

LEXICAL FEATURES OF POPULAR SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGICAL WORKS

IVANA KNEŽEVIĆ

The Faculty of Orthodox Theology University of Belgrade

Abstract: *The style of theological scientific writings is partly similar with the writings of other scientific fields, but also has unique features. The style of theological writings is also a product of a particular topic of research of theology itself. In this paper we analyse the lexical features of theological scientific writings, with the special emphasis on the vocabulary of popular scientific theological papers in comparison to the works of the academic substyle as the representative of scientific style. The results from the statistical analysis carried out were used for contrastive analysis, and the expressive and emotional markers were underlined.*

Key words: *academic substyle, functional stylistics, lexical features, popular scientific substyle, theological scientific papers*

1. Introduction

Functional stylistics recognizes some basic features of the style of scientific writings in general, which clearly distinguish them from other functional styles – belles-lettres, official, newspaper and publicist. The style of theological scientific writings is partly similar and shares some characteristics with the writings of other scientific fields, but it also has certain unique features.

The scientific style of theology distinguishes three basic substyles, and those are academic (strictly scientific), scientific-textbook and popular scientific substyle.

The particular topic that theology deals with inevitably affects the extralinguistic and intralinguistic characteristics of theological scientific writings (cf. Knežević and Ranković 2015:46-58). The extralinguistic characteristics which are common with writings of theology and other sciences are accuracy, logic, abstraction and objectiveness. The lexical field or the field of vocabulary, on the other hand, is the sphere where the uniqueness and individuality of every science, and thus of theology itself, becomes particularly visible and transparent.

This paper deals with the analysis and study of the lexical level of theological scientific papers, with the special emphasis on the vocabulary of popular scientific theological writings. For that reason, we started from the basic characteristics of the vocabulary of academic theological works since they are the main representatives of the scientific style of theology. Then, we carried out the statistical analysis of the vocabulary of a number of popular scientific and academic writings of renowned theologians in English. The results we acquired were used for contrastive analysis. The analysis included the following popular scientific works: *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine*, Thomas Hopko; “How to Read the Bible”, Kallistos Ware; *Living Prayer*, Anthony Bloom; which are contrasted with the following academic writings: *The New Testament: Introduction*, Paul Nadim Tarazi; *Of Water and the Spirit*, Alexander Schmemmann; *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*, John Meyendorff (see Knežević 2021:55-62).

The corpus of one thousand words was taken from each individual writing, and the statistical analysis was applied in order to establish the proportion of general scientific and nomenclatural terminology independently and as a whole, as well as internationalisms and Church Slavonic words. The results of the statistical analysis helped us establish the differences field of vocabulary between the popular scientific and academic theological writings.

The lexical level of each particular popular scientific writing has been analysed and presented, with underlined particularities of both their common and individual lexical features. The results of the analysis will reveal not only the specificity of the vocabulary of scientific theological writing as a whole, but also the individuality of the authors themselves.

Finally, since the popular scientific substyle is on the border of the scientific style, it also takes on the characteristics of other functional styles, and, thus, we pointed out also to the expressive and emotional markers of the popular scientific style.

2. Lexical features of theological scientific papers in general

Science in its nature tends towards accuracy and conciseness, thus the terminology is the core tool to support these requirements. There are two subgroups within the terminology: general scientific and nomenclatures or narrowly professional terminology – terms or system of names used in a particular art or science.

All scientific writings tend to use some common, general scientific lexemes, which on the other hand distinguish the style of such writings from other styles (like administrative or belles-letters), where such words are rarely used or, if used, have a particular meaning or function (cf. Гумовская 2008:35-36).

