YAN KAPRANOV

The University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw, Poland

ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0003-2915-038X

OLESYA CHERKHAVA

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine

ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0002-4504-0992

ANNA WIERZCHOWSKA

The University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw, Poland

ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0002-4340-9418

PARAMETERS OF RELIGIOUS POPULAR DISCOURSE WITHIN THEOLINGUISTIC FRAMEWORKS

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The article aims to explore theolinguistics, a discipline at the intersection of theology and linguistics, with a focus on developing it as a distinct academic field. It examines the conditions that foster conceptual meanings within religious language and delves into analyzing religious discourse (RD) and its variants like religious popular discourse (RPD) in the context of theolinguistics.

Material and Methods: The study utilizes a comparative etymological approach to understand the conceptual-semantic shifts influenced by religious beliefs. The methodology encompasses examining RD through various perspectives, including the analysis of religious texts in communicative scenarios and the interplay of genre, language, and religion. Additionally, the study focuses on the criteria for distinguishing different institutional types of discourse, particularly RD and RPD.

Results: The article identifies theolinguistics as a field deeply rooted in fideism, emphasizing the importance of reclaiming the original meanings of linguistic units in religious contexts. It exposes the significant transformations in religious terms due to secularization trends and discusses the concept of RD within academic discussions. The study categorizes RD into various forms such as missionary, fideistic, and sermon-like discourses. It also delineates the core and variant parameters in the organization of RPD, highlighting its sociolinguistic nature and its role in status-oriented institutional communication.

Conclusions: The article concludes that religious discourse constitutes a distinct category of institutional discourse, crucial for disseminating ethical values and religious beliefs. It sets forth criteria for identifying RD as an independent form, emphasizing its unique communicative structure, thematic focus, and methodological aspects.

KEYWORDS: *religious discourse, religious-popular discourse, parameters, internal structure, character*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Theolinguistics, derived from the Greek term 'θεός' (God) and the Latin 'lingua' (language), represents a pioneering interdisciplinary field that merges the studies of theology and linguistics. This area of academic inquiry has been accentuated by the contributions of distinguished scholars such as David Crystal (1965), Andreas Wagner (1999) and others. It is argued that

Theolinguistics, while still in its nascent stages, has yet to achieve a fully established theoretical framework. The evolution of this field is attributed to a broad spectrum of research endeavors examining the intricate interplay between linguistic expressions and religious phenomena (Boeve 2003; Crystal 1965; Downes 2010; Holt 2006), with a particular emphasis on the Church's role as a pivotal cultural and social entity exerting influence across a variety of religious communities.

Jean Pierre van Noppen (1995) proposes that the Church functions as a fundamentally inclusive communal entity rather than adopting an exclusive stance, thereby elucidating the intrinsic ontological connection between linguistic and religious experiences. This perspective necessitates a thorough investigation into the conditions under which conceptual meanings are formulated within the domain of religious language and the genesis of a diverse array of religious literature spanning both spiritual and secular realms. These considerations are pivotal in advocating for the recognition of Theolinguistics as a distinct scholarly discipline.

At its core, Theolinguistics is grounded in the principle of fideism, derived from the Latin 'fides' (faith), embodying a dual allegiance to the discipline as both an ecclesiastical and theological branch of linguistics and to theology as the study of faith in the Divine. This approach is predicated on a profound engagement with the vast panorama of human history and culture.

Amid rigorous debates concerning the discursive convergence of language and religion, the notion of Religious Discourse (RD) has gained increasing scholarly attention (Aşik 2012; Grimes 1994; Karaflogka, 2007). This concept is explored from various perspectives: firstly, as religious texts situated within actual communicative scenarios; secondly, as a complex phenomenon that intertwines genre, language, and religion, delineated by three binary variables—level, temporality, and modality, facilitating the differentiation between authentic and refined language (Holberg 2002: 32); thirdly, as metaphorical language in religious communication, encompassing a body of laws, ethical, and moral values such as justice, beauty, love, kindness, which constitute the ideological backbone of any society (Wittgenstein 2010: 43).

A pertinent discourse pertains to the role of **Religious Popular Discourse** (RPD) within the framework of RD concerning missionary, fideistic, and

sermon-like discourses, among others (Morgan 1997). Its objective distinguishes RPD to engage broader societal demographics in religious teachings through popularization, adaptation (simplification), and the presentation of fundamental religious principles and their conceptual meanings embedded in religious language. This discourse endeavors to render religious concepts accessible and relatable to the general populace, fostering a more extensive comprehension and acceptance of religious ideologies.

2. VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS POPULAR DISCOURSE: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

The discipline of Theolinguistics, initially coined in 1976 and subsequently referenced by Jean Pierre van Noppen (1995), only gained prominence among English-speaking scholars in 1987 following its inclusion by Crystal in the Cambridge Encyclopedia. Crystal's definition positioned it as a field concerned with the linguistic analysis of biblical scholars, theologians, and both theoretical and practicing religious adherents (Crystal, 1965: 25). In the German-speaking academic milieu, the discipline received attention from Kucharska-Dreiss in 2004, who delved into its evolution within German studies (Kucharska-Dreiss, 2015).

