].

The liturgical translations usually have a long way to reach their readership because of the lengthy ecclesiastical bureaucratic procedures of approval and approbation. For this reason, some translations have been published as separate editions before entering into liturgical practice, but these editions are "individual" or "authorial", where the work of the translator and perhaps an editor is visible. When a liturgical text goes through ecclesiastical approval, the translator's text is adjusted according to the collective view of ecclesiastical censors, who may deviate from the translator's original norms and somehow distort the translation. However, the text is considered "institutional" or "authoritative" after such consideration. The "authoritative" editions of Paprocki's translations are:

1995 – "Let us pray with the Eastern Church: Prayers of the Liturgy of Hours" [Modlimy 1995];

1997 – "Prayers before and after the Holy Eucharist" [Modlitwy 1997];

2000 – "The Great Canon of Repentance" by St Andrew of Crete [Andrzej 2000] (reeditions in 2015, 2019, 2021);

2003 – "Liturgies of the Orthodox Church" [Liturgie 2003] (2nd edition in 2014);

2003 – "The Holy Week and Pascha in the Orthodox Church" [Wielki 2003];

2006 – "Akathist Hymn to the Theotokos, the Inexhaustible Cup" [Akatyst 2006].

This publishing activity paved the way for Paprocki's translation to be recognised not only horizontally (among wider circles of diverse readers such as academia and clergy) but also vertically (in the hierarchy of religious reading communities) when his translations became "authoritative texts" of the Church.

The first ecclesiastical recognition of his translation was the publication of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom in the official herald of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church [Liturgia 1982]. However, his experience in translating liturgical texts was recognised at the turn of the 21st century, when the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church blessed and approved their

publication for its liturgical use: the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom (2001), the Liturgy of St Basil the Great (2005), the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts (2006), a collection of hymns for Vespers and Matins (2006), the Archieratikon (2011), the Synaxarion (2016-2021, 6 vols, unfinished), the Euchologion (2016, 4 volumes), the Psalter (2016, 2020). The rest is published online.

Another Church that has recognised Paprocki's translations is the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (Ukrainian Catholics of the Byzantine Rite). The public position of the clergy of this church is that the liturgical texts of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and those of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church are the same. This vision made it possible for the Ukrainian Greek Catholic eparchies and parishes in Poland to utilize the Polish Orthodox translations. The bilingual Ukrainian-Polish edition of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Божественна 2004] (2nd edition in 2013) contained the main text along with the anaphora from the Liturgy of St Basil the Great in translations by Paprocki.

To this day, he has translated all the biblical and liturgical texts needed for worship in the Church, as well as some texts for worship in monastic practice. Who are the recipients of these translations? The overwhelming majority of Orthodox believers in Poland are Ukrainians and Belarusians (whose numbers were much greater before the Second World War and greatly diminished after the exchange of territories and populations after the Second World War). In the course of interaction between different ethnic communities (e.g. mixed marriages), a small group of Orthodox Poles has also emerged. In addition, since ethnic minorities have been living in the Polish state for generations, their members have been partially or gradually assimilated, so that new generations (especially descendants of mixed families) are more involved in the mentality of the Polish language. Finally, the third group is a random one: these are guests who have come to celebrate the liturgy on a special occasion and need an understandable text to follow and participate, even if the liturgy itself is in another language.

The fundamental aim of translation criticism is to analyse the translated text in order to make recommendations for making it

better and more accurate. The painful experience of a general translator is that today, criticism does not perform this function, and editing is mainly the exclusive domain of the translator and his publisher, without the involvement of various strata of specialised and general readers. According to Kolbaia's bibliography [Kolbaia 2021], some of Paprocki's translations have been successfully reviewed. Although reviewing is present, it is superficial from the viewpoint of translation quality assessment, contributing neither to the criticism of liturgical translation nor to the personality and artistry of the translator.

Henryk Paprocki is a figure in the history of liturgical translation whose history is very similar to that of other national translation histories. His liturgical translations are a one-person programme that still managed to transcend the boundaries or restrictions of one church. They can be called ecumenical since they are (or were) practised in churches of nominally opposite confessions, belonging to Orthodoxy and Catholicism. From this perspective, these texts helped to overcome the mutual non-acceptance that arose in various difficult periods of common or neighbouring history, especially in Poland.

Translations from the translator to the public sometimes go not only through the publisher but also through the censorship institutions. This is why the same liturgical text may be considered either "ecclesiastical" (and used for public worship) or "academic" (and used for private reading but not for public worship), or both. Historically, these "academic" and "ecclesiastical" periods in the life of a book are not always contradictory, though the Church is usually a slow recipient of this product of high authority.

The most essential thing in the enterprise that Paprocki has started is who will continue his initiative. At the moment, there are no disciples and followers who could satisfy the demand for further translations of texts which have not been translated into Polish or which can be retranslated according to "higher" standards. A lot depends on the Church's ability to use and popularise the existing texts in order to create interest and need for further translations.

4.3. Ukrainian liturgical translation in exile (1921-1991)

Exile, emigration and the formation of diasporas are caused by catastrophes that can occur very quickly (such as wars or epidemics) or develop over more extended periods (gradual economic recessions and crises). All of these historical factors shape translation in exile as a specific and distinct cultural product. At the same time, exile translation does not exist in a vacuum but is a continuation or negation of the previous tradition on the mainland.

In the complicated system of cultural connections, liturgical translation gives the highest status to biblical translation, even though its assets as cultural and symbolic capital are fundamental [cf. Bourdieu 1993:67, 83], especially in the condition of migration, which destroys the entire traditional polysystem and calls for new forms of ethnic legitimation. The hierarchy of status plays well in religious contexts, where the priority of specific translations defines the dynamics of the appearance of other translations, but only the whole corpus marks the success and completeness of the fulfilled project. The role of a personality was sometimes decisive in the conditions of exile, though the influence (support or opposition) of academic and ecclesiastical climates constructed lines of perception and acceptance. It is surprising how some personalities can even change liturgical translation in the post-exile churches.

The diaspora, which seeks to be a self-producing and temporary system while awaiting the return home, reconstructs the cultural polysystem of the mainland in new territories. Although "Luhmann replaces subject-centered reason with systems rationality" [Tyulenev 2012:5], the co-existence and co-influence of personalities and institutions define the vitality of the translator's endeavour, which exists in the dimensions of autonomisation, legitimisation and hierarchisation. Thought-provoking are the correspondences between diaspora and mainland translation activities: it takes some activities to maintain the mainland translation system in exile; after the stabilisation of the system, the exile system can flourish and replicate mainland

translation strategies and literary processes; however, when the strength of the diaspora is impoverished due to inevitable assimilatory factors, diaspora translation is on the verge of collapse [cf. Tyulenev 2012:42]. The good fortune of Ukrainian liturgical translation was determined by timing: when the religious reading community was persecuted in the mainland (1920s), the diaspora contributed to the preservation and replication of translations; when the diaspora began to lose its power in foreign environments, the mainland, fortunately, restored its Independence (1991) and brought the main liturgical translation activities back to Ukraine.

Historical stimuli

The first wave of Ukrainian emigration started in the late 19th century, and it was a labour emigration. Eastern Ukrainian peasants travelled to Central and Far Eastern areas of the Russian Empire, and Western Ukrainian peasants went across the Atlantic: Canada, the USA, Brazil, Argentina. Church life, which was the core of the spiritual life of the Ukrainian migrants, revolved around the ecclesiastical institutions, which were formed according to the model existing in Ukraine (Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) or from scratch (Ukrainian Orthodox Churches). The first Ukrainian ecclesiastical institutions established in exile were the Apostolic Exarchate of Canada for Ukrainian Greek Catholic believers in 1912, the Apostolic Exarchate of the USA for Ukrainian Greek Catholic believers from Halychyna and Transcarpathia in 1913, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada in 1918, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the USA in 1919 [Thousand 1988:198, 210, 211, 215]. Gradually, Ukrainian parishes organised and maintained various relations with the recognised church centres.

The formation of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1917-1918 and later its unification with the Western Ukrainian National Republic in 1919 stimulated the linguistic and spiritual Ukrainisation of church life in the Ukrainian state. However, the collapse of the UNR and the rise of the Ukrainian Soviet government did not create favourable conditions for Ukrainian liturgical translation, which received a significant boost during the Ukrainian Revolution

of 1917-1920. Biblical and liturgical translation could only develop outside Soviet Ukraine, but even then, it involved Ukrainians both from the autochthonous Ukrainian territories annexed by Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania and from large diaspora communities in Europe and the Americas. The 1920s and 1930s saw the most radical changes in the liturgical life of the Byzantine Rite in Poland. In 1924, the Ecumenical Patriarch granted autocephaly to the Polish Orthodox Church, which served Orthodox Ukrainians, Belarusians, Czechs and Poles. The indigenous Ukrainian Orthodox community, which was the largest (2.7 million believers), became a minority in the Roman Catholic state. If the ministers of the UNR government were exiled to Warsaw for political reasons, the Ukrainian community found itself in pseudo-exile.

The same changes were experienced by the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, which had to adapt to new and sometimes quite discriminatory policies towards Eastern Christians in the Second Polish Republic: "The aggressive Polonising measures were based on the assumption that the Orthodox citizens of Poland were Poles who had lost their identity after the Partitions of Poland. The assimilators demanded the use of Polish in everyday life and in the Church (sermons and catechism in Polish)" [Łoś 2021:33]. However, this Church experienced the most drastic changes after the Second World War: in 1946, when the Western Ukrainian territories were finally reintegrated into the Soviet Union, the Russian Orthodox Church interfered and caused the fake "dissolution" of the Union of Berestia of 1596 and the Union of Uzhhorod of 1646. In fact, the official structures of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church were liquidated: some priests became members of the Russian Orthodox Church, and the rest were driven into underground activities or emigration. The new centre for the ecclesiastical life of the Ukrainian Byzantine Catholics was formed in Rome by expanding the existing structures and developing new ones, such as the St Clement Ukrainian Catholic University (1963).

During the restoration of Ukraine's Independence in 1989-1991, the ecclesiastical structures of the Ukrainian diaspora returned to Ukraine and resumed their activities, including the

publication of liturgical books and the retranslation of liturgical texts. In the late 1980s, when the religious climate in the USSR became more conducive to liturgical practice in Ukrainian, the texts of the diaspora became the main liturgical books for public use in Ukraine.

The most recent instance of living but exiled Ukrainian liturgical translation is the Ukrainian-language Orthodox liturgy celebrated by Rev. Kyrylo Hovorun in Sweden's main Lutheran cathedral in Uppsala on 24 April 2022 (Orthodox Easter). This event took place in the aftermath of the Russian invasion of Ukraine on 24 February 2022, and it demonstrated the great ecumenical power of liturgical translation, even for uniting Ukrainian Orthodox and Swedish Protestant believers.

Personalities and/like Institutions: Orthodox History

Identifying the agency of liturgical translation reveals the centres of power for introducing or sanctioning liturgical practice. In 1917, Ukraine's religious life projected the necessity of creating the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and the first Kyiv-based organ of these activities was the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council, which maintained very beneficial relations with the UNR government and managed to co-exist with the government of Soviet Ukraine until the latter physically exterminated the Church after 1930. The first book published was the Horologion (1919) [Часловець 1919], followed by the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Чин 1920]. The Ukrainisation of the Church was in full swing: first of all, the Russian pronunciation of the Church Slavonic was replaced by the Ukrainian pronunciation; Ukrainian chants were preferred; meanwhile, liturgical texts were translated and disseminated. A lot of texts were printed with typewriters and cyclostyles, which have not survived. One source mentions [Требник 1963:2] that it included services from the 1919 Euchologion and the 1922 Additional Euchologion, but these editions are beyond the reach of the wider academic public, as are some other liturgical editions whose existence was witnessed by contemporaries [Завітневич 1971:67]. The foremost translators

were Bishop (and later Metropolitan) Vasyl Lypkivskyi and Bishop (and later Archbishop) Nestor Sharayivskyi, though the linguistic expertise of other theologians was welcomed [Липківський 2018:4:155; Москаленко 2018:19-20].

The Soviet regime at first tolerated the existence of Ukrainian churches, though the environment was always hostile. The Soviets were not strong enough to compete with the Church, so they liquidated it in the 1930s through widespread destruction and massacres. The coexistence of the 1920s is witnessed by the publication of the All-Night Vigil [Всеношна 1923], the Octoechos [Октоїх 1923], the second edition of the Horologion, the Menaion [Святкова 1927] and the services for Passiontide and Easter [Служби 1927]. Pierre Bourdieu states that "the source of the efficacy of all acts of consecration is the field, the locus of the accumulated social energy which the agents and institution help to reproduce through the struggles in which they try to appropriate it and into which they put what they have acquired from it in previous struggles" [Bourdieu 1993:78-79]. This statement perfectly explains the place of this translation in the historical line of other translations. The struggle is the key image of Ukrainian nation-building. There was very little to be inherited from the previous epochs, but these translations contributed more to future potentials: almost immediately, they stimulated the individual activities of Ivan Ohiyenko in Poland; Ukrainian churches in North America began to use, republish and improve these liturgical texts; finally, they remained model texts for Orthodox translation after Ukraine regained its Independence in 1991.

Translation norms are usually defined by conventions and agreements between individual and institutional actors. In liturgical translation, each translator depends heavily on the permission – in the form of a blessing – of the ecclesiastical authority. Ohiyenko's project of translating liturgical texts resembles a massive, well-planned programme: his activities were in line with the trend of preparing translations that would be used in the future after the Ukrainian Orthodox Church became fully independent ("autocephalous"). He was a brilliant connoisseur

of the Ukrainian language, literature and church history, which helped him a lot in translating the Bible and a lot of liturgical texts into Ukrainian [see: Пуряєва 2017]. Besides, he elaborated and published his desiderata for liturgical translation, which was a systematised specific theory of translation [see: Свята 1922b]. His translations were approved by the church authorities and were even considered canonical for use by the Moscow Patriarchate in Soviet Ukraine in the late 1980s.

Historically, Ohiyenko's liturgical translation activities are fully connected with his stay in exile and can be divided into four periods:

1) the early 1920s when he stayed in the Polish city of Tarnów, which hosted the UNR's Government-in-Exile: Ohiyenko set up a publishing house and called it "Ukrainian Autocephalous Church" where he published prayer books for adults and children [Український 1921; Православний 1922], the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Свята 1922a] as well as services for Easter, Pentecost, Vespers and Matins [Свята 1922c; Свята 1922d; Свята 1922e];

2) the 1930s when he stayed in Warsaw and tightly cooperated with the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church: he published liturgical translations in graphically refined editions where the Ukrainian-language text was typeset utilising specifically altered Church Slavonic characters (e.g. [Похорон 1935; Парастас 1935]);

3) the early 1940s during the Nazi occupation: becoming a monk, priest and bishop, Ohiyenko entered a new period of publishing (the second edition of his liturgical translations) and translating (a series of new texts [e.g. Молитовник 1941; Акафіст 1941; Великий 1942; Колінопреклонні 1942; Надгробна 1943; Чин 1943a; Чин 1943b]);

4) from the late 1940s till his death in 1972, Ohiyenko remained in a new emigration in Canada: this time, he acted as a hierarch and sanctioned liturgical translations for public use while finalizing the major translation of his life, the Bible.

The Ukrainian intellectual and political emigration of the 1920s managed to organise several academic institutions, such as the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin (1926-1945) and the

Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw (1930-1939). The latter consisted of several commissions, including the Commission for the Translation of the Holy Scriptures and Liturgical Books, chaired by the Metropolitan of the Polish Orthodox Church, Dionysiy Valedynsky. It had close relations with the Theological Section of the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla Society in Lutsk (1931-1939). The core of the cooperation between the two institutions was the translation activities of Mykhailo Kobryn, who was a qualified theologian and a good connoisseur of ancient languages. As an emeritus professor, he was able to devote himself to the translation of liturgical texts, which were reviewed and published by the Commission [Літурґія 1936; Літурґія 1939a; Літурґія 1939b] and the Section [Малий 1938; Вечірня 1939].

Comparing the publishing agendas of the Commission and the Section, the Commission focused on the primary stable texts of the Liturgy, while the Section also took care of the musical form, the changing parts of the Liturgy and the practical needs (sacraments) [e.g. Чин 1936; Співи 1937; Чин 1938]. Nevertheless, this division of the printing repertoire may also have meant the practical necessity of dividing the tasks. In any case, the power of Poland's Ukrainian Orthodox translation reached its peak at the turn of the 1940s, when the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church officially published the Liturgicon [Служебник 1941] and the Little Euchologion [Малий 1942]. All these translations contributed significantly to the Orthodox tradition of liturgical translation in the Ukrainian diaspora after the Second World War.

It is not surprising that in the first years after the war, when many Ukrainians were in displaced persons camps in Germany, they republished texts from the Warsaw editions. Besides, they tried to publish everything that could be of living use for the Orthodox believers [Вечірня 1947; Молитовник 1947; Молитовник 1946; cf. Псалтир 1961]. The publishing activity for church purposes was immense [Ісіченко 2016]. The temporary centre of Ukrainian Orthodox bishops was the German city of Esslingen, where new emigrants managed to publish some texts that were later republished in the UK [Служба 1964a; Служба 1964b]. A few

years later, most Ukrainian migrants moved to America, and the Orthodox diaspora in Europe was not as strong, though they did publish the Ukrainian Orthodox Horologion [Український 1967], which was also used for worship outside Europe.

Probably, the first Ukrainian-language liturgical edition of the Byzantine Rite in North America[7] was the publication of a prayer book [Добрий 1926], whose title – "Good Shepherd" – became the title of numerous subsequent editions until today. It contained a wide range of liturgical texts in two languages: Church Slavonic (published in the Civil Script according to the Ukrainian pronunciation) and Ukrainian. The fourth edition of 1952 contained only one language: Ukrainian [Добрий 1952].

The development of Ukrainian communities stimulated the spread of book production: small and large editions were published to meet the needs of Ukrainian Orthodox children, adults and priests. Liturgical publications appeared under the auspices of the Consistory. In 1948, Ukrainian Orthodox intellectuals in Canada founded the Academic Theological Society, which became the Ukrainian Academic Orthodox Theological Society in 1954. It oversaw several high-profile liturgical editions. In general, this collaboration was very fruitful. A similar institution existed in the USA. Although these were two different churches, they maintained spiritual and ethnic unity. Their translation and publication activities are very similar:

Canada	*United States*
1954 – Pontifical Service [Архиєрейська 1954]	
1954-1960 – Euchologion [Евхологіон 1954-1960]	1954 – Euchologion [Требник 1954]
1956 – Octoechos [Священна 1956]	

---

[7] Amazingly, the year 1926 witnessed another liturgical publication: the Ukrainian translation of the 1918 Common Prayer Book of the Church of England in Canada [Соборний 1926], which is a very rare case of rendering fundamental Anglican texts into Ukrainian.

1963 – Euchologion [Требник 1963]

1963 – Liturgicon [Служебник 1963]

1972 – Liturgicon
   [Служебник 1972]

1976 – Triodion [Постова 1976]

1976 – Euchologion [Требник 1976]

1989 – Liturgicon [Служебник 1963]

In reality, however, Orthodox priests used books published in the other country: Ukrainian Orthodox liturgical translation can be seen as a pattern of cooperative interaction. In addition, Euchologions and Liturgicons were republished every ten years to meet the needs of priests. Lay people were provided with numerous prayer books, even for particular purposes, such as for the sick [Господь 1957]. Gradually the bilingual – Ukrainian and English – prayer books appeared [e.g. Віра 1960]. Priests received the published editions of separate services, such as the Sunday noon service [Чин 1967] or services for Passiontide and Easter [Служби 1976], which were convenient in common practice.

An exceptional case is the use of Kobryn's "Orthodox" translation of the Psalter from the 1930s: its linguistic modernisation and publication took place under the auspices of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in the 1980s [Молитовний 1990]. This act of ecumenism shows how the Ukrainian diaspora overcame sectarian tensions fuelled by politicos and demagogues.

Personalities and/like Institutions: Greek Catholic History

If Ukrainian Orthodox translation was the translation of resistance (resistance to all historical conditions that negated the Ukrainian state, the Ukrainian Church and the Ukrainian nation), Ukrainian Greek Catholic translation was the translation of loyalty when the Church acted in the field allowed. The holder of its power was the Roman See. Thus, the Church continued its earlier practice of publishing asymmetrically bilingual prayer books, in which some prayers, all explanations and the catechetical part were in Ukrainian, but the high-status texts – such as the loudly

pronounced formulas of the liturgy, troparia and kontakia – remained in Church Slavonic [e.g. Голос 1927; Благодарім 1943].[8] Finally, the Vatican entered the turbulent zone of reforming its liturgical practice in the mid-20th century. For the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, this meant two stages of reform or two separate reforms. The first reform, sometimes called the "Roman reform", took place in the 1940s and 1950s, when the Ukrainian Church transferred the final right of liturgical decisions to Rome. As a result, the Roman See published new Church Slavonic liturgical books [Лїтургїконъ 1942; Требникъ 1945-1953; Ієрейскїй 1950], which are still the primary originals for the Ukrainian Church. The second reform, following the Second Vatican Council, took place mainly in the 1960s-1980s, when the shift to the vernacular meant the immediate transfer to the languages spoken by Ukrainians in the diaspora: Ukrainian as their home language, and also English in the Anglophone communities where they lived.

In the history of this Church, the 1920s witnessed quite radical changes in mentality as a result of the rise and fall of the Western Ukrainian National Republic. On the one hand, the highest clergy, under the influence of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytskyi, supported the national aspirations of the Ukrainians. The eminent Greek Catholic theologian, Rev. Dr. Havryil Kostelnyk, reflected on the evolution of nationalism in the spheres of culture, politics and religion [Костельник 1922]: he presented the importance of the national language and church life for the self-preservation of nations, though he was cautious to maintain the dogmatic balance of the Universal Church. On the other hand, the public wished to pray in their mother tongue. Oleksandr Barvinskyi, the WUNR Minister of Education and Religious Affairs, published a pamphlet entitled "Is the Ukrainian Language Suitable for Translating the Holy Scriptures and Prayers and for Homilies?" [Барвінський 1921], in which he summarised the introduction of Ukrainian into

---

[8] During the Second World War, one prayer book was published entirely in Ukrainian [Чисте 1943], and its small size suggests that it was intended for private worship and perhaps even for children.

private and public liturgical use over a millennium and concluded that all Christian Ukrainians – Greek Catholic and Orthodox – appreciated the value of Ukrainian in the Liturgy.

Meanwhile, the hierarchy paid much more attention to essential liturgical reforms [see more: Василишин 2014:291-298], which were imperative for religious practice but whose external form was expressed in the Church Slavonic text. The Ukrainian translations were the exceptional activity of Rev. Dr. Yaroslav Levytskyi, who translated the Bible and liturgical texts. His translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom into Ukrainian [Служба 1927] did not provoke any reaction among priests, as was the case with his translation of the "Prayer Book for Priests" [Єрейський 1933], which contained the Horologion, troparia and kontakia of the weekly and yearly cycles, prayers before the Eucharist and the Liturgy, as well as a number of other supplementary prayers. The discussion, which arose around this edition and which was initiated by Havryil Kostelnyk [Костельник 1933], is a sporadic case of liturgical translation criticism. Kostelnyk pointed out several serious errors in the text and gave a generally striking assessment of the translation. In response to this severe criticism, other priests expressed their opinions on the strengths and weaknesses of the book [Ґалянт 1933; I. Н. 1935; Цегельський 1935]: they supported the positive features of this book, referred to the general principles of translation criticism and expressed their suggestions for improving the text. This discussion, triggered by an initially harsh reaction, is the only case of public debate in matters of liturgical translation. Otherwise, liturgical translation commissions usually work within their circles, and the general academic public cannot follow the logic of translation strategies or advise on better options. This condition is particularly evident in the historical perspective, when it is impossible to reconstruct translators' exact decisions and motivations long after the translations have been published.

All these attempts pale compared to the Church's translation activities after the Second Vatican Council. The return of Patriarch Yosyf Slipyi from 18 years of Soviet imprisonment and his

reinstatement in Rome renewed the Liturgical Commission, and its conscientious work produced new essential Ukrainian-language texts for liturgical practice [Тилявський 1985; Василишин 2018]. The first publication was a prayer book, which was later enlarged and republished several times [Господи 1966]. The official translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was published in 1968 [Священна 1968] and revised in 1988 [Священна 1988]. The official translation of this Liturgy immediately began to be republished in numerous smaller and larger prayer books, i.e. those for the laity and for priests [e.g. Свята 1970; Літургічний 1984]. This achievement of the Church was followed by the Liturgy of St Basil the Great [Священна 1980] and the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts [Божественна 1984]. Thus, when Ukrainians celebrated the millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church made an exceptionally important offering: the publication of the Book of Pontifical Services [Архиєратикон 1988]. At the same time, the official English translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was published in various formats for solemn public use and for average practical reading [Божественна 1988]. This commission also prepared the Abridged Euchologion [Малий 1973], the translation of which was continued in Ukraine after the return of the hierarchy. Some witnesses mention the translation of the Horologion, which was almost finished but remained unpublished, and only some parts appeared in the extensive prayer book "Let us come and bow" [Прийдіте 1991].

The parallel translation work was carried out in the Order of St Basil the Great, which continued its publishing traditions in exile. Their publications are a good illustration of the transition from Church Slavonic to Ukrainian. The first edition of the Basilian Prayer Book for internal use in the Order [Василіянський 1963] contained most of the prayers in Church Slavonic, though the second edition (1982) was already entirely in Ukrainian. In 1975 and 1978, they published two parts of the Divine Office [Молитвослов 1975-1978], which included prayers and hymns from the Horologion, Octoechos, Triodion, Pentecostarion, Menaion and some additional services and parts. It was intended

for private use but was eventually republished in a thick but compact volume [Молитвослов 1990]. This book is popularly known as "Vasyliyanka" in honour of the patron of the Order and Basilian Fathers. As far as the faithful are concerned, it was well received by both Greek Catholic and Orthodox communities. Later, it was even translated into English.

The UGCC's translations encouraged the shift from Church Slavonic to Ukrainian, as it facilitated the preservation of Ukrainian national and religious identity. Church Slavonic has remained the de jure sacred language of the Church. Earlier diaspora prayer books happened to contain both Church Slavonic and English texts [e.g. Христос 1954; Icyce 1962], and they actually prepared the ground for the shift from Church Slavonic to English. When this happened in 1964 as a result of the interpretation of the decisions of the Second Vatican Council, the parishioners in the USA began to protest and reached a compromise in which there was a separate Ukrainian service, a separate English service and a mixed English-Ukrainian service. This balance has survived to this day. In Poland, the UGCC used Church Slavonic until the late 1980s, and when the socialist regime fell, the national revival of Ukrainian communities in Poland was supported by a shift to Liturgy in the native language.

In Argentina, Ukrainian Greek Catholic priests published the Easter Service in Ukrainian and Spanish [Великдень 1974]. This translation seems to be aimed at local non-Ukrainian believers who can come and share the joy of this feast with Ukrainians. It would be very interesting to see more Spanish translations linked to Ukrainian communities. A rare case is the Italian translation of the Liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great in the "Byzantine-Ukrainian Rite", as it was officially called on the title page [Divina 1990]. In other words, these translation repertoires are not known.

Texts and the systems of their retranslations
The idea of a sustainable system, self-regenerating in different environments, can reveal how liturgical translation traditions have

shaped their identity and repertoire. Summarising the experience of the development or reform of two traditions and their regeneration after the Second World War in different parts of the world, it can be said that the stages of translation corresponded to fundamental religious texts or collections:

1) prayer books influenced the private lives of believers and shaped the positive acceptance or strong need for high-status texts in the language of prayer books;

2) the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom is the most common public text of the Church backed up by the Bible;

3) the Euchologion, as well as prayers and hymns for various cycles of worship, are the texts of the third line, whose partial presence or absence does not threaten the existence of the entire native-language system of worship, and the first two stages inevitably trigger the appearance of the third stage.

The complete set of liturgical books contains a large number of prayers and hymns. However, the successful religious life of a parish, especially when a parish does not celebrate all daily feasts but limits its attendance to Sundays and major feasts, requires much fewer texts, and that is why abridged liturgical books [e.g. Требник 1963] or even extensive collections of several such books [e.g. Молитвослов 1990] were convenient for priests.

Traditionally, events and personalities influenced liturgical translation, and places have the potential to determine the direction of translation development. The centres of liturgical translation were the sees of synods or eparchies. The city of Prudentópolis in the Brazilian state of Parana has also played an active role in Ukrainian liturgical translation. 75% of its inhabitants are of Ukrainian origin, making it a vibrant, sustainable community whose forms of cultural and spiritual life are successfully realised in the religious sphere. The Ukrainian population consists of both Orthodox and Greek Catholic believers. The community has maintained a functioning system, and the Greek Catholics seem quite productive in the theological domain. One of the first attempts at translation was the fully Ukrainian Horologion with the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom compiled by Rev. Vasyl

Zinko [Християнське 1963]. The initiative was continued with the Ukrainian-language Liturgy of St James [Свята 1973], which is a peculiar liturgy in the Eastern Christian calendar: this ancient liturgy is mainly celebrated once a year on the feast of St James (23 October) but not everywhere. Moreover, it is not popularised in mass-printed liturgical books. The history of the translation of exceptional liturgical texts continued thanks to the efforts of Rev. Vasyl Zinko, who translated four Oriental liturgies from German: the Chaldean-Malabar Liturgy [Халдейсько 1990], the Alexandrian-Coptic Liturgy [Свята 1991a], the Holy Qurbana Liturgy of the Syro-Malankara Rite [Свята 1991b], the Armenian Liturgy [Вірменська 1991]. The interest in these liturgical texts, which may seem extraordinary to the average Ukrainian laity and clergy, reflects the preferences of the translator himself, but it could arouse more curiosity in Ukrainian theological communities around the world.

A question of intersemiotic retranslation overlaps the Church's policies of memory in the area of exiled Ukrainian liturgical translation. Because of the ban on religious music in the USSR, Ukrainians in the diaspora had the opportunity to preserve and develop what had been composed earlier. They considered traditional Ukrainian chant and religious music of Ukrainian composers as a vital asset for preserving their identity and paid great attention to the musical aspect of liturgical practice [for details, see: Карась 2020]. The model edition for the preservation and presentation of Ukrainian religious melodies was prepared by Vasyl Zavitnevych [Співи 1963]: some prayers and hymns of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom were accompanied by up to 16 melodies (i.e. musical interpretations or retranslations). In addition to the traditional Ukrainian local chants, the editions of religious music reveal two types of composers whose opera entered Ukrainian liturgical use in exile. The first group consists of mainland composers who worked and stayed in Ukraine:

1) Maksym Berezovskyi (1745-1777);
2) Dmytro Bortnianskyi (1751-1825);
3) Artem Vedel (1767-1808);

4) Mykhailo Verbytskyi (1815-1870);

5) Havrylo Muzychenko (Musicescu, 1847-1903);

6) Semen Panchenko (1863/1867-1937);

7) Hryhoriy Davydovskyi (1866-1952);

8) Vasyl Fatiyev (Fateev, 1868-1942);

9) Yakiv Yatsynevych (persecuted, 1869-1945);

10) Stanislav Liudkevych (1879-1979);

11) Mykola Leontovych (murdered, 1877-1921);

12) Kyrylo Stetsenko (1882-1922);

13) Petro Honcharov (1888-1970);

14) Pylyp Kozytskyi (1893-1960).

This is the largest group, and it covers different stages of the advancement of religious singing when classical choral singing was enriched with local folk melodies. Moreover, the decade after 1917 was the peak period of Ukrainian church music composition, and preserving this heritage for the time of Ukraine's complete Independence was so important.

The second type consists of composers whose talent survived or matured in exile:

1) Oleksandr Koshyts (1875-1944);

2) Hryhoriy Pavlovskyi (1884-1967);

3) Mykhailo Haivoronskyi (1892-1949);

4) Andriy Hnatyshyn (1906-1995);

5) Hryhoriy Kytastyi (1907-1984);

6) Myron Fedoriv (1907-1996);

7) Symon Vasylaki-Vozhakivskyi (1911-1984);

8) Ihor Sonevytskyi (1926-2006);

9) Zinoviy Lavryshyn (1943-2017).

These composers aimed to create musical opera opposing official Soviet Ukrainian music, which neglected and avoided religious themes. This opposition was intended to restore the integrity of Ukrainian religious musical culture. A particular case is the compositional activity of Roman Hurko (1962–), an American-Canadian of Ukrainian descent who was born in Toronto but who continues cultivating Ukrainian traditions far beyond Ukraine.

Language, Nation and Religion

The first liturgy of the Ukrainian Rite was celebrated in North America (the town of Shenandoah, Pennsylvania) on 22 December 1884, while the first Vespers service took place a few days earlier, on 19 December 1884 [Krawczeniuk 1984:9]. Since it was part of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Rite, the liturgy was served in the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic. It was aimed at the Ukrainian working-class emigrants in Pennsylvania.

The first Ukranian-language liturgy is connected with the history of Ukrainian Orthodoxy. On 22 May 1919, it was served in Kyiv [Thousand 1988:211]. This liturgy was at first partially Ukrainian: the readings from the Gospel, the Epistle Lectionary and the Psalm Book were proclaimed in Ukrainian, and in July 1919, the whole liturgy was already entirely in Ukrainian [Липківський 2018:4:109-110]. This was the initiative of the hierarchical authority and was even actively promoted by the Minister of Religious Affairs of the UNR, Ivan Ohiyenko. The first Ukrainian liturgy in Canada (and perhaps in North America) was celebrated on 18 June 1922 [Мулик-Луцик 1989:158]. It is well known that Ohiyenko's 1922 translation was used. It was an official translation of the Polish Orthodox Church, and the official status meant a lot for the reception at the level of public use.

Another anecdotal fact happened in the Church of the Transfiguration in Lviv (the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) when the first Ukranian-language liturgy, according to Ohiyenko's translation, was celebrated on 26 March 1922 [Тіменик 1997:31-32]. It was the Polish police that reacted and accused the very translator of initiating the revival of the Greek Catholic Church, though the translator was an Orthodox believer. Ohiyenko was persecuted: he was immediately dismissed from his teaching post.

The Ukrainian language of the Liturgy coincidentally added an identifying feature to Ukrainian Orthodoxy in America. An interesting memory is recorded among the faithful of the first Ukrainian churches in the 1920s: in Dauphin (Manitoba, Canada), Ukrainian Greek Catholics, who were not afraid of expulsion from the Catholic Church, attended the liturgy in their native language

[Історичний 1967:19]. Gradually, the mother tongue even helped some return to Ukrainian Orthodoxy. However, the fear of expulsion is a noticeable moment in the history of liturgical translation. It turns out that the restriction on changes in the Ukrainian Rite was introduced by Pope Pius IX's encyclical "Omnem Sollicitudinem" (1874), which called for the scrupulous preservation of ancient religious customs and forbade any liturgical innovation (which also meant the introduction of the vernacular into liturgical practice). This state of affairs was not favourable to a nation overcoming its colonial conditions and heritage.

Meanwhile, the demand for the Ukrainisation of the Liturgy was a call from local grassroots activism. In the case of Volyn, a curious fact is quoted by Rev. Orest Kupranets [Купранець 1974:199]: in the late 1930s, Polish Orthodox parishioners threatened their priests that they would join the Protestants (Baptists) if the priests switched to preaching in Polish and stopped preaching in Ukrainian or Russian. This approach shows how quickly people started to see their language in the Liturgy as an axiological asset of their identity.

Contrasting two prayer books [Добрий 1952; Ісусе 1962], it is easy to see what tendencies were emerging among Ukrainian diaspora believers in the 1960s. The Ukrainian Orthodox prayer book "Good Shepherd" contained one language that served both the religious and ethnic needs of Ukrainian communities: as in the past, monolingual prayer books could serve as primary books for teaching Ukrainian. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic priests gradually moved towards publishing trilingual prayer books: one part was entirely in English, another was both Ukrainian and Church Slavonic. The division between Ukrainian and Church Slavonic was not equal: even the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was published in both languages where all the instructions, comments and explanations were in Ukrainian, and all the prayers pronounced aloud remained in Church Slavonic. It is pretty doubtful that this type of book could help Ukrainians in the diaspora to keep their language, since they had to keep three languages in mind instead of two. The reality was that not all believers understood the Church

Slavonic text very well, and they indeed turned to the English text to clarify complicated phrases. Thus, paradoxically, the book of the Ukrainian Rite encouraged Ukrainians to switch to English.

