

Відтак за митрополією Бет–Лапатською зберігалось верховенство. Єпархії в свою чергу очолювались єпископами та хорєпископами, інститут яких поступово сходиться нанівець. У віданні цих ієрархів переважно перебувало опікування численними приходами (парікіями). Подібна схема управління постає лише своєрідним горизонтом розгортання інституціональної структури церкви Сходу. Натомість її потенціал визначався внутрішньою, соборною роботою.

Узагальнюючи про особливості становлення орієнтальних інституцій в межах Ераншахру, варто ще раз наголосити, що основною християнською конфесією, що постала на теренах Персидської імперії був католикосат Селевкіє–Ктесифона. Одним із вирішальних чинників постання католикосату є формування своєрідної у християнському світі ієрократії та пов'язаного з цим процесом становлення єпархіяльної системи управління громадами, основи церковного устрою, що, в свою чергу, стала калькою адміністративно–політичного устрою тодішньої Римської імперії.

#### Список використаних джерел

1. Адонц Н. Г. Армения в эпоху Юстиниана / Н. Г. Адонц. – Ереван: Изд. Ереванского ун–та, 1971. – 526 с.
2. Болотов В. В. Из истории церкви Сиро–Персидской. Глава I. Экскурсе Б. Древнейшие митрополии в церкви Персидской / В. В. Болотов // Христианское Чтение. – СПб., 1899. – Т.1. – №2. – С.323–349.
3. Болотов В. В. Из истории церкви Сиро–Персидской. Глава II. Экскурсе Г. Что знает о начале христианства в Персии история? / В. В. Болотов // Христианское чтение. – СПб., 1900. – Т.1. – №1. – С.65–99; №3. – С.428–439.
4. Болотов В. В. Лекции по истории Древней Церкви / В. В. Болотов. – Т.II. История церкви в период до Константина Великого. – К.: Изд. им. свят. Льва, 2005. – 492 с.
5. Болотов В. В. Лекции по истории Древней Церкви / В. В. Болотов. – Т.III. История церкви в период Вселенских соборов. – К.: Изд. им. свят. Льва, 2005. – 340 с.
6. Вебер М. Социология религии (Типы религиозных сообществ) / М. Вебер // Избранное. Образ общества. – М.: Юрист, 1994. – С.78–308.
7. Восточные отцы и учителя Церкви IV века. Антология в 3 т. / Автор и составитель иером. Иларион (Алфеев). – Т.3. – М.: МФТИ, 1999. – 455 с.
8. Евсевий Памфил. Жизнь Блаженного Василевса Константина / Евсевий Памфил; Изд. 2–е. – М., 1998. – 352 с.
9. Пигулевская Н. В. Культура сирийцев в средние века / Н. В. Пигулевская. – М.: Гл. ред. вост. лит., 1979. – 246 с.
10. Селезнёв Н. Ассирийская Церковь Востока. Исторический очерк / Н. Н. Селезнёв. – М.: АЦВ, 2001. – 104 с.
11. Fiey J.–M. Assyriens ou Aramiens / J.–M. Fiey // L'Orient syrien. – 1965. – X. – P.141–160.
12. Wigram W. A. An Introduction to the history of the Assyrian Church or the Church of the Sassanide Persian Empire 100–640 A. D. / W. A. Wigram. – London, New York: S.P.C.K.; E.S. Gorham, 1910. repr: Piscata Way: First Gorgians Press Edition, 2004. – XVIII, 318 p.

#### References

1. Adonc N. G. Armenija v jepohu Justiniana / N. G. Adonc. – Erevan: Izd. Erevanskogo un–ta, 1971. – 526 s.
2. Bolotov V. V. Iz istorii cerkvi Siro–Persidskoj. Glava I. Jekskurs B. Drevnejshie mitropolii v cerkvi Persidskoj / V. V. Bolotov // Hristianskoe Chtenie. – SPb., 1899. – T.1. – №2. – S.323–349.
3. Bolotov V. V. Iz istorii cerkvi Siro–Persidskoj. Glava II. Jekskurs G. Chto znaet o nachale hristianstva v Persii istorija? / V. V. Bolotov // Hristianskoe chtenie. – SPb., 1900. – T.1. – №1. – S.65–99; №3. – S.428–439.
4. Bolotov V. V. Lekcii po istorii Drevnej Cerkvi / V. V. Bolotov. – T.II. Istorija cerkvi v period do Konstantina Velikogo. – K.: Izd. im. svjat. L'va, 2005. – 492 s.