Internationalisms occupy a significant part of the general scientific vocabulary. Since the everyday vocabulary words can be quite indefinite or even vague in their meaning, many words used for the purpose of science are borrowed from Greek and Latin (Kristal 1987:380), as well as from Hebrew. Such loanwords have undergone morphological or phonological integration into English (e.g., *Rassophore* from Greek ρασοφόρος, lit. “robe-bearer”; *Stavrophore*, Greek σταυροφόρος, lit. “the one who bears the cross, cross-bearer; *antidoron*, Greek Ἀντίδωρον; *antimension*, Greek ἀντιμύνησιον, “instead of the table”). They sometimes retain their plural form of the language they were borrowed from, aside from the acquired form with plural endings for the English language (e.g., seraph – seraphim/seraphs; cherub – cherubim/cherubs). The data about their etymology can be found in some dictionaries:

eschatology – from Greek *eskhatos* “last”. (Collins English Dictionary 1991: 530)

scripture – from Latin *scriptura* “written material”, from *scribere* “to write”. (Collins English Dictionary 1991: 1392)

Messiah – from Old French *Messie*, ultimately Hebrew *māšhîāh* “anointed. (Collins English Dictionary 1991: 981)

This data (Heb. for *anointed*) is also confirmed by *Concise Dictionary of the Christian Church* (2000:374).

However, basic, everyday words are those that make the base of all scientific writing. Since they tend to be polysemous, if used in such texts, their polysemy must be narrowed in order to make the writing unambiguous and accurately articulated. On the other hand, some everyday common words can in time become terms as well, both generally scientific and nomenclatural (e.g., *revelation*, *redemption*, *bread and wine*, *sanctuary*), which in theological writings can be additionally underlined by the use of capital letter (e.g., *the Son*, *the Ascension*, *the Descent*, *the Dormition*).

The accuracy and precision of scientific style demands not only the narrowing of word meaning, but also the repetitive use of same words, which, however, has the function to direct and concentrate the attention of the reader to the information itself. Therefore, the scarcity of vocabulary satisfies the need for the absence of repetition and redundancy.

Another important feature in the scientific sphere is represented by the phraseological units (see Aripova and Bashmakova 2018:7), which besides stylistic and pragmatic functions,

now used as terms have new meanings (in theological writings: *the Mother of God*, *primordial sin*, *prodigal son*, *the Great Fast*).

What is also characteristic for theological scientific writing is a significant number of loan translations or calques functioning as nomenclatures, usually from Greek or Latin, like *the Birthgiver of God* which is a direct translation of the Greek word *Theotokos* – the “one who gave birth to God” (*Concise Dictionary of the Christian Church* 2000:575).

Seldom, the writers tend to use words, expressions, and abbreviations in their original form and usually from the Latin language (e.g., *a priori*, *a posteriori*, *eo ipso*, i.e., e.g.), as well as archaic words, such as Church Slavonic words in Serbian, or in English – obsolete nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, or verbs with the suffixes from the Middle English *-est*, *-eth* (e.g., *hath*, *art*, *knowest*) (Ricks 1977), which are often found in the Holy Scripture and theological texts being unique markers of “high style” (see Knežević 2021:55-62).

3. Specific features of scientific popular substyle

Considering the stylistic characteristics, the popular scientific works are on the very border of scientific style, taking on elements of other styles – most often of belles-letters, but also of publicist styles, depending on the genre, the treated topic, and the author’s individuality. Consequently, the works of popular scientific substyle are stylistically most distant from the works of the academic substyle, i.e., some dominant features of the academic substyle are present to a lesser degree or almost absent in the popular scientific works.

Genres of popular scientific substyle of theological works can be realized in two forms, written and oral. Genre, according to Crystal, is a category of artistic creation that can be identified (Kristal 1987:433). Genres of written form would be: 1. popular scientific books, brochures and the like; and 2. articles in popular scientific journals. Oral forms are: 1. lectures at public forums intended for a wide audience; 2. sermons (homilies – sermons delivered in the church on, for instance, certain topics from *the Gospel*); and 3. radio and television shows, as well as various audio, video and CD recordings (Knežević and Ranković 2015:55-56).

After we have carried out the statistical analysis of the popular scientific corpus and academic writings in the field of theology in English, we have obtained the following results.

In popular scientific papers in English, general scientific terms make up, on average, about 8% of the total lexical fund, more precisely in *How to Read the Bible* they make up about 12%, in *Living Prayer* about 6%, while in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine* about 7%. In contrast, in the corpus of analysed works of academic substyle, general scientific terms make up about 11% of the total lexical fund – *The New Testament: An Introduction* about 10% of the total vocabulary, in *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* 11%, and in *Of Water and the Spirit* about 12% (see Knežević 2021:58). This comparison shows that the share of general scientific vocabulary in the works of popular scientific substyle in English has been reduced by about 3%.