The places of the holder of power determined the favourable or unfavourable dynamics of liturgical translation. When the holder was connected with the Ukrainian state, liturgical translation developed very actively, even if the general historical conditions were not encouraging: the Ukrainian National Republic boosted Ukrainian translation, but the results of Ukrainian liturgical translation were also impressive despite the obstacles created by the Ukrainian Soviet government (before its aggressive atheistic campaigns in the 1930s). When the holder stayed beyond Ukrainian national issues, the development of liturgical translation depended on universal translation tendencies: after the Roman See sanctioned liturgical translations into national languages, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic hierarchy almost immediately shifted to the liturgical use of the Ukrainian language because they fulfilled the decisions of the Second Vatican Council. This shift required the availability of Ukrainian-language liturgical books, and the translation process was indeed extremely active during the 1960s to 1980s.

Liturgical translations are part of the cultural capital of a nation, as these texts shape a specific religious mentality and form a high poetic culture within a literature. They help believers feel that they are part of the common Christian European tradition and use this membership as a tool for their development, even though ecclesiastical structures are highly conservative and do not always follow the dynamics of social development. Simultaneously, liturgical translations provide a basis for a language to perform a function of symbolic capital when it gains prestige and recognition among other similar languages, guaranteeing the preservation of national identity and the shaping of the nation itself. This is why some political holders of power have been so eager to limit the spread and strength of liturgical translation.

Although liturgical texts belong to the classical literature, their classicity can become old-fashioned due to the asymmetry

of translation reception: linguistic changes in original texts are better tolerated than those in translations, and linguistic modernisations as well as the introduction of a certain theological precision stimulated and continue to stimulate numerous retranslations of liturgical texts. In this respect, the functions of ecclesiastical institutions in exile were the same as those on the mainland: their main task was to administer the power of theological correctness, but in the diaspora, these institutions also administered the preservation of collective memory. In the area of musical interpretations, which can be seen as intersemiotic translations, church leaders supported the original creativity of diaspora composers as well as the traditional chants and melodies of mainland composers. This dual policy also opened the way for more intensive ecumenical communication between exiled churches in the sphere of using liturgical books. When the time came to return home, each ecclesiastical hierarchy had a corpus of liturgical books for mutual use.

4.4. Ukraine's Restored Independence
and its impact on liturgical praxis (1991-2021)

The restoration of Ukraine's Independence in 1991 marked a new milestone in liturgical translation, for it is a particular task to translate for the spiritual practice of the diaspora and quite another to translate for the titular nation. Translators had to take a new look at the role of Church Slavonic in modern religious discourse, assess the possibilities of contemporary readers' perception and reception, and consider the requirements for assessing the quality of translations.

The main languages in the Churches of Ukraine are Ukrainian, Church Slavonic of Ukrainian recension (used mainly in Transcarpathia but also among Orthodox and Greek Catholic believers) and Church Slavonic of Russian recension (Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate). Although language is no longer an indicator of religious affiliation [Пуряєва 2018: 139-

140], the use of the Ukrainian language promoted translation or editing of translations in all Churches, where there was a rich tradition of translation (Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) and where this tradition was created almost "from scratch" (Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Kyiv Patriarchate), and where translations into Ukrainian are a problematic case (Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate, which generally spreads Russofilic and Ukrainophobic policies).

The daily use of these books created a high and stable demand for such publications, so this problem had to be solved. The production of new translations took much longer than initially planned. The UGCC Synod of Bishops, for example, began to consider the need for new liturgical books as early as 1992. These books should unite Greek Catholics worldwide: "In the modern conditions of our nation, our Church in Ukraine and beyond its borders MUST have only One text of all liturgical books. It would unite us throughout the world with the Mother Church in the homeland" [Рішення 1992]. The Synod also reaffirmed the need for "simultaneous new translations of all the other liturgical books published by the Holy See for the Church, in order to harmonise the various expressions, names and formulations". However, the fulfilment of this dictum is still far from being implemented.

The most widespread practice remains the editing of texts produced in the 20th century. Editing also means correcting grammatical and typographical errors and adding parts from other liturgical books published in the diaspora, whose prototexts may have been the publications of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council and the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church (1920-30s). At the same time, a large-scale reprinting activity took place in the 1990s. In Transcarpathia, the interwar Zhovkva publications of the Basilian Fathers were republished in collotype for the Greek Catholics, and the Czechoslovakian editions were reprinted for the Orthodox.

The account of liturgical prints is complicated to keep (even approximately). According to the online catalogue of the Volodymyr Vernadskyi National Library of Ukraine (as of April 2021), the titles

of about 400 prayer books, liturgicons and hymnals covering all Orthodox and Catholic denominations were recorded. Instead, the current price lists (as of summer 2021) register about 100 titles of prayer books and popular editions of the liturgy in the publishing house "Dobra knyzhka" and 50 titles in the publishing house "Svichado". Thus, in recent years, there are 150 titles in two publishing houses, most of which are not recorded in the library's catalogue. Moreover, the catalogue of the most prestigious Ukrainian library does not include the most essential liturgical book of the RCC: the Roman Missal [Римський 2012]. Since not all publishers comply with the compulsory order of copies, and since printing "on demand" made it possible to print additional editions whenever and wherever one wanted, it is not entirely realistic to calculate the actual number of liturgical books (titles and editions) in public use.

Research into religious translation in Ukraine has been uneven. The subject was silenced in the USSR, and Ukraine's Independence brought new achievements. In any case, liturgical translation received little attention. Two ground-breaking conferences, where liturgical topics were debated, were conducted in Lviv in 1998 [Сучасна 1998] and in Kyiv in 2000 [Християнство 2000]. The Bulletin of the Institute of Theological Terminology and Translations of Lviv Theological Academy was launched, but unfortunately, it lasted only six years [Єдиними 1997-2002]. Practitioners of liturgical translation do not generously share their thoughts about their work, and theorists of general translation are not seriously interested in this field. The only person to investigate the matter of liturgical translation consistently is Rev. Dr. Petro Galadza [Ґаладза 1998; Ґаладза 2002-2004; Ґаладза 2017], who formulated five requirements for liturgical translation: linguistic accuracy, theological accuracy, reproduction of the original style, attention to the style of the publicly proclaimed text and musical dimensions [Ґаладза 2017:347-359]. Uliana Holovach echoes similar thoughts: "It is about the demand for appropriateness, artistic perfection and compliance with the specific features of the genre, which is aimed

at the singing of prayers and must be clear in order to have an evangelistic influence on the faithful, who will use it in their own prayers" [Головач 2015: 517]. These views must be discussed and developed because each translator can interpret them in their way. Critics of liturgical translation are needed, though in today's Ukrainian translation studies, translation criticism is generally an Achilles' heel. The lack of public in-depth discussions (but not presentations) is an antipode to the fruitful translation activities of the Ukrainian Churches.

During the restored Independence, the **Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church** was the least numerous, but as an institution, it was the closest to the traditions of the 20th century Ukrainian Orthodox movement in Ukraine and the diaspora. They rightly made intensive use of all that was available to them. In addition, the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in the USA and Canada had some success, so their publications were also used in Ukraine. Some editions were reprinted in collotype [cf. Требник 1994]. By the way, eminent linguists who had emigrated from Ukraine after the Second World War worked on diaspora editions and provided high-quality translations. The "Diaspora" Liturgicon [Служебник 1963] was slightly edited and published twice as a new edition in Ukraine [Літургікон 2005]. The editors corrected typographical errors and added additional material from the 1639 Liturgicon of St Peter Mohyla [see: Леітұргіаріон 1629] and from similar editions of the Antiochian, Greek, Russian and Romanian Orthodox Churches.

The compilation of prayer books presupposes the use of already approved and confirmed texts, taken from larger approved and confirmed prayer books or horologions, which are mainly translations from Greek but not only translations from this language as well as not only translations in general but also original national texts. On the other hand, recipients should also be remembered. Prayer books are the most popular type of religious book, and they are usually the first publications of an ecclesiastical institution. The UAOC is no exception: in the early 1990s, it published several prayer books [Великий 1992; Український 1994; Молитвослов

1995]. One of the first publications of the UAOC in Ukraine was "A Prayer Book for Children" [Дитячий 1996], which emphasised the importance of preaching to the youth in the Ukrainian language. When the Russo-Ukrainian war began in 2014, the UAOC immediately responded with two prayer books: "A Prayer Book of the Ukrainian Orthodox Warrior" [Молитвослов 2014] and "Prayers during the War" by St Petro Mohyla (translated by Liudmyla Ivannikova [Могила 2014]).

At the same time, the Church was working to produce more authoritative editions of prayer books. One of them was prepared by Archbishop Ihor Isichenko. It was the first edition of the prayer book "With Faith and Love" [З вірою 1998], which was published for private use, although the church authorities approved the following and expanded editions. The main stylistic features of these publications are "the excessive Ukrainianisation of texts", "the replacement of already established theological terms with dialectal forms and words more characteristic of fiction", but "in general, these translations of the UAOC are very beautiful, in the style of the best translations of recent decades; they can be considered a fundamental extension of the translation tradition of the UAOC" [Православний 2010:772].

Another fundamental publication of the UAOC is "The Orthodox Prayer Book" (compiled by Archpriest Volodymyr Cherpak in Kyiv in 1995 but finally published in 2010 [Православний 2010]). Some prayers were taken from existing publications and carefully edited, correcting individual translation inaccuracies or stylistic differences with modern standards. The translators-editors tried to keep a balance: on the one hand, they returned some archaic language forms describing the Lord and the Mother of God and consciously used Church Slavonic words; on the other hand, narrow dialectal forms were replaced by literary ones. The publication is significant from the viewpoint of the historiography of liturgical translation, as it contains a thorough afterword listing the main milestones of Ukrainian liturgical translation [Православний 2010:762-773] and a bibliography of publications from the 14th century until 1996 [Православний 2010:774-779].

In the early 1990s, Russian propaganda started interfering politically in the religious life of Ukraine in order to disrupt Ukrainian society. In reaction, the **Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Kyiv Patriarchate** emerged and began positioning itself as a pillar of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian State.

The translation activities of the UOC-KP were systematic. The Commission for the Translation of the Holy Scriptures and Liturgical Literature of the Holy Synod of the UOC-KP was established in 1992. It was chaired by Patriarch Filaret Denysenko and later transformed into the Publishing Department of the UOC-KP as a separate synodal institution of the Church. Within a short time, the entire main corpus of liturgical books was translated into Ukrainian, and the editions of this series were periodically republished:

- Liturgicon (1995) [Служебник 1995],
- Euchologion (2000) [Требник 2000],
- Horologion (2000) [Часослов 2000],
- Sunday Octoechos and General Menaion (2001) [Воскресний 2001],
- Divine Office of Bright Week of Pascha (2002) [Богослужіння 2002],
- Festal Menaion (2002-2003) [Святкова 2002–2003],
- Lenten Triodion (2002) [Тріодь 2002a],
- Festal Triodion (2002) [Тріодь 2002b],
- Archieratikon (2005) [Чиновник 2005],
- Psalter (2004) [Псалтир 2004],
- Octoechos (2006) [Октоїх 2006],
- Akathists (in 3 vol.; 2007) [Акафістник 2007],
- The First Week of the Lent (2012) [Перший 2012],
- Menaion (in 22 parts; 2018-2022) [Мінея 2018–2022] etc.

The publishers chose the phrase "Praise God in Ukrainian" as the slogan for their publications. Prayer books should be added to these publications, as they all carry out the vital mission of Ukrainisation. It is worth noting that the UOC-KP is the only Church that has prepared an almost complete liturgical corpus for itself in a short time. As for the quality of the translations of the UOC-KP,

they can be considered a sample of the Church Slavonic strategy because "there is not always a justified overloading of the language with Church Slavonic words", "there is an unjustified replacement of already established Ukrainian theological terms with Church Slavonic terms; the Church Slavonic poetics sometimes remained unchanged", and at the same time "some stylistic innovations were also introduced" [Православний 2010:771-772].

Despite the large-scale programme of liturgical translations, this Church did not prohibit other editions, and there was space for individual publishing projects [e.g. Акафістник 2000].

The life of the **Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate** for the last 30 years has been full of dramatic changes, from the justified and generally accepted movement for autocephaly to the perspective structured on the "canonical" or "non-canonical" status of the church hierarchy. Such a turn, with changes in leadership and self-image, hides the profound diversity of this church. Even the translators of this church are unusual, ambiguous and often contradictory figures.

Before 2006, no Ukrainian liturgical translation existed within the UOC-MP, and its inauguration was made by Metropolitan Ionafan Yeletskikh, a member of the Russian Orthodox Church and an opponent of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, who published his manuscript "The Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great in the Ukrainian language: an explanatory guide to the Divine Liturgy with a brief historical and theological commentary. Prayers of the Holy Communion, Eucharistological Articles" [Єлєцкіх 2006]. In August 2021, updated electronic editions of "An Explanatory Guide to the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom" [Єлецьких 2021a] and "An Explanatory Guide to the Divine Liturgy of St Basil the Great" [Єлецьких 2021b] were published for students of theological schools and seminaries, catechists and missionaries. They have the same essential subtitle, "The Experience of Explaining Prayers and Litanies in Ukrainian with a Historical and Theological Commentary. Eucharistological Articles". Metropolitan Ionafan has a deep understanding of translation problems, and the

proof of this is his creative credo: "The translation was made in accordance with the linguistic principle of so-called dynamic equivalence, when in modern translations preference is given to the exact conveyance of the understanding of a phrase rather than to the formal imitation of a foreign text" [Єлєцкіх 2006:9]. Or there is another opinion: "the absolute coincidence of an original text and its translation is basically impossible due to the profound difference of language systems of different nations" [Єлєцкіх 2006:10]. In his translation, he referred to both the Greek original and other translations (Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, English, German, Romanian and Italian). He also considers that "this Ukrainian translation of the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great is the first special contribution to the formation of the normative **liturgical *Dnipro*[9] language school** in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate" [Єлєцкіх 2006:10].

On the one hand, the UOC-MP deploys Church Slavonic of Russian recension in worship and print, but on the other hand, there is a desire to acquire the entire spiritual heritage of the ancient Kyiv Metropolitanate of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. One such attempt is the collection "A Great Liturgical Synaxarion" (compiled by Archpriest Oleksandr Monych [Богослужбовий 2014]), which is transliterated into the Civil Cyrillic Script according to the Ukrainian pronunciation (with occasional deviations). From the viewpoint of translation, such a publication is a mixture of interlingual and intersemiotic translation: the characters of the Church Cyrillic Script are replaced by the modern "Civil" ones; but there is also a lingual – phonetic – interpretation, which enables Ukrainian believers to think that they are using a peculiar – religious – style of the Ukrainian language. Incidentally, semantic shifts also occur in their minds because a believer reads a message in Ukrainian but not in Church Slavonic.

An unusual edition of the Liturgicon was prepared by Archimandrite Viktor Bed and Archimandrite Diodor Muratov

---

[9] Read: Dnipro dialects, i.e. Central Ukrainian dialects.

(in two volumes [Служебник 2013]). The first volume contained the Divine Office in Church Slavonic; the second volume, the same services in Ukrainian. The edition was dedicated to the 1150th anniversary of the foundation of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv during the rule of Prince Askold in 862 (863) and to the 10th anniversary of the SS Cyril and Methodius Ukrainian Theological Academy in Uzhhorod. The commemoration of Prince Askold "from the dynasty of Kyi" is an attempt to emphasise the whole spiritual heritage of the Ukrainian Church. Accordingly, the Orders of the Great Vespers, the Polyeleos Orthros and the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom were "localised": the commemoration of "Ukrainian Apostle Andrew the First-Called" is included in the texts of both languages [Служебник 2013:1:115, 123, 266, 313; 2:92, 98, 210, 248] with a justifying footnote about the Council of Kyiv in 1621 [Служебник 2013:1:115, 267; 2:92, 210]. "Our holy fathers, Scythian hierarchs", "Gothic bishops", "our holy fathers, Metropolitans of Kyiv and Halych", "holy, right-believing, Great Princes of Kyiv", etc. are added in the main text as well. The purpose of the compilers was to prepare a complete, codified Liturgicon, and that is why their translation is "the first academic translation of liturgical texts made within the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC-MP) from Greek into Ukrainian" [Служебник 2013:1:6; 2:6], based on the editions of the UOC-MP (2000) and the Greek Orthodox Church (2002).

Metropolitan Sophronius Dmytruk, a supporter of Ukrainian autocephaly, published his translation of the Archieratikon [Правильник 2015]. The prayers are translated into modern literary Ukrainian, and the correspondence with Church Slavonic and Greek texts is preserved as far as possible. All Ukrainian resources printed in Ukraine, Canada, the USA and Poland were used for comparison and verification.

A group of translators and liturgists who started translating gathered around the personality of Archpriest Andriy Dudchenko. Their first published translation was "A Prayer Book / A Prayer Book for Orthodox Believers" [Молитовник 2017]. In a short time, the Liturgicon appeared, containing not only the Liturgy of St John

Chrysostom but also the Office for the Dead, church services and prayers for various needs (Ukrainian translation from the Greek liturgical language: [Божественна 2018; Драбинко s.d.]). In the opinion of the translation team, this is an experimental translation, and the translators are open to further discussion about textual corrections and the use of Ukrainian synonyms. After establishing the Orthodox Church of Ukraine, these participants became its members, and now they are expected to form the core of translation activity in the new church.

The transformation of the UOC-KP, the UAOC and part of the UOC-MP into the local autocephalous **Orthodox Church of Ukraine** in 2018 has not yet led to intensive religious translation activities. Its Liturgical Commission is only beginning to do its work, which can be felt only after a more extended period. So, the first step was the approval of a new translation of the Creed at the meeting of the Holy Synod on 27 July 2021 [Офіційне 2021]. Comparison with existing translations shows that the Synod approved the replacement of the phrase "стався чоловіком" (became a man) by "став людиною" (became a human), thereby restoring the usage of Ivan Ohienko's 1922 variant. However, the usage of the conjunction "і" in the intervocalic position does not comply with the Ukrainian pronunciation: "однакове покоління і однакова слава", "Соборну і Апостольську Церкву". The alternative conjunction "й" can be found in Orthodox and Greek Catholic prayer books [Добрий 1952:13; Благослови 1996:9]. The most recent publications of the OCU are the Prayer Book [Молитовник 2021] and the Liturgicon [Служебник 2021–2023]. Some editions were prepared for purely practical reasons [Богослужіння 2019; Чинопослідування 2021; Військовий 2023], and they do not affect the general progress of liturgical translation in the Church.

After the return from exile and the official bans, the **Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church** also transferred from the diaspora to its historical homeland the achievements of liturgical translation from the time of service to Ukraine outside Ukraine. These achievements were the fruit of the efforts of generations of priests and linguists; hence, the translations were and are vivid

and were immediately well received in Ukraine. At the same time, the declarations of the Synod of Bishops of the UGCC on the need for new translations, unified for the entire Church, remain only declarations. However, thorough preparations for the desired new translations have been made. Thus, on 11 March 2013, the "Instruction on the Submission and Approval of Liturgical Texts, their Reprints and Translations" was approved by the ecclesiastical authorities [Матеріали 2013:65-75].

The Instruction prescribes a mechanism for the approval of translations of liturgical texts. It is worth quoting the following prescription: "The translation of liturgical texts is connected with the need to know the Classical languages, history and liturgical theology, pastoral and ecumenical dimensions, so it would be very good to create translation groups in institutions of research and teaching in theological disciplines. These institutions could also function as communities in which newly translated texts are tested by praying" [Матеріали 2013:72]. The emphasis is on the "human approach", i.e. the involvement of specialists in the assessment of translation quality, but nothing is said about the linguistic and textual principles of the desired translations (focus on Greek or Church Slavonic in terms of interpretation or style, the role of the reader's possible perception, etc.). The "Instruction on the Organisation of Book Publishing in the UGCC", approved by the Synod of Bishops of the UGCC on 29 September 2020 [Інструкція 2020], already contains interesting substantive provisions on the need for translations ("since the official liturgical language in various local Churches sometimes differs from the language of communication (in everyday life) of the faithful of that Church, translations of liturgical texts may be made into a language understood by the faithful"), on the requirements for translators ("in order to carry out this important task, one should know the Classical languages, history and theology of the liturgy, including its pastoral and ecumenical aspects, in order to carry out this important task, one should be familiar with the classical languages, the history and the theology of the Liturgy, including its pastoral and ecumenical dimensions"), on institutional supervision

("it is advisable to set up translation groups in institutions for research and teaching in theological disciplines (especially in them but also in other ecclesial communities and groups)), and – what is important and topical today – the ecumenical dimension of liturgical translation ("If in the same territory, there are different Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Churches which belong to the same liturgical family and use the same language, differences between their liturgical texts must be avoided. Rather, the common printing of liturgical books should be encouraged"). The latter principle should contribute to an even greater rapprochement of the Churches in developing or improving full-fledged Ukrainian religious discourse.

The publishing activities of the UGCC are mainly undertaken by three publishing houses: "Misioner", "Svichado" and "Dobra knyzhka". If we count the number of titles of prayer books published by these publishing houses, the UGCC is ahead of all other Churches, even if their production is counted together. There are prayer books for various readers and purposes: "God is Always With Me: A Prayer Book for Children" [Бог 2006], "A Prayer Book for the Defender of the Homeland" [Молитовник 2010], "A Prayer Book for Students" [Молитовник 2012], "The Lord is Your Healer. Prayers to the Holy Doctors: a Prayer Book" [Господь 2013], "A Mother's Prayer Book" [Молитовник 2013], "The Solemn Holy Communion: A Prayer Book" [Урочисте 2013], "An Emigrant's Prayer Book" [Молитовник 2016], "A Prayer Book for the Visually Impaired" [Молитовник 2018], etc.

Among the liturgical books, the clergy paid the greatest attention to the Euchologion. The publication of the Euchologion [Требник 2001а] was based on the Little Euchologion [Малий 1973], translated in Rome by the Liturgical Commission under the chairmanship of Patriarch Yosyf Slipyi, while some rites and prayers were also taken from the Lviv Euchologion of 1925-1926 [Евхологїонъ 1925-1926], compiled by Rev. Tyt Myshkovskyi in Church Slavonic and blessed by Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytskyi. This Lviv Euchologion was a source for other rites translated and published in the book "Euchologion. Consecrations and Blessings"

[Требник 2010]. The 2020 edition of the Euchologion incorporated the two previous editions.

Another story is that of the Euchologion, published by the Basilian Fathers: "Euchologion: Orders of the Holy Sacraments, Consecrations, Blessings, and Other Church Prayers for Various Needs" [Требник 2018]. It was compiled by Rev. Atanasiy Kupitskyi and first printed by the Basilian Fathers in Prudentópolis (Brazil) in 2001 [Требник 2001b]. The Euchologion was approved by the Church.

An essential role in the development of a new quality of liturgical translation is played by the Ukrainian Catholic University, more precisely by the members of the liturgical translation workshop "Trypisnets": Rev. Dr. Vasyl Rudeiko, Andriy Shkrabyuk, Taras Tymo and Maksym Tymo. Only one liturgical edition has been published: "The Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts: a new expanded edition with stichira from the Triodion, Octoechos and Menaion" [Божественна 2009]. However, many more texts are circulating in the electronic version, including "The Divine Office of Holy and Bright Weeks" (Lviv, 2012) and "The Divine Office of Holy and Bright Weeks: a small musical supplement by Andriy Protopsalt [Shkrabyuk]" (Lviv, 2013). In her review, Uliana Holovach points out the main virtue of these translations: the accuracy of the reproduction of the Greek text, as well as the fact that "the accuracy of the reproduction of the content does not destroy the poetics of expression; the translators do not simplify but precisely reproduce the images encoded in the language; they try to transform texts of Byzantine hymnography, which are complex for modern perception, into such texts, which are understandable for modern readers" [Головач 2015:517-518]. It is crucial that these "experimental" translations are sung in the university church and thus polished and tested by singing. Another important fact is the academic approach to translation. Rev. Vasyl Rudeiko has made an academic translation of two horologions: "The Horologion according to the Canon of the Holy Lavra of Saint Sabbas" [Рудейко 2016] and "The Horologion of twenty-four hours" [Рудейко 2017].

During the centuries of the **Roman Catholic Church**'s existence in Ukraine, it was considered the Church for the Poles, while in

Transcarpathia, it was seen as the Church for the Hungarians: historical and ecclesiastical circumstances led to the assimilation and denationalisation of the Ukrainian nation. However, as a result of drastic Soviet social events, the RCC in 1991 had not only to rebuild structures which had long been destroyed but virtually to create new ones and thus to expand into the eastern regions of Ukraine, which had not traditionally been regarded as part of the Catholic world. Consequently, the ethnic composition of the RCC's faithful was no longer as homogeneous as before the First World War. The Ukrainian language had also become the mother tongue of a certain percentage of Poles. So, the need for liturgical literature written in Ukrainian appeared immediately, and when the situation with the educational and academic institutions of the RCC stabilised, the translation process commenced [Єпископ 2013].

The leading role in preparing editions was taken by the Liturgical Commission, which, after the approval for the whole RCC in Ukraine, began to publish "typical" editions. Initially, attention was focused on the sacraments, resulting in the following publications: "The Order of the Baptism of Adults" [Обряди 2000], "The Order of the Baptism of Children" [Обряди 2002], "The Order of Confirmation" [Обряди 2003a], "The Order of Funeral" [Обряди 2003b; Обряди 2018], "The Order of the Anointing of the Sick and their Pastoral Care" [Обряди 2007], "The Order of the Celebration of Matrimony" [Обряди 2008b], "The Order of Penance" [Обряди 2008a], "The Orders of the Ordination of a Bishop, of Priests and of Deacons" [Обряди 2013]. Among the first publications there was also prepared a large prayer book, "Universal Prayer" [Вселенська 2004]. After that, the commission concentrated all its efforts on the preparation of the Missal: from the abridged version [Малий 2005] to the complete updated edition of "The Roman Missal" [Римський 2012]. Meanwhile, the commission participated in a multilingual edition of the liturgy "Ordo Missae" [Ordo 2009], in which the Ukrainian language was presented along with Latin, Polish, English, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian and Italian. After the publication of the main

book, the commission started work on Ukrainian liturgical chants accompanied by the organ ("Let us sing to God" [Співаймо 2014-2022], "Requiem aeternam" (for funerals; [Requiem 2015]) and by the choir ("Holy Week" [Великий 2019], "Musica Sacra" [Musica 2020]).

It is important to stress that the source language was Latin, unlike in the Ukrainian edition of "The Liturgy of Hours according to the Roman Rite: abridged version" [Літургія 2007], where Kostiantyn Smal made use of the Polish translation.

The functioning of translations does not correspond to the spheres and limits of the activities of the very religious denominations. At the stage of pre-translation analysis, all the translators used existing translations in Ukrainian and other languages to get some hints for making their translation decisions. Biblical fragments were also taken from available translations of the Bible. When translations were published, they also affected other denominations: the lack of publications in the early 1990s caused priests to use the available texts. Reprints helped, but even they could not save the situation. That is why Greek Catholic editions were and are used by Orthodox priests. It was a process of creating the unity of religious discourse, of finding the means to present the aesthetic glorification of God in the Ukrainian language. To a certain extent, it promoted a sense of ecumenism because, in the 1990s, relations between Orthodox and Greek Catholic believers were quite different – from peace to hostility.

A prime sample of the inter-denominational nature of liturgical texts is the publication of "The Liturgical Psalter" [Молитовний 1990], which was published by the Stoudite monks of the UGCC after the Psalter translated by the Orthodox priest Mykhailo Kobryn [Псалтир 1936]. Since the text needed to be slightly "modernised", Rev. Ivan Muzychka (UGCC), Prof. Vasyl Lev and Prof. Dmytro Stepovyk (who was an active member of Ukrainian Orthodoxy) were invited to review the language of the text. Unfortunately, the translator's name was not mentioned on either the front or back page of the Psalter, and a lot of believers will overlook the mention of his name in the text of the preface.

When we speak of translation in the Church, we usually mean the "import" of texts. However, the diaspora existence of the Ukrainian Churches has even contributed to the "export" of liturgical texts when translations were made from Church Slavonic and Ukrainian texts into other languages, such as English and Polish. The publication of the Divine Office (Horologion, Octoechos, Triodion and Menaion) in Ukrainian [Молитвослов 1990] was a monumental achievement of the UGCC. It was published by the Basilian Fathers (and is called "Vasyliyanka" in honour of their Patron). It also has an English version prepared by Dymytriy Vysochanskyi [Divine 2003]. The comparison of the two versions shows a specific dependence on the similar edition of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church: "Byzantine Daily Worship: With Byzantine Breviary, the Three Liturgies, Propers of the Day and Various Offices" (compiled and translated by Most Rev. Joseph Raya and José De Vinck [Byzantine 1969]). This Ukrainian translation has become quite popular and is used by the Greek Catholic and Orthodox faithful. Another praiseworthy liturgical anthology was published in Canada: "The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship" (edited by Rev. Dr. Petro Galadza [Divine 2004]), which summarises all the achievements of the UGCC in the domain of its liturgical translations into English. One of the main principles of these translations is the correspondence of texts with the musical traditions of the Church. "Holy Mysteries" [Святі 2012] is the bilingual – Ukrainian and English – edition compiled by Rev. Bohdan Danylo and Rev. Volodymyr Sybirnyi, though no information was provided about the translators or their translation principles. In Poland, the UGCC also published Polish translations, such as that of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom [Божественна 2004]. The most recent activities of the UGCC are bilingual editions with Ukrainian and Polish translations of the Liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great, troparia for the week and the Memorial Service from the Office for the Dead (translated into Polish by Rev. Dr. Marek Blaza, Rev. Janusz Czerski and Rev. Petro Kushka [Чин 2020c]) along with two other sacraments: "The Order of the Holy Sacraments of Baptism and

Confirmation" (translated into Polish by Rev. Szymon Jankowski, Rev. Dr. Marek Blaza and Rev. Janusz Czerski [Чин 2020a]) and "The Order of the Holy Sacrament of Matrimony" (translated into Polish by Rev. Szymon Jankowski, Rev. Dr. Marek Blaza and Rev. Janusz Czerski [Чин 2020b]). The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada published a comprehensive prayer book, which is an admirable liturgical anthology for the Orthodox "The Good Shepherd" [Добрий 2007]. It will satisfy the spiritual needs of Orthodox believers from the cradle to the grave [A new 201-?] This bilingual edition bears the same title as the earlier Ukrainian-language prayer book "The Good Shepherd" [Добрий 1926; Добрий 1952].

In Transcarpathia, there is a long tradition of transliterating Ukrainian liturgical texts into the Roman Script, which dates from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (or rather, its part, the Kingdom of Hungary) and was supported in Czechoslovakia and the present-day Slovak Republic. This way of publishing liturgical books, which seems strange to the majority of Ukrainians, overlaps with the newly created movement of "political Rusyns", whose supporters produce their so-called "Rusyn language", though, in fact, their texts represent South Lemko dialects of the Ukrainian language with a large admixture of Slovak words, or simply hybrids. The grain of truth of the "Rusyn versions" of liturgical books is that the translators are trying to resist the Slovakisation policy embodied by the Slovak Greek Catholic Church, even though the Church itself should take care of preserving the national memory of the local Greek Catholic Ukrainians. Rev. František Krajňák (Krainiak) initiated translation activities in the 1980s with a group of like-minded people who started serving the Liturgy in their translations and translating the Bible. The source texts of their translations were Church Slavonic texts. Krajňák and Yosyf Kudzei translated and published parts of the Euchologion: "The Little Euchologion. Chapters 1-10" (with the imprimatur [Малый 2013]) is published in the Cyrillic and Roman Scripts, and "The Little Euchologion. Blessings and Benedictions" (self-published

without the imprimatur [Malyj 2013]) was published only in the Roman Script. The texts were ready in 2004; the official liturgical commission approved some of them in 2005, some more in 2011, and some remain without ecclesiastical approval. Thus, only the first part of the Euchologion has been officially published. However, the prayer book "Radujte sja v Hospodi" (translated by Yosyf Kudzei and Rev. František Krajňák; with imprimatur; [Radujte 2021]), which was officially published in July 2021, contains prayers, catechetical information, services and rites, the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, troparia and kontakia, the Office for the Dead, as well as church songs. Part of the text is in two versions – in Church Slavonic and in the dialect, – but everything is printed in the Roman Script. This prayer book is a significant addition to the earlier edition: "Sunday Vespers. The Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts. Readings for the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts" (translated by Yosyf Kudzei and Rev. František Krajňák; with imprimatur; [Neďiľna 2016]).

Pannonian Ukrainians (in Vojvodina, now Serbia) began translating religious literature into their dialect earlier [Миз 1994:127; Науково 2019]. In recent decades, they have concentrated on biblical texts, especially those used in the Liturgy. Of the remaining prayer and hymn books, known is only "A Prayer Book. Peace to all" [Молитвенїк 2007], compiled by Rev. Mykhayil Kholoshniai-Matiyiv.

The restored Independence of Ukraine has triggered translation events and actions in various ecclesiastical institutions. The most important feature is that it has created a space for the realisation of the desire to create new, highly artistic and, at the same time, theologically accurate texts which correspond to the current development of the Ukrainian language and speak to the hearts of the faithful. A certain dispersion of efforts may mean that this only prepares the ground for a genuinely new stage of Ukrainian liturgical translation.

III. CASE STUDIES OF TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

1. Feminist motifs in liturgical translation:
the case of the Feast of the Nativity of the Mother of God

Mykola Zerov characterised the literary turn of the 19th century with a very insightful and precise description: "The former Ukrainian clergy and the Cossack upper class, which produced and consumed literary values in the 17th and the first half of the 18th century, gradually started to lose their national disposition" [Зеров 2003:7]. The emphasis on axiology and nationality is the key to the successful interpretation of many types of texts, including religious texts, which are often manipulated for doctrinal reasons.

Feminist translation theory belongs to the group of theories that deal with milieu-determined assessment, which usually has little to do with evaluating the quality of a translation but much to do with understanding the textual identity of an original. Although feminist theory tends to focus on heroine-centered writing for women, it can provide some criteria for judging texts outside this framework. Sherry Simon believes that female types and translated texts are relegated to discursive inferiority [Simon 1996:1], but liturgical texts and translations propagate values and visions which testify to the opposite.

The image of the Virgin Mary is one of the key images of Christian writings. Christianity, like other Abrahamic religions, appears publicly patriarchal, although, in some texts, women have managed to gain more space for visibility and activity. The liturgical service for the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary is an essential woman-centred service. Since the whole feast comprises Small Vespers, Great Vespers and Matins, the hymns of Small Vespers are particularly full of vivid female imagery, while the Matins service tends to repeat the topoi of salvation and the presence of Jesus Christ. However, this structure has suffered from

the shortening and simplification sanctioned in the second half of the 20ᵗʰ century: the Small Vespers is not celebrated and thus published in English-language translations used by various Eastern Orthodox and Greek Catholic Churches.

English can be described as a "Catholic" language because, for much of its history, it has served the needs of the Roman Catholic faithful. This Roman Catholic linguistic mentality is a decisive factor for the reader. The fundamental difference lies in naming the Virgin Mary: Roman Catholics admire the poetics of referring to the Virgin Mary, while Orthodox and Eastern Rite Catholics admire the veneration of the Mother of God.

The group of seven texts selected for the study (listed in the references) represent diverse denominations: the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Greek Orthodox Church of Antioch, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, the Melkite Greek Catholic Church, the Russian Orthodox Church. The oldest text is the 1619 Ukrainian Church Slavonic Service, which contains some deviations from today's Greek-language Textus Receptus, though the Ukrainian editors and translators claimed in the preface that they were following the Greek text. These deviations were accepted and practised in the Ukrainian, Serbian and Russian Orthodox Churches.