Theolinguistics is conceptualized as a scientific endeavor aimed at elucidating the connections between religion and linguistics on one side and between linguistics and theology on the other. Alternatively, it is defined as a discipline that scrutinizes the language used by biblical scholars, theologians, and other individuals engaged in the theoretical and practical aspects of religion. The former definition emphasizes the linguistic examination of belief in supernatural power(s) as creator(s) and ruler(s) of the universe. In contrast, the latter focuses on *theology* as the study of the divine nature and religious truth.

The contrast between the anthropocentric principle in linguistics, which views language as a mediator between external phenomena and the individual's inner world, and the theocentric principle is noteworthy. The latter perceives humans and language as divine creations, specifically emphasizing Biblical references. This perspective necessitates understanding the religious

and linguistic personality within the context of its foundational worldview perceptions across different ethnocultural groups.

In contemporary discussions, Theolinguistics actively engages with the complex and contentious relationship between *language* and *religion* (Gadomsky, 2004; Downes, 2010). Amidst this discourse, researchers have introduced the concept of **Religious Discourse** (RD), which has established a terminological field spanning various humanities disciplines, underscoring the interdisciplinary nature of Theolinguistics in exploring the nexus of language, religion, and theology.

The term *religious discourse* is broadly interpreted as 1) *religious* (*spiritual-analytical*) literary criticism in the process of analyzing the evolution of forms of artistic consciousness, 2) *an object of philosophical-religious reflection*, among others, and narrowly – in the aspect of its genres, particularly sermons, prayers, confessions, biblical prophecy.

Adjacent terms to religious discourse include *divine*, *liturgical*, *fideistic*, *missionary*, *religious-popular*, and *preachy* (*metaphysical*) *discourse*. One of the related concepts to *religious discourse* is *divine discourse,* contrasting God's speech and revelation from a philosophical standpoint (Wolterstorff 1995: 3) and analyzing the integration of the symbols *Word* and *Light* in the sense of *Sense* and *Vision* (Chidester 1992: 2). Other equivalent concepts include: 1) *moral discourse*, perceived as *a social practice that produces a series of ethical principles and laws that seek to counter social (and ethnic) inequality, oppression (use of power), or undue pride* (El-Sharif 2011: 43); 2) *sacred discourse* in the study of diachronic and synchronic aspects of religious language in the biblical text and contemporary liturgy; 3) *public discourse of religion*, aiming to establish the primary source of moral authority and break free from apparent standards and criteria that govern social life (Kettell 2009).

Yuliua Ivanova, criticizing the limitations to the term *religious-preaching style*, spoke of *the totality of components of religious communication – oral and written texts* in *religious-preaching discourse* (2007: 134-138). Moreover, in our opinion, the criticism of including only one genre component (sermons) in the name of one type of discourse led to the emergence of a whole range of corresponding (not always appropriate) synonyms to denote religious discourse.

Some controversy arises from certain scholars' positions: those who differentiate and those who equate *religious discourse* with *fideistic discourse*.

Classifying the genre specificity of confessional-religious texts by the criterion of modality, we understand *fideistic discourse* as a philosophical-philological approach to the concept of faith in the word, which takes place in activities with greater involvement of logic and intellect than in the spheres of religious and aesthetic activities, thereby distinguishing the corresponding terms.

Fideistic (religious) discourse is a specific type of institutional discourse uniquely oriented toward facilitating communication associated with people's religious beliefs. It reflects a particular type of interaction based on the transmission (dissemination) of life-essential ethical meanings for both the individual and society (Cherkhava 2011: 18).

Although a relatively new phenomenon, missionary discourse already possesses its terminological field. Attempts to represent it include 1) oral and written texts of missionary literature, where emphasis is placed on *social moral and spiritual shortcomings* of humanity, broadly addressing the psychological problems of contemporaries and proposing ways to overcome them, presenting a range of moral-ethical guidelines, prohibitions, and exhortations; 2) axiological texts, characterized by a deliberate (persuasive) impact on the emotional realm of the recipient's consciousness to shape a value scale in their cognitive system; 3) a variety of the preachy type of religious discourse (Moberg, 2022).

As a form of religious discourse, religious-popular discourse contains several constitutive features: attracting the doctrine in a particular confessional variety, adapting the main ideas of the doctrine for the general population, presenting the doctrine in vivid symbolic behavioral patterns, and adapting rituals. A variant of this type can be considered *popular-theological discourse* (conveying religious truths to non-theologians); 2), which is shaped according to the information carrier.

