RELIGIOUS VOCABULARY OF EVERYDAY LANGUAGE
OF THE ORTHODOX BELIEVERS OF UKRAINE

Yurii BOREIKO

Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University of Lutsk, Ukraine
E-mail: Boreyko.Yuriy@vnu.edu.ua, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0786-8764

Tetiana FEDOTOVA

Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University of Lutsk, Ukraine
E-mail: Fedotova.Tetiana@vnu.edu.ua, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1975-9925

ABSTRACT: The article attempts to analyze the interaction of the religious language sphere with the Ukrainian language in the context of the religious discourse. Due to the ability of religious discourse to interact with other types of discourse, the speech activity of Orthodox believers is realized within institutional and personal discourses, the latter of which covers the sphere of interpersonal communication in the context of everyday interactions. The objective of the study is to find out the specifics of the functioning of lexical units expressing religious meanings in everyday language of Orthodox believers of Ukraine.

The attributive and modus specificity of language of the religious sphere makes it possible to distinguish the language of religion as a representative of the meaning of the existence of religion and the religious language as the embodiment of manifestations of religion in the socio-cultural context. The religious language, which is objectified in the everyday language of Orthodox believers, includes a set of language units and lexical-semantic constructions peculiar to the church-religious sphere. At the same time, the everyday language of believers is characterized by coexistence of lexical units of sacred and national languages, an appeal to the emotional sphere of believers, and the use of verbal and non-verbal means of communication.

The everyday language of Orthodox believers includes theological terms, church Slavonicisms, archaisms, historicisms, borrowed words. It also contains the phenomena of polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, antonymy and acts as an additional means of communication in the context of social interactions.

KEYWORDS: religious sphere, religious discourse, speech activity, language of believers, everyday interaction, lexical unit, communicative situation, sociocultural context

Introduction

To clarify speech interaction of communication participants, scientists use the concept of "discourse", which is implemented in a socio-cultural context and is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes the process and result of speech activity. The subject area of religious discourse, which is characterized by a high degree of symbolism and metaphoricality, includes rationally unknowable phenomena that are interpreted as true and accessible for perception as a result of mystical experience.

The special context of communication, which corresponds to certain communicative situations within the limits of religious discourse, creates for Orthodox believers the use of Church Slavonic vocabulary. In Ukrainian society, the problem of using the Ukrainian or Church Slavonic language in the church-religious sphere is related to the attitude towards the Orthodox Church of Ukraine (OCU) and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (UOC MP). The creation of the OCU ensured the dominance of the Ukrainian language in the environment of this jurisdiction, which acquired the status of the language of the church sphere[1].

Since the speech activity of Orthodox believers is realized within the limits of not only institutional, but also personal discourse, a type of which is everyday communication, it is possible to distinguish the book-official and colloquial-everyday components of religious vocabulary. In this context, the layer of the language of Ukrainian Orthodox believers, which is used in everyday life and

---

[1] At the same time, according to the results of the most recent national survey conducted by the Razumkov Center from November 12 to 19, 2021, among those who identify themselves with the OCU, 6.1% of the respondents, among believers of the UOC, spoke in favor of conducting services and sermons in their native language, among believers of UOC MP – 1.6% (Особливості, 2021, p. 60). That is, in contrast to public attitudes, among believers in Orthodox jurisdictions, the issue of language use in church practice is not of great importance.

includes words with a religious content or a corresponding connotation, is of considerable research interest.

The everyday language of Orthodox believers, which contains a set of language units that express religious meanings, is usually called a social dialect (sociolect). As a branch of the national language, the Orthodox sociolect is related to it by its lexical composition, grammatical and phonetic rules. Elements of the sociolect of Orthodox believers permeate various styles and genres of the Ukrainian literary language, fiction, cinematography, etc.

Therefore, the relevance of the study of the language of Orthodox believers in Ukraine is determined, on the one hand, by public interest in the position of Orthodox jurisdictions regarding the language of church practice, and on the other hand, by the need to study the specifics of the language of Orthodox believers in the process of everyday communication.

Literature review and methodology

In the context of the study of religious communication, its levels and forms, scholars study the language of religion as a phenomenon, as well as the languages of specific religions (sacred, liturgical, etc.), their phonetic and grammatical codification (Богачевська, 2005). In linguistics and linguistic religious studies, a direction related to the analysis of religious discourse has developed. F. Batsevych focuses on the specific nature of religious (fideistic) discourse, pointing out its significant differences from other types of discourse. The specificity of fideistic texts is that they contain signs (words, verbal formulas, messages, sequences of messages, etc.), which in the process of communication of believers are attributed certain transcendental properties, in particular magical ones (Бацевич, 2004, p. 143). The phenomenon of religious discourse is studied within the framework of the philosophy of religion (K. Huber, K. Molari, A. Pellegrini, P. Ricker)[2]. At the junction of language and religion, theo-linguistics developed, within the framework of which the manifestations of religion, which were established and reflected in language, are studied. In other words, theo-linguistics examines the phenomenon of religious language in combination with the picture of the world, the linguistic means of which religious language appears (Гадомский, 2007).

In the field of constant interest of linguists are various dimensions of the study of religious vocabulary. The process of conceptualization of the sacred sphere in the Ukrainian language was analyzed by M. Skab, emphasizing the orderliness of the sacred sphere in the Ukrainian linguistic picture of the world (Скаб, 2009). The study of the dynamics of the development of the SOUL concept led the scholar to the conclusion that various aspects of religious meaning became the basis for the creation of derivative meanings, new words, idioms, figurative expressions (Скаб, 2010, p. 8). Concepts are analyzed as abstract units of the mental level that reflect the content of the results of human cognition of the surrounding world. This approach on the example of the biblical concepts "Adam" and "Eve" provides an opportunity to describe their new conceptual meanings (Скаб, 2016).

The conceptual sphere of the sacred as a representative of religious meanings and their linguisticization in language is explored in the works of T. Vilchynska. The concept sphere of the sacred appears as a field of reproduction of the layering of ethno-cultural traditions and the worldview of native speakers in a certain sphere of knowledge about religion (ВІльчинська, 2008, p. 154). The classification of religious symbols, proposed by S. Kuvychka, is based on the distribution of symbols by the form of manifestation, by content, and by the number of symbols in one (Кувичка, 2010, p. 82–84). According to the form of manifestation, among other things, verbal, gestural and background symbols are distinguished, which play an important role in the everyday communication of believers.

The sociocultural determinism and specific features of communicative taboos based on the speech of Ukrainians are investigated by Y. Yelovska (Єловська, 2013). A. Kovtun points out the intensive penetration of religious vocabulary beyond the limits of a narrow segment of communication. The scholar proves that this situation indicates the actualization of religious vocabulary in the conditions of stylistic reorganization, in particular in colloquial and everyday Ukrainian speech (Ковтун, 2019, p. 67).

Within the framework of the theory of language genres and speech-behavioral tactics, preaching, prayer, and etiquette genres – greetings, farewells, consolations, congratulations, gratitude,

---

[2] In view of the set goal, the article does not provide a detailed analysis of the works of the specified authors, as this requires a separate study.

apologies (Вежбицкая, 1996) are studied. Scholars are investigating language and speech representations of strategies and tactics of Orthodox preaching of the 20th century (Смирнова, 2016).

