The article demonstrates the basic concepts of discourse theory and offers a model of practical application of discourse analysis to determine the liturgical identity of the early American Pentecostals and Ukrainian Pentecostals of the Soviet period.

The author demonstrates that if there are common elements in the history of the origin of the Pentecostal movement and the similarity of the dogmatic basis, the causes of misunderstandings should be sought in the hermeneutics of liturgical discourse. The "apostolic discourse" of the early American Pentecostals tended to maximize the deconstruction of all forms of worship in order to maximize the revelation of human nature for the knowledge of God. The discourse of "biblical fidelity" of the Soviet Pentecostals was formed during the period of information isolationism and brutal persecution on religious grounds. Combined with the Baptist tradition of regulated worship and Eastern Orthodox ideas of spirituality, the Soviet Pentecostals formed their own local liturgical tradition.

The comparison of mystical manifestations and practices performed between the representatives of the Azusa Street Revival and the Soviet Pentecostals clearly illustrates the above theses.
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Introduction

In 2021, all Ukrainian Pentecostals celebrate the anniversary of centenary of the beginning of missionary work of Ivan Voronaev (1885-1937). Ivan Voronaev received the Pentecostal doctrine about baptizing by Holy Spirit from Glad Tidings Tabernacle (NYC) and became of missioner of Assemblies of God. For eight years, Voronaev has established near 1,000 churches and groups with more than 25,000 believers in USSR. During terrible period of information isolation of the Church in the USSR Voronaev’s disciples developed own local theology which found expression in the liturgical discourse.

As well-known, in 1991, Ukraine proclaimed the independence and local pentecostals began to build “bridges of communications” with western organizations of pentecostals. Ukrainian period of freedom showed them that they have similar doctrines with the "Assembly of God of the United States" and "Church of God". But there was a noticeable difference between the US church stile of Sunday service and local church traditions of Ukrainian Pentecostal movement in the liturgical practice of worship and rituals.

The development of interdisciplinary researches open new methodological perspectives for modern researches in theological and religious studies. One of the promising areas is the use of methods of discourse analysis to study the theological identity and worldview matrix of the religious group, the influence of its theological ideas in society, the formation of value ideals, and so on.

The purpose of the article is to model the practical application of the methodology of discourse analysis of liturgical ritual forms to identify the church identity of the national Pentecostals.

To achieve this goal, the author performs the following three research tasks:

First, a definition of discourse in the light of historical context and modern linguistics will be proposed.

Second, the author will demonstrate examples of the use of the concept of discourse analysis in modern empirical theological research.

Third, we will consider the possibility of using discourse analysis to interpret the theological and liturgical identity of a religious group (on the example of the Pentecostal movement).

Research methods

For this research, we have used the method of discourse analysis, method of comparative analysis and the method of theoretical modeling.

Result and Discussions

Modern theory of discourse began to emerge in the middle of the twentieth century as an independent field of scientific knowledge based on works of Z. S. Harris, M. Heidegger, Paul-Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jürgen Habermas, Teun Adrianus Van Dijk, Louise Phillips and Marianne Jogrensen.

Among the modern authors of the post-Soviet space, the most significant are the works of V. Karasik (2002) and M. Makarov (2017).

The concept "discourse" is widely used today by various humanities like philosophy, philology, sociology and combines a number of controversial meanings. For this reason, first of all we have to clarify the concept of "discourse".

The term "discourse" was widely used in theology and philosophy to interpret epistemological principles, the first
anthropological and social theories. In the twentieth century, two trends emerged in linguistics, which interpreted the concept of discourse differently. The first is known as "formalism" or "structuralism", and was characterized by the study of the abstract form of language and its structure. The second trend is "functionalism" and it is characterized by an interest in the purpose for which language is used. Representatives of these trends proposed their own definitions of discourse.

According to Deborah Cameron from University of Oxford, linguists’ study of the language as the “system of systems” led to the first, most common formulation of term “discourse” as “language above a sentence”. According to this definition, discourse analysis “seeks patterns and structure in elements that are broader than one sentence” (Cameron, 2015: 28).

The next definition of “discourse” is formulated as “language in action”. Its means: “language used to do something or mean something”, or “language is created and interpreted in the context of the real world”.