Preachy discourse is defined as a text offered by a preacher on behalf of a certain confession and containing its teachings, intended to change the consciousness and behavior of the addressee and implemented through appropriate strategies and tactics, dictating the choice of linguistic means with the necessary meaning; or as a reproductive-constructive realization of the universal ideational cycle from thought to word within religious discourse, most prominently represented by its core variety – the *sermon*. Researchers classify sermons according to 1) the institution (*church/non-church*), 2) confession

(*Orthodox*, *Protestant*), 3) location (*mountaintop*), which is dedicated to a particular holiday (*festive*), as well as apostolic and missionary (Moberg, 2022)

Prophetic discourse encompasses verbal and non-verbal texts in which a person's knowledge about future events or those co-occurring with the act of prophecy is formulated but inaccessible to the speaker's direct perception. Based on the communicative organization of this type of discourse, three main varieties are distinguished, corresponding to the cultural and religious tradition of human relations with God, namely: *monologic prophecy* (unilateral relations), *dialogic prophecy* (bilateral relations), and *prophecy-trilogy* (the appearance of the prophet's disciple in the communicative model)

Religious discourse is a **type** of institutional discourse (according to Volodymyr Karasik), which includes 1) missionary, 2) religious-popular, 3) preachy, and 4) prophetic discourses. These, in turn, can be supplemented, modified, or become a variety of other types, as the concept of *discourse* is not a homogeneous phenomenon.

3. Defining Criteria of Religious Popular Discourse: An Analytical Framework

Traditional criteria for distinguishing types of institutional discourse often encompass the purpose and participants of communication, including the varying degrees of openness between the participants—agents of the institution and their clients. Specifically, the differentiation of Religious Discourse (RD) according to these criteria highlights the *difference in openness between the client and the agent* (Karasik, 2000).

Furthermore, scholars have identified the content of the primary intention of speakers as a pivotal criterion for institutional discourse. In the context of RD, this invention is characterized by a unique *union in faith* (Sheigal & Ivanova, 2004).

In addition to these principal criteria, various schools of discourse analysis propose additional parameters for identifying any discourse type. These include the system of discursive formations (Foucault, 2004, p. 112), which encompasses parameters such as participants, theme, method, and the concept of context (Halliday, 1991); the sphere of communication; socio-situational

parameters; rhetorical dimensions; modes of communication; dynamic communicative roles of participants (speaker, addressee, listener, and third parties); and the normative dimension of discourse (Reinhold, 1935, p. 214). Other considerations include the contrast between oral and written discourse, the primacy of the oral form, and the influence of environment, mode, or communication style on complex speech formations.

According to Michel Foucault's criterion of discursive formations, RD can be defined as religious practices typically occurring within the framework of a religious, social institution, such as the Church, which *systematically create the objects about which they speak* (Foucault, 2004, p. 112). This conceptualization views RD as an aggregation of religious utterances that belong to a specific *discursive formation*—a linguistic manifestation of religious and social practices organized and systematized through a particular use of religious language. This use is shaped by a certain mentality, ideologically grounded, and historically determined, thus allowing the practice of belief to be termed the discourse of religion.

Michael Halliday (1991) posits that context in oral or written texts is more encompassing than the parameters of participants, theme, and method. He illustrates this with the denominations of participants, such as *Sister,* which could refer to either a professional member of a medical institution or a member of a religious community. This ambiguity underscores the potential dual nature of religious messaging. While externally directed at a specific or collective addressee, the implicit recipient is any individual reader or listener who interprets the message within their potential framework.

Considering the thematic parameter of discourse, it is essential to note that the themes of RD cover a broad spectrum of human activities, which may lead to confusion with other discourse types.

RD should be examined within **the sphere of communication** that accentuates the thematic objectification as central to distinguishing RD's nature. The effectiveness of communication, characterized by the nuanced strategies and specific sender-recipient dynamics, hinges on the shared specialized knowledge. This institutional framework encompasses both the micro (e.g., local church services) and macro scales (e.g., global religious community activities).

The institutional religious norm, stereotypical address orientations, motivational characteristics, and a pronounced social component delineate the socio-situational parameter of RD. This complexity underscores religious messages' orientation towards diverse demographic segments, integrating the concept of social sinfulness and individual pride within a broader discourse on alienation and self-actualization potential (Johnson, 2003).

A significant focus is placed on RD's rhetorical dimension, precisely the eulogical rhetoric within the Gospel, which reports on divine messages alongside the life and sufferings of Jesus Christ. This element is pivotal in studying religious speech, whether analyzed within institutional confines or as a cultural tradition specific to a community or nation.

Regarding the mode of communication, RD is categorized by its formality level and the medium of delivery, ranging from personal confessionals to grand-scale religious congresses. The hierarchical status and authoritative credibility of the message's narrator play a crucial role in engendering trust and eliciting a positive emotional response from the audience.

Finally, the dynamic communicative roles within RD emphasize the stages of hearing, reflecting, and visual representation, with specific transitional markers ensuring continuous engagement and directional speech flow. This aspect is particularly notable in prophetic RD, where pragmatic markers delineate the phases of commissioning, commission, and execution, highlighting prophetic communication's transformative nature.

This refined exploration of RD through various analytical lenses offers a comprehensive understanding of its multifaceted nature, emphasizing thematic significance, socio-situational influences, rhetorical strategies, communicative modes, and role dynamics as integral to its discourse.

The discussion on Religious Discourse (RD) elucidates its multi-dimensional framework, identifying thematic ***unity, the normative dimension, and the dichotomy between oral and written forms*** as pivotal elements. Teun Adrianus van Dijk (1992) emphasizes thematic unity through the temporal and spatial delineation of global religious events, such as Christmas, which encapsulates various smaller events (e.g., Holy Supper, Christmas Divine Service), each marked by the unity of participants across different institutions.