For the study of the everyday language of believers, the scientific work of representatives of sociological directions has a significant theoretical and methodological meaning. S. Katayev drew attention to the nature of the sacred in the context of communication, emphasizing the discourse of the sacred. According to the scholar, the nature of the sacred is determined by the individual's attitude towards it (Катаєв, 2011, p. 332). In other words, the sacred acquires essential features when all participants of communication perceive a certain object as sacred. Within the framework of the theory of communicative action, Y. Habermas emphasized the peculiarities of the subject's life in a community whose members are united by tradition and language (Хабермас, 1993). According to E. Giddens, social reality consists of social interactions, primarily in situations of "co-presence" – relations of autonomy or dependence, where communication is a direct interpersonal exchange of messages (Гидденс, 2005). I. Hoffman studied "dramaturgical behavior" that is practiced within personal interactions, the basis of which is communication (Гофман, 2007). Equating social interaction with language communication, H. Garfinkel directed the main attention to the norm of communication, that is, to the "rules of speech" (Гарфинкель, 2007).

The analysis of various scientific directions, the subject of which is communication, in particular the language of the religious sphere, leads to the conclusion that none of the approaches reflects diversity and a complex structure of the phenomenon under study. At the same time, despite the theoretical achievements in the field of humanities, there are no systematic studies of the confessional dimensions of the language of believers in the context of everyday interactions. Therefore, the objective of the study is to clarify the specifics of the functioning of lexical units expressing religious meanings in the everyday language of Orthodox believers of Ukraine. The defined goal involves solving the following tasks: to analyze the peculiarities of religious language as an actualization of lexemes and expressions of religious topic; characterize the everyday language of Ukrainian Orthodox believers as a social dialect; to investigate the lexical and semantic manifestations of the religious vocabulary of the modern Orthodox sociolect.

The research material was religious vocabulary of a terminological and commonly used character, represented by church slavonicisms, archaisms, historicisms, borrowed words used in the everyday language of Orthodox believers of Ukraine. The factual material was obtained through a continuous selection of lexemes from everyday expressions of church hierarchs, priests, church workers, representatives of monasticism, and parishioners. Interviews, clarifications, instructions of spiritual persons published in periodicals on the Internet, messages and comments of representatives of the clergy and laity on the Facebook social network, excerpts from modern works of fiction are included in the analysis. The choice of lexical material is due to an attempt to determine the nature of the combination of religious vocabulary with neutral lexemes in the everyday language of the church and religious sphere. It is in the everyday language of Orthodox believers of different categories that the originality, imagery, metaphoricality, contrast, and emotional connotation of religious vocabulary can be clearly traced[3].

The analysis of the religious vocabulary of Orthodox believers involves the use of general scientific and special linguistic methods that contribute to the understanding of the peculiarities of the actualization of the phenomenon under study. The methods of analysis and synthesis, inductive and deductive generalization make it possible to work out and systematize the theoretical basis of the research. The use of heuristic methods, in particular the method of continuous selection, ensures the formation of factual material by isolating text fragments containing contextual illustrations of the use of lexical units of religious topics. The application of elements of the methodology of external reconstruction of the comparative-historical method in combination with the techniques of the descriptive method made it possible to consider units of religious vocabulary in combination with other

---

[3] The article does not provide an analysis of the specifics of the manifestation of sociolect in the environment of the clergy, monasticism and laity. Attention is focused on the everyday speech practice of Orthodox believers of various categories, which is actualized in the Ukrainian socio-cultural context and objectified in religious discourse.

lexemes of the modern Ukrainian language. The understanding of semantic transformations of lexical units of religious content was achieved thanks to the use of component analysis. Interpretation of semantic and stylistic parameters of religious vocabulary is provided by functional analysis. The relevance of the meanings of religious-themed lexemes in the modern speech of Orthodox believers has been specified using a contextual analysis.

Analysis of the ratio of the main concepts

To achieve the goal, it is necessary to reveal the logic of using the terminological series of research. In scientific literature, the terms "language of religion", "religious language", "sacred language", "liturgical language", "religious discourse", "religious style", "religious communication", etc. are found, which indicates the ambiguous nature of approaches to the study of the language of religious spheres.

Researchers define the interactive activity of communication participants, exchange of information as a discourse, in the process of which various communicative strategies are used, their verbal and non-verbal implementation in the practice of communication (van Deyk, 1989). Discourse is a text immersed in life, characterized by special grammar, rules of word usage and syntax. Taking into account the sociocultural context, discourse can be defined as a complex communicative phenomenon, an oral speech act that contains information about the participants of communication, and also includes the processes of creating and perceiving a message (Бацевич, 2010, p. 13). In other words, discourse is a coherent sequence of language units that is created and implemented with a specific purpose.

Researchers understand religious discourse as a religious text in a situation of real communication (Богачевська, 2005), as well as a system of speech interaction regarding religious texts that contain beliefs shared by all believers. As a verbalized form of social activity, religious discourse is a type of sociocultural interaction. In religious discourse, knowledge is constructed on the basis of dogmas and the mystical experience of authoritative persons, therefore this type of discourse is characterized by the specificity of content, expression, and functioning of language elements.

Religious discourse is a unit of oral or written speech product, which implies an inseparable connection with the situation and context. It should be taken into account that the original, fundamental form of existence of the discourse is oral speech, while written discourse is derived from oral speech. This distinction is related to the channel of information transmission, because in oral discourse the channel is acoustic, in written discourse it is visual (Селиванова, 2004).

Due to the ability of any discourse to interact and converge with related types of discourse, it can be argued that the speech interaction of Orthodox believers is realized in institutional and personal discourses. Institutional discourse, in which the speaker is a representative of a religious community, communication takes place within the framework of status-role relations and involves the goal and participants of communication. The characteristics of institutional discourse are standardization, the absence of a personal, individual nature, the mandatory presence of a speaker and an addressee, dialogic and monologic forms of discourse, certain symbolic speech actions. Instead, personal discourse, which assumes the presence of an individual with individual characteristics, has an everyday variety, which is distinguished by the subjectivity of language expression, spontaneity, a lively exchange of thoughts, in which metaphors, phraseological units, folklorisms, dialectics, colloquialisms and other words with expressive and emotional coloring are used .

In this regard, we believe that the logic of the study requires a distinction between the concepts "language of religion" and "religious language", which are not identical in meaning. The concept of "language of religion" is implemented in institutional discourse and expresses the property of religious consciousness to represent meaning, the existence of which is inextricably linked with language. The way of meaning in the language of religion is the process of its symbolization. The canonized way of speaking determines the nature of language means and the choice of techniques for creating texts. The term "language of religion" in a broad sense is used to define a sign system that includes a certain range of verbal and non-verbal signs. In a narrow sense, the language of religion contains language components that are used in religious ideology, theory and practice (Горбаченко, 2002).

The terms used in the language of religion are mainly used to denote an absolute value – God, as well as values that express ultimate goals – the Kingdom of God, immortality of the soul, heaven, earthly means of achieving these goals – religion, church, faith, cult, as well as values of everyday life

which are sacralized by religion. The sources of the language of religion are the Holy Scriptures and the Sacred Tradition, as well as fixed liturgical formulas approved by the Church, which include the structure of the utterance, rhythmic repetition of individual parts, anaphora, emotional or contemplative coloring that gives the utterances a singing and static character, a mnemonic technique that facilitates memorization of texts.

In the texts of the language of religion – the Bible, prayers, doctrines, moral instructions, etc. - respect, reverence and obedience to God are revealed as the main principle of formulating an appeal to Him. Prayer texts contain an etiquette component expressed in acts of politeness – greetings, requests, apologies, thanks. It is noteworthy that the way of formulating such an intention of communication in the religious sphere is regulated by different language patterns from those in secular life. Religious texts are characterized by epithets, metaphors, and paradoxes: "Найславніший Воєводо і Господи, пекла Переможцю! Визволений од вічної смерти, творіння Твоє і слуга Твій, пісню похвальну співаю Тобі. А Ти, що маєш бермірне милосердя, визволи від усякої біди мене, що взиваю: Ісусе, Сину Божий, помилуй мене" (Акафіст, 2015)[4].