In the analysed corpus, some of the papers use general scientific vocabulary to a somewhat higher degree (e.g., in *How to Read the Bible* as much as 12%). However, these terms are often accompanied by an explanation, e.g., in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine*:

“Man is created as *di-sexual* – ‘male and female He created them’ (Genesis 1: 27; 2: 21) – in order ‘to be fruitful and multiply’”. (Genesis 1:28) (Hopko 1976:52)

“Angels (which means literally ‘messengers’) are, strictly speaking, but one rank of the *incorporeal or bodiless* powers of the invisible world”. (Hopko 1976:48)

The share of narrowly professional terms in popular scientific papers in English make up, on average, about 9.6%, i.e., in *How to Read the Bible* about 8%, in *Living Prayer* about 11%, while in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine* about 10%. From the examined corpus of academic

works in English, narrowly professional terms make up on average about 9%: in *The New Testament: An Introduction* about 9%, in *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* 7%, and in *Of Water and the Spirit* about 11% of the total vocabulary (see Knežević 2021:58-59). The share of narrowly professional terms is almost the same in the popular scientific and academic papers. Although this might be unexpected, we can certainly look for the reason in the individual style of the authors of popular works, as well as in the fact that the works are obviously intended for a narrow circle of believers to whom such specific theological terminology is not unfamiliar. Moreover, there are special words and expressions whose meaning is known only to the circle of believers and is not in connection with the level of their education. Such are, for example, the words with altered connotative meaning and lexically neutral words used in figurative sense, which often belong to the common vocabulary words, but in a given context they acquire another connotative or some figurative meaning (e.g., *flesh*, *Fall*, *Creation*, *offering*, *sacrifice*, *passion*, *sharing*, etc.).

The overall proportion of general scientific and narrowly professional terms in popular scientific works in relation to the total vocabulary is on average about 17.6%, in *How to Read the Bible* about 20%, in *Living Prayer* about 17%, while in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine* about 17%. In academic writings the total percentage of terms, of both general and narrowly professional terms in relation to the total vocabulary, is about 20%: in *The New Testament: An Introduction* about 18%, in *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* 18%, and in *Of Water and the Spirit* about 23% (see Knežević 2021:59). The difference in relation to the use of the total number of narrowly professional and general scientific terms between the works of scientific-popular and academic substyle is about 3%.

The author must be aware that he is addressing a wide range of non-experts, with different levels of education, interests and knowledge in the given field. The aim of a popular scientific work is not only to inform but also to popularize theological scientific knowledge and ideas among a diverse, wide readership. The author strives to present certain ideas in a clear and understandable way, accessible to such an audience. He explains the unknown with the help of the familiar and known. The language of science must in some way be translated into familiar forms of language, because here the expert is addressing a nonexpert, who is not adequately familiar with the language (vocabulary) and the problem of science.

As a rule, the author refrains from using not only nomenclature but also general scientific vocabulary, using primarily general vocabulary in order to make the content of his work accessible and understandable to the reader. He replaces abstract words and general scientific terms with commonly used ones and uses nomenclature ones only when the presentation requires it, defining and explaining them also with the help of familiar, common vocabulary words. However, even frequent explanations of the used narrowly professional terms, set most often in the text itself or in given parentheses, can additionally burden the text and overwhelm and discourage the recipient with superfluous information.

The use of nomenclature terms in the works of the examined corpus has been reduced to a minimum. They are usually separated from the rest of the text by being written in italics or bold type, or placed within quotation marks, with an explanation given next to them. Definitions of these terms are generally not professional – the author uses common vocabulary words to explain them, such as, e.g., in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine*:

“To *create* means to make out of nothing; to *bring into existence* that which before did not exist; or, to quote the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom once more: ‘to bring from non-existence into being’”. (Hopko 1976:44)

“There is no *dualism* in Orthodox Christianity. There is no *teaching* that ‘*spirit*’ is good, and ‘*matter*’ is bad, that ‘heaven’ is good, and the ‘earth’ is evil”. (Hopko 1976:46)

“*Angels* (which means literally ‘messengers’) are, strictly speaking, but one rank of the incorporeal or bodiless powers of the invisible world. According to Orthodox Scripture and Tradition there are *nine ranks* of bodiless powers or the *Hosts* (*Sabaoth* means literally ‘armies’ or ‘choirs’ or ‘ranks’). (Hopko 1976:48)

“In Orthodox terminology the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are called three divine *persons*. *Person* is defined here simply as the *subject of existence and life* – ***hypostasis*** in the traditional church language”. (Hopko 1976:141)

The above example shows the way in which the author explains to the nonexpert the professional term of Greek origin, *hypostasis*, which he, perhaps superfluously, separated both in bold and italics from the rest of the text.