RD's normative dimension is underscored by the social relations it navigates, including duties, authorizations, and rights that span both novel and extant normative relations. An exemplar duty within RD is the principle of altruism, motivated either by the anticipation of grace or moral obligation, illustrating the intrinsic link between RD and social morality.

The preference for oral over written discourse in RD highlights the foundational role of oral tradition in the propagation of religious texts and teachings. The original biblical texts, perceived as directives from a divine source, underscore the primacy of oral discourse in RD's inception and the subsequent development of written discourse as a derivative form.

Conclusively, RD's distinct classification as a type of institutional discourse emerges from various criteria, including discursive formations, participant roles, thematic consistency, communicative modes, and the intrinsic normative framework it operates within. These elements underscore the complex interplay between language, practice, and belief in RD, revealing its foundational significance in historical and contemporary religious practice.

4. Core and Invariant-Variant Parameters in the Organization of Religious-Popular Discourse.

The discourse commonly referred to as Religious-Popular Discourse (RPD) is a complex sociolinguistic construct, characterized primarily as a status-oriented, institutional form of communication. It facilitates speech interactions among representatives of social groups or institutions, leveraging their status-role capabilities within these collectives. The proliferation of such groups and institutions is responsive to societal demands at various developmental stages (Karasik, 2000).

As a subset of Religious Discourse (RD), RPD is delineated by several distinctive criteria, including:

I. Objective. The primary aim is to disseminate religious doctrine by making it accessible to the broader population through simplification and popularization, thereby laying out its foundational principles.

II. Fundamental Concepts. Central to RPD are key notions such as *God, Faith,* and *Salvation.*

III. Genre Diversity. This encompasses a range of formats, including religious conversations, popular sermons, articles, and letters that bear a religious-popular tone.

IV. Communicative-Situational Elements: These involve the participants, the setting (chronotope), and employed strategies.

V. Linguistic Features. RPD utilizes specific lexical, syntactic, and graphic elements to convey its message effectively.

The organization of RPD around the aforementioned criteria necessitates a nuanced understanding, particularly considering the goal of influencing the masses. This influence can be exerted either directly on the individual level or ideologically through an authoritative figure within a social institution.

A detailed analysis of RPD's discursive composition requires identifying its semantic boundaries and differentiating between its *primary* (constant) and *secondary* (optional) *characteristics*. The essence of RPD is to foster engagement with the Christian faith (a common goal within RD) by popularizing religious teachings. This is achieved not through manipulation but via persuasion, employing methods such as the simplification of religious texts, oral explanations, and the integration of visual elements. These strategies foster a unique religious aesthetic, encouraging a contemplative or creative engagement with religious narratives absent of utilitarian motives.

In summarizing the compositional framework of RPD, it is crucial to outline the core criteria defining its categorization within RD, alongside the invariant and variant textual parameters manifesting within RPD's discourse.

RPD texts can be of two types:

I. **Religious-informative types** include: 1) Religious Magazines; 2) Religious Calendar Guides:

a) Tear-Off Religious Calendars; b) Books for Spiritual Reading (Andachtsbuch); c) Daily Bible Promises (and its modern adapted version, iPhone Bible Promises For Every Day); d) Daily Planners; e) Short Daily Devotionals; f) Deep Daily Meditations;

3) International Religious Festival Booklets; 4) Religious Synod Meeting Booklets.

II. **Religious-agitational types** include: 5) Propaganda Leaflets (Prop-Leaf); 6) Propaganda Posters (Prop-Poster); 7) Propaganda Brochures (Prop-Brochure); 8) Propaganda Booklets/Pamphlets (Prop-Booklet); 9) Propaganda Fold-Out Leaflets (Prop-Leaflet); 10) Propaganda Flyers (Prop-Flyer); 11) Pocket Calendars; 12) External Propaganda Texts (billboard, lightbox, banner); 13) Propaganda Prayer Booklets (Prop-Prayer-Booklet).

For ***the core criteria identifying RPD as a type of RD***, which are inherent in all its texts, we include (Table 1).

Table 1. *Core Criteria for Identifying Religious-Popular Discourse as a Type of Religious Discourse*

1.	Purpose	Popularization of religious teaching
2.	Participants	Supernatural sender – intermediary (consolidated author and recipient)
3.	The socio-situational extralinguistic factor	Creation of religious text with consideration of institutional popularization of religious teaching
4.	The mode of contrasting oral RPD with written	Internal thought mode during reading/viewing/listening
5.	Normative extralinguistic factor	Legislation on the popularization of religious teaching
6.	Religious-popular language strategies	Transmission of knowledge. Persuasion. Attracting to faith
7.	Conceptual integrity	ATTRACTING TO CHRISTIAN FAITH THROUGH RELIGIOUS BIBLICAL KNOWLEDGE

1. Purpose: Popularization of religious teaching.
2. Participants: Supernatural sender – intermediary (possibly a consolidated author) – recipient (human). The concept of the primary source of all RPD texts is Divine power (*the supernatural sender* depends on the professed confession; for example, there may be *a dual address*, as outwardly it is directed to a specific person with positive/negative characteristics (e.g., Tyre, the wicked; The people of Israel; Enemies

of the Jews; The false-prophets [Jeremiah]; Nations; Babylon's kingdom; the Jews; The children of Israel [Isaiah]; Egypt; The Jews) or to a collective addressee (sometimes a metonymic representation of a state), but the implicit addressee can be each specific reader/listener/viewer of all RPD texts, who perceives the message within the frame of their potential.