Aesthetic dimension. The aesthetic value of the description of the Theotokos in this service is expressed first of all through beautiful epithets and metaphors. The Theotokos is described as a flower and a garden in the hymn "From Ann today" of Small Vespers. This description is a biblical reference (Isaiah 11:1), but in the Slavonic biblical tradition, the image "נצר" of this verse is rendered as "цвѣтъ" which reflects naturalistic or agricultural imagery by emphasising a more colourful and pleasant part of the plant. The Old Hebrew lexeme means a stick with interpretations of guarding and even loyalty, preparing the ground for a sapling as a symbol of power and control. In Patristic Greek, the meaning of "ῥάβδος" evolved from a stick to rich connotations, especially divine, associated with God the Father, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

The English translation by Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware followed the line of Textus Receptus by deploying the lexeme "rod". However, the following epithet after "ῥάβδος" is "φυτὸν θεόσδοτον", which can be interpreted in two ways: both as a garden plant and as a spring. This interpretation gives rise to the idea of a new generation. In the English text, the idea of a human offspring is very gentle, based on a genuine metaphor ("a branch given by God"), while in the Old Greek language, it already had direct connections with the description of a human. In the Church Slavonic text, the accent is open and vivid: "Садъ Бг҃оданенъ" ("garden given by God"). The reading movement from a flower to a garden has the effect of an aesthetic emphasis. It is a deviation from the known Greek text which may be explained by the fact that the Ukrainian translators followed a different text or introduced a more pleasant colouring of their own.

Nevertheless, the garden metaphor is reiterated in the hymn "Today God who rests upon the spiritual thrones". The same metaphor "φυτὸν ζωηφόρον" exists in the Slavonic text as "садъ живоносенъ" ("life-bearing garden"), which is an amplification or enlargement of the original image. This is a hymn of Great Vespers, and it is available in a number of translations, but all of them can be considered modern, and they contain only "branch": "a life-bearing branch" (1938, Rev. Seraphim Nassar, Antiochian Orthodox Church), "a branch full of life" (1969, Most Rev. Joseph Raya and José De Vinck, Melkite Greek Catholic Church), "a branch full of life" (2003/2014, Rev. Dmytro Vysochanskyi / Demetrius Wysochansky, Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church). However, the Ukrainian-language text of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church renders it as "живоносний сад", meaning that the Basilian Fathers used the Slavonic text as their original. The modern reader finds more beauty in the Kyivan text than the "strict" translations while the Greek text is not so strict and contains space for the stimulating interpretation of a beautiful garden.

Luise von Flotow and Farzaneh Farahzad note that "national cultures are never hermetically sealed or closed to difference; difference attracts, fascinates, triggers curiosity and interest, and

always manages to penetrate borders" [Translating 2016:xiv]. Here, we are witnessing the transformation of the Judeo-Hellenistic symbol, even though this is a text of the highest authority, which is typically rigid against corrections in dogmatic descriptions. The received sacred cult should be "hermetically sealed" for the sake of the purity of the faith, but this is not the case even in liturgical texts.

Linguistic dimension. Every image is influenced and, thus, defined by the words or images used around it. The image of the Theotokos as a nursing mother is clear, familiar and acceptable: "ἡ τροφὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν" is used in the hymn "The soil which formerly was barren" of the Small Vespers as well as in the Troparion of the Prefest. The main idea of nourishing or rearing a child (i.e. a Christian) is not distorted in all the translations: "питателница жизни нашеа" (Kyivan text), "the Theotokos who nourishes our life", "the nourisher of our life" (Antiochian OC), "she who sustains our life" (Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware), "the Sustainer of our life" (Melkite and Ukrainian GCCs), "кормителька життя нашого" (Ukrainian GCC). However, it borders on another description of the Theotokos: "θαῦμα φρικτόν" which appears as "чюдо страшно" in the Kyivan text and as "dread wonder" in Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware's translation. The terrible connotations are the ones to be avoided here, though they were originally present in the lexeme "φρικώδης". The Dictionary of Patristic Greek suggests a very successful explanation for "φρικτός": "awe-inspiring". Christian doctrine does not promote an angry God, and in a neutral and positive context, it is not fear that is implied but a specific emotional state of the feeling of respect and reverence mixed with latent fear and wonder and inspired by what is majestic or powerful in nature. The Oxford English Dictionary records similar connotations for "dread", and a more explanatory variant would be a better option for the reader. In the 1619 Kyivan text, the lexeme "страшьнъıй" might have been a possible equivalent, while in today's Ukrainian, it requires quite an inventive way out.

These contemplations show how accurate a translator should be when interpreting a time-distant text. Some hymns from

this service are now celebrated only in the Slavonic churches, and we cannot compare what variants could be acceptable for "младенствующа Дв҃а" (hymn "Кто довольнw") and "препѣтаа и҃ неискусобрачнаа" (hymn "Всечестнок твок рождество"). They should be treated in a very delicate and creative way, and the main rule for a successful translation is to keep in mind both Christian doctrine and the polysemy of Old Greek.

Luise von Flotow speaks of the need to compensate for the losses of untranslatable feminised neologisms [von Flotow 1997:22 ff], while in the available non-Greek translations, – on the contrary – the translators try to avoid failure by experimenting with the nomens for the Theotokos. This state of arts can be explained by the different time-distant amount of semantic loads in concepts, as well as by the appeal to the ideal woman – the Theotokos – who was to be described with exclusive epithets. The ideal status could also determine how other female personalities were represented. So, here we have the opposite situation: the original was stable and transparent, which is why the translations are full of highly expressive neologisms for portraying women.

Fictional dimension. The act of childbirth is the result of sexual behaviour, and it is not surprising that the sexual metaphors may be seen as easily detectible in the hymn "Today the barren gates are opened and the virgin Door of God comes forth". However, the two phrases are "πύλαι ἀνοίγονται" ("врата ѿврързаютсѧ", "the gates are opened", "брама відчиняється") and "πύλη παρθενικὴ θεία" (literally: door virgin divine) do not have a traditional sexual interpretation. On the contrary, it is much more deeply connected with righteousness as the gate of life that elevates the status of the newborn girl as a necessary condition for human salvation. Some translations directly express this majestic metaphor of a woman as the way to salvation: "the Virgin, the Gate of God" (Melkite GCC), "the Virgin, the gate of God" (Ukrainian GCC). Other translations exploited the genuine phrases and resulted in awkward formulations which are unclear without a proper theological clarification: "Дверь Дв҃ическаа, Бж҃с҃твьннаа" (1619 Kyiv), "the divine, the virginal gate" (Antiochian OC), "the

virgin Door of God" (Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware), "дівичі двері" (Ukrainian GCC).

The male genitals are present in the text as well, so we do not have a discriminatory approach to describing the event, but they indicate only the lines of the progenitors. Thus, on the second level of interpretation, we can point to the heavenly nature of women and the physical nature of men.

Sherry Simon refers to the conflicts of beauty and infidelity, production and reproduction, active/male and passive/female which are deeply rooted in the memory of Western culture [Simon 1996:11]. In the collected epithets and metaphors associated with the Theotokos, the active part, which is more evident and vibrant, is the female presence. Thus, this liturgical piece discloses a different part of ancient memory where the female component was more important and accepted as a higher status.

"True" dimension. The titular references to the Theotokos are usually perceived as granted and accustomed, whereas they have symbolically loaded senses. In the hymn "Joachim and Anna keep festival…", we worship "τὴν μόνην Θεοτόκον". In this phrase, the lexeme "μόνος" is to express the rhetorical preeminence of the Theotokos in her divine quality or action. Formally, the Slavonic and English equivalents used (respectively "**єдину Богородицу**" and "the only Theotokos") render the exceptional status of the Theotokos, although, in the array of other and much more frequently used senses, the major sense of rhetorical preeminence may not be activated in all appropriate contexts. In New Ukrainian, the lexeme "єдина" is generally dubious.

In the hymn "Today Ann the barren" and in the Troparion of the Prefest (as well as in other hymns), the Theotokos is called "θεόπαις" which the Dictionary of Patristic Greek records both as a "male" sense ("who is a divine Son") and a "female" sense ("who bears a divine Son") by fixing different roles to men and women. The Dictionary of Old Greek discloses the gender-free ground of the lexeme "παῖς", which signifies any male or female offspring, a young one, but it can also stand for a slave or servant of any age. Following the Patristic doctrine, all the translations are deviant

because, in the hymn, the focus is on the mother, who is chosen for the highest mission. The translations – "Бг҃оотроковица" (1619 Kyiv), "the divine Maiden", "the Maiden of God" (Antiochian OC), "the Child of God" (Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware), "the maiden of God", "the Maiden of God" (Melkite and Ukrainian GCCs), "божественна Діва", "Божа отроковиця" (Ukrainian GCC) – have an emphasis on the reverential quality regardless of her future birth.

Hongyu Li summarises a case of de-womanising the theme of the original [cf. Translating 2016:154], and this experience must be widespread in hardcore patriarchal societies. In the Service of the Nativity of the Theotokos, the gender role is fundamental because it reflects the physical reality and is obvious and visible. In the translations, the lowering of Her social status can be interpreted manipulatively if we want to emphasise Her family / "occupational" relations instead of Her age.

Expressive dimension. The expressive parameter of each text is also oriented to presenting the uniqueness of the protagonists' personalities. This perspective encourages us to reflect on how we see or want to see the Theotokos and what we know about her personality. In the hymn "The soil which formerly was barren", the traditional mother-daughter dyad is realised in the metaphorically extraordinary but miraculous contrast "ἄγονος χώρα" – "γῆ καρποφόρος". The physical contrast "sterile-fertile" is not very productive for studying the protagonists' emotional states or personal features as it offers too much space for imaginative interpretation. The reader may note the patristic sense of "καρποφόρος": it means "bearing offerings to the church", and it reveals more radical interpretations of the hymn. The 1619 Kyivan text contains the pair "неплодная страна" – "земля Богоплодная" (God-bearing land/soil), the latter part of which was later changed to "земля плодоносная" (fruit-bearing land/soil). It is thought-provoking whether the Ukrainian translators used a particular original or decided to offer their explanatory equivalent. In Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware's translation, the pair is "barren soil" – "fertile ground", which does not present any

peculiar difficulty in assessing its quality since basic agricultural terms are not very problematic for translation.

The emotional descriptions of the Theotokos are often missing in liturgical hymns. Her role in the salvation of the human race is much more critical than Her personality. The metaphor of "γέφυρα" (bridge) was quite popular in Patristic literature, but then again it shows the importance of the Theotokos as the essence of life and provides no information about Her self-assessment: "Ἡ τῆς ζωῆς τίκτεται σήμερον γέφυρα" – "**Живота раждаєтсѧ днесь мостъ**" (1619 Kyiv) – "Today the Bridge of Life is born" (Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware). In another hymn of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, the Theotokos is the bridge directing us to the salvation incarnate in Jesus Christ: "Як міст до творця величаємо тебе, Богородицю" – "We extol you, O Mother of God, as the bridge that leads to the Creator".

Reflecting on Eliana Maestri's observations on "how ideological institutions engage with women by regulating their perceptions of class, social interactions and mental representations" [Maestri 2018:78], we can also notice the connection between the epithets for the Theotokos and the class of peasants. At the same time, it shows the ancient state of conceptualisation and the vibrancy of archetypal visions, even if today's urban readership does not feel and absorb all the power of such comparisons.

Affective dimension. In religious texts, a number of terms are employed to evoke an emotional response in the reader immediately. In the hymn "Joachim and Anna keep festival…", the phrase "τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας" contains even more than just another epithet for the Theotokos. The lexeme "ἀπαρχή" is a primal offering or sacrifice which is offered to prophets, the poor or as a thanksgiving prayer. It signals the reader to follow and act accordingly: the writer expects the reader to make their unique and special offering. In the translation, this effect is less evocative and more hidden in the praising observations: "**начатокъ нашемȣ спасенїю**" – "first fruit of our salvation".

The Greek religious hymns are full of associations. Ancient languages are prone to polysemy and multiple interpretations.

Thus, laypeople may feel involved in creating a living text, while some semantic parts may remain uncovered. Like in the hymn "Today God who rests upon the spiritual thrones", the lexeme "thrones" will attract readers' and listeners' attention to another lexeme, i.e. "νοερός" ("Ὁ τοῖς νοεροῖς θρόνοις") which is a real challenge for elucidation because it encompasses both intellectual (thus, human), and heavenly (thus, divine). Meanwhile, something meaningful is still missing. The intellectual side is present in two translations: "на разꙋмныхъ престолѣхъ" (1619 Kyiv) and "on noetic thrones" (Antiochian OC). Four translations opted for the word "spiritual": "upon the spiritual thrones" (Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware), "on the Spiritual Thrones" (Melkite GCC), "на духовних престолах" and "on the spiritual thrones" (Ukrainian GCC). However, this variant looks too superficial to be correctly understood without involving the semantic components of thought, ratio and intelligence.

Terms in feminine writings are an central feature of female identity, and it is imperative to preserve or render the term in the translation [Дячук 2016:101 ff]. In the time-distant religious text, terms should be treated not only as a word with a narrow scientific meaning but also as a word with a specifically doctrinal sense. This is why the chosen variants should be both doctrinally correct and semantically precise.

In religious texts, the practices of silencing and erasing the Other are not numerous because the Other itself is sacred, even if it may be incognizable and threatening. On the one hand, millennia-old traditions influence the continued use of once-approved modes of expression; on the other hand, doctrinal teachings dispense with today's linguistic analysis and shape textual insights based on Patristics and personal emotions.

The historical dimensions of ancient texts, especially those that are manifestos of cultural imperialism, are superficially interpreted, frequently as exotic forms, though they reflect all the historical and emotional experience of a community: this may explain the fact that in the Ukrainian tradition the "narrow" metaphor of a branch was transformed into the "wide" metaphor

of a whole garden, which can be a mirror of a more familiar landscape.

Every text renders an identity, but a translation contains a multiplicity of identities, and sometimes, these identities can compete with each other. In the original and in the translations of the service, we still see the Theotokos as a strong, outstandingly beautiful personality who is the happy key to our salvation. The reduced image of Her, which we experience it in the abridged services, appeared as a result of liturgical reforms, which are quite another story...

2. Emotion terms in the Office for the Dead

2.1. The Byzantine/Slavonic perspective: modest grief in the translations of the Orthodox Funeral Vigil

Funerals are highly emotional events, and emotionality is also expressed in the funerary text through the appropriate set of emotion terms. Death is not only a tragic event of earthly life but also the hope of a better – heavenly – life. This approach to death helps the Christian Church to celebrate the saddest act of human life in a quietly joyful way. The contrast between folk laments and ecclesiastical rites (covering oratory and musical parts) shows how the Church tries to ease the emotional burden of this event by leading people to a more peaceful acceptance of bereavement. The balance between the use of strong and weak, positive and negative emotions is different in various denominations and communities, though it is the key to the power of influencing the emotional intelligence of the faithful.

Typically, even tactile perception can evoke references and associations to previous experience in childhood: warm objects evoke "early experiences with caretakers who provide warmth, shelter, safety and nourishment" [Williams, Bargh 2008:606]. In eschatological contexts, we also want to return to happy, safe

places, and the Church can help by using the emotion terms associated with these experiences.

The study of emotional states in speech dominates current research, and the focus on their verbalisation covers wider circles of lexis (terms and evaluative vocabulary). The emotional aspects of communicative acts, pragmatics and semasiology are broadly and deeply summarised in two volumes of the collection "Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions" [Handbook 2006; Handbook 2014], which testifies to the scarcity of research on the naming and classification of emotions. Much less attention has been paid to the naming of emotions, which depends on their etymological origin but reflects the historical dynamics of their semantic life (see the existing literature and some pioneering ideas in [Shmiher 2018]). The lexical study of emotion terms can also contribute to understanding an emotion itself as a mental phenomenon by pointing to the nexus of interacting relations between its subjects, objects, causes and means of expression in the text.

A history of texts

The study of emotion terms is conducted in the texts of the Orthodox Office for the Dead in the Church Slavonic, Ukrainian, English, Polish and partly Greek versions. The dominant tradition is Church Slavonic, which is the original for many modern Orthodox Slavonic communities. The Greek text, which should have been the authentic original for the Church Slavonic translation, differs in many places from the texts accepted today. This fact is explained by the independent life of the Churches and their shortening or changing the text for their accepted practice. This state of affairs explains why translators use the Church Slavonic text [Εὐχολογιων 1646; Εѵхологіонъ 1926] as the main text and refer to the Greek text [cf. Funeral 2011] only in exceptional cases. The authored translations are some English (by Isabel Florence Hapgood [Service Book 1922]) and Polish (by Rev. Henryk Paprocki [Euchologion 2016]). The Ukrainian texts are approved by the Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and are unsigned, like their English translations and some others. The collected texts

represent three liturgical traditions according to the accepted and approved editions circulating in the liturgical life of the Churches: first, the Greek Orthodox Church [Funeral 2011]; second, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the 17th century as well as the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church [Εγχολογιωн 1646; Εvхологіонъ 1926; Требник 2018; Требник 2020; Order 2012]; third, the Russian Orthodox Church and the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church [Требникъ 2014; Service Book 1922; Euchologion 2016]. The central texts for study are the Great Litany and the prayer "God of all spirits and of all flesh".

The importance of traditions and the outer history of emotions

The litany is constructed in such a way that it balances the powerful negative and positive emotional words, and the aim of this co-use is the outcome of a calmed emotional state. In fact, the key phrase is right at the beginning of the litany: "**блаженный покой**". The Church Slavonic "**покои**" denotes either the state of emotional, psychic peace (which is transformed into the later interpretation and sense of "death-as-sleep") or the place where a person can attain such a peaceful state. The development of the meaning from physical rest to spiritual rest, death and other mortal associations is directly connected with the essence of Christian theology.

The Russian tradition transformed blessed repose' into "blessed memory", immediately changing the leitmotif of the whole litany. Although the Patristic Greek "μακαρίτης" is associated with a dead person because of the happy memories associated with that person, the Kyiv tradition used to emphasise repose as the principal value for the afterlife and the need to exercise peacefulness in earthly life, even in the most drastic emotional events. Later in the litany, the same number of negative emotions (tribulation, wrath, necessity, dread tribunal) is contrasted with the same number of positive emotions (the realm of the living, the place of light where all the saints and the just repose, unceasing joy). This litany is not found in newer and older Greek official

Orders for the Dead that means the Kyiv translators either used even older Greek manuscripts or designed it by themselves. The internal logic of the text is clear: the idea of repose is essential for the litany, and its authors and performers do not want to arouse excessive emotions in the participants of the funeral. The Russians have modulated the text, but this "peaceful opener" is lost, and this loss is preserved in the translations by Hapgood and Paprocki.

Although these verbal formulae function as highly authoritative texts of the Judeo-Christian heritage, contradictory ways of perceiving and using them contribute to the diversity of intercultural interpretations. In the Polish cultural space, "blessed memory" ("błogosławionej pamięci") is seen as a Jewish symbol: "zikhroine livrokhe". Interestingly, this phrase entered the Polish lexicon, even though Ashkenazi Jews settled on a much larger territory. It entered Polish culture so strongly that Orthodox memory has no place in it, as recorded in the dictionaries of Polish.

Eve Sweetser once hypothesised that rhyming is also a way of conceptual and poetical blending to achieve a very powerful aesthetic effect [Sweetser 2006]. This observation applies to the litany, where the juxtaposition of positive and negative emotions can have a modulating – and soothing – effect on the listener. It gives an additional spur to interpretation: thus, the ideal "realm of the living" is the place without "tribulation"; "the place of light" is marked by the absence of "wrath"; "all the saints and the just repose" because they have the "necessity" of nothing; the greatest victory of the soul is when Christ's "dread tribunal" ends with "unceasing joy".

Ecclesiastical emotions

The sociocultural parameters for assessing the translation of emotion terms were taken from the sociological analysis of J. E. Stets and J. H. Turner [Stets, Turner 2008] and confirmed for translation quality assessment in [Shmiher 2018]. The main ideas applicable to the context of penetrating the semantic structure of emotion terms focus on revealing their correlation with social structures and cultural experience. The aim is to identify how

emotion terms represent Christian experience and values and thus can evoke the required peacefulness during funerary procedures.

The promise of "unceasing joy" sounds like an alien phrase in the Christian funerary text. The similar emotion term "ἀγαλλίασις" in Patristic Greek renders a strong, fervent joy of a spiritual nature, associated with charity, grace, the visitation of the Lord and the saint, and even the Resurrection. The term "εὐφροσύνη" stands for joy after death and the enjoyment of angels. The bookish Old Ukrainian lexeme "веселик" was used to render these two Greek emotion terms. That is why the sense of spiritual joy dominates in the written monuments, though it may have contradicted the vernacular usage (scarcely fixed), where it denotes a wedding. In the early Ukrainian translations, the lexeme "веселик" was used to change people's mentality and make them feel spiritual joy. From the point of view of a thousand-year-old written history of the Ukrainian language, this failed because in New Ukrainian, "веселість" has more to do with frivolity and entertainment than with the Christian idea of life after death.

It is not surprising that modern Ukrainian translators opted for the variant "радість", which is strongly associated with pleasantness and comfort but lacks Christian incorporation or gift. The Ukrainian translators chose "радість", which historically contains both psychic satisfaction and Christian associations, though the Christian associations are not well manifested in contemporary usage but can be considered a successful equivalent in translation. At the same time, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic translation (into English) chooses the variant "joy", which has the features of "a pleasurable state or condition; a state of happiness or bliss" and is associated with "the perfect bliss or beatitude of heaven; hence, the place of bliss, paradise, heaven". Hence, the tradition of Christian joy after death is equally represented in Petro Mohyla's and the UGCC's Offices for the Dead.

The Russian Orthodox tradition transforms the litany and propagates Christ's "оутѣшенїє", which stands for the action of cheering or comforting, which also includes religious contexts. This term expresses an emotion that is not as exultant as joy: it is more

oriented towards the listeners of the Funeral Vigil and does not actively promote the idea of the extreme happiness of meeting the Lord after death. This emotion is rendered "consolation" in English (by Hapgood) and "pociecha" in Polish (by Paprocki), accurately reflecting the Russian tradition.

The Ukrainian and Russian traditions equally appeal to the emotion of fear, though the difference is in the object of fear: in the Ukrainian tradition, it is the "tribunal"; in the Russian one, it is the "throne", which is tied to the power of God rather than the emotional assessment of a Christian. The Polish translation uses the bookish lexeme "bojaźń", which is also used in the idiom "bojaźń Boża", meaning the attitude of accepting the greatness, power and holiness of God in comparison with human fallibility and sinfulness, expressed in the desire to do good and avoid evil. This perception parallels the Christian understanding of non-sinful behaviour.

The emotional power of the tribunal/throne lies in the epithet "страшний", rendered as "awesome" (UGCC) or "dread" (Hapgood). Both words developed complicated senses of fear and reverence from the simple subjective emotion of fear. The religious perception added the connotation of majesty, which closely integrated the subject's threatened impression of the unknown and the desire to express admiration for authority. The dogmatic interpretation of man's fearful state is that God is not interested in simply frightening people but also in manifesting God's power so that people will act righteously. Today's semantic and distributional differences between "awe" and "dread" are not so significant that both lexemes are suitable equivalents for the dogmatic emotion "страшний".

Why anger?

In the litany, the happy place is a place without anger. The listener can easily interpret this as a place where a believer will not be angry. However, the logical implication is that anger can be expressed against the believer. This view has a deep dogmatic background, based primarily on the Bible, where God's wrath is a

synonym for judgement. Dogmatically, God's wrath is not a psychic concept (emotion) but an ethical one (punishment), and it always involves the improper actions of a believer.

The conceptual modelling of emotional concepts developed by L. A. Antypenko [Антипенко 1995:8] describes the scheme of a situation (feelings; cause; subject; object), a plot (retrospective and prospective implications) and associations. Looking at the emotion "anger" through the prism of the whole plot can lead us to uncover an important area of emotional life related to Christian eschatology: the Last Judgement. Anglophone religious discourse has two main synonyms for the angry emotion: "anger" and "wrath". The former emotion is the most general term; the latter is supported by the tradition of translating the funerary hymn "Dies irae" as "The Day of Wrath". The contrastive table of the conceptualisation of the two emotion terms delineates their emotional and ethical essences:

	Anger	*Wrath*
Feelings	a psychic state covering rage and suffering	a psychic state covering violent indignation and resentment
Cause	trouble, affliction, pain	unjust, mean, or unworthy actions
Subject	a human	a human OR: the Deity
Object	causative relations with other humans	causative relations with other humans OR: the Deity's reaction to the believer
Retrospective implications	improper behaviour	sinful behaviour
Prospective implications	injury and vengeance	punishment or vengeance as a manifestation of anger
Connotations	sorrow, trouble	passion
Cases	physical affliction or pain	acts of righteousness

Superficially, the emotion term "wrath" looks stronger than "anger", but its real power lies in incorporating ethical parameters that appeal to such high-authority categories as the Deity, Divine Law, Divine Punishment, and so on. This historical background makes it a good Christian equivalent for expressing the idea of God's wrath for wrong – indeed sinful and therefore criminal – behaviour that needs to be punished. This idea of divine punishment is very coherent in the text of the Funeral Vigil and relevant to the description of Paradise as a place for the righteous (people who do not cause God's wrath and punishment).

In the Middle Ukrainian mentality, the concept of anger / wrath is not divided into two: the lexeme "гнѣвъ" designates both a psychic state, which covers anger and the ethical punishment from the Deity. The cause may be painful relationships with other people, as well as unjust, mean or unworthy actions that require divine punishment. The proximity of emotional and ethical parameters is explained by the predominant place of religious views in the social and cultural life of 17th-century Ukrainians. The idioms "гнѣвъ вѣчный", "гнѣвъ Божий" and "гнѣвъ Господнїй" mean punishment by supernatural forces. In the liturgical text, the phrase "скорбъ, гнѣвъ и нужда" refers first of all to the physical conditions of a happy life after death. Thus, "wrath" is a good equivalent for Church Slavonic and Middle Ukrainian "гнѣвъ", although "punishment" could also fulfil the contextual function of this lexeme. In New Ukrainian, the role of "гнів" as an emotional and ethical amalgam has partially faded: the idioms are not recorded in the dictionaries, though their occurrence is not rare (except for the idiom "вічний гнів"). The tendency to deviate from the priority of religious writings activates primarily the stimulus of wrath-as-emotion, while wrath-as-punishment is not perceived as a result of the judgement of the deceased person's life.

The Polish counterpart "gniew" follows the conceptual scheme of the Ukrainian lexeme: in its historical dynamics, the concept "gniew" resembles the English "wrath" and the Ukrainian "гнів", indicating the semantic movement from a complex emotional and

ethical phenomenon in the Late Middle Ages to a more emotional phenomenon. The ethical essence of this concept is manifested in the idiom "święty gniew", but the Christian heritage of this word is not so often repeated in contemporary Polish discourse. Even in Old Polish, it did not have an explicit sense of punishment, so today, the lexeme "gniew"' is treated as an emotion term rather than a term associated with law and judgement.

Ancient emotions and modern readers

In the prayer "God of all spirits and of all flesh", the place of eternal rest is described in two ways: first, it is "a place of light, a place of verdure and a place of tranquillity", and second, it is a place "from which pain, sorrow and mourning have fled" ("ἔνθα ἀπέδρα ὀδύνη, λύπη καὶ στεναγμ"). The second description can again be interpreted both positively and negatively. Depending on the negation, this description refers to Paradise or Hell. Similarly, some emotion terms can also be ethical terms.

The ancient Greek term "λύπη" contained the meaning of pain in the body and mind, which enabled its ethical extension in Patristic literature, where it began to denote grief, especially grief for sins. The term "ὀδύνη" is very similar to the semantic structure of "λύπη", though it was not used in Patristic writings, and its potential for grief over sinful behaviour is not recorded. The original may suggest the dynamic movement from physical and moral suffering ("ὀδύνη") to Christian suffering ("λύπη"), which is the specification required of a pious Christian. The lexeme "στεναγμός" (sighing, groaning) did not receive the ethical or any additional Christian extension, and in the text, the third word is used for stronger sentiments.

The phrase "болѣзнь, печаль и въздыханїе" in the 1646 Euchologion of St Petro Mohyla was ethical not only because of the context of its usage and the context of the published source but also because of the well-accepted Christian heritage: "болѣзнь" meant both illness, physical suffering, moral grief and – transfiguratively – heresy. Given its usage, it was often used in various religious contexts, supporting the ethical character of this

lexeme. In New Ukrainian, this word has disappeared, and the remains of its usage refer only to illness. That is why the lexeme "болізнь" used in the accepted text of the UGCC pays homage to the Church Slavonic and Middle Ukrainian heritage but is not dogmatic since the basic idea of suffering is not even primarily evoked. The lexemes "**печаль**" and "**въздыханїє**" also contained some Christian associations related to catharsis and repentance, respectively. Their modern counterparts "печаль" and "зітхання" have moved away from the essence of deep ethical suffering and are now much closer to everyday difficulties ("печаль") or falling in love ("зітхання"). The use of the lexemes "му́ка" and "страждання" could bring the text closer to the ethical description of life after death.

The contemporary Polish phrase "boleść, smutek i west-chnienie" faces the same problems of transmitting the Christian heritage as the Ukrainian one. In today's mentality, it does not evoke specific associations with sins or other punishable behaviour. It has an impressive semantic structure: the object or cause of suffering is followed by the psychic state of sadness achieved and concluded by the external sign. Although the external sign ("sighing") can be misleading (its cause can be both suffering itself and loving admiration), it is a very dynamic phrase in the context of the whole prayer. In fact, in its Ukrainian form, this phrase became part of the general stock of sayings associated with death. If Poland had been an Orthodox country, this phrase would have been quoted very often, revealing the Christian background of the speaker.

In the English-language texts, the choice between "sickness" (Hapgood) and "pain" (UGCC) for rendering "ὀδύνη" clearly favours the latter: "sickness" stands only for physical incapacity, while "pain" has the sense of punishment and suffering for a crime. From this perspective, Hapgood's variant is person-oriented, and the option "pain" is a dogmatic word for the relevant original Patristic Greek interpretation. In the history of English, the word "pain" used to mean "the punishment or sufferings of hell (or purgatory)", though this sense is now considered obsolete.

In Hapgood's translation and in the UGCC's translation, the Greek "λύπη" is translated as "sorrow", which has a tradition of being used in translations of Isaiah 53:3, where the prophetic phrase "Man of Sorrows" means Jesus Christ. From this viewpoint, the "biblical" word is like a dogma, and it is possible to change it in order to accept a specific translation of the Bible. In the translation approved by the Melkite Greek Catholic Church, the second word of the verbal triad is "sorrow", which is also used in the same biblical verse, but in modern restricted usage, it denotes a deep or intense feeling of regret for something lost or remorse for something done.

The third member of the triad – "στεναγμός" – is rendered as "sighing" (Hapgood) or "mourning" (UGCC). The two words are quite close. Sighing' contains the component of emotional relief, which can be a word of support for mourners. As "a ceremonial manifestation of grief for the death of a person", "mourning" is stronger in terms of emotional connotations. The lexeme "mourning" fits well with the stylistic dynamics of the Greek phrase.

The analysis of the conceptual matrices of emotion terms shows that in the complicated conceptual structure of universal terms like emotions, and even in more or less uniform dogmatic interpretations, there is always a place for the national perception of the Divinity. Despite their common biblical and dogmatic background, emotion terms still represent the experience of a specific cultural community, encoded uniquely. Historically, some emotion terms have been extremely close in meaning, but gradually, the difference grows. Actually, they were all closer to each other centuries ago, and now they are gaining new experience, and previous experience is being lost. The greater the difference in time is, the greater the difference in meaning is. This can be explained by the movement away from the theocentric mentality that prevailed before the Enlightenment, but the conceptual matrix of the emotion term was drastically restructured afterwards.

The search for equivalents of emotion terms in religious discourse should be based on two interdependent principles of

verification: 1) some lexis is of biblical origin, and it is necessary to adhere to the codes accepted in the existing translation(s); 2) some lexis comes from Patristic Greek writings, where it became dogmatic. The Liturgy derives from the understanding and interpretation discussed in Patristic writings, so if there is a discrepancy between lexical options, the translator should start with Patristic Greek, where the codes acquired new associations. Sometimes liturgical texts contain biblical quotations, in which case the translator should refer to the Bible, but in other contexts, they should be aware of the radical change in conceptual matrices that existed before and as a result of Patristic literature.

This point is critical in the case of emotion terms when they do not designate emotions but other ethical concepts. The standard sample is the case of "anger", which is often a "punishment" but not a "psychic state": thus, the substitution of "anger" for "pain, punishment" can be considered successful and equivalent in some instances of translation.

Concerning retranslations, the translation historian should also be careful to identify other translations as originals that influence the understanding of the conceptual matrices of a particular liturgical tradition. Although the primary original of the Orthodox Office for the Dead existed in Greek, each Church modified the Textus Receptus according to its needs and dogmata. In this way, the Church Slavonic text was transformed into various liturgical translations, and the historian must remember that what is right for one tradition may not be so for another. Hapgood's translation with the Russian mental background may be sufficient for the Russian Orthodox Church, while it is sometimes contradictory for the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, simply because the senses and concepts of related words have different dogmatic interpretations.

The above approaches to studying emotion terms will help the analyst penetrate the exchange of interpersonal and intercultural experience, as well as the subtle beauty of literary communication and emotional manipulation. Traditionally, negative emotions have been more popular with researchers, but the study of joy can

reveal the mechanics of how Christian hymnographers wanted believers to behave morally through emotional modes (such as "calm joy" as opposed to "crazy exaltation"). In religious discourse, emotional balance is of paramount importance, and it can block believers' unintentional desires and tendencies to over-interpret under aggressive emotional states of grief or joy. Similarly, the application of emotion terms to the behaviour of target audiences can lead recipients of literary texts or political speeches from a distant culture to misinterpret the stimuli encoded in the main body of the message, especially if the common cultural – e.g. Christian – topoi are not chosen effectively.

2.2. The Roman perspective: Ancient emotions and their translation into modern languages

Christian funerary rites derived from the same biblical and theological implications: the absolution of sins for the deceased and the hope of a better life after death. Conversely, local rites chose very different points of emphasis to mention during the ceremony of seeing the dead person off to the afterlife. The differences between Roman Catholic and Byzantine Orthodox funerals were intertwined with the search for remembrance and repose, positive and negative emotions, different reactions of the faithful.

The sequence "Dies irae" had served as a recognisable symbol of funerary rites for several centuries when it was removed from the Roman Catholic Office for the Dead and left in the Mass of the last week before Advent. The Second Vatican Council wanted to emphasise the "paschal mystery of Christ", linked to hope and resurrection, and had to eliminate "a negative spirituality inherited from the Middle Ages" linked to judgement, fear and despair [Bugnini 1990:773]. Meanwhile, the sequence "Dies irae", after being a funerary sequence for 400 years, remains a commemorative hymn in the Liturgy of Hours. The emotional intelligence and the perception of the concepts of Latin emotion

terms and emotional lexis are different in various periods of the history of Latin because of the diverse experience of reading communities. Hypothetically, we can speak of three levels or modes of perception and interpretation:

1) the biblical mode draws our attention to the texts of supreme authority originally written in Old Hebrew and Old Greek and later translated into Latin;

2) the medieval mode directs our attention to the Christian poetics and mentality of the Middle Ages;

3) the modern mode raises the question of the ability of a contemporary reader/listener to comprehend and feel all the theological reverberations encoded in the cited emotion terms.

"Dies irae" provides another sample of a paradox in religious literature when the true meaning is revealed "in an act of overcoming the seeming contradiction, or resolving it on a higher level of understanding by inferring knowledge or beliefs, i.e. by actively supplying what the text has left unsaid" [Lederer 2007:40]. Applying their emotional experience, a believer can sense and comprehend why mercy is not opposed to the frightening visions of punishment by fire, but the fear of punishment is a direct path to salvation and relief. This understanding, in turn, makes the sequence more of a mystical text.

Temporal and intercultural distances make the decoding of religious key terms very complicated. First, emotion terms themselves may refer to different psychic states or even ethical categories. Second, some terms associated with curse and forgiveness evoke specific emotional responses which should be preserved in translation. Third, even the names of historical persons have an additional emotional charge in religious texts, while the charge of the same names may be different in various socio-cultural communities.