Similarly, we have an example in *How to Read the Bible*, where the author explains to the reader the two terms *canonical* and *apocryphal*:

“In the first three centuries of Christian history, a lengthy process of sifting and testing was needed in order to distinguish between that which is authentically ‘canonical’ Scripture, *bearing authoritative witness to Christ’s person and message*, and that which is ‘apocryphal’, useful perhaps for teaching, but *not a normative source of doctrine*”. (Ware 2007)

The percentage of internationalisms in popular scientific texts is also far smaller than in the case of works characteristic of the academic substyle. Internationalisms in popular scientific papers participate on average with about 5% in the total narrowly professional vocabulary, and with about 0.6% in the total vocabulary – more precisely in *How to Read the Bible* about 8% (0.8% of the total vocabulary), in *Living Prayer* about 6% (0.6% of total vocabulary), while in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine* with about 3% (0.3% of total vocabulary). In academic writings the use of internationalisms is about 12% (or 1% of the total lexical fund): in *The New Testament: An Introduction* about 6% of the total narrowly professional vocabulary (0.5% of the total lexical fund), in *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* 12% (1% of the total lexical fund), and in *Of Water and the Spirit* about 18% (2% of the total lexical fund) (see Knežević 2021:59).

The use of foreign words is very rare. The authors very carefully use narrowly professional terms as foreign words, separating them from the rest of the text by using italics or other graphic means, usually with an explanation of the meaning, and adapted in a given language by transliteration or phonological-morphological adaptation. Examples in the corpus of *How to Read the Bible* are:

“We do not refer to it as ‘the books’ in the plural, *ta biblia*. We call it ‘the Bible’, ‘the Book’ in the singular”. (Ware 2007)

In *Living Prayer*, the author introduces foreign words of Church Slavonic and Greek origin adapted at the same time by transliteration and transcription into English and explains their meaning and origin:

“The Greek word which we find in the Gospel and in the early liturgies is *eleison*. *Eleison* is of the same root as *elaion*, which means ‘olive tree and the oil from it’”. (Bloom 1966:86)

“The words *milost* and *pomiluy* in Slavonic have the same root as those which express tenderness, endearing, and when we use the words *eleison*, ‘have mercy on us’, *pomiluy*, we are not just asking God to save us from His wrath – we are asking for love”. (Bloom 1966:87)

Given the special subject of theology, popular scientific works contain specific lexical elements such as: special words and expressions known to a narrow circle of people (usually believers), words with altered connotative meaning, neutral vocabulary words in the figurative sense, archaisms, Russisms, Church Slavonicisms which also refer to common vocabulary words, “church” vocabulary words, etc. Some authors speak of this as of a special religious style or religious language (cf. Кнежевић 2013:186-193).

Since the target readership is a narrow circle of believers, the author assumes that they are familiar with this vocabulary. This vocabulary is not common in everyday speech; it is

marked, and readers perceive it as “church” vocabulary words. Even believers, although familiar with its meaning, most often will not use it in ordinary daily communication, but first of all, in the church, participating in the life of the church, in rites (church services), sometimes in communication with other members or on certain occasions, and in connection with church life and organization (in conversations with other believers on some issues and topics related to religion, in discussions at public gatherings and lectures for believers, etc.). Some general vocabulary words are here used in a narrowed sense.