3. The socio-situational extralinguistic factor of RPD text creation involves considering the institutional norm of popularizing religious teaching, address-oriented stereotypical direction (speech action on the recipient's awareness of significance, value, sacred nature of religious meanings), a system of motivational characteristics, as well as a social component (for example, when members of international religious organizations are aware of social knowledge and its impact on the natural process of creating religious texts within a social institution).

4. The mode of contrasting oral RPD with written, which correlates with the personal sphere of the recipient (internal/thought mode arises during reading/viewing/listening to RPD text): a) giving a positive/ negative evaluation of what is heard/read/seen by the recipient; b) liking/disliking interference in the life of the recipient; c) brevity of communication in case of the recipient's lack of time; d) recipient's interest in the information provided; e) method of popularization; f) the mediator's ability, using specific strategies, to present the relevant material; g) the presence of minimal religious knowledge, which accelerates the process of information perception; h) interest in information due to the attention of the social group to which the recipient belongs.

5. The Normative extralinguistic factor of RPD texts at the level of normative social relations between its participants, particularly *the duties of popularizing religious teaching, authorizations, and rights*. For example, the categorical prohibition of the distribution of religious propaganda in China: «It will be illegal for foreigners to spread religious propaganda material in China, to develop followers or to establish underground churches and other secret organizations»; disapproval in countries of the Germanic language group (Germany, England, USA) and mandatory identification of the sender of the text, usually popularized near a religious organization. In contrast, in countries of the Romance

language group (France, Spain, Italy), there is a neutral attitude towards religious propaganda.

6. 6. Religious-popular language strategies, verbalized according to the intentionality of RPD texts (language criterion of appeal or narration): 1) TRANSMISSION OF KNOWLEDGE, 2) PERSUASION, 3) ATTRACTING TO FAITH (Samoylova 2006) are directed towards maximizing the expansion of the audience (with or without interaction with the audience).

7. 7. Conceptual integrity – attracting to the Christian faith through religious biblical knowledge.

The content of the leading intention (as the speaker/author's intention to express a specific communicatively significant meaning with the aim of attracting to faith, which correlates with the nature of influence on the potential addressee during the conduct of religious agitational activity and popularization of printed polygraphic production) allows for the classification of RPD texts having *a religious-agitational character with a joint CALL to a specific action* (to do/not do something, to turn to a religious organization/read religious literature, to turn to a religious organization/read religious literature, to financially aid the needy, to do/not forget to do/not do something, to unite for joint prayer in difficult times) and *religious-informative character* with typical *NARRATION* (Religious Calendar Guides – simplified/adapted religious themed basic information with temporal attachment to each day and possible additional non-religious information to engage the addressee, International Religious Festival Booklet – primary information about the religious festival and additional overview of the culture of the place where it occurs, International Religious Synod Meeting – primary information about the Religious Synod meeting and additional information about the participants of the Synod);

The discursive formations (social practice) system of religious-agitational texts includes the distribution of RPD texts, religious-charitable activities, and religious-supporting social activities. In contrast, religious-informative texts are characterized by religious-enlightening and religious-inspiring activities.

Variant parameters of RPD texts (Table 3) are those that are differentiating/ optional for each specific type of text, namely: religious-popular language tactics of RPD texts: a) *of a religious-informative character* – COOPERATION (unity with the community, with God, and oneself); Religious Calendar Guide – SELF-PRESENTATION (authoritativeness), COOPERATION (unity with the community, with God, and oneself); b) *of a religious-agitational character* – SELF-PRESENTATION (authoritativeness), DISTINCTION, OPPOSITION; Prop-Prayer-Booklet – COOPERATION (unity with the community, with God, and oneself).

Table 3. *Variant Parameters of Religious-Popular Discourse Texts*

No.	Variant Parameters
1.	Religious-popular linguistic tactics
2.	The concept of context (constitution)
3.	Event (determines the theme, place, time)
4.	The concept of a communication intermediary (consolidated participant, possible author)
5.	Sphere of communication
6.	Rhetorical dimension (eloquence)
7.	Change of communicative roles (We Speak, We Hear, We Understand/Know)
8.	Mode of popularization
9.	Mode of communication

1. <u>Religious-popular linguistic tactics</u> are those language means characteristic of each RPD text and distinctly differentiate texts of *a religious-informative* and *religious-agitational nature*.
2. <u>The concept of context</u> (constitution) for RPD texts: a) of *a religious-informative character*: Religious Calendar Guides – personal; International Religious Festival Booklet – international; International Religious Synod Meeting – religious; b) of *a religious-agitational character*: personal and international.
3. <u>Event</u> (determines the theme, place, time): a) of *a religious-informative character*: Religious Calendar Guides – personal individual problematic event – individual loneliness (older adult). Prototype texts