A history of texts

The 13th-century sequence, allegedly composed by Thomas of Celano, immediately became an important funerary hymn. The first Polish-language fragment of the sequences dates back to the 15th

century, and the first complete translations were done by Stanisław Grochowski (1599), Jan Białobocki (1648),[10] Stanisław Jagodyński (1695) [Strawa-Iracka 2011:107, 124-125]. All Polish hymnals of the 19th and 20th centuries contain "Dies irae" in the chapter of songs-prayers for the dead [Bodzioch 2014:116]. Moreover, as part of the Office for the Dead, it was also published in Polish or Latin-Polish editions of the Missal [e.g. Roczne 1845:2:452-454; Mszał 1874:1363-1365; Mszał 1932:1717-1719]. Gradually, it entered the general literary scene when Polish writers and translators also attempted to produce an aesthetic variant of this religious text, such as Antoni Czajkowski [Czajkowski 1841:32-37] or Leopold Staff, an eminent Polish poet and composer of Czech origin born in Lviv, whose translation became a classic and was republished in Polish Catholic hymnals [Strawa-Iracka 2011:107].

The Ukrainian tradition of translating "Dies irae" is much poorer. Although the first translations into Church Slavonic appeared in the 17th-century Greek-Catholic manuscripts of the Hirmologion [e.g. Ирмолой 1662: 1-1v], this was because the very Church made some Latin influences permissible. The translations into New Ukrainian are brand new texts – by Ivan Smazhenko in 2018 [Гніву день 2018] and by Anton Herasymenko in 2019 [Гніву день 2019], which have not acquired an authoritative status in religious publications and performances.[11] This situation is strange as "Dies irae" is part of numerous musical Requiems, many of which follow the Mass for the Dead strictly. However, no Ukrainian-language translation of any Requiem has circulated in Ukrainian musical culture by now, and the translation of "Dies irae" opens the way for stimulating the appearance of the complete Requiem in Ukrainian translation.

The Anglophone culture of translating "Dies irae" is extremely rich. A source claims that at the turn of the 20th century, the English-language versions of "Dies irae" outnumbered 200 trans-

---

[10] Published in the bilingual collection of his translations [Hymny 1648:279-283].
[11] The third translation was made by Anatoliy Olikh in 2022. It has not been published, but it was approved for liturgical use by the Liturgical Commission of the Roman Catholic Church in Ukraine in April 2022.

lations (for the profound overview of early translations, see [Warren 1904]). This is why only seven translations are selected to identify general strategies in interpreting and rendering the original: the translators are Edward Caswall [Lyra Catholica 1849:241-244], Richard Crashaw [Crashaw 1858:195-198], Bishop Edward G. Bagshawe [Breviary Hymns 1900:29-31], W. F. Wingfield and Fr. Aylward [Hymns 1936:202-204]. As part of the Roman Catholic funeral [Office 1825:85, 87; Sarum 1911:200-202], this sequence also survived in the Anglican Church [Anglican Missal 1921:G122-G124].

Anger for frightening or for punishing

Since poetic language also aims to depict religious experience, it combines two mysteries of religious sensation and cognition – "mysterium tremendum", which highlights the majesty of God, and "mysterium fascinans", which brings it closer to the believer through prepared perception. The terrifying and fascinating – "numinosum" – stimulates believers to search for ways of purification, sanctification and reunion with God [Krupa 2011:13-15]. Death is the ideal opportunity to reflect on past earthly experiences and take a step towards a new and – hopefully – better life. Heaven is usually meant for the deceased, though someone's death is also an important experience for the living to change themselves, their behaviour or even identity. As this happens emotionally, it makes us think that emotions are not only the psychic states of believers but also stimuli for their behaviour.

In the oldest parts of the biblical texts – i.e. those written in Old Hebrew, – anger is a strong emotion, aroused by a wrong experience and ultimately calling for revenge. It includes "all degrees from displeasure and indignation at unworthy acts to wrath and fury" [Jewish Encyclopaedia 1901:1:597]. The cluster of Hebrew synonyms dealing with this violent human passion denotes various aspects of its outpouring, such as boiling, provocation, chagrin, anger and fury, which are anthropopathically attributed to God. Nevertheless, even in the Old Testament, anger is seen as "an element of punitive or vindictive justice in man" [ibid]. One of

the brightest images of divine anger comes from Deuteronomy: "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell" (32:22), which may have inspired the author of the sequence, though in the Vulgate, the emotion term from this quote is "furor".

The direct reference comes from the Book of Zephaniah: "Dies irae dies illa, dies tribulationis et angustiae, dies calamitatis et miseriae, dies tenebrarum et caliginis, dies nebulae et turbinis, dies tubae et clangoris super civitates munitas, et super angulos excelsos" (1:15-16).[12] This image describes the Judgment of Gehenna very expressively, although later in Romans (1:18), the Apostle Paul speaks of righteousness and unrighteousness in a much milder, less emotional but more lawful way. This is the central collision between these two contexts – the clash of vengeance and punishment. A believer's crime can be petty or serious enough to require punishment, but only serious crimes cause vengeance.

Dictionaries of ancient and medieval Latin do not fix the idiom "dies irae", which means that its interpretation in relation to punishment was flexible and required a direct biblical or theological context. The emotion term "ira" implies a fierce conflict, but it can be directed at a person who feels it (just giving it away) or at a person who receives it (another person has to experience it). Thus, the pragmatic goal is initially unclear: it may be to frighten or to punish.

The supporting emotion term "tremendus" works with the aim of frightening, even though in Christianity, the idea of awe remains mainly between fear and admiration. The lexeme "tremendus" is indeed numinous, but the tandem with the lexeme "ira" indicates the perceiver's strong emotional state associated with the frightening.

In translation, this emotional landscape is distorted because the poetic and musical patterns have to concentrate on the key

---

[12] The King James Version reads: "That day *is* a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, A day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers."

ideas and concepts of the original, which means the loss of some important structural and expressive details. In the eternal struggle between content and form in the process of translation, the main interpretation usually dominates over other associations that may still speak to a believer but are silenced in translation.

In the Polish translations, the emotion term "gniew" retains the emotional charge that leads believers to think about their atonement. In the structure of the whole sequence, this term begins the passionate description of the Last Judgement. It can be seen as the emotional perception of the sequence that gives the first hint, and the hint develops more and more (horrific scenes of the dead being brought back to life for punishment). The key tone is rendered literally as "gniew" in most Polish translations (15th-century manuscript, Grochowski, 1845 and 1874 Missals, Czajkowski).

Emotional perception is opposed to rational perception when the first stanza immediately reveals the objective theme and aim of the image. The idea of judgement is openly expressed by replacing the legal term "sąd" (trial) with the emotion in the translation (15th-century manuscript, Jagodyński, 1874 Missal). The 1932 Missal and staff employ the lexeme "pomsta" ("vengeance"), which is stronger than "sąd" because it promotes the idea of punishment when the presumption of innocence is not even mentioned and implied, and this is frightening. The coexistence of the emotional and the legal in one verse makes the main expression even more frightening: "gniew" and "sąd" (15th-century manuscript, 1874 Missal) or "pomsta" and "gniew" (Staff).

The sum of the Ukrainian translations leaves little room for experimentation with words and associations. The Ukrainian translators try to be quite literal by insisting on the emotion term "гнів". They have to reverse the word order ("гніву день" instead of "день гніву") in order to preserve the rhythmic pattern. Smazhenko introduces the metaphor "День Гніву і Слави" ("Day of Wrath and Glory"), which generally reiterates the believer's original attention to God: it underlines God's power but does not stimulate the believer to reconsider their behaviour. By the way,

the 17ᵗʰ-century translation reads "день гнѣвꙋ", so the direct word order for musical performance was possible long ago.

The history of Anglophone translation is so rich that there is room for strict religious translations and free poetic adaptations that show how deeply this sequence has penetrated popular culture. In any case, the phrase "Day of Wrath" predominates in translations. Curiously, it is always a day of "wrath", whereas theologians traditionally and mainly speak of God's "anger". The word "anger" can be adapted into a shortened phrase that retains the meter. However, the lexeme "wrath" has a longer history of describing the relevant context, and this translation variant was not challenged. Returning to the question of what dominates the translation – a motif of fear or a call for punishment – some neighbouring lexemes, such as "mourning" (Sarum) or "doom" (Anglican), support the former idea. The latter option is well introduced later, in Stanza 2: the lexeme "Judge" (Crashaw, Office, Bagshawe and others) can redirect the opinion of despair into the stream of seeking justice, though the emotional picture of Stanza 1 is then unaltered. The variant "Day of Prophecy" (Caswall) has a sound theological foundation, but in the case of the sequence, it sounds more poetical than theological.

The phrase "Rex tremendae maiestatis" expresses the state when admiration borders on fear. This numinous state is well encoded in the lexemes "dread", "awe", "tremendous" and even "formidable" (Office), while the option "fearful" (Bagshawe) lacks associations with admiration and veneration. The Ukrainian variants "страшний" (Herasymenko) and "жахний" (Smazhenko), as well as the Polish options "straszliwy" (Grochowski, Jagodyński, Czajkowski), "straszny" (1874 Missal) "strach" (1845 Missal), gromy" (1932 Missal), "bezmierny w grozie" (Staff) present only the frightening authority of God that makes the theological sense of this divine epithet much poorer and less valuable.

Incidentally, the sequence "Dies irae" is a perfect sample of how the musical mode of performance determines the listener's interpretation: the Gregorian chant evokes the feeling of atonement for our sins in the spirit of the Apostles' teachings, while

the musical patterns of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Giuseppe Verdi lead the listener to the contexts of the Old Testament.

Cursed and forgiven acts

Remembering that the identification of equivalence in interlingual and intercultural juxtaposition is determined by the shared knowledge of the experienced context [cf. Кудрявцева 2017:119], the decoding of the very emotion terms and contexts strongly depends on the more profound dogmatic interpretive power of these terms. This power is somewhat subjective, as a believer's ability to integrate their subjective feelings and dogmatic knowledge can vary greatly.

The lexemes "tremor" ("trembling"), "ingemiscere" ("to moan, groan") and "patior" ("to suffer"), as well as their numerous derivatives in the form of verbs, participles or verbal nouns, all have a common feature: the presence of the emotion of ***fear generating power***. This emotion is not expressed directly, and it partially resembles our usual strategy of using action verbs to describe actual emotional states. A good example is the term "sigh", which is understood both as an emotion term for sadness and as an action verb for physical activity. This makes sense because a person uses their physical experience to penetrate their psychic depths. It should come as no surprise that some verbs later acquired the ability to serve a double purpose by being both action and emotion in different contexts (distinguishing between physical and psychic spaces of description).

This is why, in my opinion, the lexemes "tremor", "ingemiscere" and "patior" are used to demonstrate how the emotion of fear can be exercised. The lexeme "tremor" expresses the highest degree of fear in the initial stage, while in the final stage, when the believer's psychic state is exhausted and calmed, fear is calmed and has less power: the words "ingemiscere" and "patior" (especially the past participle form "passus") show the end of the action when the goal of repentance has been achieved.

Translators have immense problems decoding the personal and cultural echoes of emotional states in intercultural

communication. The transferred physical experience can help them to find good correspondents in the target language. For instance, some Polish and English translators identified the basic emotion and exploited this idea by naming the exact emotion term (Pol. "strach", "przestrach"; Eng. "fears", "dread", "terror", "tremor") or its derivatives (Pol. "straszliwy"). Others applied action verbs and nouns (Pol. "wzdychać", "jęczec", "jęk i łkanie", "zamęczony", "umęczony", "cierpiący"; Eng. "cry", "moan", "groan", "pain", "suffer"; Ukr. "тремтіти"). These variants expanded the spectrum of subjective emotional feelings. In some cases, the emotional word disappeared in translation, such as "patior" in the Ukrainian texts.

Cathartic pity deals with the basic emotion of sadness and the minor emotions of regret and guilt, though its goal is the emotion of relief. This tangled bundle of major and minor emotions is complex to describe rationally. In a state of exaltation, everything is mixed, as in Stanzas 17 and 18: "parcere" ("to spare, show consideration"), "suplicare" ("to kneel, beg humbly"), "acclinis" ("inclined, disposed"), "contritus" ("penitent, contrite"), "lacrimosus" ("tearful"). Taken together, these lexemes paint a complete picture of suffering and remorse. Their emotional links are so close that it is problematic to identify the exact lexical pair in the source and target texts. Moreover, a translator's emotional aspirations and poetic structures encourage wider use of synonyms and amplifications. This is particularly true of English-language verse translations: for example, in the description of "heart-submission", the heart is not only "contrite" but also "crushed and crumbled" or "crushed and dry". In the Polish translations, the exact and short versions "skrucha" and "skruszony" are echoed in the longer versions "w pokutnym worze" and "bijąc czołem".

Of all the translations studied, amplification is the most successful strategy for conveying the impression of atonement in this fragment. It prolongs the emotional tension until the desired effect is achieved. The single epithet "lacrimosus" has been transformed into the phrase "tears and mourning". Even the emotion "fear" is repeated. The Ukrainian translator Smazhenko adds the emotion term "утіха" ("consolation"): "Втішну дай кончину". This amplifi-

cation trick introduces the emotion of relief, which is a symbol of Christian hope, and makes the stanza less gloomy. Theologically and emotionally, it is justified: after catharsis, a believer should feel relief and liberation. Astonishingly, a subsequent responsory of the Office of the Dead is the prayer "Libera me".

Unjoyed forgiveness is what the reader feels after reading the whole sequence. The anti-emotional ending can also mean that no emotion is an emotion as well. This is a normal psychic state after a series of violent sensations. In fact, a new emotion appears: quiet comfort or peaceful pleasure. In this way, the lexeme "requies" ("rest") can be interpreted as an emotion term of relief. In the last line of the last stanza, this word sums up the emotional strain of a believer participating in the funeral.

The original is very laconic and precise: it uses only one noun. The majority of translations tend to use amplifications: Pol. "wieczny pokój", "błogie / wieczne spoczywanie"; Ukr. "блаженний мир", "вічний затишок"; Eng. "blessed requiem", "eternal / sweet rest". The additional adjective "wieczny / вічний / eternal" is explained by the proximity of another but almost identical context "requies aeterna" in the separate prayer "Requiem aeternam" or part of the antiphon "Lux aeterna". The formula "blessed requiem" / "блаженний мир" also functions in religious discourse. Meanwhile, the epithet "błogi / sweet" sounds confusing. The Oxford English Dictionary notes that this lexeme stands for "an emotional epithet expressive of the speaker's personal feelings as to the attractiveness of the object". So, relief in the afterlife is indeed highly desirable, but the very "attractiveness" is quite striking from the viewpoint of funerary discourse.

The physical features of the term "requies" are subordinated to spiritual relief, and the variants "odpoczywanie", "spoczywanie", "pokój", "мир", "rest" and "requiem" are successful equivalents for the activity and pseudo-emotion term. The only exception is the Ukrainian "затишок", which has no funerary associations, and the lexeme "спочинок" is very often used in the relevant contexts.

Earlier, in Stanza 4, the verb "stupere" ("to be stupefied, knocked senseless") can be understood as an emotion term

combining amazement and numbness. Death and Nature will be stunned, and so will believers. However, the effect is not caused by happiness, so this resolution of the seen cannot be accompanied by joy. Most translators opted for the emotion of surprise: Pol. "truchleć w podziwie", "przejmać dziwy", "zdumieć"; Eng. "amazed / in amaze". Rare are the variants of silence (Ukr. "мовчати"; Eng. "struck") and even fear ("horror", "appal"). The case of mentioning the emotion term "horror" illustrates how translators make an emotion term even more expressive by clearly naming emotions, but this also correctly draws the reader's attention to the emotional essence of typical non-emotion terms.

Emotions in names

The text of the sequence is highly emotional, and so are all its components. This is especially true when it comes to deeply meditative or symbolic concepts such as "culpa" ("guilt") or "favilla" ("ashes"). From this viewpoint, proper names can convey some emotion in two ways: first, historical figures have acquired some emotional associations (Jesus as a comforter of the suffering); second, their proper names have become contextually and later traditionally general (Sibylla as a prophet, sibyl who can be fearful). This reveals a translation strategy whereby when a proper name does not fit the rhythm of the verse, a general name with the same emotional associations can be substituted.

David is famous for his psalms, and his title "psalmist" evokes a sense of awe and reverence for his authority, for it was he who composed the perfect prayers sung by Christians at Mass and in private worship. He is also a king-prophet who prophesied the coming of the Messiah (Acts 2:29-31). In the original, David has the proper authority to prophesy the Last Judgement. Rarely do translations omit the names of David and Sibylla (Polish: 15th-century manuscript; 1845, 1874 Missal; English: Caswall); more often, the name of Sibylla is replaced.

The authority of David's name should inspire awe and respect. This authority derives from his royal position, which is evident in the translations: "król psalmista" (Czajkowski) or "цар

Давид" (Smazhenko). The reference to "Psalm" (Crashaw) is not so emotionally charged as to evoke further emotions such as compassion and suffering for sins. Meanwhile, the variant "Seer" (Sarum) is an earlier synonym of a prophet and means "a person gifted with profound spiritual insight" (Oxford English Dictionary). So, substituting the proper name "David" for the capitalised general name can be considered a success, as the awe-inspiring authority is not only preserved but is apparent.

Sibyls are less popular among Christians, though they have earned respect in Christian history. It was the Erythraean Sibyl who prophesied the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the Redeemer and Judge, and this prophecy is recorded by St Augustine [Augustine 1952:483-484]. She portrayed the Last Judgement similarly to Zephaniah and is thus revered as a prophet in the sequence. Consequently, the translation of her name as "Sibyls" (Office, Bagshawe) in some English translations is a textual and historical error. The use of the Ukrainian term "віщунка" (Herasymenko) carries the same emotional charge of awe-inspiring respect for an ancient sibyl "сивіла", but it is less intense than in the lexeme "пророк, пророчиця", whose general currency reflects a much higher status. The Polish phrase "proroczy śpiew" (prophetic singing; 1874 Missal) reaches this high emotional status, though the proper names are not mentioned.

The authority of the name "Jesus" is insurmountable and protective. Although at the beginning of the sequence, the second coming of Jesus is described in fearful terms, later, the very name appears with the epithet "pius" (merciful), which brings the emotion of peaceful happiness observed in the second part of the sequence.

The name "Mary" in Stanza 13 is complicated. First of all, an ordinary reader (especially one who is not very steeped in Christian theology) will immediately associate this name with St Mary, the Mother of God. The person who is referred to is typically meant to be St Mary Magdalene. Yet, the Ukrainian translator Smazhenko comments that this name can refer both to St Mary Magdalene (who was a sinner absolved by Jesus Christ) and to St Mary,

Mother of God (who was absolved of the Original Sin by giving birth to Jesus Christ). In any case, after the Second Vatican Council, the text of the sequence was modulated, and the proper name "Maria" was replaced by the general term "peccatrix" (female sinner). Interestingly, a Polish translation had already used this option: "grzeszna" (Missal 1845). In the Anglophone culture, it was also the Anglican Missal (1921) which indicated "a sinful woman" instead of the proper name. The use of the lexemes "sinner" and "robber" is intended to evoke the emotion of disgust, which will contribute to catharsis, but the last line of the stanza is more optimistic and hopeful: it promises salvation to a believer because of the salvation given to Mary and the Penitent Thief.

The Anglophone translations do not fix the use of the name "Magdalene", while the Polish and Ukrainian translators regularly referred to this option: "Magdalena" (Grochowski, 1874 Missal) and "Магдалина" (Herasymenko). The reason may also lie in the emotional treatment of this name: St Mary Magdalene witnessed all the tragic stages of Jesus' life, which suggests the emotion of compassion. It is precisely this emotion that the faithful seek on the deathbed.

Nevertheless, most translations used the original proper name: in Polish, "Maria" (1932 Missal, Czajkowski, Staff); in Ukrainian, "Марія" (Smazhenko); in English, "Mary" (all the translations except the Anglican Missal). This left more space for personal, subjective meditations.

Perceiving religion as memory is an impressively fruitful way of searching for hidden values and forgotten contexts that pass beyond the average believer's attention of. A thorough knowledge of biblical and theological motifs can contribute to a broad appreciation of any religious text. Funerary texts are specific because of the time and place, in which they function. Funerals usually redirect or disperse a believer's understanding of this text, and it shows different characteristics under different conditions of meditation on it. Translators have a great responsibility to provide a text that will be pronounced, read or sung in emotional situations and evoke different emotional

perceptions. They have to work out a level of explicitness and implicitness that emphasises the desired theological points without distracting from other neighbouring but not necessary visions.

The sequence "Dies irae" and its translations show how, in the process of transforming the text, translators have to replace action terms with emotion terms after adequately assessing the emotional load of the words written or suggested. Hidden emotions are particularly important because a religious text (especially a liturgical one) depends heavily on the emotional, faith-based ability to perceive what religious authorities want readers or listeners to perceive.

One point of dissatisfaction or displeasure with this sequence was that it was too dark and gloomy. Indeed, the emotion of fear dominates the text. Besides, the poetic translation stimulated the translators to use more emotion terms of fear explicitly as they tried to preserve the profound drama of the Last Judgement. For this reason, it was reasonable to introduce more Paschal motifs into the Office for the Dead during the liturgical reform that followed the Second Vatican Council. The ecclesiastical authorities were aware of the needs of a living reading community, which was different from the one that lived under different conditions of appreciating human life and death.

Medieval Latin poetics is very precise and the original author triumphantly achieved his goal of laconicism. His poetics created additional difficulties for translators, who had to adapt the grammar of the target languages to the poetic structures and patterns. In time-distance texts, amplification is often justified. The same can be said of greater explicitness. Every translation is always an interpretation of a single translator and leaves enough space for another.

3. Triduum as a text and cognitive space:
the problem of translating its entire symbolicalness

The Easter Triduum, which joins Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, is the liturgical year's central part of. This period sums up the dogmatic essence of the life of Jesus Christ: divine sufferings unlock human salvation. The texts of the Triduum are imbued with the idea of venerating Christ's Passion, glorifying His gift to humanity and commemorating His acts and deeds.

The liturgical reform after the Second Vatican Council required new translations into the national languages. Some languages (such as English) were relatively quick in producing new translations of the entire cycles of prayer (the Triduum hymns are sung in the Roman Missal and the Liturgy of Hours); some were slower, taking up to two decades to translate everything (such as Polish); some are still in progress because Roman Catholicism is not the main religion of their speakers (such as Ukrainian). Nevertheless, the multiplicity of translations offers more successful variants for further retranslations, and the process of translating even the Triduum hymns will never end. Hence, the aim of this chapter is to assess the possibilities of translation interpretation and choices by applying terms and tools of Cognitive Poetics.

The cornerstone of this chapter lies in the apparatus, principles and implications of Cognitive Poetics, which can be applied to in-depth literary interpretation: "It is necessary to know the principles of Cognitive Linguistics, for example, and have a systematic notion of how language and communication works, in order to be able to provide a proper, rational account of literary meanings and effects" [Harrison, Stockwell 2014:219]. Cognitive Studies can offer a promising and non-rigid analytical scheme for describing the textual connections, cultural associations and semantic values that are important to any translator.

Iconicity is often explored through the prism of sound symbolism, as lexical concepts may not seem very problematic, and the grammatical structures of the source text have to be largely ignored in order to produce a target text [e.g. Cohen, Fischer

2015]. However, lexical means of expression have so many pitfalls that it is worth looking at them in a broad cultural and historical context (sometimes even involving etymological insights).

The figure-ground relationships reveal the depth of interpretation of the gestalt, which is visibly asymmetrical in intercultural communication. The textual image and the prototypical image of the same object are also usually asymmetrical. Thus, it is necessary to remember that "the operations of selective attention [are] fundamental to higher mental processes, which are dynamically structured by a distinction between foreground (focus of attention) and background" [Sinha 2007:1279]. The focus of attention is crucial for correctly interpretating a text (or a sign in a text).

Texts as memory
The Liturgy is a model of ecclesiastical history-making: the events of Christ's life are recalled in connection with moral teachings. Indeed, this approach is the repetition of the ancient attitude towards a text summarised by Horace: "He has won every vote who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and instructing the reader" [Horace 1942:479]. Delighting and instructing worked very well in aural cultures, and since most medieval societies were largely illiterate, listening and easy memorisation determined the success of a proper message and evangelisation.

Symbolically, the first hymn of the Triduum contains the quint-essential term "memory" ("O memoriale mortis Domini"). All the hymns that celebrate the Triduum in Latin [Liturgia 1977] are united by the idea of Christ's death, which creates life, atonement through empathic suffering, pain that brings glory and the gift of salvation. Death is seen as the end of life, even the end of earthly life, but it is the reason for eternal happy life ("O memoriale mortis Domini" (Thursday, Vespers)). Death is even presented as the payment of a price – or a debt – ("Salva Redemptor, plasma tuum nobile" (Friday / Saturday, Terce)), which directs our attention from the present misfortune to the future life, which will be full of benevolence and benediction.

Passions are not presented as detrimental emotional states but with due respect ("En acetum, fel, arundo" (Friday, Matins)), which can generate more hope linked to the greatness of Christ's Deed and Sacrifice instead of creating only a gloomy mood of fatality. In the time of mourning, lament is also replaced by a sense of triumph, as the salvation of the faithful is achieved in the face of astute temptations and is treated as a victory that can be underestimated in the usual everyday contexts ("Pange, lingua, gloriosi proelium certaminis" (Friday, Office of Readings)). The Cross on which Christ was crucified becomes a sign of blessing and a cause for gratitude ("Crux, mundi benedicto" (Friday/Saturday, Sext); "Per crucem, Christe, quaesumus" (Friday/Saturday, Nones)): the awareness of remembering our gratitude to God inspires an emotional harmony in the faithful, who are called to combine faith and despair in the narrative of Passiontide.

Although He is a sacrifice, Jesus Christ is never a victim: He is our Lord ("Christe, caelorum Domine" (Saturday, Office of Readings)) and our triumphant King ("Vexilla regis prodeunt" (Friday, Vespers); "Auctor salutis unice" (Saturday, Vespers)). This vision already motives shared joy and expected improvement among the faithful. The King's triumph is also in His justice ("Tibi, Redemptor omnium" (Saturday, Matins)), and we implore Him for our gifts because of His justice and our desire to be saved.

In the Latin Liturgy of Hours [Liturgia 1977], we see how this consistency of images forms a general picture of suffering and salvation, and the emotional perception ranges between the fear of one's death, suffering and the joyful hope of eternal life, salvation. The Polish official translations [Liturgia 1984:vol. 2; cf. Małaczyński 1985:328] more or less reproduce this consistency, as far as the translation of religious poetry allows. The Ukrainian translations currently being prepared by Anatoliy Olikh [manuscripts shared by the translator (2022)] or in the separate existing translations [Літургія 2007; Великий 2019] also provide an approximate consistency. In the Anglophone world, "Liturgia horarum" exists in two English-language variants: the three-volume Divine Office for use in the United Kingdom and Australia [Divine 1974] and the four-

volume Liturgy of Hours for use in the United States and Canada [Liturgy 1976:vol. 2]. Still, the collection of Triduum hymns in English is different in the two translations. The reason for this discrepancy is that the Holy See does not require that all the hymns of the Liturgy of Hours be translated into national languages [Małaczyński 1985:328]. Since it is permitted to use original hymns, Anglophone translators and compilers used several texts from the very rich English tradition of religious hymns. As a result, the consistency of the Latin imagery varies between the Latin, Polish and Ukrainian texts on the one hand and the English translations on the other.

Iconicity

The phenomenon of iconicity was already described in the writings of Charles Peirce, who defined the "icon" as the closest concrete experience of our senses, the "index" is one step removed, and the "symbol" is the most abstract: thus, "the skull iconically signifies the living person, it points to the fact of human mortality, and it symbolises death" [Freeman 2009:170-171]. Iconicity is a ground for masterful religious intention and interpretation in texts. It is enough to select a few keywords to understand how one word is essential in discarding the rest of the intended message.

Word	Icon	Index	Symbol
Lingua (tongue)	Human beings	Speech	Glorification
Vexillum (banner)	Army or Authority tool	Service	Victory; Foundation of a colony
Pellicanus (pelican)	Caring being	Mercy at one's own expanse	Inclination to sacrifice

In the Bible, the tongue often represents a language or an utterance. So, the tongue is also a bearer of God's message (in the language of a prophet) or a message to God (in the language of a believer). Tongues can mean not only many speakers of one language but also speakers of many languages or the languages themselves. In the phrase "Pange, lingua, gloriosi", the translators have chosen a variant between an interpretation of collectivity (many nations speak) or an interpretation of individuality (one

individual believer speaks). While the Polish, some Ukrainian and 1974 English translations do not interfere with further cognitive space, being relevant for interpretation, the 2018 Ukrainian and 1975 English translations followed the opposite path: the phrase "язик людський" denotes the whole of humanity, and the expression "I shall praise" focuses the reader's attention on the personality of the speaker. The Latin verb "pango" does not have any glorifying associations but is limited to composing poems, which can be of various orientations. Glorification is thus encoded in the keyword "lingua" and is manifested openly in the following adjective "gloriosus". The presence of words which clearly indicate a glorifying song (Eng. "praise glory", Pol. "sławić", Ukr. "славити", "оспівувати") draws the associations of glorification from "tongue" to itself, and its cognitive symbolism is not so effective in the translations.

Banners have been symbols of the highest authority which could possess a territory (placing a banner in a territory meant that the territory was handed over to the possession of the owner of the banner). Jesus' victory is closely associated with the final possession of the souls of good Christians (possession is loosely associated with salvation, but God's possession and the Devil's possession are different). The banners themselves may also represent the Triumphant Church (in Heaven). In the translations, all variants (Eng. "banner", Pol. "sztandar", Ukr. "хоругва" and "знамено") successfully render the formal image of a battle flag, and its symbolic aim is closely linked to victory, though it can also mean divine assistance, personal strength and authoritative dictum.

In Catholic symbolism, the pelican is viewed as a bird that feeds its young with its own blood, symbolising Christ's sacrifice for humankind. The original story was of Egyptian origin and mentioned a different bird, but in Catholicism, this image of sacrificial mercy was known and revered, partly because of its direct association with blood in the context of the Last Supper and Holy Communion. This image is well known in English literature, so the expression "pelican of heaven" is easily interpreted as a metaphor for Jesus. In Polish literature and folk culture, this image is not very popular, and the Polish translator decided to avoid it

(this decision was followed by the Ukrainian translator Kostiantyn Smal). This image is less known in Ukrainian sacred art, although Olikh decided to preserve it because of his experience of observing it in Ukrainian Roman Catholic churches. His experience is shared by some Catholics, but most Ukrainians will have difficulty identifying the first stage of the intended iconicity.

Incidentally, "klepsydra" (hourglass) also means obituary in Polish culture. Perhaps we can speak of the circle of iconicity: at first, the hourglass was an icon of time, which turned out to be an index of flowing/flying time and a symbol of death or the end of life. Finally, it reappeared as a new icon of an obituary. A new cycle of indexing and symbolism began.

Figure–ground

The classical criteria for describing gestalt – area, proximity, closedness, symmetry, good continuation – proposed by Julian Hochberg and describing how "the mind organises perception into Figure and Ground" [Tsur 2009:239-240] can be very informative in revealing the asymmetry of interlingual and intercultural communication. They can help reveal zones of confusion where a translator's choice of speaking/writing and a receiver's choice of hearing/reading may not overlap.

Areas can help a translator add reinforcing words (often adjectives) in cases where extra syllables are needed to correct the rhythm. The Cross is commonly associated with suffering and pain (and, as a pre-Christian variant, with torture and punishment), but the Church wants to see it, or make us see it, as a sign of hope. This is why the lexeme "Cross" is surrounded by inspiring metaphorical descriptions: "spes unica" ("unique hope"), "mysterium" ("mystery, mystical essence"), "mundi benedictio" ("the blessing of the world"). They all form a relatively positive macro-image of the Cross. Instead of hurting and making wounds, the Cross is seen as hope, and since hope is mainly associated with light, the Cross also shines (Lat. "fulgeo", Eng. "shine", Pol. "jaśnić", Ukr. "ясніти"). Meanwhile, amplifying epithets appear: Pol. "chwalebny" ("worthy of praise"), Ukr. "любий" ("beloved").

These epithets do not render the idea of the verse, nor do they contradict the usual environment of the lexemes. Thus, they can be considered as successful additions.

Proximity is important because, in interlingual and intercultural communication, speakers of different languages rarely deal with the same objects: even stereotypes and prototypes can reasonably vary in their material representations. A lot of discussion has taken place about whether Jesus Christ was nailed to the cross or still tied to it, or which nails were used for the crucifixion, or whether nails evoke completely different images in the minds of believers, and these images are all based on modern experience. The search for pitfalls helps a translator and analyst to identify discrepancies in the perception of the "same" words in the source and target texts. "Acetum" is a drink made from a variety of fruits. So, a contemporary believer, who only knows vinegar made from apple cider, claims that the translation of "acetum" as "sour wine" is correct. This translation is never questioned by a member of the highly developed viticulture. Besides, water and vinegar (a drink offered to Christ in traditional stories) was a traditional Roman drink called "posca", which was considered a good food along with salted port and cheese. It was posca that the Romans drank and shared as their usual drink, not as an act of insult [Alcock 2006:91], and which was mistranslated as "ὄξος" (lit: "acetum", "vinegar") in Greek, where it was initially unknown [Dalby 2003:270]. This is how, in the biblical context, vinegar unjustly became a symbol of suffering.

Closedness is created by typical experience when a context really matters. The context lays the groundwork for supporting cognitive operations, which can sometimes be misleading. To return to the story of the vinegar, vinegar was seen as unpleasant and painful because the adjacent action word was "to mock". However, in the same fragment of Christ's Passion narrated by the Apostles Matthew (27:34) and Mark (15:23), the drink is described as wine mixed with gall (Matthew) or myrrh (Mark). The mixture of wine and myrrh is a potent medicinal drink used to stupefy condemned criminals before their execution and

to relieve their pain. This was a custom of the pious women of Jerusalem, unknown to the editor of the Greek text of Matthew, who logically substituted gall for myrrh to make the offering bitter and unpalatable to Jesus [Commentary 1978:717]. This is how gall appeared in Catholic symbolism, even though the drink itself was an act of mercy towards Jesus. So, in the hymn "En acetum, fel, arundo, sputa, clavi, lancea...", two of the six symbols of abuse and humiliation are not historical but are effectively repeated in the source and target texts in order to secure the Catholic sense.

Symmetry is an operative cognitive mechanism which helps to perceive the unknown via tertium comparationis and to generate innovative conceptual blends for metaphorical speech and multifaceted interpretation. The absence of symmetry results in such chaos that any possibility of comparison and association is blocked. The identification of symmetrical objects usually involves the juxtaposition of virtually similar things, though symmetry could also extend to neighbouring entities. In the hymn "Pange, lingua, gloriosi proelium certaminis" by St Venantius Fortunatus, the close positioning of the phrases "parentis protoplasti fraus" and "pomum noxiale" makes them a textual symmetry, but in the mind, they can also overlap.

Latin	Parentis protoplasti fraus	Pomum noxiale
Literal	Primal progenitor deceived	Fruit corrupting
English 1974	Man's rebellion	Fruit's deceiving
Polish	Praojciec zbuntowany	Owoc zgubny
Ukr. 2007	Предок збунтувавшись	Плід гріховний
Ukr. 2022	Прабатько піддавсь обману	Плід отруйний

In verse translation, the repeated ideas influence the translator's mind that descriptive features can change their objects. This explains the English translation of the pair where the descriptive features change their objects (with the necessary correction): the parent becomes corrupting; and the fruit, deceitful.

The Hymn speaks of Adam and his eating of the forbidden fruit. Gathering all the descriptions of Adam from the translations, we find the pattern of an asymmetrical line of vertical relationship.

The line seems to be divided into three parts:
man (1st generation; Eng.) ←
    └ progenitor (2nd or even earlier generation) ←
        └ forefather/ancestor (a very early generation;
                            Lat., Pol. and Ukr.).

The broken symmetry between these texts produced different images and diverted the original message of seeing all humanity as Adam's children, even though the same person is named in all these texts. In the Slavonic translations, Adam is a distant ancestor: this vision eliminates familial associations but brings a more pious reverence shown to ancestors.

Good continuation in translation is the expected and justified extension of an original semantic unit: an additional component completes the idea or does not distort the intended meaning. Otherwise, the successful shortening of an original semantic series can also be seen as a reverse good continuation if the intended sense is preserved fewer words. Amplification is often mentioned, and shortening is not so popular, though it can also be helpful.