The authors of popular scientific works (as well as scientific textbook) tend to repeat the same words in order to achieve the most precise expression. Repetition, however, does not only refer to terms, as the most precise carriers of dense semantic content, but also to common vocabulary words, which the authors repeat without trying to enrich the content of the presentation with synonyms. Thus, they underline the “scientific” nature of a given popular work, its primary function – informativeness. However, some authors are still inclined to use the repetition of the same word as an expressive means – to underline and emphasize the thought, to arouse the reader’s attention, to stimulate his thought apparatus, and the like. Thus, we have an example of the repetition of nomenclature vocabulary in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine*:

“Thus, according to the Orthodox Tradition, it is the mystery of God that there are Three who are *divine*; Three who live and act by one and the same *divine* perfection, yet each according to his own personal distinctness and uniqueness. Thus, it is said that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are each *divine* with the same *divinity*, yet each in his own *divine* way. And as the uncreated *divinity* has three *divine* subjects, so each *divine* action has three *divine* actors; there are three *divine* aspects to every action of God, yet the action remains one and the same”. (Hopko 1976:142)

Then, after some time, the author continues:

“The examples could go on indefinitely: the one *divine* Father personifying every aspect of His *divinity* in His one *divine* Son, who is personally activated by His one *divine* Spirit. We will see the living implications of the Trinity as we survey the activity of God in his actions toward man and the world”. (Hopko 1976:142-143)

Or an example of repeating a common vocabulary word:

“Every *action* of God is the *action* of the Three. No one person of the Trinity acts independently of or in isolation from the others. The *action* of each is the *action* of all; the *action* of all is the *action* of each. And the divine *action* is essentially one”. (Hopko 1976:140)

Since popular scientific texts strive to popularize and present scientific knowledge to the widest readership, the layman, the content plan is relieved of the classification context. The information is communicated without indicating the cognitive process that led to it. In connection with the way of presentation that does not have such a strict form as in academic papers, extremely long, complex sentences, condensed forms of expression (such as infinitive, gerund and participle phrases), large number of nominals, etc. are not common. Therefore, there is no need to use a large number of the most diverse conjunctions in order to express thoughts and connect sentences into a logical and clear whole. The words that organize the presentation into one whole are often repeated. The frequency of use and variety of word organizers for scientific presentation may vary slightly from work to work, depending on the way the author expresses himself. In works which have a higher degree of “scientific nature”, or are stylistically closer to academic works, their frequency and diversity will be higher, while the works on the very periphery of the scientific style will show a slightly lower frequency.

The following are examples of such popular scientific papers with the features of a “stricter, more scientific” style, where the authors insist on gradual steps of expressing thoughts,

facilitating the perception of the content to a wide readership with the help of the organizers. In *How to Read the Bible*:

“Combining Saint Tikhon’s words and the Moscow statement, *the four key characteristics* which mark the Orthodox “Scriptural mind” may be distinguished. *First*, our reading of Scripture is obedient. *Second*, it is ecclesial, in union with the Church. *Third*, it is Christ-centred. *Fourth*, it is personal”. (Ware 2007)

Or in *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine*:

“According to Orthodox Tradition, *there are a number of wrong doctrines* which must be rejected. *One wrong doctrine* is that the Father alone is God and that the Son and the Holy Spirit are creatures, made ‘from nothing’ like angels, men and the world [...]

Another wrong doctrine is that God in Himself is One God who merely appears in different forms to the world: Now as the Father, then as the Son, and still again as the Holy Spirit [...]

A third wrong doctrine is that God is one, and that the Son and the Spirit are merely names for relations which God has with Himself [...]

Still another wrong doctrine is that the Father is one God, the Son is another God, and the Holy Spirit still another God. There cannot be ‘three gods’, says the Church, and certainly not ‘gods’ who are created or made”. (Hopko 1976:138-139)

4. Expressive means and stylistic devices of popular scientific substyle – atypical characteristics

As the popular scientific substyle is on the border of the scientific style, it acquires to a certain extent the characteristics of other functional styles. What especially differentiates it from the essentially strict and “dry” style of academic papers is its expressiveness. The author of popular scientific papers in the field of theology has one additional and specific task in comparison to the authors of the same type of papers in some other fields of science. Unquestionably, these works also have the purpose of informing the audience in a simple and acceptable way, so the authors strive to bring liveliness, stimulate the mental apparatus, arouse the interest of the reader, and gain his attention. On the other hand, the author of a popular theological paper wants to influence his reader, most often a believer, not only on the intellectual level, but also on his feelings and will. For that reason, the special use of stylistic devices, as well as the use of conversational and emotional lexical, phraseological and syntactic means is more characteristic for the style of these works. Assessments are often made openly, directly, unsupported by objective evidence, and with the help of various means of expression of a given language.