(Andachtsbuch / Devotionals / Meditations / Ukrainian / Russian-speaking Calendar), which began to be popularized through the Internet for youth who are isolated in social networks; *the Daily Bible Promises site* is aimed at *IT-technology progressive recipients*; International Religious Festival Booklet – organization of religious youth gatherings (*XX Weltjugendtag-Internationales **Festival** in Fulda 2005, XXVI World Youth **Days** in Madrid 2011*); International Religious Synod Meeting – congress of highly qualified theologians (Selection of the Church Synod in Munich 2014); b) of *a religious-agitational character*: appearance of a) religious literature (e.g., *Jesus our Destiny*) or b) religious organization; RK – a) illness – a calendar with an image (Visual Piety) (as a talisman for the needy or for almsgiving), while b) festive event (name day) – image of the corresponding saint, c) fear on the road – the corresponding calendar-talisman; RN – popular celebration in Ukraine of Father's Day and Mother's Day – *billboards with religious inscriptions*: *Thus saith the Lord: Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land; Bible, Book of Deuteronomy chapter 5, verse 16,* and during the Great Fast (religious event) *In fasting, the main thing is not to eat each other*; Prop-Prayer-Booklet – events in Ukraine in 2014 led to the appearance of Prop-Prayer-Booklet (*Prayer book for a fighter for dignity. Five steps to achieve spiritual victory in Ukraine*), which was popularized en masse across all institutions in Ukraine.

4. <u>The concept of a communication intermediary</u> (consolidated participant, possible author) for RPD texts:

   4.1. *For religious-informative types*, where the communication intermediary, working on the text (e.g., Religious Calendar Guides), maximally simplifies it and incorporates much additional non-religious information into its structure, expects that the recipient not only becomes acquainted with the material but is also prepared to reflect on it: either accepting the author's views (strengthening faith and joining the religious community) or mentally opposing them. Accordingly, the recipient can appear as a) an active participant (reacts to the information, continues to buy Religious Calendar Guides, starts searching for additional religious information); b)

a passive recipient (familiarizes themselves but shows no interest). They are aimed at a well-organized recipient (possible member of a religious community) who embraces religious teachings in solitude. Two recipients are possible: a) a religiously knowledgeable person for whom the Religious Calendar Guides text serves as a religious diary; b) an average buyer. Consolidated participants can be competent (usually in a church kiosk) / incompetent sellers who provide/do not provide advice to the buyer. The author, for example, of the International Religious Festival Booklet (who can also act as an intermediary, being a member of a religious organization participating in the festival) is oriented towards a more informed narrow audience (distributed only within a religious organization, community, both within and outside the Church, and direct participants of the international religious festival). Creating the booklet text, the author tries to present in it a part of the event that awaits the recipient-participant shortly if they join the community of religious like-minded people in one of the European cities, to engage them and further contact with local organizers and direct organizers of the festival where the religious event will take place. The informative-ideological character of the international religious festival presupposes *a whole range of accompanying informative textual documents*, both religious (about the congress, meeting, election of Religious Synods within the festival), religious-cultural (visits to churches, holy places of the host country), cultural (cultural monuments of the host nation), and non-religious (legal – agreement of the hosting party to accept respective participants, assistance, providing additional written information, instructions (clear instructions) for preparing participants, computer – further internet correspondence). The framework of partnership communication in this discourse text determines the equal status of its participants with the readiness of both to cooperate. Consolidated participants can be creators of logos and music of the anthem in the booklet (possibly with religious knowledge or simply a creative personality).

4.2. *For religious-agitational types*, the communication intermediary depends on the type of its a) positive/constructive or b) negative/destructive (mass, personal) orientation (Martschukat 2012). In the first case, we observe equality with the recipient, ensured by the awareness of both parties of the material's truthfulness, which can change the fate of an individual/humanity and mutual interest in each other's personalities. In contrast, in the oppositional case, we see significant dominance, authority to impose their convictions to incite enmity, social/personal conflicts, intensifying confrontation in society, and agitation of an individual/group of people into a religious sectarian organization. The recipient here appears as a) an average person (people) captivated by the proposed issue with a susceptible character, who will instantly react to the setting of some individual problematics, as they are in a difficult psychological situation and need support (in the negative form of communication, not suspecting that personal problems are used as a starting point for the topic of conversation); b) a neutrally disposed person (s) who agrees with the author's statements but does not show further interest, operating with a lack of time. Consolidated participants can be mute personalities who distribute/sell religious-popular literature (agitational leaflets, booklets, calendars, billboard installers, choosing the most suitable place). For example, the author of Prop-Prayer-Booklet can also act as an intermediary, being a member of a religious organization or church community, jointly concerned about the country's fate and its spiritual unity. The recipient – every citizen of the country. Consolidated participant – a member of a social institution that distributes Prop-Prayer-Booklet.

5. <u>Sphere of communication</u> includes *church services for believers* (for religious agitation, there is its concept of the «temple»: for example, Religious Calendar Guides texts can be sold both within and outside the temple; International Religious Festival Booklet operates within an organization that is part of a church community or any religious public organization not subordinate to church activities); *religious*

public activity (religious agitation can take place in specifically designated places of non-religious social institutions, for example, Jehovah's Witnesses often organize meetings in cinemas and stadiums to discuss the activities of each of its members with subsequent activation in family, educational, and other institutions; International Religious Festival Booklet also starts its activity at the local level but moves to a larger scale than the previous types – international).