Unlike the language of religion, religious language functions within the everyday communication of believers and is used within the framework of religious behavior. Religious language is constituted by biblicalisms and theological terms that make up a group of words culturally and historically connected with faith and religious rites: "У храмі тим часом диякон обрурював кадилом ікони та присутніх. …Молитва повинна здійматися до Небесного Трону так само легко, як і дим ладану. Кажуть, диявол зі своїм виводком не переносить фіміаму… Недарма у нашій лексиці вкоренився вислів "боїться як чорт ладану" (Чопенко, 2006). The spoken language of believers has a number of features, including spontaneity and immediacy, which ensures high psychological content, because the speaker represents himself through utterances: "…Один священик (…) написав сонет, який присвятив мені, тоді ще молодому диякону (…). У тому сонеті були слова "Тримай і тримайся за потир". З тих пір я завжди згадую ті слова, коли тримаю Святу Чашу" (Мартиненко, 2021). Necessary elements of language manifestation are sound represented by voice and intonation, silence (pause), as well as individual motor expressiveness manifested in gestures, facial expressions, etc.

As we can see, the functioning of the religious discourse of Orthodox believers is not limited to the use of the language of church service, dogmatic texts, worship, but extends to all speech practices of the religious community. Thus, spoken language, which is realized in everyday religious discourse and used in the process of everyday interactions, is a means of live communication of believers.

Everyday language of Orthodox believers as a social dialect

The colloquial language of Orthodox believers is realized in oral form and is used in official or informal communication. As a means of everyday communication, colloquial language is encouraged among various categories of Orthodox believers, in particular priests and their family members, students of theological institutions of education, parishioners, participants of pilgrimages, processions, etc. and is distinguished by a special flavor: "Ось (…) заїжджав бус у монастир і йшов наш ієромонах Лазар. Він фактично нічого не чує. Він іде по вузькому провулку і машина ззаду їде (…) сигналить, а він (…) нічого не чує. Ну так він смиряє навколишніх людей" (Отець, 2021).

A variety of the language of a certain social community, in particular a religious group, which is based on a standard language, differing from it only in special vocabulary and word formation, is called a social dialect. Among researchers, there is still no agreement on the interpretation of the term "social dialect" and the definition of the criteria for its content. For the most part, the concept of "sociolect" is defined as a group language that does not have a fully recognized status. The concept of "sociolect" is also interpreted as a synonym for the language of a certain group, as a general concept for professional language or jargon, as the language of a certain social stratum. The common feature of all sociolects is that they always coexist in speech practice with other forms of language functioning,

---

[4] Constatives of the language of religion, functioning in the form of prayer, oath, vow, eulogy, etc., include not only information about a person's connections with absolute reality, but also contain the creative potential of believers.

acting as an additional means of communication of certain social or professional groups (Олійник, 2019).

Characteristic sociolectic features are manifested in a number of signs (variants) and fully or partially form a social group, the main feature of which is language. H. Löffler calls only language variants whose speakers form a separate group in society based on other characteristics as sociolects (Löffler, 2010). Sociolects are understood as specific and special languages, the defining feature of which is, on the one hand, in promoting the integration of community members, and on the other hand, in their isolation from the outside world. The use of special languages is also considered by scientists as a means of identification for accepting other people into the community (König, 1994, p. 133).

In the context of everyday communication, the listener shows a tendency to perceive the speaker's statement so close to his own position that the speaker is assigned a positive or negative evaluation in advance. As a result, the listener agrees or disagrees with the speaker under the influence of the initial and unconscious attitude. The listener cannot do otherwise, because in everyday language the rules of using words are not strictly prescribed. It is about the consensus that accompanies the activity of subjects, which concerns, on the one hand, the proposed (objective) content of statements, thoughts and intentions, and on the other hand, intersubjectively significant expected actions that accompany statements (Ситниченко, 1996).

The specified peculiarity of everyday communication is clearly visible in the communicative structure of the Orthodox parish circle. The church subculture is characterized by a peculiar way of life, which is regulated by the church order, as well as a mystical worldview, which is distinguished by linguistic and gestural stereotypes. At the same time, facial expressions, gestures, and body movements are of great importance in everyday interpersonal interactions. According to the observations of S. Kuvychka, the existence of religious gestural symbolism is quite natural, since a person conveys most of the information in a non-verbal way - gestures, facial expressions. Gesture symbols include certain body movements, as well as actions that have an ideological semantic load and a sacred meaning (Кувичка, 2010, p. 84).

It is noteworthy that the possession of a specific version of the language is considered by its speakers and external observers not only as a sign of belonging to the community of believers, but also as a mandatory cultural competence. Members of the church subculture can be identified by their appearance and manner of behavior, which become identifying features, in particular, for the members of the community themselves. The language of this community is characterized by church vocabulary, verbal formulas expressing self-deprecation: "Я, грішний, прожив у Троїце-Сергієвій лаврі 18 років, там я прийняв монашеський постриг…" (Я ним, 2023). The speech of "church people" expresses emphasized modesty, which is demonstrated by lowered eyes: «Черниця закриває очі, бере до рук чотки, повільно перебирає. – Тому, хто живе з Богом, легше і спокійніше" (Вегеа-Абрамович, 2020).

The "bookish" nature of the culture of the church environment determines the knowledge of Orthodox literature and the understanding of the Church Slavonic language. The use of religious texts depends on the communicative situation or form of communication. In particular, "spiritual conversation" involves aesthetically designed genres, and joint prayer is realized in ritualized forms – spiritual poems, akathists. Unstructured genre formations are used for situational communication: "В одного старця у Почаївській лаврі поцікавився рецептом від гріха (…): нарий коріння послуху, набирай квітів душевної чистоти, нарви листя терпіння, плодів нелицемірних. Усе це висуши постом, (…) приправ смиренням, слізьми покаяння, сіллю братолюбства, щедротами милостині…" (Чопенко, 2006).

Intonation is a constructive feature of the utterances of believers in the church circle, as it encourages the interpretation of meaning, therefore, the generation of new meanings. Intonation establishes, on the one hand, the connection of the word with the extra-verbal context, and on the other hand, it expresses the contact of the speaker with the listener. As an element of language orientation and the structure of external and internal speech, silence, a pause in speech is actively used. Silence has an ambiguous character and can be understood as reluctance to communicate, dissatisfaction, agreement, etc., that is, it implies the possibility of meaning-making. It is worth paying attention to communicative prohibitions that are actualized in the process of communication and depend on the situation and the persons involved in the act of communication. Communicative taboos are associated

with prohibitions on the use of certain words, phrases and topics (Єловська, 2013, p. 175). Restrictions also apply to certain features of the tone, intonation, and spectrum of sounds: "...Монахиня, що нами опікувалася, розповіла коротко про внутрішні правила. Вона говорила тихо (розмовляти голосно там не прийнято), а ми вслухалися в кожне слов" (Піти, 2022).

Among Ukrainian Orthodox believers, the Church Slavonic language occupies an important place, which is due to the creation of a body of liturgical literature based on it, which has a centuries-old authority[5]. As the language of worship, Church Slavonic, along with specific clothing, colors and smells in the temple, appears for believers as a register of inclusion in the regime of religious communication (Holt, 2006, pp. 1 – 14). It is obvious that the Church Slavonic language influenced the construction of the language of religion, which is regulated by church tradition, as well as the formation of the everyday language of Orthodox believers.