Religious poetry is sometimes knotty, as in the following stanza:

> Genitori, Genitoque
> Laus et jubilatio,
> Salus, honor, virtus quoque
> Sit et benedictio:
> Procedenti ab utroque
> Compar sit laudatio.

Unsurprisingly, analysts who compare source and target texts question whether these translations are true originals. In fact, the translations differ radically from the source text. The divine triad is deciphered in much more explicit and more typical formulae ("the Trinity: Father, Son and Holy Spirit") than the original, witty metaphors ("Genitor, Genitus, Procedens"). The additional code "Trinity" immediately determines the limits of what the recipient is supposed to understand.

The synonymous cluster "laus, jubilatio, salus, honor, virtus, laudatio, benedictio", quoted throughout the stanza, conveys the dual idea of praise and salutation to God. It makes some sense to

compress this range into two words, such as "cześć" and "chwała" (Pol.) or "похвала" and "слава" (Ukr. 2022). The 2007 Ukrainian translation installs the same word "слава" twice. The 1975 English translation gives four textual equivalents: "honour, glory, might and merit". This variant transforms all the extravagant synonyms into four keywords that more accurately reflect the original amalgamation. "Virtus" does not sound appropriate in the line of salutation, though the English translation manages to preserve it. So, the original concept remains oblique in the translation, but that is the problem with the original.

Cognitive tools offer a rich set of tools which translation analysts can use to interpret texts and assess translation quality. More importantly, they can provide methodological support and practical means for dealing with a group of texts which function as a whole, but whose content may vary under different conditions (languages, books, cultures). The interplay of smaller actual texts within an imagined macro-text ensures the multiplicity and diversity of interpretations that are how believers approach Divine Wisdom through meditation.

The cultural background of translations depends heavily on both the intentions of the source text and the conceptual directions and limits of the faithful. Believers' mentality may interact with different original information components, and the blended interpretation is facilitated by a longer and logical context but complicated by the lack of factual religious and historical knowledge. Consequently, historicism can fail and give way to new myths, thereby ruining the original catechetical purpose.

Cognitivism has defined a number of key terms for its description of lexical semantics. Two sets of terms related to iconicity (icon, index and symbol) and to figure-ground relations (area, proximity, closedness, symmetry and good continuation) are promising sets of criteria for assessing how the religious macro vision can be rendered in translation, with or without the exact naming of the phenomena of the source text. From this standpoint, it is also relevant to circles of poetic texts in other macro contexts.

4. Linguacultural histories of texts: the Creed

The Creed is one of the three most recited prayers, along with the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary. The Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary are constructed from biblical texts and can be considered the domain of biblical translation; the Creed, which exists in two main variants – the Apostles' Creed and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed – is a product of Christian theology and part of the Liturgy. The Byzantine Rite uses only the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, while the Roman Rite uses both: the most popular version is the Apostles' Creed and the text used during the Mass is the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. The Apostles' Creed has some phrases in common with the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, so it may appear that the Apostles' Creed incorporates the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed with slight modifications, though these texts have different histories.

Liturgical texts between politics and people

The texts of the Creed were popular and authoritative in Ukraine and Poland. In 1248, the Synod of Wrocław even decreed that the Lord's Prayer and the Creed should be recited in Polish during Mass [Średniowieczna pieśń 1980:xiii]: this official recognition of Polish liturgical translation was a response to German expansion, which threatened the Polish Church and nation. The earliest surviving Polish texts circulating in manuscript are translations of the Apostles' Creed from the 14th and 15th centuries [Bystroń 1886:352-353]. The German and Polish translations were published in the first book printed in Poland (1475), the Synodal Statutes, which were published in Latin but also contained the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary and the Apostles' Creed in German and Polish, the main languages of the faithful in Silesia [Synodalia statuta 1475:f. 13-14]. In 1577, the Roman Church in Poland adopted the Tridentine Mass, which included the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed as part of the Mass. This opened the way for receiving it in Polish translations, first in the form of catechisms and finally in the first Polish complete translations of the Mass [Ceremonie 1780: 2:198-199].

In Ukraine, the sacred Church Slavonic version was dominant for a much longer, but it was also much more understandable to the Ukrainians than the Latin sacred text was to the Poles. The text of the Creed was fundamental not only for religious practice but also for primary education: it was included in primers for teaching reading, e.g. Ivan Fedorovych's Primers of 1574 and 1578 [Федорович 1574:52-54; Федорович 1578a:11-14; Федорович 1578b:52-55] and Lavrentiy Zyzaniy's Primer of 1596 [Зизаній 1596:7-8]. Some extracts from the translated Creed are found in catechisms.

The apparently first translation into Middle Ukrainian appeared in 1620, at the height of the theological polemics between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The translation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed was published in Zakhariya Kopystenskyi's "Book on the True Faith and the Holy Apostolic Church" [Копистенський 1620:165-167], and this fact is one of many that characterise the flourishing translation activities of the early 17th-century Kyiv Orthodox Metropolitanate, whose translation heritage has not enjoyed much attention from translation experts. Zakhariya Kopystenskyi was a remarkable figure in the Ukrainian polemical literature of the early 17th century. He was also an expert in Greek and Latin and translated several Greek religious books, including "Horologion" (1617), "Nomocanon" (1625) and the writings of St John Chrysostom. This is why the translation of the Creed was not a casual translation but a powerful tool in Orthodox-Catholic polemics.

The 19th century brought more luminous liturgical translations in both countries. The four-volume Missal was published in Berlin, the capital of Prussia [Roczne 1844–1845]. It was a largely bilingual Latin-Polish edition with a function both liturgical (the Latin part) and educational for Poles (the Polish part). It contains the Latin and Polish texts of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed [Roczne Nabożeństwo 1844:1:vii-viii]. Latin was still the dominant language of liturgical praxis, and this bilingual edition helped to follow the Mass in full detail. It was not the only edition in the 19th century: in 1874, the bilingual edition for the faithful was already called

the Roman Missal [Mszał 1874]. Meanwhile, the authority of Latin as a sacred language was also supported in other ways. For instance, several Polish-language prayer books offered meditative adaptations of the Creed to be recited by the faithful while the priest recited the Latin Creed at Mass [e.g. Książka modlitw 1830:28-33; Anioł Stróż 189-?:53]. The fact that such prayer books were published shows that the Polish faithful did not understand the Latin Mass well and often chose an alternative way of praying and following the Mass. Another bilingual Missal was published in the 20th century: in 1920, it was prepared by Rev. Gaspar Lefebvre with the French translation by Rev. Louis-Claude Fillion as a version for France and Belgium, which was translated into Polish and published in 1932 [Mszał 1932]. It was later revised and translated again in 1949 (republished in 1956) [Mszał 1956]. The texts of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed differ [Mszał 1932:109-111; Mszał 1956:872-873]. The events of the 1960s – the last revision of the Tridentine Mass and the introduction of the Paul VI Mass (Novus Ordo Missae) – led to a large-scale project of translating liturgical books. The "typical editions" resulting from the Second Vatican Council shaped new standards, which also influenced the text of the Creed that was later used widely and published in numerous prayer books [e.g. Spotkanie z Bogiem 1983:55-57].

In Ukraine at the turn of the 1870s, a wave of polemics broke out between the advocates of the exclusive use of Church Slavonic as a liturgical language and the promoters of introducing New Ukrainian into liturgical practice. In 1869, the eminent Ukrainian physicist (by profession) and theologian (by training) Ivan Puliui published a very abridged edition of a prayer book [Молитвослов 1869]. Two years later, he published the first complete prayer book in New Ukrainian [Молитовник 1871], which marked the start of a new period in the history of publishing prayer books in Ukraine. The emergence of an independent state – the Ukrainian National Republic – influenced the restoration of ecclesiastical independence in Ukraine. The new efforts began with the Ukrainian-language Liturgy and prayer books and continued after clergy were forced to emigrate and work in the diaspora. Thus, the

Creed was translated by Rev. Andriy Herashchenko [Молитовник 1917:12-13], by the exiled minister Ivan Ohiyenko [Свята 1922а: 59-60], by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada [Добрий пастор 1952:12-14] or by the Ukrainian Catholic (Greek Catholic) Church in exile [Священна 1988:50-51]. In 2021, two years after the proclamation of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church ("the Orthodox Church of Ukraine", 2019), its Synod adopted a new version of the Creed with some "minor" changes [Офіційне 2021]. This fact indicates the importance of maintaining the high authority of this text.

Theory and text

One view of retranslation is that it helps to construct "a gradual move from an initial rejection of the foreign, via a tentative but nevertheless appropriating foray into the source culture, culminating in an idealised move which privileges the source text and all its alterity" [Deane-Cox 2014:3]. Religious texts occupy a special place among other texts: their high status is unquestioned. Their authoritative power is sealed by the emotionality of the worshiper, who treats prayers as a dialogue with God, so these texts cannot be foreign. Understanding Christianity and God has been a successful motto for recent liturgical reforms.

One reason given for new retranslations is ageing. In religious translation, it is the other way around. Tradition is sanctified by time. The Greek and Latin texts were formed in the early 1st millennium; and the Church Slavonic texts, in the late 1st millennium. At the turn of the 3rd millennium, they are still being practised, and that gives them such a unique sense of life and power.

The translation of the texts of power should turn the translator's attention from the spectrum of gradual approximation to the complicated nexus of social, cultural and theological visions. Can we consider the addition of the Filioque as a unique fact of translation from Orthodox into Catholic? Nevertheless, "the most recent retranslation strives towards a reconfiguration of the field by asserting the value of the source text" [Deane-Cox 2014:78], but this only occurs when the whole translation programme is realised.

Multiple retranslations were the result of complicated real-life conditions and attitudes. These conditions aimed to solve problems of domination and legitimisation of a nation and its institutions, such as the Church and language. Typologically, the conditions supporting the search for a new text in the target language can be grouped as follows:

1) political reasons show how a military invasion (Poland, 13th century) or the defence of a "national" Church (Ukraine, early 17th century) can stimulate the need to refer to the Creed as a fundamental text both for the Church and for a nation;

2) social motives reveal that a nation survives various boons and crises, but when the need for a search for national self-identity arises, the major efforts are initially focused on the religious text as a reflection of a nation's worldview (the 19th century, when Poland was divided between Prussia, Russia and Austria, and Ukraine between Russia and Austria);

3) cultural life poses new challenges when the Church has to introduce some religious revisions of its fundamentals both for a better perception and reception of Christian dogmata (especially Poland after the 1960s and the Second Vatican Council) and for an additional legitimisation of its authority (especially Ukraine after 2019 and the proclamation of the autocephaly of Ukraine's Orthodox Church);

4) the historical background cannot be avoided, as every language develops and deviates from its older standards, and this objective mutability is usually not radical (see Polish texts from the 19th and 20th centuries), but the chaotic existence creates space for linguistic experimentation (see Ukrainian texts during and after the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920).

Christian and cultural dogmata

Although dogmata are part of theology, some theologians ignore that every language is a system of codes, and their belief in very particular – dogmatic – senses of a word does not mean that the whole community shares this belief. This view has led to many heresies in the history of the Church. This is why the connection

between dogmatics and culture is not a coincidence but a close and interdependent influence.

Biblical vocabulary is at the heart of liturgical translation. In a general perspective, the discrepancies between biblical and liturgical texts are not permissible because they not only change the codes of religious communication (leaving room for additional and unnecessary interpretations) but can also cause some dogmatic turmoil. The verse "φῶς ἐκ φωτός" is rendered "свѣтлость з свѣтлости" (1620), which contradicts today's "світло від світла" (1871 and all later translations). In the Polish texts of the Creed, this formula appears in the version "światłość ze światłości", which corresponds to the biblical statement: "Bóg jest Światłością i nie ma w Nim żadnej ciemności" (1 John 1:5). The Ostroh Bible of 1581 fixes the lexeme "свѣтъ", which could also have been used in the translation of the Creed. The question remains whether any pre-1620 Polish text (e.g. the Polish translations of the Bible or the translation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed) influenced the Middle Ukrainian text since neither the Early Polish Dictionary [Słownik staropolski 1982: t. 9, z. 1:51-54] nor the Early Ukrainian dictionary [Тимченко 2003:313] substantiate the advantage of the lexeme "światłość / світлість" over the lexeme "światło / світло", even though the first variant was much more widely used. In New Ukrainian, the use of the lexemes "світло" ("light") and "світлість" ("lightness") is clearly differentiated.

The epithet "Παντοκράτωρ" created a dogmatic difference in translation back in the time when it was translated into Latin. Power can be interpreted in two ways: strength or sovereignty. Western Christianity followed the path of strength as it is in the Latin form "omnipotens", which has been translated into Polish as "wszechmogący" since the earliest manuscripts. The same tradition is recorded in the English-language Missal: "almighty" [Roman Missal 2011:527]. However, Patristic Greek speaks more in the direction of authority and supremacy, which was literally rendered in Church Slavonic as "вседержитель" (1574). The authority and tradition of Church Slavonic determined that the main translation variant in New Ukrainian was "вседержитель"

(1871, 1988, 2021). Meanwhile, interesting translation variants also appeared during the revolutionary period, which influenced linguistic issues. Herashchenko suggested "Вседержавець" (1917), which elegantly renders the political tradition of representing authority: the supreme ruler. Ohiyenko initiated a translation tradition which tends more to powerfulness and, thus, is even more Catholic: "Всемогучий" (1922, 1952). Slight linguistic experiments were observed in Polish Orthodox prayer books from the 1930s to the 1940s: "Wszechdzierżyciel" (1931), "Wszechwładca" (1937), "Wszechdzierżący" (1944).

One more case of linguistic experimentation is connected with the epithet "Ζωοποιών" ("the giver of life") whose translations ranged from a very Church-Slavonic-like option ("Господь Животворящий" 1917) via rather a domesticated form ("Господь оживляючий" 1922, 1952) to a well-balanced morphological solution ("Господь животворний" 1988; "Господь Животворчий" 2021). A hard phrase was "became man", which was rendered in Church Slavonic as a single word "въчеловѣчшаса" (1574). The Ukrainian translations hesitated between a Church-Slavonic-like but artificial form "стався" ("self-became": "людиною стався", 1917; "стався людиною" 1922, "стався чоловіком", 1952) and a normative form "став" ("became": "став чоловіком", 1988; "став людиною", 2021). The hesitation between "чоловік" ("man", 1952, 1988) and "людина" ("human", 1917, 1922, 2021) overlaps with two tendencies: one is a conscious digression from Church Slavonic where "чловѣкъ" means both a man and a woman; the other is an unconscious pro-feminist tendency to incorporate genderless lexis. The Polish translations do not show similar ideological discrepancies but some minor ones, like the semantic and grammatical rearrangements in the phrase "things visible and invisible": "widomych i niewidomych rzeczy" (1780), "rzeczy widomych i niewidzialnych" (1932), "rzeczy widomych i niewidomych'" (1874), "rzeczy widzialnych i niewidzialnych" (1956, 1983).

The Ukrainian text cannot exist independently of the Church Slavonic version. Some important dogmatic notions-terms had been incorporated into the vernacular and considered as typically Ukrainian back in the time of Middle Ukrainian: "Богъ Отецъ",

"вседержитель", "въскресенїе", "грѣхъ". The 1620 text contains some obviously Polish words or those modified under the influence of Polish: "кролевство", "збавеня", "правдивий", "вшистки". The origin of these words is – as of today – unknown and, thus, two possibilities remain: firstly, the Ukrainian text could have been influenced by the existing – and now unknown – Polish translations; or, secondly, it was defined by the linguistic practice of the then Ukrainian speakers living in the polylingual society where Polish had an official status. Thus, the Ukrainian text of 1620 emerged as a nexus of many linguistic practices: Ukrainian vernacular, which claimed the necessity of translations into it; Church Slavonic, which provided dogmatic terms; Polish vernacular, which influenced the choice of some lexemes (perhaps motivated by the existing Polish and Czech translations or by common linguistic practices).

The influence of common linguistic practice is a reliable explanation for using some Polish words in the Middle Ukrainian text. The earliest texts, however, reveal an essential terminological feature which can be considered antidogmatic in today's Polish Catholic texts: this is the usage of the word "cerkiew". According to the dictionaries of contemporary Polish, "cerkiew" designates a series of concepts ("group of people", "institution", "place of worship") associated with Orthodoxy. The "Early Polish Dictionary", on the other hand, does not register any specific sense related to Orthodoxy [Słownik staropolski 1954: t. 1, z. 4:218-219]. While the Middle Polish translations were influenced by Czech or, less likely, Church Slavonic translations, the standard term in more recent Polish translations is only "Koscioł".

The choice of the lexeme "cerkiew" calls for a reconsideration of some ideas about the New World Translation of the Bible (by Jehovah's Witnesses), which is criticised, for instance, for replacing the well-established "Koscioł" with "ogólne zgromadzenie" [Zając]. Here a distinction must be borne in mind – between biblical and liturgical vocabulary. The Patristic writings developed a new sense of the Christian institution for the Greek "ἐκκλησία", but in the time of the New Testament, the sense "assembly duly summoned" dominated.

The exciting difference between the current Polish translations of the Apostles' Creed and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed concerns the Greek "ἀνάστασις" or the Latin "resurrectio", which sounds identical in both texts in both languages. In the Polish translations of the Apostles' Creed and of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, made from the earliest times until the mid-20th century, the resurrection of the dead is called "zmartwychwstanie", which is a reasonably accurate rendering of the original Greek lexeme associated primarily with "rising". This very lexeme can be seen as a key to the success story of Jesus Christ when after difficulties and obstacles, i.e. falling down, He was able to "rise up" to success and glory. The Ukrainian "воскресіння", as well as other Slavonic terms from this root, means first and foremost "return to life": this word signifies God's mystical act in which humans are not involved. This is why the goal of involving believers in repenting for sins and earning eternal life is better promised by the term "zmartwychwstanie", which reminds them that they should follow and appreciate Jesus Christ's path from suffering to happiness. In the more recent Polish translations of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (1956, 1983), the idea of resurrection is translated as "wskrzeszenie", which limits the rich variety of means of obtaining life after death to the mere process of revival.

Summing up the lines of historical development in two ostensibly opposing Christian traditions, we face several striking similarities. The texts of the Creed functioned as signs of extreme authority, which had the same meaning for nations and national churches: retranslation activities became active during national and social crises (foreign expansions and occupations). The major ecclesiastical reforms also coincide more or less in time: Ukraine's claim to its autocephalous Church at the turn of the 1920s and Poland's reflections on the liturgical movement concluded during the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. The historical changes in the target languages did not play a decisive role in stimulating new retranslations, but the results were sometimes bright and unusual from the viewpoint of linguistic reception and interpretation.

Afterthougths

In the history of the Liturgy, the poetic factor was decisive for glorifying God, but during intercultural transitions, it was formalised and gave way to the meditative meaning of communion with God. So, this book focuses on liturgical books that perform euchographic and hymnographic functions.

Ukraine is not only a territory but also an essence, so we explored the practice of liturgical translation into Ukrainian and dialects or with/through the Ukrainian language in other languages outside the territory of the Ukrainian State. The same applied to Polish liturgical praxis.

Criticism of liturgical translation – like any other kind of translation – stands at the intersection of related disciplines. Erich Steiner has proposed a good formula: translation assessment refers to anthropology, history, literary criticism on the one hand and to psychology and linguistics on the other [Steiner 2004:87, 98-100]. These disciplines are the key to a reliable interpretation of the liturgical text (and religious texts in general):

– anthropology explains the identity of the text as a reflection of the collective memory of a particular community in specific circumstances;

– history reveals the context of the events and objects described, which are often distorted by the application of one's modern experience;

– literary criticism shows the poetic, rhetorical and genre characteristics of the text, which are the result not only of spiritual inspiration but also of the aesthetic development of the literary community as a whole and of an individual author as its representative;

– psychology focuses on such categories that cause a reaction (positive or negative, ethical, numinosum, etc.) from reading, or do not cause a reaction (and why?), or cause an undesirable or unpredictable reaction;

– linguistics determines how it is possible to overcome the asymmetry of the expression of reality in the source and target languages, and in liturgical translation, the asymmetry between ancient and new languages must be taken into account.

These parameters help to formulate an understanding of the characteristics of the liturgical text that are essential for its reproduction, as well as the "pitfalls" that any translator may encounter.

It is clear that at the heart of liturgical translation is the cultural issue of reproduction. Leslie A. White outlines three basic components of the cultural system: technical, social and ideological [White 1975:17]. The ideological aspect, i.e. concepts and beliefs, is of primary concern. The social aspect, i.e. customary, institutional and traditional ties, is not overlooked either. Instead, the technical aspect, i.e. the tools and their use, is often underestimated. This is why vinegar, a positive symbol of the Roman army, becomes a negative symbol in the Crucifixion scene.

The classification of Georgios Floros, who identified three features of cultural combinations – quantity, quality and value – will also be useful for textual analysis [Floros 2003:69-71]. It means the correlation of parameters of physical verbal content (no shortening and no amplification) and accurate reproduction (no generalisation and no specification). However, even if we find such a counterpart "one to one" according to quantitative and qualitative parameters, we must not forget the category of value. Behind every sign, there is a story that gives rise to a particular attitude of the speaker towards this sign and to some characteristic associations. It is the value parameter that allows for sometimes radical textual substitutions that prevent misinterpretations. Moreover, this is important from the viewpoint of establishing a safety measure so that in the future, new heresies and sects not arise from the interpretation of the text.

Translation is sometimes perceived as a two-way phenomenon, combining aesthetic and ethical issues [cf. Babel 2015:184-229]. Sufficient attention has been paid to the aesthetic side, but the ethical side has mainly been limited to judgments about how much it is possible or worthwhile to shorten or modify the target

text. Instead, here we can look at the issue more deeply through the prism of the asymmetry of the relationship to the text (from the standpoint of the liturgist, the linguist or the believer), and this asymmetry can lead to a conflict between the desired and the actual way of interpreting the text. Here, it is worth emphasising that any theoretical construct can be understood as a tool for thinking, triggering some thoughts and blocking others [Baynham, Lee 2019:13]. Such a limit, which would keep the faithful from excessive and further distorted interpretation, is fundamental in liturgical translation.

Among translation scholars, the question sometimes arises as to the extent to which translation theory and translation criticism should be descriptive or normative [cf. Steiner 2004:101]. For the researcher, the descriptive seems to be more weighty, deeper, multifunctional; on the other hand, for the liturgist and for a specific use, the acceptance of the norms makes it possible to maintain the unity and uniformity of a series of texts, to give them the same dogmatic and poetic weight, to protect them from misinterpretations and heresies.

Our liturgical texts are typically published in exquisite editions. We want this elegance to be not only aesthetic but also academic. What is meant is the need for publications with thorough paratexts: prefaces and commentaries. Some researchers pay attention to the semantic diversity of such paratexts [e.g. Peligra 2018]: the representation of identity, hybridity, truth and memory, the importance of translators' prefaces and afterwords, etc. Our editions typically include a very brief note on the need for such books, occasionally mentioning the originals of these translations. Such prefaces are different from those of the early 17th century when authors wrote about the language of church books, the education of the reader and the philosophy of reading. One must be able to read liturgical texts, and even more, one must be able to appreciate them. Without well-developed paratexts – primarily commentaries – the reader is left to their devices and their erudition, which usually lacks even an approximate understanding of the aesthetics of an ancient or medieval text.

REFERENCES

LITURGICAL SOURCES (in chronological order)

Greek liturgical sources

Εὐχολόγιον 1754: Εὐχολόγιον σὺν Θεῷ Ἁγίῳ νεωστὶ μετα-τυπωθὲν, καὶ μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας διορθωθέν. Ῥώμη, 1754. [12], 460 σ.

Μηναῖον τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου: Περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ Ἀκολουθίαν / Διορθωθὲν πρῴην μὲν ὑπὸ Βαρθολομαίου Κουτλουμουσιανοῦ τοῦ Ἰμβρίου. Ἔκδοσις ἑνδεκάτη. Βενετία: Φοῖνιξ, 1889. [20], 176 σ.

Latin liturgical sources

Ritvale 1631: Ritvale sacramentorvm ac aliarum ecclesiae caeremoniarvm: ex decreto Synodi Prouinc. Petricouien. ad uniformem ecclesiarum regni Polon. vsum recens editum: P. 1-2. Cracovia: Andreas Petricovius, 1631. [8], 151 [de facto: 211], [6], 479 p.

Graduale 1979: Graduale triplex. Solesmis: Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Solesmes, 1979. 918 s.; music. score.

Liturgia 1977: Liturgia horarum: iuxta ritum romanum. Vol. 2: Tempus Quadragesimae, Sacrum Triduum Paschale, Tempus Paschale. Editio typica, decima impressio. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1977. 1793 p.

MIDDLE AGES

Synodalia statuta 1475: Synodalia statuta episcoporum Wratislaviensium. Wratislavia, 1475. [71 f.]

Октоїх 1491: [Октоїх]. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, 1491. 172 арк.

Тріодь 1491: [Тріодь цвѣтная. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, бл. 1491]. 366 арк.

Трьпѣснець 1491: Трьпѣснець. [Тріодь пісна. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, бл. 1491]. 314 арк.

Часословець 1491: Часословець. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, 1491. 384 арк.

EARLY MODERN TIME

Agenda 1514: Agenda latino et vulgari sermone Polonico videlicet et Alemanico illuminata incipit feliciter. [Kraków: Jan Haller, 1514]. [1], 94, [9] f.

Seklucian 1549: Seklucian I. Catechismvs to iest Krotka a prosta starey wiary chrzescianskiey nauka powtore wydana... Krolewec Pruski: Ian Weinreych, 1549. [96] k.

Hozjusz 1562: Hozjusz Stanisław. Ksęgi o jasnym a szczyrym Słowie Bożym. … Item, Rozmowa o tym, godzili sye laikom kielicha, ksężey żon dopuścić, a w kościelech służbę Bożą iężykiem przyrodzonym sprawować / łacińskim iężykiem napisane, a teraz na polski przełożone. Kraków: Łazarz Lazarz Andrysowic, 1562. [4], 147, [8] k.

Herbest 1566: Herbest B. Nauka prawego chrześcijanina. Kraków: Mateusz Siebeneicher, 1566. [848] s.

Białobrzeski 1567: Białobrzeski M. Katechizm albo Wizerunk prawey wiary chrześciańskiey wedle nauki Pana Jezusa Chrystusa, apostołów iego y Kościoła iego Swiętego przeciwko wszytkim obłędliwościam tych czasów barzo pożyteczny. [Kraków: Łazarz Andrysowic], 1567. [16], 386, [2] k.

Katechizm 1568: Katechizm albo nauka wiary y pobożności Krzésćijańskiey / wedlug uchwały S. Tridentskiego Concilium [...] przez [...] Walentego Kucborskiego [...] z Łaćinskiego na Polskie wyłożony. Kraków: Mikołaj Scharffenberg 1568. [8], 439, [28] s.

Godzinki 1582: Godzinki na vroczyste święta, to iest Iutrznie, Prima, Tertia, Sexta, Nona, Nieszpory y Komplety, których Kościół powszechny Apostolski Rzymski na cześć y na chwałę Panu Bogu wssechmogącemu w Tróycy iedynemu używa. Kraków: Lazarz, 1582. [12] k., 839 s.

Agenda 1591: Agenda Sev Ritvs Cæremoniarvm Ecclesiasti-carvm: ad vniformem Ecclesiarum per vniuersas Prouincias Regni Poloniæ vsum, officio Romano conformati: Ex decreto Synodi

Prouincialis Petricouiensis denuo conscripti & editi / Hieronim Powodowski. Cracovia: Officina Archaitypographica Regia & Ecclesiastica Lazari, 1591. [8], 290, [8], **4, Aa6, Bb-Zz6, Aaa6, Bbb5 p.

Hymny 1598: Hymny koscielne: cokolwiek sie ich w breuiarzach terazneyszych znayduie y niektore insze / przekł. Stanisława Grochowskiego. Kraków: Jak. Sibeneycher, 1598. [2], 51, [4] k.

Officivm 1598: Officivm abo Godziny blogoslawioney Panny Mariey: nie dawno reformowane y z roskazania Pivsa papieża piątego wydane / przez d. Iakuba Wvika [Jakuba Wujka] przełożone. Kraków: Andrzej Piotrkowczyk, 1598. [15] k., 661, [3] s.

Powodowski 1604: Powodowski H. Litvrgia Abo Opisanie Mszey Swiętey, y Obrzędów iey: Wybrane z Postille Laćińskiey nowey, Chrystologia nazwaney / polskim iezykiem wydane. Kraków: Lazarz; Bazyli Skalski, 1604. [16], 208 s.

Modlitwy 1606: Modlitwy koscielne, ktorych przy mszach swiętych y inszey chwale Bozey y wszelakim nabozenstwie przez rok Koscioł vzywa / nigdy przed tym, dopiero teraz prządnie według biegu rocznego zebrane y polskim iezykiem wydane przez X. Hieronima Powodowskiego. Kraków: Mikołaj Scharffenberger, 1606. xx, [22], 415 s.

Hymny 1648: Hymny y prozy polskie: W zwyczaynym używaniu y nabożeństwie Kościoła świętego Katholickiego, z Brewiarza Rzymskiego w iednę książkę zebrane / z łac. hymnów na pol. przez Iana Białobockiego przełoż. Kraków: F. Cezary, 1648. 283, [1] s., [6] k.

Ecphonemata 1671: Ecphonemata liturgiey greckiey. Harmonia albo krótkie pogodzenie rożnic w obrzędach miedzy mszą s. rzymską, a liturgią grecką / przez X. Pachomiusa Ohilewicza. Wilno: Monastyr S. Troyce O.O. Bazylianow, 1671. [184 s.]

Officivm 1701: Officivm na pierwszą srzodę qvadragezymy i Wielgo-Tygodniowe według mszała i brewiarza rzymskiego na roskazanie Pivsa Piątego wydane, od Clemensa VIII i Urbana VIII przeyrzane. Poznań: Drukarnia Collegium Societatis Jesu, 1701. [14], 402 [to jest 401], [2] s.

Witkowski 1730: Witkowski Jan. Obserwacye święte czasu rocznego albo dni niektore w roku honorowi Jezusa, Matki nayswiętszey y swiętych Panskich poswięcone do chrześcianskiey

obserwancyi przez osobliwsze nabozenstwa podane. Poznań: Drukarnia Collegium Societatis Jesu, 1730. [4], 600 [to jest 510] s.

Wykład 1743: Wykład Mszy Sw. Jana Chryzostoma według zwyczaju cerkwi Wschodniey / po słowiańsku i polsku. Supraśl: Monaster Zwiastowania Przenajświętszej Bogurodzicy, 1743. 35 f.

Flos 1756: Flos odorem devotionis spirans ad radios Basilii Magni columnae in avita Nereziorum rosa explicatus alias Hymnus acathistus Ad dulcissimum nomen Jesu Christi. Львів: I. Филипович, 1756. [8], 25 арк.

Hymn 1762: Hymn. Akathist do Przeczystey Bogarodzicy Panny Maryi. Почаїв: Друкарня Успенського монастиря, 1762. [2], 112, [6] с.

Akatist 1764: Akatist i Moleben, dwa sławne Kościoła Wschodniego do Matki Boskiey nabożenstwa / tłum. pol. oparte na przekł. Giuseppe Schirò, arcybiskupa Durazzo. Wilno: Drukarnia XX. Bazylianów, 1764. [12], 120 s.

Ceremonie 1780: Ceremonie czyli obrządki y zwyczaie ktore bywaią w Kościele Katolickim w przypadaiących rożnych okolicznościach zazywane: w 2 t. Kalisz 1780.

Mszał 1780: Mszał współkapłański świeckim osobom służący. 40 mszy albo modlitw podczas mszy św. pobożnych i skutecznych zamykający / Pracą i Staraniem Ks. Marcina Kochemensa [Martin von Cochem], niemieckim językiem napisany, potem po łacinie, teraz na polski przetłum. Kraków: Drukarnia Seminaryum Biskup. Akademickiego, 1780. 226 s.

Nabożeństwo 1781: Nabożeństwo dzienne, tygodniowe i roczne, które się odprawuje w Kościele Farnym Warszawskim Świętego Krzyża dla wygody parafianów przedrukowane. Warszawa: Drukarnia XX. Missionarzów, 1781. [2], 246 s.

Nabożeństwo 1783: Nabożeństwo do błogosławionego Jozafata M. arcybiskupa połockiego [...] z łacinskiego na polskie przełożone i Zywot tegoz b. męczennika / Susza Jakub Jan. Wilno: Drukarnia XX. Bazylianów, 1783.

Nabożeństwo 1785: Nabożeństwo do S. Onufrego Officium i Litania z przyłożeniem Summariusza życia. Почаїв: Друкарня Успенського монастиря, 1785. 61 с.

Rożne 1791: Rożne nabożenstwo od świętych Oyców złożone / na pol. iezyk przetłum., też i posłowieńsku i popolsku wydruk. Почаїв: Друкарня Успенського монастиря, 1791. 351 с.

Мала 1522: [Мала подорожна книжка: у 22 ч.]. Вільнюс: Франциск Скорина, бл. 1522.

Федорович 1574: [Федорович Іван]. [Азбука]. Львів, [1574]. [79] с.

Федорович 1578a: [Федорович Іван]. [Азбука]. Острог, [1578]. [16] с.

Федорович 1578b: [Федорович Іван]. Начало ученїѧ дѣтемь. Острог, [1578]. [96] с.

Зизаній 1596: [Зизаній Лаврентій]. Наука ку читаню. Вільнюс, [1596]. [8] с.

Служебник 1604: [Служебник]. Стрятин, 1604. [2], 11, 570 с.

Требник 1606: [Требник]. Стрятин, 1606. [8], 681, [7] арк.

Часословъ 1616: Часословъ. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, бл. 1616. [21], 190, [2] арк.

Букварь 1618: Букварь Ѧзыка Славенска. Єв'є, 1618. 52 арк.

Анѳологіон 1619: Анѳологіон. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1619. [16], 1048 с.

Копистенський 1620: Копистенський Захарія. Книга о вірі єдинои, святои апостолскои церкве. Київ: Друкарня Києво-Печерської лаври, 1620. [4], 317, 308 с.

Зизаній 1627: [Зизаній Лаврентій]. [Катихисисъ великий]. Москва, [бл. 1627]. [395] арк.

Тріѡдіон 1627: Тріѡдіон сиєстъ Тріпѣснецъ С[вя]тои Великои Четырдесѧтници. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1627. [4], 802 с.

Леітургіаріон 1629: Леітургіаріон си єстъ Служебникъ. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1629. [28], 144, 300, [4] с. (enlarged edition in 1639)

Тріѡдіон 1631: Тріѡдіон сиєстъ Трипѣснецъ с[вя]тои великои Пѧтдесѧтницы. Пентикостаріон. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1631. [22], 828 с.

Могила 1645: [Могила Петро]. Събраніе короткои науки о артикулахъ вѣры Православнокаѳѡлическои хрістіянскои ведлу(г) вызнаня и науки Ц(е)ркве с(вятой) Восто(ч)нои соборнои ап(осто)лскои / первѣй языкомъ полски(м), а теперъ дїалектомъ руским выданое. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1645. 102 арк.

Еухологіѡн 1646: Еухологіѡн албо Молитвословъ или Требникъ. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1646. Ч. 1: [20], 890, 900-946 с.; ч. 2: [4], 263 с.; ч. 3: [2], 430 с.

Ирмолой 1662: Ирмолой. Супрасль, 1662. 294 арк. Рукопис: Lietuvos mokslų akademijos biblioteka (Vilnius). Шифр: LMAB RS F 19-115.

Ірмолой 1700: Ірмолой, си єстъ Ѡсмогласникъ. Львів: Собор св. Юра, 1700. [4], 446, [26] с.

Понтификалъ 1716: Понтификалъ си єстъ Служебникъ с[вя]-тителскій съдержащъ в себѣ, по чину С[вя]тыя Восточныя церкви Литургію святителскую, освященіе антімиссов и мира святаго, постановленіе в вся чины ієрейскія, и прочая. Супрасль: Друк. Благовіщ. монастиря, 1716. [1], 42 арк.

Леітоургікон 1733: Леітоургікон си єстъ Служебникъ. Унів: Успенська Лавра, 1733. [10], 259 с.

Леітоvрг̈іаріонъ 1755: Леітоvрг̈іаріонъ или Служебникъ. Почаїв: Успенська Лавра, 1755. [8], 354, [10] с.