5. Bolotov V. V. Lekcii po istorii Drevnej Cerkvi / V. V. Bolotov. – T.III. Istorija cerkvi v period Vselenskih soborov. – K.: Izd. im. svjat. L'va, 2005. – 340 s.
6. Veber M. Sociologija religii (Tipy religioznyh soobshhestv) / M. Veber // Izbrannoe. Obraz obshhestva. – M.: Jurist, 1994. – S.78–308.
7. Vostochnye otcy i uchiteli Cerkvi IV veka. Antologija v 3 t. / Avtor i sostavitel' ierom. Ilarion (Alfeev). – T.3. – M.: МФТИ, 1999. – 455 s.
8. Evsevij Pamfil. Zhizn' Blazhennogo Vasilevs Konstantina / Evsevij Pamfil; Izd. 2–e. – M., 1998. – 352 s.
9. Pigulevskaja N. V. Kul'tura sirijcev v srednie veka / N. V. Pigulevskaja. – M.: Gl. red. vost. lit., 1979. – 246 s.
10. Seleznjov N. Assirijjskaja Cerkov' Vostoka. Istoricheskij ocherk / N. N. Seleznjov. – M.: ACV, 2001. – 104 s.
11. Fiey J.–M. Assyriens ou Aramiens / J.–M. Fiey // L'Orient syrien. – 1965. – X. – P.141–160.
12. Wigram W. A. An Introduction to the history of the Assyrian Church or the Church of the Sassanide Persian Empire 100–640 A. D. / W. A. Wigram. – London, New York: S.P.C.K.; E.S. Gorham, 1910. repr: Piscata Way: First Gorgians Press Edition, 2004. – XVIII, 318 p.

**Kondratieva I. V.**, Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Religious Studies, Kyiv National University Taras Shevchenko (Ukraine, Kyiv), [irynd.k@i.ua](mailto:irynd.k@i.ua)

#### Features of the formation of the institutions of the church of the East

The article discusses the issues of identification of the Christian East institutions related to the Oriental Christianity, namely, the peculiarities of formation of one of the institutional structures of Iranshahr – the future Eastern Church. Emergence and development of a peculiar type of the Christian hierocracy as well as formation of the church system's foundations are discussed. It is noted that the Seleucian Department was the one to become the seat of the First Hierarch of the Church and the residence of the Eastern Church.

**Keywords:** church, eparchy, institutionalization, bishopric, hierarchy, ordination, hierocracy, Catholicosate, state, system, management.

\* \* \*

UDC 261.6:230.2

**Shatalov Ye. O.**, competitor of the Department of Cultural Studies of the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University (Ukraine, Kyiv), [yevgen.shatalov@gmail.com](mailto:yevgen.shatalov@gmail.com)

#### THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE AND COMMUNITY IN THEOLOGY

The article presents the role of language and community in theology in the Stanley J. Grenz's theological methodology. The language plays a vital role in Grenz's theological method. In the process of dialogue with contemporary linguists and philosophers, Grenz abandons the referential theory of language together with the correspondence theory of truth. The main thesis of modern theologians is that language creates symbolic space or the context in which reality finds its realization (be it Ultimate or even our daily reality). The contemporary speech–act theory shows that language does much more than only shaping the community sociologically. Knowledge can be personal but it can also be communal, and in this way, we can really talk about community «interpreting». Considering the importance of ritual and narrative for our knowledge formation together with the symbolic nature of language, which is able to direct one's participation in God, we conclude that community is vital for Christian epistemology.

**Keywords:** language, community, knowledge, narrative, communitarian theology, Stanley J. Grenz.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Stanley J. Grenz belongs to those theologians who, first of all, try to «discern the times» before discerning the framework of theology. In his works he constantly draws our attention to the fact that we no longer belong to the age of modernity. Grenz clearly understands that any theology is never done in a vacuum but is always culturally and historically dependent. Discussion of any theological method for Grenz needs to