As it happened historically that the Church Slavonic language functioned mainly in church usage and was almost never used in live communication, believers perceived it as a marker of the divine sphere, an integral attribute of religious practices, which cannot be used in other communicative spheres. A certain vagueness of the meaning of the Church Slavonic texts was explained by the "sacred darkness" necessary for the liturgical text. In other words, it was believed that sacred texts should contain something unattainable by ordinary perception, hidden, intimate, accessible only after going beyond the limits of human existence and communicating with God without the limitations imposed by physical reality. However, the clarity of Church Slavonic texts was often misleading, as the lexical meaning of the words often did not coincide with the "simple" language, because the texts contained many borrowed words. In Ukrainian culture, according to scientists, the Church Slavonic language has become a special component of creating an axiological picture of the world, the formation of which occurs through the production of certain textual information that circulates in society in the language signs of the artistic form of sacred texts, which are distinguished by codification and canonicity (Переломова, 2008, p. 110).

Therefore, the functioning of the Church Slavonic language on the Ukrainian spiritual soil led to diglossia (Білих, 2016, p. 67), that is, a linguistic situation in which two languages are perceived by speakers as one, but in higher and lower forms, and the use of one form of the language mutually excludes the possibility of using another. So, in the perception of Orthodox believers, there is a clear hierarchical division of languages into simple and sacred, everyday and church. The situation of diglossia, when the language of worship did not penetrate into other groups of vocabulary and spheres of functioning in society, contributed to the construction of the original "heavenly" quality of the language, which was given a contemplative meaning[6].

As we can see, for centuries the Church Slavonic language was outside the process of live usage, turning into a closed codified system that practically stopped developing. However, certain lexemes and syntactic constructions, which are still used for stylistic purposes, are an important source of formation of the everyday language of Orthodox believers. At the same time, it is accepted that it is impossible to study the Church Slavonic language using established linguistic approaches, because certain features of orthography and grammar are justified not from a linguistic point of view, but from a doctrinal point of view. So, the word "angel" has different spellings with the opposite meaning (angel of God or spirit of evil). The lexeme "word" in its usual meaning belongs to the neuter gender, and in the meaning "God the Word" is declined in the masculine gender.

Therefore, functioning in the form of a sociolect, the everyday language of Orthodox believers is not a complete system of communication, but is a feature of speech, functioning in the form of words, phrases, and syntactic constructions. According to the vocabulary and grammatical basis, the Orthodox sociolect is almost no different from the commonly used language, but it is different from the languages of other social communities.

---

[5] Church Slavonic is the sacred language of believers of a separate denomination, which does not correspond to Orthodox theology, but is de facto proclaimed and accepted.
[6] The reflection of this property of the Church Slavonic language, which contributed to the symbolic structuring of the Slavic language world, is sometimes difficult to translate into modern literary languages.

Lexical and semantic representations of the language of Orthodox believers

Numerous homonyms originate from the Church Slavonic language, in particular, "агнець" (ahnets) – a part of the prosphora, which is taken out at the proscomidia for the celebration of the Eucharist: "Євхаристійний Агнець (…) перевтілюється в Тіло Христове" (Капітула, 2013), and "Агнець" (Ahnets) – the symbolic name of Jesus Christ, who sacrificed himself for atonement for the sins of mankind: "…Кров Агнця непорочного Господа нашого Ісуса Христа – спасіння людей" (Капітула, 2013). The homonym "трапеза" (trapeza) denotes eating and drinking at home by the whole family or in the monastery by the brothers: "Перед кожною трапезою сестри стають вздовж столу і читають три молитви" (Піти, 2022). In the language of believers, homonyms that do not coincide in meaning are also used, for example, in Ukrainian the word "живіт" (zhyvit) means a part of the body (abdomen), and in Church Slavonic – "живот" (zhyvot) means life: "І сущим во гробіх (…) Живот дарував" (Господь, 2010).

The everyday language of Orthodox believers, based on the commonly used language, includes religious vocabulary with theological terms and everyday words represented by Church Slavonicisms, archaisms, historicisms that express religious meanings. The words of the Ukrainian language that have a certain origin include, for example, "пустельник" (pustelnyk) – recluse: "Аби дістатися монастиря, можна скористатися безліччю стежок …Нижня пролягає повз братську церкву та чотири келії і аж до так званої келії пустельника" (Задністровський, 2015); "спасіння" (spasinnia) – salvation from sin: "…Спасіння є даром Божим чи плодом наших зусиль, нашої турботи і старання?" (Від кожного, 2021); "врозумлятися" (vrozumliatysia) – to reconsider, to come to one's senses: "А ми, розумні християни, кожен помолимося за нього (неї), хоча б коротким: Господи, змилуйся і вразуми цього (цю) раба (у) твого (ю)!" (Відгуки, 2022); "подвизатися" (podvyzatysia) – to act, to participate, to show oneself in something: "Наш монастир був інтернаціональним. У ньому подвизались люди різних національностей…" (Я ним, 2023); "труждатися" (truzhdatysia) – to work diligently: "Це мало хто й зрозуміти може, тільки ті, хто й самі труждаються" (Тихий, 2022); "намолений" (namolenyi) – a word that characterizes an object or a place near which or in which one prayed a lot and for a long time: "Століттями намолене місце вже стало святим" (Свято-Миколаївський, 2021).. Notably, that some words of the Orthodox sociolect, depending on the context, can acquire a different meaning or connotative meaning, for example, "вкушати" (vkushaty) – consume, eat (food products): "Кожна людина готує на свято ті страви, які не можна було вкушати протягом посту" (Волинський, 2021) or know, realize, experience, feel (sin, humility): "У просторі гріха людина вкушає печаль…" (Софійчук, 2018).

Starting from the end of the 20th century, when the role of the church in social life became more active, a significant layer of religious vocabulary began to be used in a limited circle of believers, penetrating into other spheres. It is an outdated vocabulary that includes a layer of Church Slavonicisms, Ukrainianisms, Russianisms and words borrowed from other languages, for example, Hebraisms, Greekisms, etc. An example of Church Slavonicism with a changed meaning is the word "благовірний" (blahovirnyi), which in the religious context means the face of Orthodox saints from among the monarchs: "Благовірний княже Ярославе, моли Бога за нас і нашу державу" (Благовірний, 2023), in the secular context – a married person in relation to his wife. Historicisms include a number of words that are used in a figurative sense, for example, the word "єлей" (yelei) denotes vegetable oil for use in the church, but another meaning – "that which soothes, comforts, praises"): "…Співається канон про оливу (…) священики просять Господа «єлеєм милосердя втішити душі і тілеса людські" (Молебний, 2022); "паперть" (papert) means the area in front of the inner vestibule of the temple, instead it is used in the sense of "standing on the porch" – to beg: "Хто ж це там на паперті стоїть? Чи ж це не та, забута нами пісня?..." (Осіння, 2010); "Голгофа" (Holhofa) – denotes the name of the hill on which Jesus Christ was crucified, and in another sense – the place of execution or torture: "Я на Голгофі, Господи, стою. Твої муки, мій Ісусе, бачу" (Записки, 2020). Among the words considered obsolete, the lexeme "білець" (bilets) means a novice in a monastery, "ктитор" (ktytor) – a church elder who takes care of property and performs other functions at the church (Смирнова, 2016, p. 33).

The language of Orthodox believers includes a number of words that have a different meaning from that recorded in explanatory dictionaries. These are polysemic terms, the vast majority of which

are ambiguous. So, if the word "proofing" (vychytka) means proofreading or editing a text, then in the Orthodox sphere it has the meaning of exorcism through special prayers, i.e. exorcism: "…Не раз у Почаєві чую як паломники шукають (…) старця Тихона, що проводить вичитки" (Ославська, 2021). The word "hlas" (hlas), which means "voice" in the common language: "…Голос народу – це Глас Божий" (Багряний, 2013), is a term of liturgical music and has several meanings – sound, sound, melody, chant, chord scale. The word "vigil" (bdinnia) means a state of intense attention, and as a religious term in the expression "all-day vigil" (vsenichne bdinnia) has the meaning of worship on the eve of especially revered holidays: "Бдіння – зауважила мати Феоксенія – завжди має бути пов'язане з покаянням, воно очищає розум монахів після денних турбот" (Никодим, 2018).