Богогласникъ 1790: Богогласникъ. Почаїв: Успенська Лавра, 1790. [292] арк.

19th CENTURY*

Książka 1811: Książka do nabożeństwa dla katolickich chrześcijan / przez J. A. Schneidera ; z niem. na ięz. pol. przełożona. Wrocław: u Wilhelma Bogumiła Korna, 1811. [2], 286 s. (republished in 1817, 1825, 1839)

Złoty 1812: Złoty ołtarzyk wonnego kadzenia przed stolicą bożą, to iest modlitwy rozmaite, które duch gorący na wonność Panu Bogu słodkości chwały jego ofiarować może : z przydatkiem niektórych pieśni przedrukowany. Poczajów: [s.n.], 1812. [30], 813, [8] s. (a lot of earlier and later editions)

---

* With some pre-WWI exceptions.

Obrządek 1823: Obrządek poświęcenia wody na uroczystość Epifanii czyli ziawienia Pańskiego dnia 6. stycznia w kościele wschodnim używany / z ruskiego na polski ięzyk przetłum. Warszawa, cenz. 1823. 29 s.

Książka 1827: Książka do nabożeństwa dla Polek / przez J. J. Siwickiego. Wrocław: B. Cichowicz, 1827. [4], 231, [1] s.

Książka modlitw 1830: Książka modlitw dla pobożnych Chrześcian wyznania katolickiego w celu wzbudzenia ich ducha w bogoboyności. Nowe wydanie. Wrocław: Wilhelm Bogumił Korn, 1830. 104 s.

Nabożeństwo 1834: Nabożeństwo dla chrześcian katolików na wszystkie dni roku rozłożone : w 7 t. / przez Jana Michała Haubera. Warszawa: S. H. Merzbach, 1834.

Książka 1836: Książka do nabożeństwa dla Polek / [wybór K. Hoffmanowa]. Kraków: D. E. Friedlein, 1836. 20, VIII s. (republished in 1851, 1852, 1901, 1905)

Ołtarzyk 1838: Ołtarzyk polski to jest zbiór nabożeństwa katolickiego / ułoż. przez Stefana Witwickiegi. Leipzig: Brockhaus i Avenarius, 1838. [24], 780 s. (republished in 1839 (Paris), 1841 (Berlin; Poznań), 1842 and 1847 (Berlin), 1859 (Paris), 1863 and some other editions)

Śpiewnik 1838–1854: Śpiewnik kościelny, czyli pieśni nabożne z melodiami w Kościele katolickim używane. / zebrane przez M. M. Mioduszewskiego. Kraków, 1838. 378, [5] s. + Dodatek. Kraków, 1842. S. 385-766, [2]. + Dodatek II. Kraków, 1849. S. 769-960. + Dodatek III. Lipsk, 1853. S. 961-1024, [8] s. + Uzupełnienie Dodatku III. Lipsk, 1854. S. 1028-1056.

Czajkowski 1841: Czajkowski A. Niektóre poezye. Warszawa, 1841. XXIV, 234, [4] s.

Muravjov 1841: [Muravjov A. N.] Opisanie Mszy Świętéy odprawianéy przez Biskupa Wschodniego Katolickiego Kościoła / tłóm. z ros. przez Emiliję Jarocką. Warszawa, 1841. 85 s.

Schmid 1841: [Schmid J. E.] Msza święta w swoich obrzędach wyjaśniona, oryginalnie w języku niemieckim / przez Schmidt; a na jęz. pol. przeł. przez J. Szczygielskiego. Warszawa: J. Glücksberg, 1841. [4], 156 s., 36 s.

Książka 1842: Książka do nabożeństwa dla wszystkich katolików szczególniéj zaś dla wygody katolików archidyecezyi gnieźnieńskéj i poznańskiéj / ułożona przez Marcina Dunina. Leszno; Gniezno: E. Günther, 1842. Dla mężczyzn. [12], 786, [6] s.; Dla kobiet. [12], 782, [6] s. (republished in 1844, 1850 (in Poznań), 1853, 1862 and later; a lot of editions had two versions: for men and for women)

Nowa 1843: Nowa książka do nabożeństwa dla Polek / [wybór Paulina Krakowowa]. Warszawa: G. Sennewald Księgarz, 1843. [6], 333, [5] s. (republished in 1849)

Wielki 1843: Wielki i Święty Tydzień według obrządku świętego rzymsko-katolickiego kościoła. Vilnius: [s.n.], 1843. [8], 614, [2] s. (republished in Vilnius 1859, 1862, 1880; Kyiv, Odesa, 1890)

Roczne 1844–1845: Roczne Nabożeństwo według obrządku świętego Rzymsko-katolickiego Kościoła: w 4 cz. Berlin, 1844–1845.

Ołtarzyk 1846: Ołtarzyk rzymsko-katolicki czyli Zbiór katolickiego nabożeństwa / [A. E. O.: Antoni Edward Odyniec]. Leipzig: Breitkopf i Härtel, 1846. XXXIX, [1], 1044 s. (republished in 1857, 1875 (Warsaw))

Muravjov 1850: [Muravjov A. N.] Objaśnienie mszy świętéy odprawianej przez Kapłana Wschodniego Katolickiego Kościoła / tłóm. z ros. przez Emilię Jarocką. Warszawa, 1850. iii, 102 s.

Mszalik 1858: Mszalik polski. Warszawa: XX. Missyonarzy u Ś. Krzyża, 1858. XII, 864 s.

Obrzędy 1859: Obrzędy poświęcenia cmentarza, węgielnego kamienia, kościoła, ołtarza i dzwonów, z dołączonym ich wykładem : dla pożytku duchownego katolików / tł. z łac. na pol. jęz. przez Jakóba Szkiłłądzia. Wilno: [s.n.], 1859. X, 349 s.

Jezus 1868: Jezus, Marya, Franciszek Reguła brewiarzyk tercyarski : to jest sposób życia i modlenia się dla braci i sióstr IIIgo Zakonu Świetego Franciszka Serafickiego, nie pod klauzura zakonną mieszkających, z dodatkiem róznych stosownych nauk i nabożeństw. N. Piekary: U św. Anny na Szlązku, 1868. [2], XXIX, [1], 774, X, [2] s.

Mszalik 1871: Mszalik polski. Mikołów: T. Nowacki, 1871. 504 s.

Mszał 1874: Mszał rzymski dla użytku wiernych obejmujący całoroczne nabożeństwo poranne / przekł. z łac. Kraków: L. Paszkowski, 1874. XXVIII, 1388, XI s. (republished in 1905).

Śpiewniczek 1876: Śpiewniczek zawierający pieśni kościelne dla użytku młodzieży szkolnej / zebrał J. Siedlecki. Kraków, 1876. 96 s.

Nowy 1885: Nowy brewiarzyk tercjarski to jest Sposób życia i modlenia się dla braci i sióstr IIIgo Zakonu Świętego Ojca Franciszka Serafickiego nie pod klauzurą zakonną mieszkających : z dodatkiem różnych stósownych nauk i nabożeństw: książka modlitewna zebrana i ułożona w Klasztorze u Św. Anny. S.l: s.n., 1885. [4], 995 s.

Nowy 1886: Nowy brewiarzyk tercyarski / ułożony przez O. L. K. [Leon Doliński]. Kraków: nakladem autora, 1886. [8], 938 s. (republished in 1894, 1910, 1919, 1928)

Nowowiejśki 1886: Nowowiejśki A. Djakon i jego czynności podczas Mszy ś. i w innych obrzędach Kościoła katolickiego. Warszawa, 1886. 191, v s.

Brewijarzyk 1887: Brewijarzyk trzeciego zakonu świętego ojca Franciszka / ułoż. M. Bartynowski. Kraków: Księgarnia Katolicka, 1887. LXXXIX, [3], 959 s.

Anioł Stróż 189-?: Anioł Stróż chrześcianina katolika: zbiór modłów i pieśni dla dusz pobożnych. 10-e wyd., nanowo przejrzane i poprawione. Grudziądz: Wyd-wo Dzieł Katolickich G. Jalkowskiego, [189-?]. 581, XI s.

Молитвослов 1869: Молитвослов и коротка наука о христіянсько-католицкой вірі. Відень: Вид. оо. Мехітаристів, 1869. 16 с.

Молитовник 1871: Молитовник для руського народу. 2-е вид., побільшене. Відень, 1871. 245 с. (Republished as Volume 3 of *Writings* by Ivan Puliui in Kyiv, 1997).

Народный 1878: Народный рускій молитвенникъ. Львôвъ, 1878. viii, 484, [4] с. (Another abridged edition and an edition for children in the same city and year)

Збôрникъ 1898: Збôрникъ пѣсней церковныхъ / зôбравъ о. Омелян Козаневичъ. Жовква: Печатня ОО. Василіянъ, 1898. 1-214, 315-355, iv, 16 с.

Дорога 1902: Дорога крестна или провôдникъ по Кальваріи пацлавской. Перемышль, 1902. 236, iv с.

Псалтиря 1904: Псалтиря розширена въ дусѣ христіянськои молитвы и церковного богослуженя / на основѣ выкладôвъ М. Вольтера, Р. Белярмина и В. Райшля уложивъ А. Слюсарчукъ. Жовква: Печатня оо. Василіянъ, 1904. 526 с.

Служебник 1910: Служебник і збірник церковних пісний / зібрав і уложив І. Бодруґ. Нью-Йорк: Союз, 1910. 48 с.

Пѣсенникъ 1913: Пѣсенникъ или собраніє пѣсней. Ужгород: Уніон, 1913. 367 с.

20th and 21st CENTURY

Polish Roman Catholic Church

Wianek 1904: Wianek nabożeństw odprawionych w ciągu roku kościelnego / zebr. i ułożył S. Siatka. Chicago: [s.n.], 1904. 95 s. (republished in 1924)

Catechismus 1910: Catechismus: to jest nauka barzo pożyteczna każdemu wiernemu krześcijaninowi, jako sie ma w zakonie Bożym a w wierze i w dobrych uczynkach sprawować, 1543 r. / Urbanus Rhegius; tłum. Mikołaj Rej; wyd. F. J. Pułaski. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1910. [vi], 176, [2] s.

Nabożeństwo 1910: Nabożeństwo żałobne: obrzędy kościelne, wigilie, spiewy i modlitwy przy pogrzebie osób dorosłych oraz inne nabożeństwa, modlitwy i pieśni za dusze w czyścu cierpiące / zebr. Józef Bielicki. Pelplin: Pielgrzym, 1910. [3], 138 s.

Mały 1912: Mały mszalik: książka do nabożeństwa ułożona według kościelnych modlitw / przez H. D. [Helena Darowska?]. Kraków, 1912. [4], 718 s.

Święcenia 1916: Święcenia kapłańskie czyli Modlitwy i obrzędy kościelne przy udzielaniu św. Sakramentu kapłaństwa: dla ludu wiernego / przetł. i objaśnił J. K. [Jan Korzonkiewicz]. Kraków, 1916. 79 s. (republished in 1926)

Śpiewnik 1919: Śpiewnik kościelny / wydał W. Gieburowski. Poznań, 1919. 74, [4] s. (republished in 1920, 1922, 1926, 1929, 1938, 1947)

Mszał 1924: Mszał maryawicki : porządek mszy świętych. S.l., ca 1924. 742 s.

Mszał 1925: Mszał rzymski w skróceniu / wydany z rozporzą- dzenia Jego Eminencji Edmunda kardynała Dalbora przez A. Żych-

lińskiego. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1925. [4], 629 s. (republished in 1928, 1931, 1935)

Życie 1925: Życie chrześcijanina w obrzędach Kościoła : modlitewnik liturgiczny / ułożył K. Thullie. Wyd. dla młodzieży. Lviv: Książnica-Atlas, 1925. VII, [1], 668 s. (republished in 1928, 1935)

Rytuał 1926: Rytuał maryawicki wraz z katechizmem. Płock, 1926. 60 s.

Obrzędy 1931: Obrzędy chrztu świętego / z rytuału rzymskiego przeł. i objaśnił Jan Korzonkiewicz. Kraków: "Mysterium Christi," 1931. 23 s. (republished in 1938)

Hymny 1932: Hymny kościelne / w nowym przekł. T. Kary-łowskiego; z przedm. S. Windakiewicza. Kraków: Wydaw. Księży Jezuitów, 1932. 334 s. (republished in Warsaw, 1978)

Mszał 1932: Mszał rzymski z dodaniem nabożeństw nieszpornych / oprac. G. Lefebvre; przekł. pol. popr. S. Świetlicki i H. Nowacki. Bruges: Opactwo Św. Andrzeja, 1934. 1934, 78, [2], 19, [1], 25, [3], 63, [1] s. (republished in 1949, 1956)

Ciebie 1934: Ciebie Boga chwalimy: książka do nabożeństwa liturgicznego i pieśni religijne / oprac. St. Tworkowski. Warszawa, 1934. 704, [8] s. (a lot of reeditions)

Mszał 1935a: Mszał niedzielny i świąteczny / zebr., zest., uwagami i objaśnieniami poprzedził M. Kordel. Kraków: Mysterium Christi, 1935. 639 s. (enlarged edition in 1936)

Mszał 1935b: Mszał Rzymski na niedziele i święta I i II klasy Roku Kościelnego / w języku łac. i pol. oprac. ks. dr. G. Szmyd. Lviv, 1935. XIV, 1374, [2] s. (republished in Częstochowa, 2019)

Mszał 1937: Mszał na niedziele i na główne święta roku kościelnego z dodatkiem błogosławieństwa, nieszporów, komplety i niektórych modlitw / przejrzał M. Kordel. Turnhout: Brepols, 1937. 442 s.

Mszał 1938: Mszał rzymski na niedziele i święta / komentarz liturgiczno-ascetyczny oprac. J. Wojtukiewicz. Vilnius, 1938. VIII, 48, 576 s.

Mój 1940: Mój niedzielny mszalik czyli Najłatwiejszy sposób słuchania mszy św. wraz z wyjaśnieniem jej liturgicznym na każdą niedzielę i święto: łacino-polskie wydanie, także msza św. z dialogiem / ułożył, oprac. i wyd. J. F. Stedman; przetł.

A. Syski. Brooklyn, N. Y, 1940. 352 s. (republished in 1945, 1947 and later)

Mszał 1942: Mszał rzymski w skróceniu : z dodaniem nieszporów niedzielnych oraz najważniejszych litanij i różnych modlitw. Londyn: F. Mildner, 1942. 564 s.

Wianek 1945: Wianek nabożeństw odprawianych w ciągu roku kościelnego, z dodaniem rytualiku parafialnego (ex rituali romano) / zebrał i ułożył Franciszek S. Uzdrowski. Wyd. 3 popr. Chicago, IL: Spółka Wydawnicza Polska, 1945. 215 s. (republished in 1958)

Mszał 1947: Mszał na niedziele i święta / oprac. R. Tomanek; przedm.: S. Adamski et al. Katowice: Księgarnia Św. Jacka, 1947. XXXVI, 536 s. (republished in 1950)

Mszalik 1948: Mszalik niedzielny / oprac. R. Tomanek. Katowice: Księgarnia Św. Jacka, 1948. XXXVI, 440 s. (republished in 1956, 1959)

Mszalik 1949: Mszalik rzymski na niedziele i święta oraz ważniejsze uroczystości w ciągu roku / Stan. Wójcik. Wrocław: OO. Redemptoryści, 1949. 832 s.

Mszał 1954: Mszał niedzielny i świąteczny / oprac. Jan Wierusz-Kowalski. Warszawa: Pax, 1954. 952 s. (republished in 1956)

Mszał 1956: Mszał Rzymski z dodaniem nabożeństw nieszpornych / [oprac.] G. Lefebvre; przekład pol. oprac. mnisi opactwa w Tyńcu. Tyniec: Opactwo ŚŚ. Piotra i Pawła; Bruges: Opactwo Św. Andrzeja, [1956]. 1847, [317], 63*, (26) s.

Mszał 1957: Mszał / oprac. R. Tomanek. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Kurii Diecezjalnej, 1957. XL, 904 s.

Przekład 1958: Przekład Ordo Missae ustalony przez Komisję Liturgiczną Episkopatu do modlitewników i publicznego używania w Kościele // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1958. Nr. 5. S. 369-383.

Mszał 1959: Mszał niedzielny: msze święte na niedziele i główne święta roku kościelnego / opracowany przez O.O. Benedyktynów z Tyńca. Torino: Editrice Marietti, 1959. 999, [1] s.

Collectio 1963: Collectio rituum continens excerpta e rituali Romano ecclesiis Poloniae adaptato / przedm. S. Wyszyński. Katowice: Kuria Diecezjalna, 1963. 444 s.

Mszał 1963: Mszał rzymski / przekł. i objaśn. oprac. benedyktyni z opactwa tynieckiego. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1963. 1520 s. (republished in 2012)

Mszał 1968: Mszał rzymski łacińsko-polski. Paris: Ed. du Dialogue, 1968. XV, [1], 495, [1] 496, 175 s. (2nd corrected edition in 1970)

Obrzędy 1972: Obrzędy chrztu dzieci według Rytuału Rzymskiego. Katowice: Wyd-wo Kurii Diecezjalnej, 1972. 119 s. (republished in 1987, 1992, 1994 and other later editions)

Obrzędy 1974a: Obrzędy bierzmowania. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1974. 39 s.

Obrzędy 1974b: Obrzędy sakramentu małżeństwa dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich. Katowice: Wydaw. Kurii Diecezjalnej; Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1974. 109 s. (republished in 1996, 2015, 2017, 2021)

Obrzędy 1975: Obrzędy bierzmowania według Pontyfikatu Rzymskiego. Katowice: Wyd-wo Kurii Diecezjalnej, 1975. 103 s. (republished in 2015, 2019)

Obrzędy 1977: Obrzędy pogrzebu: dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1977. 318 s. (republished in 1991, 2002, 2010, 2010, 2017, 2021)

Sakramenty 1978: Sakramenty chorych: obrzędy i duszpasterstwo. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1978. 239 s. (republished in 1980, 1998, 2014, 2015, 2017, 2021)

Agenda 1981: Agenda liturgiczna Diecezji Opolskiej: nabożeństwa, poświecenia i błogosławieństwa / oprac. zbior. Diecezjalnej Komisji Liturgicznej; red. oprac. H. J. Sobeczko. Opole: Wyd-wo Św. Krzyża, 1981. 628 s.

Obrzędy 1981: Obrzędy pokuty: dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1981. 238 s. (republished in 1996, 2014)

Liturgia 1982-1988: Liturgia godzin: codzienna modlitwa Ludu Bożego: w 4 t. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1982-1988. (republished in 2006, 2020)

Spotkanie z Bogiem 1983: Spotkanie z Bogiem: Modlitewnik dla osób starszych, samotnych i cierpiących / [oprac.] S. Pruś. Wyd. 15-e, popraw. i uzupeł. Warszawa, 1983. 646 s.

Komunia 1985: Komunia święta i kult tajemnicy eucharystycznej poza Mszą świętą : dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1985. 71 s.

Mszał 1986: Mszał rzymski dla diecezji polskich / tł. z łac. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1986. 1385 s. (wiele liczb.)

Obrzędy 1988: Obrzędy chrześcijańskiego wtajemniczenia dorosłych: dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1988. 203 s. (republished in 2020)

Obrzędy 1994: Obrzędy błogosławieństw dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich: we 2 t. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1994. (republished in 2001)

Obrzędy 1999: Obrzędy święceń biskupa, prezbiterów i diakonów / Wyd. 2 wzorcowe. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 1999. 336 s. (republished in 2019)

Obrzędy 2001a: Obrzędy konsekracji dziewic. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2001. 111, [4] s.

Obrzędy 2001b: Obrzędy poświęcenia kościoła i ołtarza. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2001. 188, [1] s.

Egzorcyzmy 2002: Egzorcyzmy i inne modlitwy błagalne. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2002. 104 s.

Obrzęd 2004: Obrzęd koronacji wizerunku Najświętszej Maryi Panny. Wyd. wzorcowe. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2004. 34 s.

Mszał 2009: Mszał rzymski dla diecezji polskich / tł. z łac. Wyd. 2-e poszerz. Poznań: Pallottinum, 2009. 1436 s. (wiele liczb.) (republished in 2010, 2012, 2013)

Ceremoniał 2013: Ceremoniał liturgicznej posługi biskupów: wydanie wzorcowe. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2013. 461 s.

Obrzędy 2014: Obrzędy ustanowienia lektorów i akolitów oraz przyjęcia kandydatów do diakonatu i prezbiteriatu. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2014. 84, [2] s.

Obrzęd 2015: Obrzęd profesji zakonnej. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2015. 148 s.

Obrzędy 2016: Obrzędy błogosławieństwa olejów katechumenów i chorych oraz konsekracji krzyżma. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka, 2016. 22, [2] s.

Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church*

Modlitewnik 1927: Modlitewnik prawosławny. Warszawa, 1927 [okł. 1928]. 71 s.

Modlitwa 1931: Modlitwa domowa i cerkiewna chrześcijanina prawosławnego: podręcznik szkolny w językach polskim i słowiańskim / ułożył dla swoich uczniów i uczennic Mikołaj Kusznieruk. Warszawa, 1931. 100 s.

Nauka 1932: Nauka o nabożeństwach prawosławnych: podręcznik do nauki religji prawosławnej. Warszawa, 1932. 40 s.

Pannichida 1936: Pannichida czyli Nabożeństwo za spoczywających w Panu. Warszawa, 1936. 24 s.

Święta liturgia 1936: Święta liturgia Świętego Jana Złotoustego / [Jan Chryzostom]. Warszawa, 1936. 83 s.

Przyjaciel 1937: Przyjaciel żołnierza: modlitewnik dla żołnierzy wyznania prawosławnego. Warszawa: Wojskowy Instytut Naukowo-Oświatowy, 1937. [5], 300 s.

Modlitewnik 1944: Modlitewnik prawosławny / ułożył i oprac. Michał Bożerianow. Nairobi: Wyd-wo Prawosławnego Duszpasterstwa Polskiego w Afryce, 1944. [4], 188 s.

Liturgia 1963: Liturgia: (msza św. Jana Złotoustego z IV wieku po Chr. / przeł. w oparciu o liczne tłumaczenia europejskie i przekł. filologiczny Witolda Klingera; z oryg. grec. [przeł. Serafin [Korczak]-Michalewski]. Warszawa, 1963. 55 s.

Liturgia 1982: Liturgia św. Jana Złotoustego / tłum. z cerkiewno-słowiańskiego H. Paprocki // Wiadomości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego. 1982. Rocznik 12, z. 1. S. 3-47.

Wieczerza 1988: Wieczerza mistyczna. Anafory eucharystyczne chrześcijańskiego Wschodu / wybór, wstęp, przekł. i przypisy H. Paprockiego. Warszawa: In-t Wydawniczy PAX, 1988, 331 s.

Modlitwy 1997: Modlitwy przed świętą Eucharystią i po świętej Eucharystii / tłum. z cerkiewno-słowiańskiego H. Paprocki. Hajnówka: Bratczyk, 1997. 30 s.

Andrzej 2000: Andrzej z Krety św. Wielki kanon pokutny / tłum. z greckiego i cerkiewno-słowiańskiego H. Paprocki. Hajnówka: Bratczyk, 2000. 144 s.

---

* See also the Ukrainian section later.

Liturgie 2003: Liturgie Kościoła prawosławnego / tłum. H. Paprocki. Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2003. 318 s.

Akatyst 2006: Akatyst do Najświętszej Bogurodzicy ku czci Jej cudownej ikony "Kielich Nieupijający" / [tłum. z cerkiewno-słowiańskiego H. Paprocki]. Białystok: ELEOS, 2006. 88 s.

Euchologion 2016: Euchologion / przekład ks. Henryk Paprocki. Warszawa: Warszawska Metropolia Prawosławna, 2016. T. 1. 687 s. T. 2. 604 s. T. 3. 476 s.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine

Молитовник 1917: Молитовник: Ц.-славянський та україн-ський тексти (з поясненням) / пер. А. Геращенко. Вид. 2-е, без одмін. Б.м., 1917. 30 с.

Часловець 1919: Часловець: (Скорочений для вжитку). Українською мовою / [пер. Н. Шараївського]; Всеукр. православ. церк. рада. Київ, 1919. 154 с. (2nd ed. Kyiv, 1925).

Чин 1920: Чин Божественної літургії святого отця нашого Івана Золотоустого. Українською мовою / [пер. В. Липківського]; Всеукр. православ. церк. рада. Київ, 1920. 113 с. (another edition in 1922)

Всеношна 1923: Всеношна служба Божа українською мовою / [пер. Н. Шараївського]; Всеукр. православ. церк. рада. Київ, 1923. 76 с.

Октоїх 1923: Октоїх (скорочений). Служби Божі воскресні. Ч. 1. Українською мовою / Всеукр. православ. церк. рада. Київ, 1923. 47 с.

Святкова 1927: Святкова й загальна мінея українською мовою / [пер. В. Липківського й Н. Шараївського]; Всеукр. православ. церк. рада. Київ, 1927. 464 с. (republished in Winnipeg, 1970 and Kyiv, 1992)

Служби 1927: Служби Божі в Страсний четвер, п'ятницю, суботу й на Великдень українською мовою / [пер. В. Липківського й Н. Шараївського]; Всеукр. православ. церк. рада. Київ, 1927. 72 с.

Ivan Ohiyenko

Український 1921: Український православний молитовник / на укр. мову пер. І. Огієнко. Тернів: Вид-во „Укр. Автокефальна Церква", 1921. 64 с. (extended and republished as "Православний молитовник" in Warsaw, 1928, 1930)

Православний 1922: Православний молитовник для шкіл початкових мовою церковно-слов'янською й українською / склав І. Огієнко. Тернів: Вид-во „Укр. Автокефальна Церква", 1922. 64 с.

Свята 1922a: Свята Служба Божа св. отця нашого Іоана Золотоустого мовою українською. Ч. 1: Текст. / на укр. мову з грец. пер. І. Огієнко. Львів, 1922. 95 с. (2nd ed., Kholm, 1942)

Свята 1922b: Свята Служба Божа св. отця нашого Іоана Золотоустого мовою українською. Ч. 2: Пояснення до тексту / уклав І. Огієнко. Львів, 1922. 77 с.

Свята 1922c: Свята відправа Вечірня і Рання мовою українською / на укр. мову з грец. пер. І. Огієнко. Львів; Київ, 1922. 290 с. (2nd ed., Kholm, 1942)

Свята 1922d: Свята Великодня Відправа / з грец. на укр. мову пер. І. Огієнко. Кремінець: Вид-во „Укр. Автокефальна Церква", 1922. 32 с.

Свята 1922e: Свята Відправа на Зелені Свята / з грец. на укр. мову пер. І. Огієнко. Тернів: Вид-во „Укр. Автокефальна Церква", 1922. 32 с.

Парастас 1935: Парастас або Велика Панахида за в Бозі спочилих / пер. з грец. на укр. мову І. Огієнка. Варшава: Синодальна Друкарня, 1935. 60 с.

Похорон 1935: Похорон світських людей у / пер. з грец. на укр. мову І. Огієнка. Варшава: Синодальна Друкарня, 1935. 80 с.

Псалтир 1936: Псалтир / пер. з грец. М. Кобрин. Варшава, 1936. 87 с.

Молитовник 1941: Молитовник для православних українських дітей / на укр. мову пер. І. Огієнко. Холм, 1941. 64 с.

Акафіст 1941: Акафіст Пресвятій Богородиці перед Її чудотворним Образом Холмським / пер. Іларіон [І. Огієнко]. Холм, 1941. 20 с. (2nd ed., Kholm 1992)

Великий 1942: Великий Канон Св. Андрія Критського / пер. Іларіон [І. Огієнко]. Холм, 1942. 51 с.

Колінопреклонні 1942: Колінопреклонні Молитви на Вечірні Св. П'ятдесятниці / пер. Іларіон [І. Огієнко]. Холм, 1942. 16 с.

Надгробна 1943: Надгробна Утреня в Страсну Суботу / пер. Іларіон [І. Огієнко]. Холм, 1943. 20 с.

Чин 1943a: Чин Великого Освячення води на Святе Богоявлення / пер. Іларіон [І. Огієнко]. Холм, 1943. 20 с.

Чин 1943b: Чин Божественних Страстей Христових або Пассії / пер. Іларіон [І. Огієнко]. Холм, 1943. 22 с.

Theological section of the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla

Чин 1936: Чин Таїн Св. Хрещення і Миропомазання. Луцьк, 1936. 61 с.

Співи 1937: Співи на Літургії Св. Йоана Золотоустого: на мішаний хор. Луцьк, 1937. 61 с.

Чин 1938: Чин Тайни Сповіді. Чин Сповіді й Святого Причастя хворого. Молитви перед Святим Причастям. Молитви після Святого Причастя. Луцьк, 1938. 55 с.

Малий 1938: Малий октоїх / укр. пер. М. Кобрина. Луцьк, 1938. 195 с.

Вечірня 1939: Вечірня та рання. Луцьк, 1939. 157 с.

Translation Series of the Holy Scriptures and Liturgical Books of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw

Літургія 1936: Літургія св. Йоана Золотоустого / пер. М. Кобрина. Варшава, 1936. 40 с.

Літургія 1939a: Літургія св. Василія Великого / пер. М. Кобрина. Варшава, 1939. 50 с.

Літургія 1939b: Літургія Раніш Освячених Дарів св. Григорія Двоєслова / пер. М. Кобрина. Варшава, 1939. 30 с.

Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church*

Служебник 1941: Служебник. Варшава: Синодальна Друкарня, 1941. 376, iv c.

Малий 1942: Малий Требник. Варшава: Синодальна Друкарня, 1942. 303 c. (republished in Esslingen, 1946)

Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada, including **Ukrainian Academic Orthodox Theological Society**

Добрий 1926: Добрий Пастир: Укр. православ. молитвенник. Вінніпеґ, 1926. 288 c. (republished several times)

Добрий 1952: Добрий Пастир: Укр. православ. молитовник. 4-е вид. доп. Вінніпеґ, 1952. 464 c.

Архиєрейська 1954: Архиєрейська літургія й архиєрейська візитація. Вінніпеґ: Тризуб, 1954. 80 c.

Евхологіон 1954-1960: Евхологіон, або Требник...: у 2 ч. Вінніпеґ, 1954, 1960.

Священна 1956: Священна книга Октоїх. Вінніпеґ, 1956. 195 c. (republished in 1993)

Господь 1957: Господь моя втіха та поміч: Молитовник для болящих та для засумованих. Вінніпеґ, 1957. 48 c.

Віра 1960: Віра: Православний молитовник / упор. С. В. Савчук. Вінніпеґ, 1960. 135 c. (text in Ukrainian and English on opposite pages)

Псалтир 1961: Псалтир і Часослов: Переклад київський. Торонто, 1961. 158, 101 c. (republication of the 1947-1948 Psalter and the 1950 Horologion compiled by archbishop Mykhail Khoroshyi after the Kyiv editions of the 1920s; republished in Winnipeg, 1989)

Чин 1967: Чин воскресної обідниці = Sunday noon service / приготовив С. В. Савчук. Вінніпеґ, 1967. 47 c.

Служебник 1972: Служебник. Вінніпеґ, 1972. 237 c.

Служби 1976: Служби Божі на Страсний Четвер, П'ятницю, Суботу й Великдень. Вінніпеґ, 1976. 72 c.

---

* See also the Polish section earlier.

Добрий 2007: Добрий пастир = The Good Shepherd: a prayer book / Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada. Winnipeg: Ecclesia, 2007. x, 899 p. (republished in 2013, 2016)

Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the US, including **Academic Theological Society**

Требник 1954: Требник. Нью Йорк, 1954. Ч. 1. 264 с.

Співи 1963: Співи на Літургії / зред. і впоряд. В. Завітневич. Нью-Йорк, 1963. 399 с.

Требник 1963: Требник: (Скорочений для вжитку). Чікаґо: Православний українець, 1963. 96 с. (republished in 1992)

Служебник 1963: Служебник. С. Бавнд Брук. 1963. 240 с. (republished in 1989, 1992 (Kyiv), 2002 (Lviv))

Постова 1976: Постова Тріодь. Нью-Йорк; С. Бавнд Брук, 1976. 240 с.

Требник 1976: Требник. Нью-Йорк; С. Бавнд Брук, 1976. Ч. 1. 264 с. (republished in Kyiv, 1994)

Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Europe

Вечірня 1947: Вечірня і Утреня Служба Тріоди та празників подвижного круга. Мюнхен, 1947. 267 с.

Молитовник 1947: Молитовник УАПЦ. Гайденав, 1947. 128 с.

Молитовник 1948: Молитовник для українського народу в рідному краю. Байройт, 1948. 488 с.

Служба 1964a: Служба на Різдво Христове, Новорічний молебен і на Хрищення Господнє. Лондон, 1964. 32 с. (republished from the 1946 edition in Esslingen)

Служба 1964b: Служба в день Світлого Воскресіння Христового (Великдень) і на П'ятидесятницю (Зелені свята). Лондон, 1964. 39 с. (republished from the 1946 edition in Esslingen)

Український 1967: Український православний часослов. Карлсруе, 1967. 248 с. (republished in Winnipeg, 1993).

The Church of England in Canada

Соборний 1926: Соборний молитовник і подавання святих тайн та инши обряди та звичаї / The Church of England

in Canada. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1926. 405 с.

Roman Reform (in Church Slavonic)

Літургіконъ 1942: Літургіконъ сїєсть Служебникъ. Римъ: Криптоферратскаѧ обитель, 1942. [8], 678 с.

Требникъ 1945-1953: Требникъ: у 5 ч. Римъ: Криптоферратскаѧ обитель, 1945-1953.

Ієрєйскїй 1950: Ієрєйскїй Молитвословъ. Римъ: Криптоферратскаѧ обитель, 1950. 943 с.

Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (Lviv, Rome, Toronto)

Ευхологїонъ 1925-1926: Ευхологїонъ или Требникъ: у 2 ч. Львів, 1925-1926. [563] с. (in Church Slavonic)

Голос 1927: Голос душі: Молитвеник / зладив о. М. Марисюк. Жовква: Вид-во ЧСВВ, 1927. 672 с.

Ευхологіонъ 1926: Ευхологіонъ, или Требникъ, имѣѧй в себі чины Свѧтыхъ Тайнъ, благословенїй, ѡсвѧщенїй и иныхъ моленїй церковныхъ на различныѧ потребы вѣрныхъ. Жовква: Видавництво оо. Василіян, 1926. 907 с.

Служба 1927: Служба Божа св. Йоана Золотоустого зі службами ріжних намірень / пер. о. Я. Левицький. Львів: Михайло Гарух, 1927. 79 с.

Єрейський 1933: Єрейський молитвослов / пер. о. Я. Левицький. Львів, 1933. 536 с.

Благодарім 1943: Благодарім Господа: Молитовник для вірних / уклав о. С. Хабурський. Львів, 1943. 264 с. (republished in München, 1946)

Чисте 1943: Чисте серце Богові: Молитовник з літургічних текстів / зладив о. В. Кучабський. Краків; Львів: Укр. вид-во, 1943. 39 с.

Христос 1954; Христос між нами: Божественна Літургія св. Івана Золотоустого = Christ with us: Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom / зладив А. Сенишин. Стемфорд, 1954. xii, 307 с. (in Church Slavonic and English)

Ісусе 1962: Ісусе, люблю Тебе: (Молитовник Першого Св. Причастя) = Jesus, I love You: (First Holy Communion Prayer-

book) / о. М. Щудло. 2-е вид. випр. Йорктон: Голос Спасителя, 1962. 192 с.

Василіянський 1963: Василіянський молитовник. Рим, 1963. 382 с. (in Church Slavonic and Ukrainian); 2nd ed. in Rome, 1982 (in Ukrainian); 3rd ed. in Lviv, 2020 (in Ukrainian)

Християнське 1963: Християнське богослуження / зладив на укр. о. Василь Зінько. Прудентопіль, 1963. 328 с.