We will single out, first of all, those examples of expressive and emotional markers of the text that are significantly different from these markers of texts of the academic substyle, which gives this substyle a special “signature” among the works of other mentioned substyles. Namely, in the popular scientific works, there will be no adverbial and adjectival markers which we find in scientific-textbook and academic works. Thus, in *How to Read the Bible* we have the following examples:

“This joint statement, signed by the delegates of both traditions, forms an *excellent* summary of the Orthodox view: ‘The Scriptures constitute a coherent whole’”. (Ware 2007)

In the given sentence, the author uses adjectives to openly express his personal position, personal criticism that is not supported by any evidence or explanations. Or an example where a colloquial, informal phrase that is not characteristic of the “dry” tone of strictly scientific papers:

“*The trouble is that* most of us are better at talking than at listening”. (Ware 2007)

In the example that follows, the author seems to talk to the reader and address him with an imperative (*Suppose*); then, he clearly states that he expresses his subjective opinion (with the expression: *in my view*):

“*Suppose*, for example, that it could be proved that the Fourth Gospel was not actually written by Saint John the beloved disciple of Christ – *in my view*, there are in fact strong reasons for continuing to accept John’s authorship – yet, even so, this would not alter the fact that we regard the Fourth Gospel as Scripture”. (Ware 2007)

The author uses the metaphor of the stratification of the earth (the structure of the layers of the earth):

“But, by exploring the use made of the Old Testament in the Church lectionary, *we can discover layer upon layer of meanings* that are far from obvious at first sight”. (Ware 2007)

The example of metaphorical expression:

“But *there is gold in the patristic texts*, if only we have the persistence and imagination to discover it”. (Ware 2007)

Or the comparison:

“*We are like someone launching out in a tiny boat across a limitless ocean*. But, however great the journey, we can embark on it today, at this very hour, in this very moment”. (Ware 2007)

In *Living Prayer*, the expressiveness and picturesqueness of expression is evident in the following examples:

“Therefore, to set out deliberately *to confront the living God is a dread adventure*: every meeting with God is, in a certain sense, *a last judgment*”. (Bloom 1966:9)

“In a sense of course this is true; but something very much more far-reaching is being forgotten when such statements are made: it is that *prayer is a dangerous adventure* and that we cannot enter upon it without risk”. (Bloom 1966:9)

“When we consider ourselves *without the fragrant background of God’s presence*, sins and virtues become small and somewhat irrelevant matters”. (Bloom 1966:11)

With an exclamatory sentence, the author introduces emotions:

“How strange it would be to imagine, for example, that when the Son becomes man and prays to his Father and acts in obedience to Him, it is all an illusion with no reality in fact, a sort of divine presentation played before the world with no reason or truth for it at all!” (Bloom 1966:11)

5. Conclusion

Considering all the above stated, we can conclude that the popular scientific works are the most distant from the works of the strictly scientific, academic substyle in terms of their stylistic characteristics. Specific elements of vocabulary characteristic of academic theological works can be found in popular scientific works to a certain extent, depending on the individuality of the author, the genre of the scientific text, the subject of research, etc.

We notice that the total percentage of general scientific and narrowly professional terms is expectedly lower in popular scientific works, because the author has in mind the target readership which he addresses and to which he must make his presentation comprehensible. Even if he uses narrowly professional terms, the author feels the need to separate them from the rest of the text, to explain and define them. Their higher percentage is often a consequence of

frequent repetition of such a term – once explained – throughout the rest of the text. The share of internationalisms is noticeably lower than is the case with academic papers, while words of foreign origin are extremely rare, separated from the rest of the text and often translated or explained.

Popular scientific works do not have such a strict form of presentation as works intended for professional audiences, so the authors avoid long and complex sentences, condensed forms of expression, the burden of nominals, as well as numerous and various conjunctions necessary in the organization of the academic text.