In the modern lexicon of Orthodox believers, there is a terminologicalization of religious vocabulary, which is manifested in the transition of common units into a category of terms, for example, "служба" (sluzhba) means worship: "Вже двічі служив Божественну Літургію за цим перекладом" (Мартиненко, 2023); "отець" (otets) means a priest: "Ну що ж, всечесні отці, (…) перед вами приклад істинного пастиря, який душу свою покладає за доручене йому Богом стадо" (Таргонський, 2017). Instead, determinologizing involves the transition of religious terms into everyday language through metaphorical use, for example, "sanctify yourself in the pit": "…Після причастя не освятився, тому що не було віри" (Тварь, 2020).

The vocabulary of believers includes the everyday address to the priest "батюшка" (batiushka) instead of the normatively established "отець" (otets): "Батюшка, повірте, кращого священика ніж Ви годі було й бажати" (Таргонський, 2017). The language of Orthodox believers is distinguished by a special tonality and emotional coloring, which is facilitated, in particular, by the use of diminutives in the names of objects of religious use ("іконка" (ikonka) – icon, "проскурка" (proskurka) – prosphora: "Чому проскури складаються з двох частин? – Вони символізують два єства Ісуса Христа – Боже і Людське" (Чопенко, 2006); "водичка" (vodychka) – water): "Хай свята водичка скропить ваші личка..." (Україна, 2017). A significant part of the used agionyms are of foreign origin, but adapted to the norms of the Ukrainian language – Микола Чудотворець, (Mykola Chudotvorets), Юрій Змієборець (Yurii Zmiieborets): "У народі Микола Чудотворець – популярний святий" (Українка, 2018).

The language of believers is characterized by the frequent use of synonymous pairs, among which one word is a borrowed theological term, the other is of Slavic origin, for example, "хіротонія" (ordination) –"рукоположення" (rukopolozhennia): "В ПЦУ звершено архієрейську хіротонію єпископа Васильківського Єфрема (Хом'яка)" (В ПЦУ, 2023); "…Архімандрита Єфрема (Хом'яка) було рукоположено у сан єпископа Васильківського" (Драбинко, 2023); one refers to literary language, the other – religiolect, for example, "тиждень" (week) – "седмиця" (sedmytsia): "Була Страсна Седмиця, ранок четверга, там якраз прибирали перед Пасхою" (Толстой, 2022); both words of Slavic origin, for example, "прикладатися" (prykladatysia) – "цілувати", in particular an icon or a cross: "…Отримавши льняну ікону, Митрополит Володимир приклався до неї і сльози зявились на очах Блаженнійшого" (Польченко, 2012); one word is Church Slavic, another is commonly used, for example, "благовоління" (blahovolinnia) – "affection" (favor): "Ми бачимо в цих служіннях знак духовної втіхи, божого благовоління та натхнення на подальшу працю з оновлення цієї святині" (Митрополит, 2023). Among believers, there are also stable word combinations and phraseological units, for example, "одр" (odr) – deathbed: "Батюшка Іоанн (…), навіть лежачи на смертному одрі, являв чудеса, гідні великого подиву" (Рік, 2018); monakhynia" – Christ's bride: "Більшість чекає не дочекається, коли ігуменя благословить на постриг у мантію, щоби стати ближче до нареченого – Ісуса Христа" (Чопенко, 2006)[7].

The language of Orthodox believers includes antonyms in which the opposite is expressed not so much by semantic meaning, but by the frequent figurative use of opposite words in the language (earth – heaven, heaven – hell, soul – body, mind – heart, Church – world, divine – earthly, etc.): "Замість мирського весілля – духовне" (Чопенко, 2012). In the religious sphere, there are facts of the semantic opposite of words that are not direct antonyms in common language, for example, sin –

---

[7] The article does not provide a detailed study of the peculiarities of the use of phraseological units in the everyday language of Orthodox believers, therefore, for illustrative purposes, separate phraseological units are presented.

repentance (as a way of getting rid of sin): "Ті, які зізнаються, сповідають цей гріх…, – розповідає ігуменя" (Вегера-Абрамович, 2020). The peculiarity of the use of antonyms in the Orthodox context is their frequent use not only in written texts, but also in oral speech.

Among Orthodox believers, words are used to denote objects or phenomena that already have names in the commonly used version of the language. Such words include, for example, calling a church a temple, the use of the word "матінка" (matinka) in cases where it is necessary to address an unfamiliar woman of any age, the worldly alternative to which are the words "woman", "lady", etc: "Черниця (…) пояснює, що матушка – це християнське звернення до жінки" (Вегера-Абрамович, 2020). This form of address differs from the normative one, as it is customary to call a priest's wife that way. It is notable that there is no special appeal to the husband in such cases in the Orthodox sociolect.

A characteristic feature of the everyday language of Orthodox believers is the use of tokens denoting different groups in the community, for example, "причт" (prycht) – a group of persons who perform certain duties at the church: "Церковний причт на чолі з отцем Василем робить багато корисних справ…" (Червона, 2020); "благочинний" (blahochynnyi) – an administrative position of a priest who manages a church district: "По своєму послуху благочинного виїжджаю часто в місто…" (Отець, 2021); "жертвуватель" (zhertvuvatel) – one who voluntarily makes donations: "Ми дякуємо і державі Україна (…), і приватним жертвувателям…" (Андріївська, 2020);, "трудник" (trudnyk), a person who lives and works in a monastery on a non-profit basis: "Нас цей досвід (…) надихнув теж спробувати попрацювати трудницями" (Піти, 2022); "воцерковлений" (votserkovlenyi) – a parishioner, an active participant in church life: "…Є люди більш воцерковлені, які краще розуміють духовне життя…" (Піст, 2021), etc.

Therefore, the presence in the Orthodox sociolect of words that express religious meanings, but are considered outdated, suggests that the use of these lexical units most vividly illustrates the specificity of the functioning of the everyday language of Ukrainian Orthodox believers.

Conclusions

Therefore, given the ability of religious discourse to cover not only the institutional, but also the interpersonal sphere of communication, it can be stated that religious language is a communication tool of believers in the context of everyday interactions. Religious language expresses belief in the supernatural and is used within the framework of religious behavior, differing from secular language in the object of speech. In religious language, faith in God as the source of all values is combined with a context in which lexemes of common language acquire the highest axiological meaning. Meanings of religious language are articulated in written and oral texts and with the help of non-verbal language. In the process of everyday communication, religious language is realized in the form of a social dialect that serves linguistic needs and determines the speech behavior of believers.

The sociolect of Orthodox believers is a relatively stable subsystem of the Ukrainian language, which contains neutral lexical units and lexemes expressing religious meaning. The functioning of the sociolect illustrates the specificity of the combination of this vocabulary in the Ukrainian sociocultural context. As a form of actualization of everyday language, the sociolect of Orthodox believers contains a system of non-verbal communication tools, including gestures, body configurations, voice characteristics. Given the special parameters and multifaceted possibilities of functioning, the sociolect of Orthodox believers acts as an independent microsystem, which is characterized by lexical, word-forming and grammatical features.