Господи 1966: Господи, до Тебе підношу душу мою. Рим, 1966. 76 с. (in Church Slavonic and Ukrainian); 2nd enlarged edition: Господи, до Тебе возношу душу мою. Рим, 1971. 920 с. (in Church Slavonic and Ukrainian); 3rd edition: Господи, до Тебе возношу душу мою. Рим, 1977. 276 с. (in Ukrainian) (other editions in Toronto 1976; Rome, 1983; Melbourne, 1991)

Священна 1968: Священна і Божественна Літургія во святих отця нашого Йоана Золотоустого. Рим, 1968. 79 с. (in the usual and enlarged formats)

Свята 1970: Свята Літургія св. Івана Золотоустого / вживано офіційну мову пер. Йосифа Сліпого. Йорктон: Redeemer's Voice Press, 1970. 61 с.

Свята 1973: Свята Літургія св. Якова брата Господнього. Прудентопіль, 1973. 20 с.

Малий 1973: Малий Требник. Рим, 1973. 358 с.

Великдень 1974: Великдень: Празник Христового Воскресення. Раннє Богослуження або Утреня = La Pascua: Solemnidad de la Resurreccion de Cristo. La Function Matutina. Буенос Айрес: Салезіянське вид-во, 1974. 31 с.

Молитвослов 1975-1978: Молитвослов: у 2 ч. Рим: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1975, 1978.

Священна 1980: Священна і божественна Літургія св. отця нашого Василія Великого. Рим, 1980. 99 с.

Божественна 1984: Божественна Літургія Передшеосвячених Дарів. Рим, 1984. 102 с.

Літургічний 1984: Літургічний молитвослов / Укр. Папська колегія св. Йосафата. Рим, 1984. 404 с.

Архиєратикон 1988: Архиєратикон або Святительський служебник / Синод Укр. катол. церкви. Торонто: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1988. 279 с.

Божественна 1988: Божественна Літургія святого Йоана Золотоустого = The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom / Synod of the Hierarchy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988. 143 p. (hardbound, paperback in usual and smaller formats)

Священна 1988: Священна і божественна Літургія св. отця нашого Йоана Золотоустого / Синод ієрархії Укр. катол. церкви. Торонто: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1988. 147 с.

Divina 1990: Divina Liturgia de S. Giovanni Crisostomo e di San Basilio in Rito Bizantino-Ucraino. Roma, 1990. 64 p. (in Italian and Romanized Ukrainian)

Молитвослов 1990: Молитвослов: Часослов – Октоїх – Тріодь – Мінея. Рим, Торонто: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1990. 1373 с. (republished in Zhovkva, 2015, 2019)

Молитовний 1990: Молитовний Псалтир / осучаснений пер. М. Кобрин. Рим, 1990. 416 с. (republished in Lviv, 2000, 2007, 2010, 2016, 2018)

Халдейсько 1990: Халдейсько-Малабарська Св. Літургія / [пер. з нім. о. Василь Зінько]. [Прудентопіль, 1990]. 10 с.

Вірменська 1991: Вірменська Служба Божа / [пер. о. Василь Зінько]. [Прудентопіль], 1991. 10 с.

Прийдіте 1991: Прийдіте, поклонімося. Молитовник. Рим, 1991. 1023 с. (republished several times in Ukraine)

Свята 1991a: Свята Літургія Олександрійсько-Коптійського обряду в Єгипті / пер. о. Василь Зінько. Прудентопіль, 1991. 23 с.

Свята 1991b: Свята Літургія Курбана Сиро-Маланкарського обряду в Індії / пер. з нім. о. Василь Зінько. Прудентопіль, 1991. 14 с.

Типик 1992: Типик Української Католицької Церкви: пер. з церковнослов. / укл. о. Ісидор Дольницький. Рим: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1992. 618 с.

Благослови 1996: Благослови, душе моя, Господа: моли-товник. Львів, 1996. 199 с.

Требник 2001a: Требник. Львів: Свічадо, 2001. 486 с. (republished in 2014; enlarged edition in 2020)

Требник 2001b: Требник / уложив о. Атанасій Купіцький. Прудентопіль: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 2001. 208 с. (republished in Lviv, 2018)

Divine 2003: Divine Office: Horologion – Octoechos – Triodion – Menaion / comp. by Demetrius Wysochansky [Dmytriy Vysochanskyi]. Stamford, Zhovkva, 2003. 1373 p. (republished with an appendix in 2014)

Божественна 2004: Божественна Літургія з коментарем та змінними частинами: Текст українсько-польський = Boska liturgia z komentarzem i częściami zmiennymi: tekst ukraińsko-polski / укл. о. П. І. Кушка. Варшава: Греко-католицька парафія Успіння Пресвятої Богородиці, 2004. 133 с. (republished in 2013)

Divine 2004: The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship / ed. by Rev. Dr Petro Galadza; Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies. Ottawa, 2004. xiv, 1160 p.

Бог 2006: Бог завжди зі мною: молитовник дитини. Львів: Свічадо, 2006. 288 с.

Божественна 2009: Божественна Літургія Передосвячених Дарів: нове розшир. вид. зі стихирами Тріоді, Октоїха та Мінеї / з грец. та церковнослов'ян. пер. А. Шкраб'юк, Т. Тимо і М. Тимо. Львів, 2009. 239 с.

Молитовник 2010: Молитовник захисника Вітчизни / упоряд. М. Чайка. [Львів]: [Свічадо], [2010]. 268 с. (2nd enlarged edition in 2014)

Требник 2010: Требник: Освячення та благословення. Львів: Свічадо, 2010. 253 с.

Архиєрейська 2012: Архиєрейська Божественна Літургія = Episcopal Divine Liturgy / Едмонтон. Єпархія Укр. Греко-Кат. Церкви. Едмонтон, 2012. 139 с.

Молитовник 2012: Молитовник школяра / упорядкув. О. Жаровської. Львів: Свічадо, 2012. 78 с. (republished in 2016)

Святі 2012: Святі Таїнства – Holy Mysteries. Львів, 2012. 175+175 с.

Господь 2013: Господь – твій цілитель. Молитви до святих лікарів: молитовник / упоряд. Антон Мельник. Львів: Свічадо, 2013. 92 с.

Молитовник 2013: Молитовник матері / ідея Л. Нищей; відп. ред. Т. Ференц. Львів: Свічадо, 2013. 32 с.

Урочисте 2013: Урочисте Святе Причастя: молитовник / упорядкув. О. Жаровської. Львів: Свічадо, 2013. 208 с.

Молитовник 2016: Молитовник емігранта / упоряд. О. Жаровська. Львів: Свічадо, 2016. 95 с.

Рудейко 2016: Рудейко В. Часослов за каноном лаври святого отця нашого Сави: Впровадження. Переклад. Коментарі. Львів: Вид-во Укр. катол. ун-ту, 2016. 238, [1] с.

Рудейко 2017: Рудейко В. Часослов двадцяти чотирьох часів: Впровадження. Переклад. Львів: Вид-во Укр. катол. ун-ту, 2017. 215 с.

Молитовник 2018: Молитовник для осіб з вадами зору. Львів: Свічадо, 2018. 254 с.

Требник 2018: Требник: Чини Святих Таїнств, освячення, благословення, і інші церковні моління на різні потреби / упоряд. о. Атанасій Купіцький. Львів: Місіонер, 2018. 471 с. (1st edition in Prudentópolis, 2001)

Требник 2020: Требник. Львів: Свічадо, 2020. 714 с.

Чин 2020a: Чин святих таїнств хрещення і миропомазання = Obrzęd świętych sakramentów chrztu i bierzmowania / пер. польською: о. Ш. Янковський, о. М. Бляза і о. Я. Черський. Перемишль; Вроцлав, 2020. 85 с.

Чин 2020b: Чин святого таїнства подружжя = Obrzęd świętego sakramentu małżeństwa / пер. польською: о. Ш. Янковський, о. М. Бляза і о. Я. Черський. Перемишль; Вроцлав, 2020. 53 с.

Чин 2020c: Чин Священної і Божественної літургії = Porządek Świętej i Boskiej Liturgii / пер. польською: о. М. Бляза, о. Я. Черський і о. П. Кушка. Перемишль; Вроцлав, 2020. 187 с.

Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church

Великий 1992: Великий молитовник / Всеукр. братство св. апостола Андрія Первозваного. Київ: Воскресіння, 1992. 300 с.

Український 1994: Український православний молитовник / УАПЦ, Львів-Галиц. єпархія. Львів, 1994. 405 с.

Молитвослов 1995: Молитвослов. Київ: Світло для світу, 1995. 718 с.

Дитячий 1996: Дитячий молитовник / Харків.-Полтав. єпархія УАПЦ. Харків; Київ: Світло для світу, 1996. 118 с.

З вірою 1998: З вірою і любов'ю: православ. молитовник / упоряд. Ігор Ісіченко. Харків, 1998. 285 с. (2nd enlarged ed., Kharkiv, Lviv, 2003; 3rd ed., Kharkiv, Kyiv, Lviv, 2007; 4th ed., Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv, 2010)

Парастасник / упор. о. Ярослав Маланюк. Львів, 2000. 292 с.

Служебник / упор. о. Ярослав Маланюк. Львів, 2000. 132 с.

Літургікон 2005: Літургікон або Служебник. Київ, Харків, Львів: [Святогорець], 2005. 477 с. (enlarged ed. in 2019).

Православний 2010: Православний молитвослов / упор. прот. В. П. Черпак; пер.: Л. В. Іваннікова, В. П. Черпак; Св. Покров. Поділ. церква м. Києва. [Київ], 1995 [de facto 2010]. 793 с.

Малий требник: Таїнства Хрещення та Миропомазання, і Вінчання. Молебень до Божої Матері. Чин освячення автомобіля / упор. о. Ярослав Маланюк. Львів, 2013. 330 с.

Могила 2014: Могила Петро свт. Молитви в час війни / пер. із церковнослов'ян., упоряд., передм., комент. Л. Іваннікова; НАН України, Ін-т укр. археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського, Ін-т мистецтвознавства, фольклористики та етнології ім. М. Т. Рильського, Свято-Покров. Поділ. громада м. Києва. Київ: Освіта України, 2014. 183 с.

Молитвослов 2014: Молитвослов українського православного воїна / упоряд. єп. Володимир (Черпак); Ком. УАПЦ по зв'язку із збройними силами України та силовими структурами, Св. Покров. Поділ. громада УАПЦ м. Києва. Київ: Преса України, 2014. 170, [1] с.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Kyiv Patriarchate

Требник 1994: Требник. Київ: Воскресіння, 1994. 630 с. (This reprint contains Part 1 of the 1976 Bound Brook edition and Part 2 of the 1960 Winnipeg edition.)

Служебник 1995: Служебник. Київ: Воскресіння, 1995. 413, [2] с. (republished 1999, 2006, 2011, 2012, 2016)

Акафістник 2000: Акафістник / упоряд. о. Роман Братковецький. Б.м.: Всеукр. вид. православ. місія, 2000. 813 с.

Требник 2000: Требник: у 2 ч. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2000. (republished in 2006, 2013)

Часослов 2000: Часослов. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2000. 391 с. (republished in 2006, 2013)

Воскресний 2001: Воскресний октоїх і Загальна мінея. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2001. 694 с.

Богослужіння 2002: Богослужіння на Світлий тиждень Пасхи. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2002. 166 с. (republished in 2012)

Святкова 2002–2003: Святкова Мінея: у 2 ч. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2002–2003.

Тріодь 2002a: Тріодь постова: у 2 ч. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2002. 696 с. (republished in 2005, 2015)

Тріодь 2002b: Тріодь квітна: у 2 ч. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2002. (republished in 2005)

Псалтир 2004: Псалтир. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2004. 440 с. (republished in 2006, 2008, 2009)

Чиновник 2005: Чиновник Архиєрейського священнослужіння. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2005. 495 с.

Октоїх 2006: Октоїх: у 2 ч. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2006.

Акафістник 2007: Акафістник: у 3 т. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2007. (republished in 2011-2012)

Перший 2012: Перший тиждень Великого Посту: у 2 ч. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2012.

Смотрицький 2015: Смотрицький Мелетій. Тренос, або Плач Єдиної Святої Помісної Апостольської Східної Церкви з поясненням догматів віри… = ΘΡΗΝΟΣ to jest Lament jedynej św. Powszechnej Apostolskiej Wschodniej Cerkwi, z objaśnieniem Dogmatów Wiary… / пер. із старопол., слов. та передм. Р. Радишевського. Київ: Талком, 2015. 559 с.

Мінея 2018–2022: Мінея: [у 22 кн.]. Київ: Вид. від. УПЦ КП, 2018–2022.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate

Єлєцкіх 2006: (Єлєцкіх) Іонафан. Божественна Літургія святителів Іоанна Златоуста та Василія Великого українською мовою: тлумачний путівник Божественною Літургією з коротким історико-богословським коментарем. Молитви до святого Причастя, євхаристологічні статті. Херсон, 2006. 215 с. Online edition: http://rahny-orthodox.org/files/liturgy_ua.pdf [Accessed on 15 August 2022]

Служебник 2013: Служебник: у 2 т. / архим. Віктор Бедь та архим. Діодор Муратов. Ужгород: Вид. від. УУБА-КаУ, 2013.

Богослужбовий 2014: Богослужбовий великий збірник: зібр. церк. чинів і служб із Часослова, Октоїха, Міней і Тріодей / упоряд. протоієрей О. Монич. Ужгород: Патент, 2014. 879 с.

Требникъ 2014: Требникъ. Черновцы: УПЦ, 2014. 606 с. (in Church Slavonic)

Правильник 2015: Правильник: [зб. устав. молитов. текстів] / пер. та заг. ред. Софронія Дмитрука]. Корсунь-Шевченківський, 2015. 511 с. (republished in Cherkasy, Smila, 2017).

Молитовник 2017: Молитовник = Молитовник православних вірян / упоряд., ред. протоієр. А. Дудченко; пер., наук. ред. В. Шолох. Київ: Дух і Літера, 2017. 168 с. (its abridged version was published in 2017 and 2020)

Божественна 2018: Божественна літургія святого отця Іоана Златоуста, архієпископа Константинопольського / укр. пер. з богослужбової грец. мови: В. Шолох, прот. А. Дудченко, протодиякон Р. Воробій, М. Білецький, М. Бурдейна; остаточна ред. – митр. Олександр Драбинко; Фонд пам'яті Блаженнішого Митрополита Володимира. Київ, 2018. 208 с.

Єлецьких 2021а: (Єлецьких) Іонафан. Тлумачний путівник Божественною Літургією святителя Іоанна Златоуста: Досвід викладення молитвословій та єктеній українською мовою з історико-богословським коментарем. Євхаристологічні статті. S.l., 2021. 76 с. (Updated in 2022) Online edition: https://tulchin-eparchia.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/mitropolit_ionafan_eleczkih_tlumachnij_putivnik_bozhestvennoyu_liturgiєyu-4.pdf [Accessed on 15 August 2022]

Єлецьких 2021b: (Єлецьких) Іонафан. Тлумачний путівник Божественною Літургією святителя Василія Великого: Досвід викладення молитвословій та єктеній українською мовою з історико-богословським коментарем. Євхаристологічні статті. S.l., 2021. 86 с. (Updated in 2022) Online edition: https://tulchin-eparchia.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/mitropolit_ionafan_eleczkih_tlumachnij_putivnik_bozhestvennoyu_liturgieyu.pdf [Accessed on 15 August 2022]

Orthodox Church of Ukraine

Богослужіння 2019: Богослужіння Великого Четверга, Пятниці, Суботи та Великодня / упоряд. В. Генсьор. Львів: Святогорець, 2019. 256 с. (this edition incorporates texts from: Постова 1976; Служби 1976; Літургікон 2005; З вірою 1998 (2007 ed.))

Служебник 2021–2023: Служебник. Ч. 1. [Київ, 2021.] 296 с. Ч. 2. Київ, 2023. 295 с.

Офіційне 2021: Офіційне повідомлення про засідання Священного Синоду 27 липня 2021 р. / Православ. церква України // https://www.pomisna.info/uk/vsi-novyny/ofitsijne-povidomlennya-pro-zasidannya-svyashhennogo-synodu-27-lypnya-2021-r/ [Accessed on 7 February 2021].

Молитовник 2021: Молитовник. Глибока, 2021. 584 с. (published in the enlarged and small formats)

Чинопослідування 2021: Чинопослідування освячення храму / упоряд. єп. Борис (В. Ю. Харко); ПЦУ, Таврій. єпархія. Херсон, 2021. 308 с.

Військовий 2023: Військовий требник / упоряд. єп. Борис (В. Ю. Харко). Миколаїв; Херсон, 2023. 1312 с. (published in the usual and enlarged formats)

Roman Catholic Church in Ukraine

Обряди 2000: Обряди християнського втаємничення дорослих. Київ, 2000. 232 с.

Обряди 2002: Обряди Хрещення дітей. Київ, 2002. 110 с.

Обряди 2003a: Обряди Конфірмації. Київ, 2003. 68 с.

Обряди 2003b: Обряди похорону. Київ, 2003. 274 с.

Вселенська 2004: Вселенська Молитва. Луцьк, 2004. 752 с.

Малий 2005: Малий Месал. Луцьк, 2005. 514 с.

Літургія 2007: Літургія годин: скорочена версія / пер. з пол. і лат.; бібл. тексти у пер. І. Хоменка. Київ: Вид-во Католицького медіа-центру, 2007. 900 с.

Обряди 2007: Обряди Єлеопомазання і пастирства хворих. Луцьк, 2007. 144 с.

Обряди 2008a: Обряди Покаяння. Луцьк 2008. 144 с.

Обряди 2008b: Обряди укладення Подружжя. Київ, 2008. 128 с.

Ordo 2009: Ordo Missae: latina, polski, English, český, slovenský, українська, magyar, italiano. Katowice [?], 2009. 186 p.

Римський 2012: Римський месал. [Луцьк], 2012. 1480 с.

Обряди 2013: Обряди Рукоположення єпископів, пресвітерів і дияконів. Луцьк, 2013. 264 с.

Гніву день 2018: Гніву День гряде і Слави / пер. І. Смаженка; 27.12.2018 // http://virchi.pp.net.ua/publ/158-1-0-25290

Обряди 2018: Обряди поховання. Львів, 2018. 362 с.

Співаймо 2014-2022: Співаймо Господу. Т. 1. Луцьк, 2014. 234 с.; Т. 2. [Львів], 2022. 248 с.

Requiem 2015: Requiem aeternam: літургійні співи та музика під час похоронних обрядів та жалобних церемоній. Луцьк, 2015. 164 с.

Гніву день 2019: Гніву день уже надходить / пер. А. Герасименко;17.11.2019//https://slovamolytvy.home.blog/2019/11/17/секвенція-dies-irae-поетичний-переклад/

Великий 2019: Великий тиждень: Неділя страстей Господніх. Святе пасхальне тридення. Львів, 2019. 188 с.

Musica 2020: Musica Sacra: Хорові твори для співу під час літургії, Київ: Кайрос, 2020. 176 с.

Slovak Greek Catholic Church

Малый 2013: Малый Требник: русиньска верзія: [Ч. 1], Глава 1-10. Пряшів, 2013. 105 с.

Malyj 2013: Malyj Trebnîk: rusîňska verzija: [Č. 2] Posvjačiňa i blahoslovľiňa, [Č. 3: Blahoslovľiňa nevisty po Vinčanci. Kurta odprava Tajny pomazaňa oľijom]. [Пряшів], 2013. 107 с.

Neďiľna 2016: Neďiľna večurňa. Liturgija opered posvjačenych dariv. Čitaňa na liturgiji opered posvjačenych dariv / per. Josîf Kudzej, o. Franťišek Krajňak; Obščestvo sv. Joana Krestîteľa. S.l., 2016. 160 s.

Radujte 2021: Radujte sja v Hospoďi: Molîtvennîk / per. Josîf Kudzej, o. Franťišek Krajňak; Obščestvo sv. Joana Krestîteľa. S.l., 2021. 555, [4] s.

Greek Catholic Church of Croatia and Serbia

Молитвенїк 2007: Молитвенїк. Миръ всъмъ / пририхтал Михаил Холошняй-Матїйов; Грекокатолїцка парохия Рождества пресвятей Богородици. Дюрдьов, 2007. 452 с.

Anglophone liturgical translations

Office 1825: The Office and the Masses for the Dead, with the Order of Burial: From the Roman Breviary, Missal, and Ritual: In Latin and English. London: Keating and Brown, 1825. 144 p.

Lyra Catholica 1849: Lyra Catholica / transl. by Edward Caswall. London: James Burns, 1849. xxxii, 311 p.

Crashaw 1858: Crashaw R. The Complete Works. London: John Russell Smith, 1858. xxxii, 340 p.

Breviary Hymns 1900: Breviary Hymns and Missal Sequences / transl. by Edward G. Bagshawe. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1900. viii, 216 p.

Sarum 1911: The Sarum Missal: In English: Part 2 / newly transl. by Frederick E. Warren. London: The De la More Press, 1911. [10], 640 p.

Anglican Missal 1921: The Anglican Missal. London: The Society of SS. Peter and Paul, 1921. xxxii, A272, B134, Blviii, C58, Ccii, D204, E342, F92, G156, H140, [12] p.

Service Book 1922: Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church / comp., transl., and arranged from the Old Church-

Slavonic service books of the Russian Church and collated with the service books of the Greek Church by Isabel Florence Hapgood. Rev. ed. New York: Association Press, 1922. xl, 615 p.

Hymns 1936: The Hymns of the Breviary and Missal / ed. with Introduction and Notes by Rev. Matthew Britt. New York et al.: Benziger Brothers, 1936. 384 p.

Book 1938: Book of Divine Prayers and Services of the Catholic Orthodox Church of Christ / comp. and arranged by Rev. Seraphim Nassar; Antiochian Orthodox Church. New York: The Blackshaw Press, 1938. 1146 p.

Festal 1969: The Festal Menaion / trans. from the original Greek by Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware. London: Faber & Faber, 1969. 564 p. (The Service Books of the Orthodox Church).

Byzantine 1969: Byzantine Daily Worship: With Byzantine Breviary, the Three Liturgies, Propers of the Day and Various Offices / comp. and transl. by Most Rev. Joseph Raya and José De Vinck; Melkite Greek-Catholic Church. Allendale, N.J.: Alleluia Press, 1969. [6], 1020 p.

Divine 1974: The Divine Office: The Liturgy of the Hours according to the Roman Rite: in 3 vols. London; Glasgow: Collins; Sydney: E. J. Dwyer; Dublin: Talbot, 1974.

Liturgy 1975–1976: The Liturgy of the Hours: According to the Roman Rite: in 4 vols. / prep. by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy. New York: Catholic Book Publ. Co., 1975–1976.

Funeral 2011: Funeral Service = Ακολουθια Νεκρωσιμοσ. Sydney: St Andrew's Orthodox Press, 2011. 179 p.

Roman Missal 2011: The Roman Missal / English translation according to the third typical edition; Approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See. Washington, D.C., 2011. 1514 p.

Order 2012: Order of Burial for Laity: online edition / St Stephen Protomartyr Ukrainian Catholic Church. Calgary, Alberta, 2012. 112 p.

THEORETICAL LITERATURE (in alphabetic order)

A new 201-?: A new: A new prayerbook / Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, Liturgical Commission // https://uocc.ca/articles/a-new-prayerbook/ Доступ: 30 серпня 2021 p.

Alcock 2006: Alcock J. P. Food in the ancient world. Westport, Connecticut; London: Greenwood Press, 2006. xxxii, 276 p.

Apter, Herman 2016: Apter R., Herman M. Translating for Singing: The theory, art, and craft of translating lyrics. London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2016. xxvi, 282 p.

Arrington 2021: Arrington A. 2021. "Translated" or "Transformed": The Use of Western Hymns in the Evangelization of the Lisu of Southwest China // Religions 12:772. 8 p. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12090772

Augustine 1952: Augustine St. The Confessions. The City of God. On Christian Doctrine. Chicago et al.: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952. x, 698 p.

Babel 2015: Babel R. Translationsfiktionen: Zur Hermeneutik, Poetic und Ethik des Übersetzens. Bielefeld: transcript, 2015. 417 S.

Bailey 2000–2001: Bailey M. The Impact of Translated Text on Musical Form in Byzantine Liturgical Practice // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 2000-2001. Vol. 41/42. P. 129-150.

Baynham, Lee 2019: Baynham M., Lee Tong King. Translation and Translanguaging. London; New York: Routledge, 2019. 199 p.

Bednarz 1964: Bednarz M. ks. Jezuici a religijność polska (1564-1964) // Nasza przeszłość. Kraków, 1964. T. 20. S. 149-224.

Bernacki 1910: Bernacki L. Najdawniejszy pomnik katechizmu polskiego // Pamiętnik Literacki. Lwów, 1910. T. 9, z. 1/4. S. 317-319.

Bodzioch 2014: Bodzioch B. Cantionale ecclesiasticum na ziemiach polskich w XIX i XX wieku. Lublin: Polihymnia, 2014. 213 s.

Bodzioch 2015: Bodzioch B. Śpiewy monodyczne *Matutinum Tenebrarum* w języku polskim po Vaticanum II. Lublin: Polihymnia, 2015. 134 s.

Borkowska 1988: Borkowska U. Królewskie modlitewniki: Studium z kultury religijnej epoki. Jagiellonów (XV i początek XVI wieku). Lublin: Wyd-wo KUL, 1988. 386 s.

Bourdieu 1993: Bourdieu P. The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1993. viii, 322 p.

Brückner 1904: Brückner A. Literatura religijna w Polsce średnowiecznej. Warszawa, 1904. T. 3. 256 s.

Bugnini 1990: Bugnini A. The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975 / transl. by M. J. O'Connell Collegeville. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990. xxxiii, 974 p.

Bystroń 1886: Bystroń J. Rozbiór porównawczy znanych dotąd najdawniejszych tekstów Modlitwy Pańskiej, Pozdrowienia Anielskiego, Składu Apostolskiego i Dziesięciorga Przykazań // Prace filologiczne. T. 1, zeszyt 2/3. Warszawa, 1886, s. 345-390.

Chlebowski 1905: Chlebowski B. Najdawniejsze kancyonały protestanckie z połowy XVI w.: przyczynek do dziejów polskiej liryki religijnej // Pamiętnik Literacki. Lwów, 1905. T. 4, z. 4. S. 405-424.

Chmiel 1985: Chmiel J. Rodzaje literackie i schematy myślenia. O pewnym błędnym przekładzie w DV 12 // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1985. Nr. 1. S. 45-46.

Chmielowski 1745: Chmielowski B. Nowe Ateny albo Akademia wszelkiey scyencyi pełna... Lwów: Paweł Iozef Golczewski, 1745. Cz. 1. [12], 896, [4] s.

Cho at al. 2021: Cho Eun Young, Hayoung Wong, Geem Zong Woo. 2021. The Liturgical Usage of Translated Gregorian Chant in the Korean Catholic Church // Religions 12:1033. 16 p. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12121033

Chrisomalis 1993: Chrisomalis S. Numerical Notation: A Comparative History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. ix, 486 p.

Chupungco 1997: Chupungco Anscar J. The Translation of Liturgical Texts // Handbook for liturgical studies. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997. Vol. I. P. 381-397.

Cichy 1978: Cichy S. Język łaciński w odnowionej liturgii // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 2. S. 83-88.

Cieślak 2000: Cieślak S. "Harfa duchowna" – Modlitewnikowy bestseller jezuity Marcina Laterny (1552-1598) // Nasza Przeszłość. Kraków, 2000. T. 93. S. 23-48.

Cohen, Fischer 2015: Cohen I., Fischer O. Iconicity in translation: Two passages from a novel by Tobias Hill // Iconicity: East Meets West / ed. by M. K. Hiraga, W. J. Herlofsky, K. Shinohara and K. Akita. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2015. P. 163-184.

Commentary 1978: A Commentary on the Holy Bible by various writers / ed. By Rev. J. R. Dummelow. New York: Macmillan, 1978. clvi, 1092 p.

Comparative 1997: The Comparative Approach to American History / ed. by C. Vann Woodward. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. xiii, 370 p.

Crystal 1990: Crystal D. Liturgical language in a sociolinguistic perspective // Language and the Worship of the Church / ed. by D. Jasper and R. C. D. Jasper. Macmillan, 1990, pp. 120–146.

Dąbek 1994: Dąbek S. Polska pieśń religijna w źródłach rękopiśmiennych i drukowanych // Nasza przeszłość. Kraków, 1994. T. 82. S. 323-352.

Dalby 2003: Dalby A. Food in the ancient world from A to Z. London; New York: Routledge, 2003. xvi, 408 p.

Deane-Cox 2014: Deane-Cox Sh. Retranslation: translation, literature and reinterpretation. London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2014. xi, 210 p.

Desblache 2019: Desblache L. Music and Translation: New Mediations in the Digital Age. S.l.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. xxi, 407 p.

Dostál 1965: Dostál A. The Origins of the Slavonic Liturgy // Dumbarton Oaks Papers. 1965. Vol. 19. P. 67-87.

Dream 1999: Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming / ed. by D. Shulman and G. G. Stroumsa. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. x, 325 p.

Edwards 2017: Edwards M. Ku poetyce chrześcijańskiej / tłum. M. Szuby. Gdańsk: Wyd-wo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego; Pelplin: Bernardinum, 2017. 295 s.

Fauconnier, Turner 2002: Fauconnier G., Turner M. The way we think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities. New York: Basic Books, 2002. xx, 440 p.

Filonov Gove 1988: Filonov Gove A. The Slavic Akathistos Hymn. Poetic Elements of the Byzantine Text and its Old Church Slavonic Translation. München: Otto Sagner, 1988. xiii, 290 p.

Floros 2003: Floros G. Kulturelle Konstellationen in Texten: Zur Beschreibung und Übersetzung von Kultur in Texten. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2003. 206 S.

Freeman 2009: Freeman M. H. Minding: feeling, form, and meaning in the creation of poetic iconicity // Cognitive poetics: goals, gains, and gaps / ed. by G. Brône, J. Vandaele. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. P. 169-196.

Garnczarski 2018: Garnczarski S. Polskie śpiewy na Boże Ciało w kancjonale S. S. Jagodyńskiego (wyd. 1638, 1695) // Roczniki teologiczne. 2018. T. 65, z. 13. S. 95-113.

Gliński 1948: Gliński E. Wyjaśnienie Komisji Biblijnej w sprawie używania nowego przekładu psalmów // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1948. Nr 2. S. 101-102.

Gruchała 2013: Gruchała Ja. S. „Psalmy, hymny, pieśni pełne ducha": Studia o staropolskich tekstach religijnych. Kraków: UNUM, 2013. 263 s.

Handbook 2006: Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions / ed. by J. E. Stets and J. H. Turner. New York: Springer, 2006. xiii, 657 p.

Handbook 2014: Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions. Vol. 2 / ed. by J. E. Stets and J. H. Turner. New York: Springer, 2014. viii, 579 p.

Harper 1991: Harper J. 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, 1991. xiv, 337 p.

Harrison, Stockwell 2014: Harrison C., Stockwell, P. Cognitive poetics // The Bloomsbury Companion to Cognitive Linguistics / ed. by J. Littlemore and J. R. Taylor. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. P. 218-233.

Hill, Hill, 1980: Hill A. O., Hill B. H., Jr. Mark Bloch and Comparative History // The American Historical Review. 1980. Vol. 85, no. 4. P. 828-846.

Historia 1974: Historia Kościoła w Polsce: T. 1, cz. 2 / red. ks. B. Kumor i ks. Z. Obertyński. Poznań; Warszawa: Pallottinum 1974. 512 s.

Hładki 2020: Hładki A. Recepcja soborowej odnowy liturgii w Polsce w świetle prac nad wydaniem *Mszału rzymskiego* w języku polskim // Perspectiva: Legnickie Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne. Legnica, 2020. R. 19, nr 1 (36). S. 78-88

Hodgson 1993: Hodgson M. G. S. Rethinking world history: Essays on Europe, Islam, and World History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. xxi, 328 p.

Horace 1942: Horace. Satires, epistles and Ars poetica / with an English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942. xxx, 509 p.

HTS 2010–2013: Handbook of translation studies: in 4 vols. / edited by Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010–2013.

Hughes 2003: Hughes G. Worship as Meaning: a Liturgical Theology for Late Modernity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. vii, 330 p.

Instrukcja 1961: Instrukcja Episkopatu Polski o wprowadzeniu w życie przywileju Stolicy Apostolskiej z dnia 7 lipca 1961 r. // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1961. Nr. 6. S. 331-333.

Instrukcja 1971: Instrukcja o tłumaczeniu tekstów liturgicznych / Rada do wykonania Konstytucji o liturgii; tłumaczył ks. Jan Adamecki // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1971. Nr. 6. S. 320-329.

Inwentarz 2012: Inwentarz rękopisów do połowy XVI wieku w zbiorach Biblioteki Narodowej / oprac. J. Kaliszuk, S. Szyller. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa, 2012. 296 s. (Inwentarze Rękopisów Biblioteki Narodowej; 3).

Jan 1974: Jan Chryzostom św. Wybór pism: modlitwy liturgiczne, pisma o charakterze wychowawczym / tłum. ks. Henryk Paprocki, ks. Wojciech Kania; wstęp i oprac. Henryk Paprocki, Anna

Słomczyńska. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1974. 321, [3] s. (Pisma Starochrześcijańskich Pisarzy; t. 13).

Język 1961: Język polski we mszy świętej / Święta Kongregacja Obrzędów // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1961. Nr. 6. S. 330-331.

Jougan 1928: Jougan A. Liturgika czyli Wykład obrzędów Kościoła katolickiego. Lwów: H. Altenberg, 1928. 101 s.

Kamińska 2015: Kamińska J. Przepisy regulujące przygotowywanie tłumaczeń i wydawanie ksiąg liturgicznych // Kortowski Przegląd Prawniczy Strona. 2015. Nr. 1. S. 47-53.

Kantor 1983: Kantor M. Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes. Ann Arbor, 1983. 304 p.

Karpiński 1792: Karpiński F. Pieśni nabożne. Supraśl: Drukarnia XX. Bazylianów, 1792. [8], 92 s.

Kolbaia 2021: Kolbaia D. Bibliografia prac księdza profesora Henryka Paprockiego // Pro Georgia. Warszawa, 2021. Vol. 31. P. 9-82.

Korzo 2015: Korzo M. A. O tekstach religijnych w XVI-wiecznych elementarzach Polskich // Pamiętnik Literacki. 2015. T. 106, z. 1. S. 169-182.

Kowalewski 1921: Kowalewski T. Liturgika czyli Wykład Obrzędów Kościoła katolickiego. Wyd. 12-e. Płock: B-cia Detrychowie, 1921. 112 s.

Koziara 2018: Koziara S. Język i liturgia słowiańska u zarania chrystianizacji Polski – dawne i nowsze fakty, hipotezy, dyskusje // Studia Pigoniana. 2018. T. 1, nr 1. S. 15-29.

Krawczeniuk 1984: Krawczeniuk O. The Ukrainian Church in America: Its Beginnings / transl. by V. Andrushkiw and M. Stefaniuk. Detroit: The Ukrainian Millennium Committee, 1984. 43 p.

Krivko 2011: Krivko R.N. Перевод, парафраз и метр в древних славянских кондаках // Revue des Études Slaves. 2011. Vol. 82. No. 2. P. 169-202; No. 4. P. 715-743.

Krupa 2011: Krupa M. Duch i litera: Liryczna ekspresja mistycznej drogi Jana od Krzyża w polskich przekładach. Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria, 2011. 294 s.

Kundera 1984: Kundera M. The tragedy of central Europe / transl. by E. White // The New York Review of Books. 1984. April 26 (no. 7). P. 33-38.

Kuźmina 2002: Kuźmina D. Katechizmy w Rzeczypospolitej XVI i początku XVII wieku. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Bibliotekarzy Polskich, 2002. 185, [1] s.

Kuźmina 2004: Kuźmina D. Jakub Wujek (1541-1597) – pisarz, tłumacz i misjonarz. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Bibliotekarzy Polskich, 2004. 234 p.

Łaś 1966: Łaś J. W sprawie kompozycji liturgicznych w języku polskim // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1966. Nr. 6. S. 371-376.

Lash 1998: Lash Ephrem archmandrite. Translating Liturgy // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 1998. Vol. 39, nos. 2/4. P. 191-217.

Lederer 2007: Lederer Th. Sacred Demonization: Saints' Legends in the English Renaissance. Wien: Braumüller, 2007. x, 270 p.