6. <u>Rhetorical dimension</u> (eloquence) – this is the teaching of special religious-agitational, religious-charitable, religious-inspiring, religious-supporting, religious-informative, religious-enlightening eloquence, which is taught within a religious organization, possibly an institute (for example, in religious agitation, unique methods of attracting the addressee's attention), teaching exceptional religious eloquence in the form of briefing, clear instructions, and demands.

7. <u>Change of communicative roles</u> – participants in religious-agitational communication: speaker – addressee – listener – third parties (who do not participate but are mentioned in the communication), which change according to the stages of communication of each type of RPD, for example: a) we hear (necessarily includes correct understanding of the meaning of the religious utterance) – we reflect – we observe (visual representation); b) we talk-hear-understand/recognize; c) we see-understand/recognize-reflect. For each stage of communication, we can represent the process of the recipient's perception of information as 1) raising a particular personal problem «MEINE FRAGE?»; 2) learning about God «GOTT KENNENLERNEN»; 3) receiving advice «BERATUNG»; 4) turning to the church «KIRCHE FINDEN» or a religious community, symbolically depicted in German-language texts.

8. <u>Mode of popularization</u> (extralinguistic parameter) involves a) street agitation, conducted orally (in conversation) and through the distribution of printed polygraphic products; b) sale of corresponding visual material in specially designated places; c) distribution of informative material for specialized international mass gatherings. However, the placement of each RPD text on the internet (channel for transmitting religious information as a mode of communication) reduces the concept of the addressee to sender-recipient uniformity (any author – any web user who identifies or does not identify with a particular confession, and undergoes adaptation of ideas, formulas, behavior rules, definition of concepts).

9. <u>Mode of communication</u> allows classification of RPD texts by the level of formality in popularizing religious teaching (for example, during street religious conversations by agitators, we observe a greater distance between participants than within the recipient's home) and the relationship of status positions of participants in religious-popular communication, particularly the authority of the narrator of the religious-popular message (especially in International Religious Festival Booklet), which is ensured by: a) their knowledge, experience, status, references to biblical context (and to Divine power as the source of the religious message), instilling trust in the listener/reader and expressing the ability (sometimes with categorical commands) for actions and logical thinking of an individual (group of people); b) positive emotional attitude towards them as a representative of the religious community.

5. Concluding Remarks

Religious discourse is delineated as a distinct category of institutional discourse, which is predominantly oriented toward facilitating communication that pertains to individuals' religious beliefs. This form of discourse is distinguished by its unique communicative structure that primarily revolves around disseminating ethical values of profound significance to individuals and the broader society.

The categorization of religious discourse as an independent form of institutional discourse is predicated on various criteria. These encompass a system of discursive formations, encompassing aspects such as the participants involved, thematic focus, and methodology; the contextual dynamics present in both oral and written texts; the sphere of communication it inhabits; socio-situational parameters; its rhetorical dimensions; the mode of communication employed; and alterations in the communicative roles of participants, including the speaker, addressee, listener, and third parties who, while not directly involved in the discourse, are referenced within it. Other critical factors include the subject matter, location, timing of the event, the normative dimension of the discourse, and the contrast between oral and written forms, with a particular emphasis on the predominance of the oral tradition.

Within the broader realm of religious discourse lies the subcategory of religious-popular discourse. This variant is identified through core criteria such as its purpose, the participants in discursive interactions, socio-situational extralinguistic factors, the interplay and contrast between oral and written forms of religious-popular discourse, normative extralinguistic factors, and the specific linguistic strategies employed in religious-popular discourse. These strategies are integral to all its texts, irrespective of whether they are of a religious-informative or religious-agitational nature. Invariant parameters within this domain include the content of the primary intention and the system of discursive formations (social practices), which facilitate the differentiation of religious-agitational and religious-informative texts. Variant parameters are realized distinctly in each specific type of religious-popular discourse text.

REFERENCES

Aşik, M. Ö. (2012). Contesting religious educational discourses and institutions in contemporary Egypt. Edited by B. Charlier. Social Compass, 59(1), 84–101. Cambridge: SAGE Publications.

Boeve, L. (2003). Linguistica ancilla Theologiae: The Interest of Fundamental Theology in Cognitive Semantics. In K. Feyaerts (Ed.), The Bible through Metaphor and Translation. A Cognitive Semantic Perspective (pp. 15–36). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Braun, W. (2000). Guide to the study of religion. London: Continuum.

Cherkhava, O. O. (2011). Anglomovne bibliyne prorotsvo yak riznovid fideistichnogo diskursu (na materiali King James Bible): Dis. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04. Odessa.

Chidester, D. (1992). Word and Light: Seeing, Hearing, and Religious Discourse. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Crystal, D. (1965). Linguistics, language and religion. London: Burns Oates. Retrieved from https://www.davidcrystal.com/Files/BooksAndArticles/-4923.pdf

Department of Religious Education, Catechization, and Missionary Work at the Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Retrieved from http://www.rokim.org.ua/etika/pravo/

Dijk, T. A. van (1992). Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London and New York: Longman.