The religious vocabulary of Orthodox believers of various categories contains lexical units that express their dogmatic thinking, sacred worldview and mystical experience. An analysis of the lexical-semantic features of the sociolect of Orthodox believers shows the widespread use of Church Slavonicisms, archaisms, historicisms, borrowed words of religious themes in everyday speech. The semantics of the religious vocabulary is being transformed, new connotations are appearing, and the deatheization of a certain group of words is ongoing. Polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, antonymy are widespread in the everyday language of Orthodox believers.

REFERENCES:

Акафіст (2015)   *Акафіст до Господа нашого Ісуса Христа* (*Akafist* do Hospoda nashoho Isusa Khrysta).

<https://uaoc.lviv.ua/detalno/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=33&cHash=3de89863a647 7af63e92e26dce92a7d2> (15.04.2023)

Андріївська (2020)   *Андріївська церква поновлює регулярні богослужіння* (*Andriivska* tserkva ponovliuie rehuliarni bohosluzhinnia). https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-society/3153778-andriivska-cerkva-ponovlue-regularni-bogosluzinna.html (17.04.2023)

Багряний, С. (2013)   *Патріарх Філарет: “Голос народу – це Глас Божий”* (*Bahryanyy, S.* Patriarkh Filaret: “Holos narodu – tse Hlas Bozhyi”). <https://ukrnationalism.com/direct-speech/125-patriarkh-filaret-holos-narodu-tse-hlas-bozhyi.html> (17.04.2023)

Бацевич, Ф. С. (2010)   *Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики: монографія.* Львів: ПАІС. 336 с. (*Batsevych, F. S.* Narysy z linhvistychnoi prahmatyky: monohrafiia. Lviv: PAIS, 336 s.)

Бацевич, Ф. С. (2004)   *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики: підручник.* Київ: Видавничий центр “Академія”. 344 с. (*Batsevych, F. S.* Osnovy komunikatyvnoi linhvistyky: pidruchnyk. Kyiv: Vydavnychyi tsentr “Akademiia”, 344 s.)

Білих, О. (2016)   *Словозміна у церковнослов’янській мові української редакції (кінець XVI – XVII ст.).* Кіровоград: ФОП Александрова М. В., 328 с. (*Bilykh, O.* Slovozmina u tserkovnoslovianskii movi ukrainskoi redaktsii (kinets XVI – XVII st.). Kirovohrad: FOP Aleksandrova M. V., 328 s.)

Благовірний (2023)   *Благовірний княже Ярославе, моли Бога за нас і нашу державу!* (*Blahovirnyi kniazhe Yaroslave, moly Boha za nas i nashu derzhavu!*) <https://patriarchia.org.ua/news/blagovirnyj-knyazhe-yaroslave-moly-boga-za-nas-i-nashu-derzhavu/> (16.04.2023)

Богачевська, І. (2005)   *Християнська наративна традиція: методологія філософсько-релігієзнавчого аналізу.* Київ: Світ знань, 236 с. (*Bohachevska, I.* Khrystyianska naratyvna tradytsiia: metodolohiia filosofsko-relihiieznavchoho analizu. Kyiv: Svit znan, 236 s.)

Ван Дейк, Т. (1989)   *Язык. Познание. Коммуникация.* Москва: Прогресс, 312 с. (*Van Deyk, T.* Yazyik. Poznanie. Kommunikatsiya. Moskva: Progress, 312 s.)

Вегера-Абрамович, В. (2020)   *Про цнотливість, куріння та гріхи монахинь: відверта розмова з черницею з Волині.* (*Vehera-Abramovych, V.* Pro tsnotlyvist, kurinnia ta hrikhy monakhyn: vidverta rozmova z chernytseiu z Volyni). https://www.pravoslaviavolyni.org.ua/stattia/mariia-ihnatenko/587-pro-tsnotlyvist-kurinnia-ta-hrikhy-monakhyn-vidverta-rozmova-z-chernytseiu-z-volyni/ (17.04.2023).

Вежбицкая, А. (1996)   *Язык. Культура. Познание.* Москва: Русские словари, 416 с. (*Vezhbitskaya, A.* Yazyik. Kultura. Poznanie. Moskva: Russkie slovari, 416 s.)

Відгуки (2022)   *Відгуки* (гостьова книга). Український православний сайт знайомств “Надія” (*Vidhuky* (hostova knyha). Ukrainskyi pravoslavnyi sait znaiomstv “Nadiia”). <http://www.nadezhdaps.org.ua/bgk.php> (15.04.2023).

Від кожного (2021)   *Від кожного з нас, зокрема, залежить – прийняти дар спасіння чи відкинути його – Митрополит Епіфаній* (*Vid kozhnoho z nas, zokrema, zalezhyt – pryiniaty dar spasinnia chy vidkynuty yoho – Mytropolyt Epifanii*). <https://www.pomisna.info/uk/vsi-novyny/vid-kozhnogo-z-nas-zokrema-zalezhyt-pryjnyaty-dar-spasinnya-chy-vidkynuty-jogo-mytropolyt-epifanij/> (16.04.2023).

Вільчинська, Т. (2008)   Концептосфера сакрального в сучасній науковій парадигмі. // *Теорія і практика викладання української мови як іноземної,* Вип. 3, с. 150–159. (*Vilchynska, T.* Kontseptosfera sakralnoho v suchasnii naukovii paradyhmi. // *Teoriia i praktyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi,* Vyp. 3, s. 150–159)

Волинський (2021)   *Волинський священник розповів, що покласти у великодній кошик і коли його освячувати.* (*Volynskyi sviashchennyk rozpoviv, shcho poklasty u velykodnii koshyk i koly yoho osviachuvaty*). <https://www.volynpost.com/news/184508-volynskyj-sviaschennyk-rozpoviv-scho-poklasty-u-velykodnij-koshyk-i-koly-jogo-osviachuvaty> (15.04.2023)

В ПЦУ (2023)   *В ПЦУ звершено архієрейську хіротонію єпископа Васильківського Єфрема (Хом’яка).* (*V PTsU zversheno arkhiiereisku khirotoniiu yepyskopa Vasylkivskoho Yefrema (Khomiaka).* <https://risu.ua/v-pcuzversheno-arhijerejsku-hirotoniyu-yepiskopa-vasilkivskogo-yefrema-homyaka_n137107> (17.04.2023)

Гадомский, А. (2007)   Религиозный язык – теолингвистика – языкознание. // *Ученые записки Таврического национального университета им. В. И. Вернадского,* Т. 20, № 1, с. 287–293. (*Gadomskiy, A.* Religioznyiy yazyik – teolingvistika – yazyikoznanie. // *Uchenyie zapiski Tavrichesko go natsionalnogo universiteta im. V. I. Vernadskogo,* Vol. 20, № 1, s. 287–293)

Гарфинкель, Г. (2007)   *Исследования по этнометодологии.* Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 336 с. (*Garfinkel, G.* Issledovaniya po etnometodologii. Sankt-Peterburg: Piter, 336 s.)