have its opening with epistemology; therefore, his entire methodological proposal is oriented around communitarian epistemology. Here I sketch why discussion of epistemology becomes so important in theologizing. According to Grenz, during the days in the new world of modernity, Christianity started losing ground and, as a result, Protestant scholastics tried to make Christian theology compatible with the new empirical science. While looking for sure foundations in the theology, some reduced them to a universal human religious experience. Others found them in the propositions of an error-free Bible, which was a storehouse for divine revelation and could endow one with epistemological certitude. In this methodological endeavor, conservatives and liberals alike took their cue from the modern scientific method in their actual theologizing. The current transition from the modern to postmodern era challenges the church and its mission to the emerging generation, which is being nurtured from the postmodern well. It is evident that the church cannot hold to the theological and epistemological categories of modernity without any examination if it wants to reach contemporary people. Thus we can see that Grenz appears to be one of the revisionist pioneers who call theologians and churchmen alike to start doing theology in the postmodern context.

The language plays a vital role in Grenz's method. In the process of dialogue with contemporary linguists and philosophers, Grenz abandons the referential theory of language together with the correspondence theory of truth. However, I think that neither truth nor function of language can be best explained along pragmatic lines alone. Therefore, I believe a deeper, perhaps even more mystical dimension of language needs to be examined for a truly communitarian theology. In his presentation of the postmodern gospel Grenz insisted that it should be more mystical (and not irrational), but he never developed this theme in his method.

#### *Symbolic Nature of Language*

Naugle as well as Grenz argues that the whole of culture must be studied as a communicative phenomenon. He also believes that signs create and comprise humans' worldview and that semiotics is best conceived as a general theory of culture. Naugle talks about worldviews. However, Grenz's «interpretative framework» seems to be the same thing as Naugle's *Weltanschauung* by definitions and by their use. Therefore, at this point I will use some of David Naugle's material to expand the work of Grenz. The reason for this lies in the essential semiotic nature of human person. Naugle states: «A defining trait of persons as persons who possess *logos* is the ability to use one thing to stand for another thing (*aliquid stans pro aliquot*), to section off one part of reality and employ it to refer to, mean, or stand for another part of reality. ... In turn they [humans] have developed a symbol system of letters, words, and written discourse to represent the same. By these primary semiotic activities, people have been able to parse the cosmos and to create maps of reality» [9, p. 292].

I share this vision because indeed symbolic epistemology lies at the very heart of biblical narrative. Human beings as the *imago Dei* are signs or images of a Trinitarian God whose relation and nature are also conceived semiotically, for the ingenerate Father is known only to himself only by beholding his own image in his Son (2 Cor 4:4; Heb 1:3), and both of them are revealed to us by the Holy Spirit, who shares coeternal relations with Father and Son (John 15:26). To this should be added that not only humans but the entire

universe manifests the ontosemiotic Trinity and thus should be interpreted pansemiotically as the song of God's glory and power (Ps 19:1; Isa 6:3; especially Rom 1:20) [Ibid., p. 293].

The notion that symbols permeate all aspects of our culture and are essential to cognition and communication is vital for Eastern and Western theological traditions as well. Alexander Shmeman [10] and Hans Urs von Balthasar [See 5, p. 70] both have argued that language creates symbolic worlds in which people live, move and have their being. Theological and ecclesial language renders the spiritual reality and thus serves as a vehicle for divine communication. Symbol in Christian theology and practice, according to Alexander Schmemman, is not merely «a representation» of reality but rather its «epiphany». The very Greek term *symbolw* meaning «to connect» or «hold together», points to the epiphanic nature of symbol. By means of its participation in reality, symbol connects us with the reality it «symbolizes» [10, p. 43–49]. The main thesis of these theologians is that language creates symbolic space or the context in which reality finds its realization (be it Ultimate or even our daily reality). It is not that the words themselves bear a kind of transcendent attachment. But it is that symbolic space created by language is able to manifest transcendent. Therefore they argue for the meditative symbolic function of language, which is necessary for Christian theology.

Of course, not all language is semiotic, and symbols are woven into much broader category than language. But generally speaking, language is the symbol and semiotic nature of our world, and some of language in particular, point that language is able to connect us to Reality. Believing this, Christians would rather die than deny publicly their faith in Jesus. That is why confession, blessing and liturgical prayer played a role in creating a sacred space and public speech-act of exorcism or prayer of renouncement with faith freeing a person from demonic powers. Therefore, I think that some level of correspondence is necessary for explaining the Christian faith and thus doing communitarian Christian theology.