Downes, W. (2010). Language and Religion: A Journey Into the Human Mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

El-Sharif, A. (2011). A linguistic study of Islamic religious discourse: Conceptual metaphors in the prophetic tradition [PhD Thesis]. London: Queen Mary University.

Foucault, M. (2004). Archeologiia znaniia [Archaeology of knowledge] (M. B. Rakova & A. Y. Serebryannikova, Trans.; A. S. Kolesnikov, Intro.). Saint Petersburg: Humanities Academy; University Book (Series «Au Pura. French Collection»).

Furey, M. C. (2011). Body, Society and Subjectivity in Religious Studies. Journal of the American Academy of Religion. Oxford: Oxford Scholarly Editions Online. Retrieved from http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/11/16/jaarel.lfr088.full

Grimes, J. (1994). Problems and Perspectives in Religious Discourse: Advaita Vedānta Implications. USA: State University of New York Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1991). Corpus Studies and Probabilistic Grammar. In K. Aijmer & B. Altenberg (Eds.), English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik (pp. 30–43). London & New York: Longman.

Holberg, I. (2002). Religious-sermon style of modern Russian Literal Language thesis: Moral concepts. Moscow: Nauka.

Holt, R. A. (2006). Socio-Linguistic Approach to Religious Language. Australian eJournal of Theology, 6. Retrieved from http://aejt.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/395193/AEJT_6.10_Holt.pdf

Jabłońska-Karczmarczyk, K. (2024). Towards Socially Responsible Consumption: Assessing the Role of Prayer in Consumption. *Religions*, 15(4), 445. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15040445

Johnson, G. (2003). The Economies of Grace as Gift and Moral Metaphor Accounting: Insights from Cognitive Linguistics. In K. Feyaerts (Ed.), The Bible through Metaphor and Translation. A Cognitive Semantic Perspective (pp. 84–103). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Karaflogka, A. (2007). E-Religion: A Critical Appraisal of Religious Discourse on the World Wide Web. USA: Equinox Publishing.

Karasik, V. I. (2000). Religioznyy diskurs. In V. I. Karasik & N. A. Krasavskiy (Eds.), Yazykovaya lichnost': institutsional'nyy i personal'nyy diskurs (pp. 5–19). Volgograd: Peremena.

Kettell, S. (2009). On the public discourse of religion: An analysis of Christianity in the United Kingdom. Politics and Religion, 2(3), 420–443. Cambridge: University of Warwick.

Martschukat, J. (2012). The Religious Discourse on Criminal Law in England, 1600–1800: From a Theology of Trial to a Theology of Punishment. In J. Martschukat (Ed.), Religion and Politics in Europe and the United States: Transnational Historical Approaches (pp. 85–99). Washington/Baltimore: Depkat, Volker.

Moberg, M. (2022). *Religion, Discourse, and Society: Towards a Discursive Sociology of Religion*. Routledge. Available from: https://www.routledge.com/Religion-Discourse-and-Society-Towards-a-Discursive-Sociology-of-Religion/Moberg/p/book/9781032193632

Morgan, D.A. (1997). History and Theory of Popular Religious Images. California: University of California Press.

Noppen, J.-P. van (1976). Alter Wein in neuen Schuhen? Ein Beitrag zur empirischen Betrachtung von Kommunikationsproblemen in der Rede von Gott. Linguistica Biblica. Interdisziplinäre Zeitschrift für Theologie und Linguistik.

Noppen, J.-P. van (1980). Spatial theography. A study in linguistic expression and communication in contemporary British popular theology [Ph.D. Dissertation]. Université Libre de Bruxelles.

Noppen, J.-P. van (1995). Methodist Discourse and Industrial Work Ethic. A Critical Theolinguistic Approach. Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis / Moderne Talen en Letterkunde, 73(3), Ghent University.

Peregrin, J. (2012). The normative dimension of discourse. In K. Allan & K. Jaszczolt (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics (pp. 209–225). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pleizier, T. (2024). The Soul in Preaching. *Religions*, 15(4), 446. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15040446

Porter, S.E. (1996). Problems in the Language of the Bible: Misunderstandings that Continue to Plague Biblical Interpretation. In S.E. Porter (Ed.), The Nature of Religious Language: A Colloquium (pp. 20–46). England: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.

Poulos, E. (2023). Three Discourses of Religious Freedom: How and Why Political Talk about Religious Freedom in Australia has Changed. *Religions*, 14(5), 669. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14050669

Reinhold, N. (1935). Interpretation of Christian Ethics. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Sheygal, E. I., & Ivanova, Yu. M. (2004). Preelection televised debates as a genre of strategic communication. Vestnik Volgogradskogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta *Chelovek v kommunikatsii: Kontsept, zhanr, diskurs* / otv. red. E. I. Sheygal, 102–105. Volgograd: VolGU.

Wagner, A. (1999). Theolinguistik. Internationale Tendenzen der Syntaktik und Pragmatik, 507–512.

Wittgenstein, L. (2010). Philosophical Investigations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wolterstorff, N. (1995). Divine Discourse: Philosophical Reflections on the Claim that God Speaks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.