Гидденс, Э. (2005)	*Социология*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС,. 632 с. (*Giddens, E.* Sotsiologiya. Moskva: Editorial URSS, 632 s.)
Горбаченко, Т. (2002)	*Вплив християнства на становлення писемної культури Русі-України: філософсько-релігієзнавчий аспект*. Автореферат. Київ, Ін-т філософії імені Г. С. Сковороди НАН України, 35 с. (*Horbachenko, T.* Vplyv khrystyianstva na stanovlennia pysemnoi kultury Rusi-Ukrainy: filosofsko-relihiieznavchyi aspekt. Avtoreferat. Kyiv, In-t filosofii imeni H. S. Skovorody NAN Ukrainy, 35 s.)
Господь (2010)	*Христос Воскрес! Господь – моя пісня*: Збірник релігійних пісень. Львів: Свічадо, 2005, 656 с. (*Khrystos Voskres! Hospod – moia pisnia*: Zbirnyk relihiinykh pisen. Lviv: Svichado, 2005, 656 s.)
Гофман, И. (2007)	*Представление себя другим в повседневной жизни*. Москва: Директ-медиа Паблишинг, 546 с. (*Gofman, I.* Predstavlenie sebya drugim v povsednevnoy zhizni. Moskva: Direkt-media Pablishing, 546 s.)
Драбинко, О. (2023)	*Напередодні неділі сиропусної*, 25 лютого 2023 року (*Drabynko, O.* Naperedodni nedili syropusnoi, 25 liutoho 2023 roku). *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/oleksandr.drabinko> (15.04.2023)
Єловська, Ю. В. (2013)	Соціокультурний аспект комунікативних табу. // *Філологічні студії*, Вип. 9, с. 173–180. (*Yelovska, Yu. V.* Sotsiokulturnyi aspekt komunikatyvnykh tabu. // *Filolohichni studii*, Vyp. 9, s. 173–180)
Задністровський, О. (2015)	*Задністровський О. У Чернівецькій області є унікальний в Україні скельний монастир*. (*Zadnistrovskyi, O. U* Chernivetskii oblasti ye unikalnyi v Ukraini skelnyi monastyr) <https://pogliad.ua/news/u-cherniveckiy-oblasti-e-unikalniy-v-ukrayini-skelniy-monastir-130179> (16.04.2023)
Записки (2020)	Записки християнина (Zapysky khrystyianyna.). *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/NotesCristian/photos/a.824891404535224/1151405015217193/?type=3&paipv=0&eav=Afbj_DFgRxOOOnk_D1o-q8RYtzDSczbpwNkDabeWESrNRxdgEYeBc4riGfAW_eNGSBw&_rdr> (18.04.2023)
Капітула, М. 2013	Що таке Євхаристійний Агнець? (*Kapitula, M.* Shcho take Yevkharystiinyi Ahnets?) <http://rivne-cerkva.rv.ua/statti/1247-kanon.html> (23.04.2023)
Катаєв, С. Л. (2011)	Сакральне у повсякденному житті. *Соціальні технології*, № 50, с. 331–337. (*Kataiev, S. L.* Sakralne u povsiakdennomu zhytti. *Sotsialni tekhnolohii*, № 50, s. 331–337)
Ковтун, А. А. (2019)	Експресія як чинник стильової переорієнтації релігійної лексики. // *Лінгвістичні дослідження. Збірник наукових праць ХНПУ ім. Г. С. Сковороди,* Вип. 50, с. 66–75. (*Kovtun, A. A.* Ekspresiia yak chynnyk stylovoi pereoriientatsii relihiinoi leksyky. // *Linhvistychni doslidzhennia. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats KhNPU im. H. S. Skovorody*, Vyp. 50, s. 66–75)
Кувичка, С. О. (2010)	Види релігійних символів. // *Грані. Філософія*, № 4 (72), с. 81–85. (*Кувичка, С. О.* Vydy relihiinykh symvoliv. // *Hrani. Filosofiia*, № 4 (72), s. 81–85)
Мартиненко, В. (2021)	Колись давно один священик… (*Martynenko, V.* Kolys davno odyn sviashchenyk…). *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/starsenij/> (17.04.2023).
Мартиненко, В. (2023)	Вже двічі служив Божественну Літургію за цим перекладом (*Martynenko, V.* Vzhe dvichi sluzhyv Bozhestvennu Liturhiiu za tsym perekladom). *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/starsenij/> (17.04.2023)
Митрополит (2023)	Митрополит Епіфаній на Водохрище провів службу в Києво-Печерській лаврі (*Mytropolyt* Epifanii na Vodokhryshche proviv sluzhbu v Kyievo-Pecherskii lavri). <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-society/3655124-epifanij-na-vodohrese-provodit-sluzbu-v-kiivskij-lavri.html> (15.04.2023)
Молебний (2022)	*Молебний спів*. (*Molebnyi spiv*). <http://ni.biz.ua/6/6_5/6_53943_molebnoe-penie.html> (17.04.2023)
Никодим (2018)	*Братія на конференції в Супрасльській лаврі*. (*Nykodym*. Bratiia na konferentsii v Supraslskii lavri). <https://lavra.ua/uk/bratiya-na-konferentsiyi-v-supraslskij-lavri/> (16.04.2023)
Олійник, Л. (2019)	Місце молодіжного сленгу у структурі мовних варіантів німецької мови. // *Наукові записки. Серія: Філологічні науки*, Вип. 175, с. 63–67. (*Oliinyk, L.* Mistse molodizhnoho slenhu u strukturi movnykh variantiv nimetskoi movy. // *Naukovi zapysky. Seriia: Filolohichni nauky*, Vol. 175, s. 63–67)
Осіння (2010)	*Осіння літургія*. (*Osinnia* liturhiia). <https://www.pisni.org.ua/songs/1132323.html> (17.04.2023)
Ославська, С. (2021)	"І тут я розумію, що з мене виганяють диявола". Театр екзорцизму за годину від Києва (*Oslavska, S.* "I tut ya rozumiiu, shcho z mene vyhaniaiut dyiavola". Teatr

ekzortsyzmu za hodynu vid Kyieva.). <https://zaborona.com/i-tut-ya-rozumiyu-scho-z-mene-viganyayut-diyavola-teatr-ekzorczizmu-za-godinu-vid-kiyeva/> (15.04.2023)

Особливості (2021)   *Особливості релігійного і церковно-релігійного самовизначення громадян України: тенденції 2000 – 2021 рр.* Київ: Центр Разумкова, 172 с. (*Osoblyvosti* relihiinoho i tserkovno-relihiinoho samovyznachennia hromadian Ukrainy: tendentsii 2000 – 2021 rr. Kyiv: Tsentr Razumkova, 172 s.) <https://razumkov.org.ua/uploads/article/2021_Religiya.pdf> (21.12.2022))

Отець (2021)   *Отець Сильвестр – монах-богатир і благочинний Свято-Миколаївського монастиря* (*Otets* Sylvestr – monakh-bohatyr i blahochynnyi Sviato-Mykolaivskoho monastyria) <https://www.chernectvo.com/post/отець-сильвестр-монах-богатир-і-благочинний-свято-миколаївського-монастиря> 15.14.2023)

Переломова, О. (2008)   *Лінгвокультурні коди інтертекстуальності українського художнього дискурсу: діахронічний аспект.* Суми: Вид-во СумДУ, 208 с. (*Perelomova, O.* Linhvokulturni kody intertekstualnosti ukrainskoho khudozhnoho dyskursu: diakhronichnyi aspekt. Sumy: Vyd-vo SumDU, 208 s.)