Theology steps into the domain of value orientations of each individual – a member of a certain confessional community, so in terms of linguistic expression it is far more open and accessible to the understanding of a much larger number of recipients than is the case with other sciences. Taking into account the fact that the authors who create for a wide circle of believers make sure to present the facts and teachings of the Church not only in a clear and understandable way, but also to further arouse the interest and encourage the reader. The theologian should strive to convey in his work well-founded information, which influences the reader primarily intellectually. However, aware of his important role in witnessing to the truth and the teachings of the Church in relation to the recipient of his presentation, he strives to act on him both emotionally and volitionally. The theologian is not only a scientist but also a preacher, supporter and representative of the community of believers. He wants to bring that knowledge closer to the reader and explain it, to convince him, to disarm him and leave him without a counterargument. He must and wants to win him not for his own, but for the teaching of the Church. However, on that occasion he is not guided by personal, selfish goals. He does not want to win the reader over to “himself” and “his own”, but to the true and saving teaching, to the only truth without which not only there is no life, but which is life itself. He is aware not only of his obligation as a scientist to inform, but, which is more important, of his obligations and responsibilities to enlighten spiritually, to illuminate the ignorance of what is the essence of life. For this purpose, he will use all the available means of a language, even atypical for scientific style of expression, such as stylistic devices (figures of speech), conversational, and emotional lexical and phraseological and syntactic means. In the popular scientific substyle, we even find elements of colloquial vocabulary words, colloquial phrases and expressions, which bring a certain refreshment and liveliness to the scientific text.

This paper represents a modest contribution to the study of a wide and insufficiently studied field of vocabulary of theological science, and represents an introduction to future and more exhaustive analyses.

References

- Aripova, A.Darya and Irina S. Bashmakova. 2018. “Towards Phraseologism Formation and Terminologization in Scientific and Technical Texts”. *SHS Web of Conferences* 50(1): 01028, <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001028>.
- Bloom, Anthony. 1966. *Living Prayer*. Springfield, IL: Templegate Publishers.
- Collins English Dictionary*. 1991. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 2000. [ed. E.A. Livingstone]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Гумовская, Галина. 2008. *LSP: English for Professional Communication: Английский язык профессионального общения*. Москва: Аспект Пресс.
- Норко, Thomas. 1976. *The Orthodox Faith: Doctrine*. New York: The Department of Religious Education – Orthodox Church in America.
- Кнежевић, Ивана. 2013. “Религијски стил као посебан функционално-стилски комплекс”. *Богословље: часопис Православног богословског факултета*, LXXII(1), Београд: Православни богословски факултет, pp. 186-193.
- Knežević, Ivana and Zoran Ranković. 2015. “Naučni stil i žanrovi naučnih radova u oblasti teologije”. *Komunikacija i kultura online*, 6(6): 46-58, <https://www.komunikacijaiikultura.org/index.php/kk/article/view/63> [Accessed 2020 May 26].
- Knežević, Ivana. 2021. “University Textbooks of Theology: Lexical Features in Relation to Academic Theological Papers”. *Elpis*, 23: 55-62.

- Kristal, Dejvid. 1987. *Kembrička enciklopedija jezika*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Meyendorff, John. 1982. *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Ricks, Eldin. 1977. *A Short Glossary of Obsolete Words in the King James New Testament*, <https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/new-era/1977/04/a-short-glossary-of-obsolete-words-in-the-king-james-new-testament?lang=eng> [Accessed 2021, January 27].
- Schmemmann, Alexander. 1974. *Of Water and the Spirit*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Tarazi, Paul Nadim. 1999. *The New Testament: An Introduction*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Ware, Kallistos. 2007. *How to Read the Bible*. <http://www.oca.org/Docs.asp?ID=180&SID=2> [Accessed 2020, May 26]

Notes on the author

Ivana KNEŽEVIĆ, PhD Associate Professor, is currently the Head of the Department for Languages at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology University of Belgrade. She has presented numerous papers at national and international conferences and has published over 45 manuscripts in reputable national and international journals. She is the author of a monograph and of university textbooks for English language students, such as: *Theological Discourse of English and Serbian Languages: lexical, semantic and stylistic problems of translation*. 2010; *Tongues of Fire*, 2016; *Not-Made-by-Hands*, 2020. Her main fields of interest are English language, linguistics, theolinguistics, and stylistics.