Limiting the description of the evolution of the content of the concept of “discourse”, we note that this concept has undergone significant development in linguistics in the works of Norman Fairclough and Teun van Dijk. The following definition was given: “… discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, purpose and addressee), which are necessary for understanding the addressee” (Khumratullin, 2009). For Teun Van Dijk, “discourse must be understood as an action” or as “text in context” or “an event that must be described empirically” (van Dijk, 2013: 47).

M. Stubbs identifies three main characteristics of discourse: first, "discourse is a unit of language that is formally more than one sentence"; secondly: "in terms of content, the discourse is related to the use of language in a social context"; third, "the discourse must be interactive and in a text organization" (Karasik, 2002: 189).

Interactivity of intertextuality is the basis of the methodology of discourse analysis. After all, “texts do not have meanings in themselves; they make sense only in the process of interaction with other texts, the discourses with which they are associated, the ways of their production, "scattering" and consumption. Discourse analysis is aimed at studying how texts acquire meaning in these processes, as well as their role in the construction of social reality in the process of creating meanings” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002).

In conducting a discourse analysis, M. Halliday proposed to accept social interaction as the "central unit of research". Which means, for M. Halliday: "everything is a text that matters in a certain situation"; and "the text means a continuous process of semantic choice" (Tycher et al., 2017: 52).

Jay Lemke as expert at discourse analysis argues that "we speak with the voices of our societies, and to the extent that we have individual voices, we shut them out of the social voices that ares available to us. We are appropriating the words of others to express one’s own word" (Cameron, 2015: 35). D. Cameron notes, "discourse analysis can be seen as a method of studying the ‘social voices’ available to people whose language is collected by analysts" (Cameron, 2015: 36).

In sum, discourse analysis has become an alternative approach to the study of language and relations in society, exploring the influence and power of language (Cipriani, 2002: 3).

Karasik distinguishes several types of discourse: domestic, artistic, scientific, business, philosophical, religious, political, and even advertising and computer. That is, discourse is formed in the speech act as an interaction between actors in various information fields (Karasik, 2002: 41-66).


The subject of the study of religious and theological discourses can be any sacred text that is an expression of worship. For examples a sermon, a song, a prayer or a sacred ritual (liturgy). The study of theological discourse allows a researcher to conduct empirical research in theology.

An important example of the application of the methodology of discourse analysis in religious and theological research is a collection of works edited by Hans Schilderman "Discourse in Ritual Studies" (2007). The proposed publication is an example of an empirical approach to the study of theology. The authors focused on the study of liturgical forms of the Roman Catholic Church in three perspectives: theoretical, empirical and hermeneutic.

Hans Schilderman emphasizes that the liturgy always attracts the attention of researchers, because it is an outward manifestation of the public worship of the Church and the practice of community faith conducted according to the precepts of formal conduct. The researcher argues that any religion becomes known through its public representation. Historically, the liturgical model has become the embodiment of the Church’s faith and the expression of Christian dogmas. In relation to practical Christian life, fidelity to the liturgical tradition is equated with fidelity to God. Therefore, the discourse analysis of liturgical church rituals opens a new level of understanding of the role of the church and its relationship with society in the spheres of human dignity, freedom and justice (Schilderman, 2007: 76).

The proposed methodology for analyzing the liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church can be applied to the study of the identity of Pentecost.

The modern Pentecostal movement has become one of the most dynamic components of world Christianity during 120 years of its development. According to Alistair McGrath, "Today, Pentecost in its various forms is the largest single Christian community since Catholicism and outnumbers all other forms of Protestantism combined" (McGrath, 2017: 575).

It is important to note that the analysis of the names of the various Pentecostal associations demonstrates the dynamics of attempts to be identify with the Apostolic Church of the New Testament. For example, the first Pentecostal communities under the leadership of Charles F. Parchem was called "Apostolic Faith Groups." Later, in the process of institutionalizing religious communities, the name "Assembly of God" and "Church of God" appeared in the United States. The Ukrainian Pentecostals adopted the name "Christians of the Evangelical Faith" in accordance with biblical texts (Acts 11:26 and Philip 1:27), "Philadelphian" is also popularly known among European Pen-
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of the Azusa Street Revival and the local liturgical practice of the Ukrainian Pentecostals.