Піст (2021)   "*Піст потрібен для тілесного і духовного спасіння кожної людини": волинський священик про Різдвяний піст* ("*Pist* potriben dlia tilesnoho i dukhovnoho spasinnia kozhnoi liudyny": volynskyi sviashchenyk pro Rizdvianyi pist). <https://t1.ua/video/62804-pist-potriben-dlya-tilesnoho-i-dukhovnoho-spasinnya-kozhnoyi-lyudyny-volynskyy-svyashchennyk-pro-rizdvyanyy-pist.html> (22.14.2023)

Піти (2022)   *Піти в монастир: як столичні кралі стали послушницями.* (*Pity* v monastyr: yak stolychni krali staly poslushnytsiamy). <https://ukrainky.com.ua/pity-v-monastyr-yak-stolychni-krali-staly-poslushnyczyamy/> (15.04.2023)

Польченко, О. (2012)   Володимир Денщиков: "Я – лише інструмент у руках Всевишнього…" (*Polchenko, O.* Volodymyr Denshchykov: «Ia – lyshe instrument u rukakh Vsevyshnoho…). <http://svitlytsia.crimea.ua/?section=article&artID=9840> (17.04.2023)

Рік (2018)   Рік без протоієрея Іоанна Хільчука (Rik bez protoiiereia Ioanna Khilchuka). <https://xn--80a3aeu4czas.xn--j1amh/rik-bez-protoiiereia-ioanna-khilchuka/> (15.04.2023)

Свято-Миколаївський (2021)   Свято-Миколаївський монастир у селищі Жидичин (*Sviato-Mykolaivskyi* monastyr u selyshchi Zhydychyn). *Facebook.* <https://www.facebook.com/Orthodox.in.Ukraine/photos/a.2014852958590835/3858649720877807/?type=3/> (14.04.2023)

Селиванова, Е. (2004)   *Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации.* Киев: Брама; Изд-во Вовчок О. Ю., 2004, 336 с (*Selivanova, E.* Osnovyi lingvisticheskoy teorii teksta i kommunikatsii. Kiev: Brama; Izd-vo Vovchok O. Yu., 2004, 336 s.)

Ситниченко, Л. (1996)   *Першоджерела комунікативної філософії.* Київ: Либідь, с. 84–91. (*Sytnychenko, L.* Pershodzherela komunikatyvnoi filosofii. Kyiv: Lybid, s. 84–91)

Смирнова, М. (2016)   Проповідь у релігійному православному дискурсі XX століття: лінгвопрагматичний аспект. Дис. на здобуття ступеня к. філол. наук. Маріуполь, Маріупольський державний університет, 271 с. (*Smyrnova, M.* Propovid u relihiinomu pravoslavnomu dyskursi XX stolittia: linhvoprahmatychnyi aspekt. Dys. na zdobuttia stupenia k. filol. nauk. Mariupol, Mariupolskyi derzhavnyi universytet, 271 s.)

Скаб, М. (2009)   *Концептуалізація сакральної сфери в українській мові.* Дис. на здобуття ступеня д. філол. наук, Київ, Ін-т української мови НАН України, 620 с. (*Skab, M.* Kontseptualizatsiia sakralnoi sfery v ukrainskii movi. Dys. na zdobuttia stupenia d. filol. nauk, Kyiv, In-t ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy, 620 s.)

Скаб, М. (2010)   Основні напрями дослідження взаємодії української мови і сфери сакрального: здобутки та перспективи. // *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету ім. Юрія Федьковича. Слов'янська філологія,* Вип. 506–508, с. 3–10. (*Skab, M.* Osnovni napriamy doslidzhennia vzaiemodii ukrainskoi movy i sfery sakralnoho: zdobutky ta perspektyvy. // *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. Yuriia Fedkovycha. Slovianska filolohiia,* Vyp. 506–508, s. 3–10)

Скаб, М., Скаб, М. (2016)   Концепт "Єва" на тлі концепту "Адам", або про гендерне питання крізь призму біблійних образів. – В: (За ред. І. Кононенко, І. Митнік, С. Романюк) *Тенденції розвитку української лексики та граматики.* Ч. III.. Варшава – Івано-Франківськ, с. 102–115. (*Skab, M., Skab, M.* Kontsept "Ieva" na tli kontseptu "Adam", abo pro henderne pytannia kriz pryzmu bibliinykh obraziv. – V: (Za red. I. Kononenko, I. Mytnik, S. Romaniuk) *Tendentsii rozvytku ukrainskoi leksyky ta hramatyky.* Ch. III.. Varshava – Ivano-Frankivsk, s. 102–115)

Софійчук, В. (2018)   *Інтерв'ю предстоятеля: Щоб отримати зцілення, потрібно поставити правильний діагноз.* (*Софійчук, В.* Interviu predstoiatelia: Shchob otrymaty ztsilennia,

potribno postavyty pravylnyi diahnoz). <https://news.church.ua/2018/03/23/intervyu-predstoyatelya-shhob-otrimati-zcilennya-potribno-postaviti-pravilnij-diagnoz/#2023-04-23> (24.04.2023)

Таргонський, Д. (2017) *Батюшка теж людина. Бувальщина*. (*Tarhonskyi, D.* Batiushka tezh liudyna. Buvalshchyna). <https://www.religion.in.ua/main/36160-batyushka-tezh-lyudina-buvalshhina.html> (17.04.2023)

Тварь (2020) "Тварь такая, чого ти прийшла на сповідь?" Митрополит РПЦвУ накинувся на вірян через епідемію ("*Tvar* takaia, choho ty pryishla na spovid?" Mytropolyt RPTsvU nakynuvsia na virian cherez epidemiiu). <https://religionpravda.com.ua/?p=43697> (17.04.2023)

Тихий, С. (2022) Двійко довоєнних оповідань (*Tykhyi, S.* Dviiko dovoiennykh opovidan). <http://litforum.com.ua/index.php?r=16&a=8053/> (14.04.2023)

Толстой, А. (2022) *Ієромонах Іов (Ольшанський)*: "Якщо священик вас не надихає, шукайте іншого" (*Tolstoi, A.* Iieromonakh Iov (Olshanskyi): "Iakshcho sviashchenyk vas ne nadykhaie, shukaite inshoho"). <https://velychlviv.com/iyeromonah-iov-olshanskyj-yakshho-svyashhenyk-vas-ne-nadyhaye-shukajte-inshogo/> (15.04.2023)

Україна (2017) Вітаємо зі святом Хрещення Господнього! (Vitaiemo zi sviatom Khreshchennia Hospodnoho!) *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/AmazingUA/photos/a.501804686539108/1369518629767705/?type=3/> (17.04.2023)

Українець, С. (2018) 22 травня. Весняний Микола. (*Ukrainets, S.* 22 travnia. Vesnianyi Mykola). *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/SolomiaUkrainian/photos/a.1479204768813594/1818281128239288/?paipv=0&eav=AfbHoN-WF-PojdBarqJH-VYeZTCQvnogOGAT4arIJq-5lOZNm_ZJSn4RWOyfALnoT6E&_rdr/> (17.04.2023).

Хабермас, Ю. (1993) Теория коммуникативного действия. // *Вестник Московского университета: Философия*, № 4, с. 43–63. (*Habermas, Yu.* Teoriya kommunikativnogo deystviya. // *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta: Filosofiya*, № 4, s. 43–63)

Червона (2020) *Червона церква Рубанівського*. (*Chervona* tserkva Rubanivskoho). **<**https://www.dnipro.libr.dp.ua/Rubanivske_hram_Pokrova> (17.04.2023)

Чопенко, В. (2006) *Христові невісти*. (*Chopenko, V.* Khrystovi nevisty). <https://zn.ua/ukr/SOCIUM/hristovi_nevisti.html> (15.04.2023)

Я ним (2023) "Я ним не цікавився і не користувався" – митрополит УПЦ МП визнав, що мав російське громадянство. ("*Ia nym* ne tsikavyvsia i ne korystuvavsia" – mytropolyt UPTs MP vyznav, shcho mav rosiiske hromadianstvo.) <https://prolviv.com/blog/2023/04/09/ia-nym-ne-tsikavyvsia-i-ne-korystuvavsia-mytropolyt-upts-mp-onufrii-vyznav-shcho-mav-rosiiske-hromadianstvo/> (26.04.2023)

Holt, R. (2006) Socio-Linguistic Approach to Religious Language. // *Australian Journal of Theology*, № 6, p. 1–14.

König, W. (1994) *dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache*: *Tafeln und Texte*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 256 S.

Löffler, H. (2010) *Germanistische Soziolinguistik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 222 S.