Lewandowicz-Nosal 2019: Lewandowicz-Nosal G. Modlitewniki i Mszaliki Dla Dzieci w Polsce w Latach 1945-1949 // Z badań nad książką i księgozbiorami historycznymi. Warszawa, 2019. R. 10. S. 251-278.

Lewański 1981: Lewański Ju. Dramat i teatr średniowiecza i renesansu w Polsce. Warszawa: PWN, 1981. 631 s., [64] s. tabl.

Łoś 2021: Łoś Jarosław ks. Próby delegalizacji Kościoła prawosławnego w II Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej // Świadczyć o wierze naszych ojców: Prawosławna Diecezja Lubelsko-Chełmska w latach 1989-2019 / red. abp Abel. Lublin, 2021. S. 31-38.

Maestri 2018: Maestri E. Translating the Female Self across Cultures: Mothers and daughters in autobiographical narratives. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2018. xiii, 302 p.

Małaczyński 1958a: Małaczyński F. Kronika ruchu liturgicznego // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1958. Nr. 2. S. 169-171.

Małaczyński 1958b: Małaczyński F. O nowy przekład litanii loretańskiej // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1958. Nr. 3. S. 239-247.

Małaczyński 1961: Małaczyński F. Poprawiony tekst litanii loretańskiej // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1961. Nr. 5. S. 229-232.

Małaczyński 1963: Małaczyński F. Nowy rytuał dla Polski // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1963. Nr. 4. S. 211-219.

Małaczyński 1975: Małaczyński F. Obrzędy bierzmowania, Pallottinum 1974 // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1975. Nr. 1/2. S. 87-88.

Małaczyński 1985: Małaczyński F. Wydawanie ksiąg liturgicznych w języku polskim // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1985. Nr. 4/5. S. 321-331.

Małaczyński 1985: Małaczyński F. Wydawanie ksiąg liturgicznych w języku polskim // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1985. Nr. 4/5. S. 321-331.

Małaczyński 1987: Małaczyński F. Mszał rzymski dla diecezji polskich // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1987. Nr. 1. S. 49-58.

Malloy 2014: Malloy P. Translating the *Roman Missal*: An Episcopal Reflection on the Process and the Product // Anglican Theological Review. 2014. Vol. 96, no. 2. P. 365-381.

Mańkowski 1932: Mańkowski A. Najdawniejszy polski śpiewnik kościelny i katechizm diecezji chełmińskiej. Pelplin: SP. Z. O. P., 1932. 15 s.

Marcinkowska-Malara 2018: Marcinkowska-Malara M. Modlitwy przygodne w polskich drukach oświeceniowych: Praca doktorska / Uniwersytet Śląski. Katowice, 2018. 258 s.

Michałowska 1999: Michałowska T. Średniowiecze. 5-e wyd., uzup. Warszawa: PWN, 1999. 908 s.

Michałowska 2011: Michałowska T. Literatura polskiego średniowiecza. Leksykon. Warszawa: PWN, 2011. 934 s.

Mironowicz 2013: Mironowicz A. The Methodian mission on the Polish lands until the dawn of 11th century // ELPIS. 2013. R. 15 (26), zesz. 27 (40). S. 17-32.

Misijuk 2009: Misijuk W. Rozważania o języku cerkiewnych nabożeństw // Prawosławie. Światło ze Wschodu / red. K. Leśniewski. Lublin, 2009. S. 357-377.

Modlimy 1995: Modlimy się z Kościołem wschodnim. Modlitwy liturgii godzin. Wybór, przekł. i oprac. H. Paprockiego. Warszawa: Verbinum, 1995. 101 s.

Modlitewnik Gasztołda 2015: Modlitewnik Olbrachta Gasztołda, kanclerza wielkiego litewskiego 1528 r.: Facsimile /

Wstęp/Introduction W. Wydra. Poznań: Wyd-wo Nauk. UAM, 2015. 88 s., ii, 232, [1] k.

Modnicka 2009: Modnicka N. "Nie jestem z tego świata" – czyli o osobliwościach mowy protestantów ewangelikalnych // Protestancka kultura słowa / pod red. Z. Paska. Krakow: Nomos, 2009. S. 212-226.

Mrowiec 1981: Mrowiec K. Twórczość mszalna ks. Hieronima Feichta CM // Nasza przeszłość. Kraków, 1981. T. 56. S. 103-145.

Naróg 1959: Naróg P. Kronika ruchu liturgicznego // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1959. Nr. 1. S. 102-107.

Nida 1995: Nida E. A. Dynamic Equivalence in Translating // An Encyclopaedia of Translation: Chinese-English, English-Chinese / ed. by Chan Sin-Wai and D. E. Pollard. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1995. P. 223-230.

Nováková 2010: Nováková J. A. Služebník z r. 1979 – ojedinělý pokus o překlad v českém pravoslavném prostředí // Problematika prekladov do živého jazyka : Súbor štúdií / Š. Marinčák (ed.). Košice: Centrum spirituality Východ–Západ Michala Lacka, 2010. S. 185-194.

Nowak 2017: Nowak D. M. Officium defunctorum w języku polskim po Soborze Watykańskim II. Opole, 2017. 474 s.

O'Loughlin 2004: O'Loughlin Th. Translating Panis in a Eucharistic Context: A Problem of Language and Theology // Worship. 2004. Vol. 78, no. 3. P. 226-235.

O'Loughlin 2012a: O'Loughlin Th. A Vernacular Liturgy versus a Liturgy in the "Vernacular"? // Worship. 2012 Vol. 86, no 1. P. 244-255.

O'Loughlin 2012b: O'Loughlin Th. Latina Veritas! – language a guarantor of truth? // The Furrow. 2012. Vol. 63, no. 7/8. P. 343-347.

O'Loughlin 2019: O'Loughlin Th. How Many Lectionaries Do We Need? // Doctrine & Life: Religious Life Review. 2019. Vol. 69, no. 7 (September). P. 2-11.

Paprocki 2012: Paprocki H. Język w Kościele prawosławnym (na przykładzie tłumaczeń tekstów liturgicznych) // Oblicza polszczyzny / red. A. Markowski A. R. Pawelec. Warszawa: NCK, 2012. S. 113-117.

Peligra 2018: Peligra C. Representing Cultural Hybridity in Translation Paratext: A Comparative Analysis of how *Selected Works* by Hella S. Haasse are Introduced and Framed in English and Italian // Translating Boundaries: Constraints, Limits, Opportunities / ed. by S. Barschdorf and D. Renna; foreword by J. Munday. Stuttgart: ibidem, 2018. P. 145-169.

Pieronek 1978: Pieronek T. Teksty kościelnego prawa powszechnego odnoszące się do liturgii // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 2. S. 88-94.

Pisarzak 1979: Pisarzak M. Zmiana pojęć w liturgii błogosławieństw // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 4. S. 205-222.

Psałterz 1939: Psałterz Florjański łacińsko-polsko-niemiecki: rękopis Biblioteki Narodowej w Warszawie / wyd. R. Ganszyniec, W. Taszycki, S. Kubica. Lwów: Zakł. Nar. im. Ossolińskich, 1939. vii, 403 s.

Pskit 2017: Pskit W. Części zmienne Mszy św. w przekładzie: wybrane kolekty w dwóch angielskich wersjach Novus Ordo Missae // Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze. Poznań, 2017. T. 34. S. 125-140.

Pskit 2019: Pskit W. The post-Vatican II Roman Missal in English: a preliminary comparison of two English translations // Roczniki humanistyczne. 2019. T. 67, zesz. 11. S. 47-60.

Raj 2006: [Raj duszny]: Hortulus animae polonice. [Kraków, Florian Ungler i Wolfgang Lern, 1513] 8° / pod red. W. Wydry. Poznań: Wyd-wo Poznańskich Studiów Polonistycznych, 2006. 22 p.

Rak 1958: Rak R. Śpiew gregoriański a przeżycie liturgiczne // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1958. Nr. 6. S. 550-552.

RPC 1953: The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian text / transl. and ed. by S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953. [10], 313 p.

Sczaniecki 1950: Sczaniecki P. Wiadomości liturgiczne // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1950. Nr 1/2. S. 157-160.

Sczaniecki 1962: Sczaniecki P. Służba Boża w dawnej Polsce: Studia o Mszy św. Poznań; Warszawa; Lublin: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1962. 255 s.

Sczaniecki 2009: Sczaniecki P. Msza po staremu się odprawia. Tyniec; Kraków: Wyd-wo benedyktynów, 2009. 230 s.

Shevchenko 2013: Shevchenko T. The Complete Kobzar: The Poetry / transl. by P. Fedynsky. London: Glagoslav, 2013. xxiii, 413 p.

Shmiher 2018: Shmiher T. Stories behind Words of Emotions: Ways to Assess the 1076 Kyivan Literary Monument in Contemporary Ukrainian and English Translations // Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio N: Educatio nova. Lublin, 2018. Vol. 3. P. 175-194.

Simon 1996: Simon Sh. Gender in Translation: Cultural identity and the Politics of Transmission. London; New York: Routledge, 1996. x, 195.

Sinha 2007: Sinha Ch. Cognitive Linguistics, Psychology, and Cognitive Science // The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics / ed. by D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2007. P. 1266-1294.

Sinka 1983: Sinka T. ks. Polska pieśń w liturgii // Nasza Przeszłość. Kraków, 1983. T. 60. S. 235-273.

Sitarz 1955: Sitarz E. Polskie przekłady mszału rzymskiego // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1955. Nr. 4/5. S. 205-229.

Ślusarczyk 2009: Ślusarczyk D. Biblia jako źródło inspiracji dla kompozytorów luterańskich. Relacje słowa i muzyki na przykładzie twórczości Jana Sebastiana Bacha // Protestancka kultura słowa / pod red. Z. Paska. Krakow: Nomos, 2009. S. 191-200.

Sobeczko 1990: Sobeczko H. Działalność o. Franciszka Małaczyńskiego OSB w Komisji Liturgicznej Episkopatu Polski // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1990. Nr. 1/2. S. 78-89.

Sobeczko 2001: Sobeczko H. J. Przekłady posoborowych ksiąg liturgicznych na język polski // Seminare. Poszukiwania naukowe / Towarzystwo Naukowe Franciszka Salezego. Warszawa, 2001. T. 17. S. 125-144.

Średniowieczna pieśń 1980: Średniowieczna pieśń religijna polska / opracował M. Korolko. Wyd. 2, zmienione. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum, 1980. lxxvi, 288 s.

Sroka 1978: Sroka J. Język polski ksiąg liturgicznych // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 2. S. 73-82.

278

Steiner 2004: Steiner E. Translated texts: properties, variants, evaluations. Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang, 2004. [5], 192 p.

Stets, Turner 2008: Stest J. E., Turner J. H. The Sociology of Emotions // Handbook of emotions / ed. by M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, L. Feldman Barrett. 3rd ed. New York; London: The Guilford Press, 2008. P. 32-46.

Strawa-Iracka 2011: Strawa-Iracka M. Repertuar sekwencyjny w graduałach piotrkowskich // Annales Lublinenses pro Musica Sacra. 2011. R. 2, nr. 2. S. 101-142.

Subardjo 2019: Subardjo M. T. The Fundamental Criterion of Liturgical Translation: *Valde Utilis Apud Populum* // Jurnal teologi. 2019. Vol. 08, no. 01. P. 17-30.

Susam-Saraeva 2015: Susam-Saraeva Ş. Translation and Popular Music Transcultural Intimacy in Turkish-Greek Relations. Oxford et al.: Peter Lang, 2015. x, 180 p.

Švagrovský 1999: Švagrovský Š. Z histórie slovenských prekladov byzantských liturgických textov // Slavica Slovaca. 1999. R. 34, no. 1. S. 42-51.

Sweetser 2006: Sweetser E. Whose rhyme is whose reason? Sound and sense in *Cyrano de Bergerac //* Language and Literature. 2006. Vol 15(1). P. 29-54.

Świerzawski 1978a: Świerzawski W. Duszpasterskie implikacje tłumaczenia liturgii // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 2. S. 94-100.

Świerzawski 1978b: Świerzawski W. Tłumaczenie liturgii rzymskiej na języki ojczyste // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 2. S. 63-73.

Szymanek 1969: Szymanek E. Ekumeniczny przekład Listu do Rzymian // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1969. Nr. 6. S. 328-332.

Szymanek 1978: Szymanek E. Teksty biblijne w liturgii // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1978. Nr. 2. S. 57-63.

Taft 1998: Taft R. F. Translating Liturgically // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 1998. Vol. 39, nos. 2/4. P. 155-184.

Tarcza 2016: Tarcza duchowna, [Kraków, Florian Ungler, 1533 lub 1534] / pod red. W. Wydry. Poznań: Wyd-wo Poznańskich Studiów Polonistycznych, 2016. 79 s.

Teksty 1991: Teksty o Matce Bożej: Prawosławie: we 2 cz. Niepokalanów: Wyd-wo Ojców Franciszkanów, 1991.

Teksty 1995: Teksty o Matce Bożej: Kościoły przedchalcedońskie. Niepokalanów: Wyd-wo Ojców Franciszkanów, 1995. 261 s.

Thousand 1988: A Thousand Years of Christianity in Ukraine: An Encyclopedic Chronology / compl. and ed. by O. Zinkewych and A. Sorokowski. New York; Baltimore; Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1988. 312 p.

Tötösy de Zepetnek 2006: Tötösy de Zepetnek S. Nowa Literatura Porównawcza jako teoria i metoda / przeł. A. Zawiszewska i A. Skrendo // Konstruktywizm w badaniach literackich: Antologia / red. E. Kuźma, A. Skrendo, J. Madejski. Kraków: Universitas, 2006. S. 347-389.

Translating 2016: Translating women: different voices and new horizons / ed. by Luise von Flotow and Farzaneh Farahzad. New York, Routledge, [2016]. xvi, 235 p.

Tsur 2009: Tsur R. Metaphor and figure-ground relationship: comparisons from poetry, music, and the visual arts // Cognitive poetics: goals, gains, and gaps / ed. by G. Brône, J. Vandaele. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. P. 237-277.

Tyulenev 2012: Tyulenev S. Applying Luhmann to translation studies: translation in society. New York; London: Routledge, 2012. xv, 235 p.

Ugolnik 2000-2001: Ugolnik A. Englishing the Byzantine // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 2000-2001. Vol. 41/42. P. 29-47.

Venturi 2001: Venturi G. Traduzione liturgica // Liturgia: Dizionari / a cura di D. Sartore, A. M. Triacca, C. Cibien. Milano: Edizioni San Paolo, 2001. P. 2020-2028.

von Flotow 1997: von Flotow L. Translation and Gender: Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'. Manchester: St Jerome; Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1997. [8], 114 p.

Ware 2000-2001: Ware Kallistos bishop. Clarity, Truth and Beauty in Liturgical Translations // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 2000-2001. Vol. 41/42. P. 5-16.

Warren 1904: Warren C. F. S. Notes on the "Dies irae" and its English versions // The Dolphin. 1904. No 5. P. 500-513.

White 1975: White L. A. The concept of cultural systems: A key to understanding tribes and nations. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975. xiii, 192 p.

Wichowa 2003: Wichowa M. Stanisław Grochowski jako tłumacz hymnów kościelnych: na podstawie tomiku "Rytmy łacińskie, dziwnie sztuczne..." // Collectanea Philologica. 2003. T. 6. S. 237-250.

Wielki 2003: Wielki Tydzień i święto Paschy w Kościele prawosławnym / tłum. z greckiego H. Paprocki. Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2003. 188 s.

Wierusz-Kowalski 1952: Wierusz-Kowalski J. Ruch liturgiczny za granicą // Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny. 1952. Nr 1. S. 83-86.

Wilkoń 2004: Wilkoń A. Dzieje języka artystycznego w Polsce: Renesans. Katowice: Wyd-wo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2004. 241 s.

Williams, Bargh 2008: Williams L. E., Bargh, J. A. Experiencing physical warmth promotes interpersonal warmth // Science (New York, N.Y.), 2008. Vol. 322(5901). P. 606-607.

Woronczak 1952: Woronczak Je. Tropy i sekwencje w literaturze polskiej do połowy XVI wieku // Pamiętnik Literacki. 1952. T. 43, no. 1/2. S. 335-374.

Wydra 2012: Wydra W. *Pieśni nabożne…* z krakowskiej oficyny Antoniego Wosińskiego (1627) // Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Literacka. 2012. Nr. 19 (39). S. 329-345.

Zaborowski 1514-1515: Zaborowski S. Orthographia seu modus recte scribendi et legend Polonicum idioma quam utilissimus. Kraków: [Florian Ungier, 1514-1515]. [23] p.

Zając: Zając R. Na drogach i bezdrożach przekładów Pisma Świętego // http://www.bu.kul.pl/art_15512.html [accessed on October 5, 2021].

Živčák 2017: Živčák Ján. K problematike typologického zaradenia liturgického prekladu: na príklade slovenského a francúzskeho translátu paschálneho kánonu a veršových stichír Paschy // World Literature Studies. 2017. Vol. 9, no. 2. P. 115-126.

Антипенко 1995: Антипенко Л. А. Опыт концептуального анализа имен негативных эмоций в русском языке: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук; спец. 10.02.01 − русский язык / Харьков. гос. ун-т. Харьков, 1995. 20 с.

Апокріфи 1896: Апокріфи і леґенди з українських рукописів. Т. 1: Апокріфи старозавітні / Зібрав, упор. і пояснив І. Франко. Львів, 1896. lxvi, 394 с.

Афанасьева 2015: Афанасьева Т. И. Литургии Иоанна Златоуста и Василия Великого в славянской традиции (по служебникам XI-XV вв.). Москва: Ун-т Дмитрия Пожарского, 2015. 447 с.

Барвінський 1921: Барвінський А. Чи українська мова пригідна до перекладу св. Письма і молитов, та духовної проповіди? Перемишль: Кнолєр і Син, 1921. 32 с.

Белей 1929: Белей В. Латинська мова як викладова в богословії // Богословія. 1929. Т. 7, кн. 1. С. 258-260.

Богдановичъ 1938: Богдановичъ В. Церковнославянский язык как религиозно-культурная ценность. Гродно, 1938. 33 с.

Василишин 2014: Василишин І. Нові видання богослужбових книг у XX столітті як плід літургійної реформи // Reformy liturgii a powrót do źródeł: Ad fontes liturgicos 4. Kraków: Wyd-wo Nauk. Un-tu Papieskiego Jana Pawła II, 2014. S. 285-299.

Василишин 2018: Василишин І. Літургійно-богослужбові видання Патріарха Йосифа Сліпого у ІІ половині XX ст. Ретроспектива // Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції до 100-річчя ієрейських свячень Йосифа Сліпого / упоряд. Ю. Скіра. Львів: Колесо, 2018. С. 113-129.

Власовський 1998: Власовський І. Нарис історії Української Православної Церкви: у 4 т., 5 кн. Київ: УПЦ КП, 1998.

Вульфсон 2003: Вульфсон Б. Л. Сравнительная педагогика. История и современные проблемы. Москва: УРАО, 2003. 231 с.

Головач 2015: Головач У. Рецензія на переклад богослужбових текстів Страсного тижня і Пасхи майстерні літургійних перекладів "Трипіснець" (В. Рудейко, Т. Тимо, М. Тимо, А. Шкраб'юк) // Наукові записки УКУ: Богослов'я. Львів, 2015. Вип. 2. С. 517-519.

Ґаладза 1998: Ґаладза П. о. Порівняльний богословський аналіз перекладів літургії св. Івана Золотоустого УГКЦ 1968 та 1988 років // Сучасна українська богословська термінологія: Від історичних традицій до нових концепцій: Матеріали Всеукр. наук. конф. (Львів, 13-15 трав. 1998 р.) Львів: [Вид-во Львівської Богословської Академії], 1998. С. 33-47.

Ґаладза 2002-2004: Ґаладза П. "Віки вічні" чи "віки віків"? // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 2002-2004. Vol. 43/45. P. 361-367.

Ґаладза 2017: Ґаладза П. Літургійні тексти і переклади // Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies. 2017. Vol. 58, nos. 1–4, pp. 347–363.

Ґалянт 1933: Ґалянт М. Переклад єрейського молитвослова // Нива. 1933. Т. 28. С. 435-437.

Джиджора 2018: Джиджора Є. В. Гімнографія Київської Русі XI-XIII ст.: структурне ціле канону мінейного циклу. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. 480 с.

Драбинко s.d.: [Драбинко] Олександр митр. "Переклад Літургії Іоана Златоуста – це краще, що є на сьогодні": інтерв'ю // http://mvfund.org/novini/792-zaproshuemo-u-sofiyu-kijivsku-na-prezentatsiyu-ukrajinskogo-perekladu-liturgiji-sv-ioana-zlatousta. Доступ: 31 серпня 2021 р.

Дячук 2016: Дячук Л. С. Сучасна французька жіноча проза в українських перекладах: Дис. … канд. філол. н. / КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка. Київ, 2016. 291 с.

Єдиними 1997-2002: Єдиними устами: бюлетень Інституту богословської термінології та перекладів. 5 випусків. Львів, 1997-2002.

Єпископ 2013: Єпископ Станіслав Широкорадюк про видання Римського Месалу українською мовою: [інтерв'ю]. Джерело: CREDO: https://credo.pro/2013/01/74883. Доступ: 4 серпня 2021 р.

Завітневич 1971: Завітневич В. Видавнича діяльність Української Православної Церкви в США (з анотаціями найголовніших видань) // Ювілейна Книга: 50-річчя Відродження Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви, 1921-1971. Бавнд Брук, 1971. С. 63-71.

Зеров 2003: Зеров М. Українське письменство. Київ: Основи, 2003. 1301 с.

І. Н. 1935: І. Н. В справі українського перекладу єрейського молитвослова // Нива. 1935. Т. 30. С. 399-400.

Інструкція 2020: Інструкція про впорядкування книго-видання в УГКЦ. Джерело: https://synod.ugcc.ua/data/instrukt-siya-pro-vporyadkuvannya-knygovydannya-v-ugkts-4384/. Доступ: 31 серпня 2021 р.

Ісіченко 2016: Ісіченко Ігор архиєп. Українське церковне служіння і роль служителя на поселеннях: минулий досвід і пріоритети на майбутнє // https://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/ukrainian_zmi/34905-ukrayinske-cerkovne-sluzhinnya-i-rol-sluzhitelya-na-poselennyax-minulij-dosvid-i-prioriteti-na-majbutnye.html [posted on 13 Dec 2016]

Історичний 1967: Історичний нарис Української Греко-Православної Церкви Св. Юрія в Давфині в сорокліття громади від 1927 до 1967 р. Вінніпег: Тризуб, 1967. 103 с.

ІУЛ 2014– : Історія української літератури: у 12 т. Київ: Наук. думка, 2014–.

Карась 2020: Карась Г. Церковна музика композиторів української діаспори у відродженні національно-культурної та релігійної ідентичності православної і греко-католицької церкви в сучасній Україні // European vector of modern cultural studies and art criticism: the experience of Ukraine and the Republic of Poland. Włocławek; Riga: Baltija Publishing, 2020. С. 55-72.

Каталог 2014: Каталог памятников древнерусской письменности XI-XIV вв. (Рукописные книги) / отв. ред. Д. М. Буланин; сост. Д. М. Буланин, А. А. Романова, О. В. Творогов, Ф. Томсон, А. А. Турилов. Санкт-Петербург: Дмитрий Буланин, 2014. 944 с.

Кобрин 2004: Кобрин М. Про мову богослуження: Доклад 5-ій Комісії Передсоборного Зібрання. Рівне, 2004. 183 с.

Ковч 1932: Ковч Е. Чому наші від нас утікають. Львів, 1932. vii, 147 с.

Корзо 2007: Корзо М. Украинская и белорусская кате-хетическая традиция конца XVI-XVIII вв.: становление, эво-

люция и проблема заимствований. Москва: "Канон+" РООИ "Реабилитация", 2007. 671 с.

Корзо 2016: Корзо М. А. Апостольский символ веры и исповедание Афанасия в православной книжности Киевской митрополии (XVI-XVII вв.) // Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия II: История. История Русской Православной Церкви. 2016. Вып. 1 (68). С. 20-31.

Костельник 1922: Костельник Г. Народна чи вселенська Церков? // Нива. 1922. Т. 17. С. 20-25; 64-68, 109-122, 170-178, 209-214.

Костельник 1933: Костельник Г. Український переклад єрейського молитвослова о. Яр. Левицького // Нива. 1933. Т. 28. С. 343-351, 376-380.

Кристианс 2008: Кристианс Д. От подражания форме к дословному переводу: принципы параллельной адаптации мелодии в текстах византийских песнопений в славянской традиции // Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия 3: Филология. 2008. № 11. С. 26-53.

Кудрявцева 2017: Кудрявцева Н. Лінгвістична відносність і проблеми перекладу філософської термінології: лінгвокогнітивний підхід. Київ: Вид. дім Д. Бураго, 2017. 458 с.

Купранець 1974: Купранець О. Ф. Православна церква в міжвоєнній Польщі. 1918-1939. Рим, 1974. xxi, 235 с.

Липківський 2018: Липківський Василь. Вибрані твори: у 6 т. Київ: Укр. пропілеї, 2018.

Мансветовъ 1882: Мансветовъ И. Д. Митрополитъ Киприанъ въ его литургической дѣятельности. Москва, 1882. [4], 202, [2], xxxviii с.

Матеріали 2013: Матеріали Синоду Єпископів Української Греко-Католицької Церкви (Київ, 11-18 серп. 2013 р.): Спецвип. "Благовісника Верховного Архиєпископа Києво-Галицького Української Греко-Католицької Церкви 2013 року". Львів, 2013. 75 с.

Мещерский 1958: Мещерский И. А. История иудейской войны Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе. Москва; Ленинград: Изд-во АН СССР, 1958. 578 с.

Миз 1994: Миз Роман о. Корифей церковного друкованого слова // Християнски календар “Дзвони” за 1995. рок: На чесц 250-рочнїци приселєня. Нови Сад, 1994. С. 125-127.

Москаленко 2018: Москаленко М. Переклади 1920-1930-х років // Слово і Час. 2018. № 12. С. 19-31.

Мулик-Луцик 1989: Мулик-Луцик Ю. Історія Української Греко-Православної Церкви в Канаді. Т. 4: Українська Греко-Православна Церква в Канаді в юрисдикції архиєпископа Івана Теодоровича. Вінніпег: Екклезія, 1989. 829 с.

Науково 2019: Науково и популарни статї / підп.: мгк // Руске слово. 2019. 25. юлий. https://www.ruskeslovo.com/науково-и-популарни-статї/. Доступ: 3 вересня 2021 р.

Огієнко 1921: Огієнко І. Українська мова як мова богослужбова: Право живої мови бути мовою церкви. Тернів: Укр. автокефальна церква, 1921. 32 с.

Огієнко 1922: Огієнко І. Методи перекладу богослужбових книг на українську мову // Свята Служба Божа св. отця нашого Іоана Золотоустого мовою українською / на укр. мову з грец. переклав І. Огієнко. Б. м., 1922. Ч. 2: Пояснення до тексту. С. 3–25.

Огієнко 1929: Огієнко І. Історія церковно-слов’янської мови. Т. 5: Найважніші пам’ятки церковно-слов’янської мови, Ч. 1-3: Пам’ятки старо-слов’янські X-XI віків. Варшава, 1929. 493 с.

Остапчук 2017: Остапчук В. Труднощі перекладу конфесійних текстів // Султанівські читання. 2017. Вип. 6. С. 63-74.

Пентковский 2016: Пентковский А. М. Славянское богослужение византийского обряда и корпус славянских богослужебных книг в конце IX – первой половине X веков // Slověne. 2016. № 2. С. 54–120.

Пуряєва 2017: Пуряєва Н. В. Богослужбові переклади Івана Огієнка // Іван Огієнко і сучасна наука та освіта. Серія: Філологічна. 2017. Вип. 14. С. 296-305.

Пуряєва 2018: Пуряєва Н. Українська мова в літургійній практиці українських церков // Проблеми гуманітарних наук. Серія: Філологія. 2018. Вип. 42. С. 128–146.

Рішення 1992: Рішення і постанови Синоду Єпископів Української Греко-Католицької Церкви, що відбувся у Львові в днях 16–31 травня 1992 року. Джерело: https://synod.ugcc.ua/data/postanovy-synodu-pyskopiv-ugkts-1992-roku-321/. Доступ: 20 серпня 2021 р.

Саидов 2006: Саидов А. Х. Сравнительное правоведение. Москва: Норма, 2006. xii, 355 с.

Сводный каталог 1984: Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР, XI-XIII вв. / АН СССР, Отд. истории, Археограф. ком. Москва: Наука, 1984. 404, [1] с.

Седакова 2017: Седакова О. Мариины слезы. К поэтике литургических песнопений. Київ: Дух і літера, 2017. 176 с.

Скаб 2020: Скаб М. Церковнослов'янська мова української редакції. Чернівці: Технодрук, 2020. 643 с.

Соловій 1964: Соловій Мелетій М. о. Божественна Літургія: історія – розвиток – пояснення. Рим: ОО. Василіяни, 1964. xiv, 422 с.

Станчев 2017: Станчев К. Проблема оригинальности древнеславянской гимнографии // Fontes Slaviae Orthodoxae. Olsztyn, 2017. No. 1. С. 43-55.

Сучасна 1998: Сучасна українська богословська термінологія: від історичних традицій до нових концепцій: матеріали Всеукр. наук. конф., Львів, 13-15 трав. 1998 р. Львів, 1998. 351 с.

Темчин 2014: Темчин С. Ю. Древнейшая восточнославянская служба Перенесению мощей святителя Николая Мирликийского (9 мая) как переработка переводной службы Перенесению мощей апостола Варфоломея (24 августа) // Slavistica vilnensis. 2014. Т. 59. С. 17–29.

Тилявський 1985: Тилявський І. Літургічна комісія та її переклади під проводом Патріарха Йосифа // Богословія. Рим, 1985. № 49. С. 151-166.

Титовъ 1918: Титовъ Ф. Типографія Кіево-Печерской Лавры: Историческій очеркъ (1606–1616–1916 г.г.): Приложенія к Т. 1 (1606–1616–1721 г.г.). Кіевъ, 1918. 18, фмs [546] с.

Тіменик 1997: Тіменик З. Іван Огієнко (Митрополит Іларіон). 1882-1972: життєписно-бібліографічний нарис / Наук. т-во ім. Шевченка у Львові. Львів, 1997. 227 с.

Християнство 2000: Християнство й українська мова: матеріали наук. конф., Київ, 5-6 жовт. 2000 р. Львів, 2000. 514 с.

Цегельський 1935: Цегельський Т. Довкруги українського перекладу єрейського молитвослова // Нива. 1935. Т. 30. С. 432-434.

Шевченко 2003: Шевченко Т. Зібрання творів: у 6 т. Київ, 2003. Т. 2: Поезія 1847-1861. 784 с.

Шмігер 2018: Шмігер Т. Перекладознавчий аналіз – теоретичні та прикладні аспекти: давня українська література сучасними українською та англійською мовами. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2018. 508 с.

Шумило 2016: Шумило С. М. Богослужебные песнопения в "Слове о расслабленном" Кирилла Туровского // Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики. 2016. № 66. С. 103-108.

Юдин 2015: (Юдин) Далмат иером. Начальный этап бытования молитв утренних и вечерних по печатным источникам (1596-1622): возникновение, вариативность состава, пути передачи текста // Богословский вестник. 2015. № 18/19. С. 289-340.

Юдин 2017: (Юдин) Далмат иером. Молитвы утренние и вечерние в составе печатных сборников частного молитвенного обихода: возникновение и путь в московскую книжность // Сб. материалов науч.-богослов. конф. каф. филологии Московской духовной академии, посвящ. памяти проф. МДА М. М. Дунаева "Таинство слова и образа" (30 сентября 2016 года). Москва: Орфограф, 2017. С. 222-245.

DICTIONARIES

A Greek-English Lexicon / comp. by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott; revised and augmented throughout by Sir H. S. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars; with a revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. xlv, 2041; Suppl. xxxi, 320 p.

A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic / based on the Lexicon of W. Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson; ed. by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1939. xix, 1127 p.

A Patristic Greek Lexicon / ed. by G. W. H. Lampe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961. xlix, 1568 p.

American 2018: The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Rev. 5th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, [2018]. xxvii, 2084 p.

CE 1913–1914: The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church: in 15 vols. and Index / ed. by Ch. G. Herbermann et al.; Special Edition under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus Catholic Truth Committee. New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913–1914.

Dictionary of biblical imagery / gen. eds. L. Ryken, J. C. Wilhoit, T. Longman III; consulting eds. C. Duriez, D. Penney, D. G. Reid. Downers Grove, Ill.; Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1998. XXI, 1058 s.

EK 1995–2014: Encyklopedia katolicka: w 20 t. / Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Lublin, 1995–2014.

EU 1985–2001: Encyclopedia of Ukraine: in 5 vols., Map and Gazetteer, Index and Errata / The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian studies, The Shevchenko Scientific Society (Sarcelles, France), The Canadian Foundation for Ukrainian studies. Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1985–2001.

Jewish encyclopedia 1901–1906: The Jewish encyclopedia: in 12 vols. New York; London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901–1906.

NCE 2003: New Catholic Encyclopedia: in 15 vols. / The Catholic University of America. 2nd ed. Detroit et al.: Gale. Thompson Learning, 2003.

OED 1989: The Oxford English Dictionary: in 20 vols. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. xxiii, 2126 p.

Słownik języka polskiego: w 11 t. / red. W. Doroszewski. Warszawa: PWN, 1958–1969.

Słownik staropolski: w 11 t. / red. S. Urbańczyk; Instytut języka polskiego PAN, Kraków 1953–2002.

The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary: Complete Text Reproduced Micrographically: in 2 vols. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Wielki słownik języka polskiego / red. P. Żmigrodzki; Instytut języka polskiego PAN. Kraków, 2007. – http://www.wsjp.pl

Генеральний регіонально анотований корпус української мови (ГРАК) / М. Шведова, Р. фон Вальденфельс, С. Яригін, А. Рисін, В. Старко, Т. Ніколаєнко та ін. Київ, Львів, Єна, 2017–2021. – http://uacorpus.org/

ПЭ 2000–: Православная энциклопедия. Москва: Церк.-науч. центр «Православная энциклопедия», 2000–.

Словник української мови XVI – першої половини XVII ст. / НАН України, Ін-т українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича. Львів, 1994–.

Словник української мови: в 11 т. / АН УРСР, Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні. Київ: Наук. думка, 1970–1980.

Словник української мови: у 20 т. / НАН України. Київ: Наук. думка, 2010–.

Срезневскій И. И. Матеріалы для словаря древне-русскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ: в 3 т. Санктпетербургъ, 1893–1912.

Тимченко 2003: Тимченко Є. Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови XV-XVIII ст. Київ; Нью-Йорк, 2003. Кн. 2. 512 с.

NAME INDEX

SUBJECT INDEX

PLACE AND STATE INDEX*

---

* The terms "Ukraine" and "Poland" are not in this index because of the great frequency of their mentions.

BIONOTE

TARAS SHMIHER (1980) is Doctor Habilitatus and Professor at the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine. He researches and publishes on the history and theory of translation (especially liturgical translation), translation quality assessment, and early Ukrainian and British texts.

Shmiher authored several books: "A History of Twentieth-Century Ukrainian Translation Studies" (Kyiv, 2009, in Ukrainian), "Translation Quality Assessment, Its Theoretical and Applied Aspects: Early Ukrainian Literature as Translated into Contemporary Ukrainian and English" (Lviv, 2018, in Ukrainian), "A History of Ukrainian Translation Studies" (Lviv, 2021, in English), "A Chronology of Ukrainian Biblical and Liturgical Translation" (co-authored with Oksana Dzera; Lviv, 2023, in English), "Translating Milton into the Slavic World" (co-authored with Marián Andričík; Levoča, 2023, in English) and a comprehensive bibliography of twentieth-century translation studies in Ukraine in 2013.

He is a laureate of the Hryhoriy Kochur Literary Prize and a full member of the Shevchenko Scholarly Society (both 2015). He was also a Fulbright scholar at the University of California, Berkeley (USA), a visiting researcher at Prešov University and the Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice (both in Slovakia), the Technical University of Chemnitz (Germany), Hong Kong Baptist University (SAR Hong Kong, China) and a research fellow at the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin (Poland). His main interests not limited to research are translation studies, medieval literature, liturgical translation, reception, and perception.