Table 1. – Comparison of liturgical practice of Azusa Street Revival (1906) and Ukrainian pentecostals in USSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Azusa Street Revival USA (1906) (Robek, 2011)</th>
<th>Ukrainian pentecostals at USSR (1921-1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speaking and singing with tongues and prophecy (&quot;glossolalia&quot;)</td>
<td>All of them accepted it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Writing texts in &quot;other languages&quot;</td>
<td>Unknown practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall down &quot;under the influence of the Spirit&quot;</td>
<td>Forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;Holy rolling&quot; on the floor under the influence of the Spirit&quot;</td>
<td>Forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Holy laughter&quot; (&quot;this phenomenon is better known as the &quot;Toronto Blessing&quot;)</td>
<td>Forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dancing movements during Worship</td>
<td>Forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Applause as an element of expression of worship of God.</td>
<td>Forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The use of specific musical motifs of African Americans</td>
<td>The use of modern music for worship was forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Worship of God in singing and with musical accompaniment.</td>
<td>Depended on the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spontaneity in the sermon, and testimony.</td>
<td>Depended on the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ordination of women to pastoral ministry</td>
<td>Forbidden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the given table, it is clear that the Churches from USSR strictly forbade all mystical practices of the early Pentecostals ("fall down", "Rolling on the floor", "holy laughing" and others), of course, except aux the practice of "glossolalia" as a Gift of Holy Spirit. As well known, for Ukrainian churches, the order of worship and sermon was regulated according tradition of a Baptist churches in USSR. It becomes clear that Voronaev’s followers rejected almost all the mystical actions that were present in the churches at the United States.

The modern liturgical discourse of the Ukrainian Pentecostals, communicated through liturgical practice and preaching, is to preserve the "holiness" and "righteousness" of the Church as the "bride of Christ" (Ps. 44/45). Of course, the process of forming the content of "holiness", "righteousness" and "piety" was influenced by the context of Eastern Orthodox spirituality. In this way, the apostolic discourse of the early Pentecostals was transformed into the local discourse of "fidelity to the truth" of the Ukrainian Pentecostals of USSR. In practical sphere, certainly the lack of understanding of the nature of the formation of the American missionary Pentecostal discourse leads to misunderstanding between Ukrainian and American forms of worship.

According the table, the American and Ukrainian Pentecostals, having a common history and similar doctrines, formed a different liturgics discourse, which led to the closure of local theological churches for cooperation with American missionaries. Therefore, when interpreting the liturgical forms of American and Ukrainian Pentecostals, it is necessary remembering the local context of development of each church group, which influences the formation of liturgical discourse.

Conclusions
Examining the concept of "discourse" in the light of historical context and modern linguistics, it was found that "discourse should be understood as an action" or "an event that must be described empirically". Accordingly, the Pentecostal movement was formed in the discourse of realizing its own mission in the revival of the apostolic faith.

The use of the concept of discourse analysis in modern empirical theological research was demonstrated on the example of the study of rituals of the liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church.

Using a comparison of American and Ukrainian Pentecostals, a parallel analysis of two liturgical discourses was conducted, revealing the reasons why local theological groups did not accept American missionaries, despite the common dogmatic basis.

Thus, a modeling of the practical application of the methodology of discourse analysis of liturgical ritual forms was performed to identify the church identity of the national Pentecostals.
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ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ ДИСКУРС-АНАЛІЗ ПРАКТИКИ ЦЕРКОВНОГО ПОКЛОНІННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ТА АМЕРИКАНСЬКИХ П’ЯТИДЕСЯТНИКІВ

Стаття демонструє основні поняття теорії дискурсу та пропонує модель практичного застосування дискурс-аналізу для визначення літургійної ідентичності ранніх американських п’ятдесятників та українських п’ятдесятників радянського періоду. Показано, що при наявності спільних елементів в історії зародження п’ятдесятницького руху та подібності догматичної бази причини непорозумінь потрібно шукати у герменевтиці богослужбового дискурсу. «Апостольський дискурс» ранніх американських п’ятдесятників тяжів до максимальної деконструкції усіх богослужбових форм із метою максимального розкриття естива людини для пізнання Бога. Дискурс «Біблійної вірності» радянських п’ятдесятників був сформований у період інформаційного ізоляціонізму і жорстких переслідувань за релігійними ознаками. У поєднанні із баптистською традицією регламентованого богослужіння та східно-православними уявленнями про духовність, радянські п’ятдесятники сформували власну локальну літургійну традицію. Проведене порівняння містичних проявів і практик між представниками пробудження Азуза-Стріт та радянськими п’ятдесятниками наочно ілюструє наведені тези.
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