#### *Speech-acts Theory*

Here I would like to utilize a speech-act theory as a possible perspective for integrative language into Christian theology. Caneday's criticism of Grenz, for example, also suggests paying more attention to the speech-act theory [3, p. 157]. The contemporary speech-act theory shows that language does much more than only shaping the community sociologically. While neither Schmemman nor von Balthasar appropriated the theory it, nevertheless, presents conclusions very similar to theirs. Besides describing things language expresses feelings, creates space and literally does things. The theory demonstrates that language is multidimensional and performative [2, p. 32–35]. Applying the notion of speech-acts to theology Vanhoozer defines language not as a mere tool for information processing, but as a rich medium of communicative action and personal interaction. As Hebrews 1:1–2 says God's speech to humans proceeded «in many and various ways» but most definitively «by a Son». This means that God *does* something when he *says* something. Since Scriptures are «the very words of God» (Rom 3:2) they should properly be understood not simply as deposit of revelation but as one of God's mighty acts – his mighty communicative action. It is Jesus who is God's definitive Word (something that God says and does), but Scripture is

necessary to extend his action [13, p. 47–48]. These insights require a deeper and more symbolic understanding of the way language functions.

To go further we might note that the cross is the most extraordinary communicative act of God, for example. On the cross, God communicates much more than information (not simply propositions). In his crucified Word, God communicates the reality of salvation itself, its promise and assurance. Nevertheless, the perlocution of this communicative act – a share in the divine life – is not an automatic consequence of God's utterance. Unless the illocution of God's act is received and appropriated by a hearer it does not really communicate salvation. Yet, the perlocutionary effect of God's communicative act remains possible because it transfers the truth of the Word to humans. The Spirit today is active not in producing new illocutions, but rather in ministering the illocutions of the text [Ibid., p. 65–67]. Indeed, John 3:16 fails as a performative utterance unless certain background realities actually exist and the propositional content describing those realities is actually true. In a similar manner, the Eucharist as Church's communicative action where Christians «proclaim the Lord's death until he comes» (1 Cor 11:26) will lose its perlocutionary power if there is no reality behind it. There are indeed certain ecclesiastical practices that use language in order to perform things (exorcisms, confessions, repentance, marriage, etc). The speech-act theory, together with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, presents a promising perspective for the use of religious language. Of course I do not mean that the words simply «hang» by their transcendent meaning and that by using them we can manipulate reality. This sounds like magic. The point I am trying to make is to view language as a communicate action (which, as a brief acquaintance with the speech-act theory can demonstrate, never states that the words have their fixed meanings without any context), which can be used by ultimate Reality to communicate itself to us and that language really matters.

#### *Some Revealing Difficulties with Grenz on Language*

Grenz tried to appropriate this concept, but, as I see it, he did not reach a good result. His overall assertion that the Spirit creates through Scripture a communal world is very healthy and right. For Grenz this perlocutionary act of the Spirit is performed through «the illocutionary act of speaking» by «appropriating the biblical text as the instrumentality of the divine speaking» [6, p. 365]. However, several difficulties can be seen here. First, speaking is the locutionary, but not the illocutionary act. Second, as Vanhoozer notes, it is the role of narratives to display a world, and thus is an illocutionary and not a perlocutionary act (elsewhere Grenz also speaks about the world displaying function of narratives) [12, p. 198]. Third, it is not clear at all how Scripture's actual text and content is related to the Spirit's work. Grenz does not want to deal with actual locutions, or text, of the Scripture most likely because of his overall theory of language. Hence, in some way in the Spirit's speaking it is «an illocutionary, and not a locutionary, act» that matters [6, p. 358]. Such an abandonment of the actual text (locution) in favor of its illocutionary content relegates the Scripture. Thus here I side with Vanhoozer, who rightly notes: «The Spirit's creating a world, then, is not a new illocutionary act but rather the perlocutionary act of enabling readers to appropriate the illocutionary acts already inscribed in the biblical text, especially the narrative act of

‘displaying a world’» [12, p. 198]. Scriptural communicative action (as well as its perlocutionary acts) cannot be detached from its locutionary acts. And this works simply because the language itself (and not only the concepts) becomes the vehicle for communication.

#### *Community, Knowledge and Narrative*

Knowledge can be personal but it can also be communal. In this way, it seems to me, we can really talk about community «(interpreting) and, hence, creating reality (not ontologically of course), because our knowledge of this reality is always an interpretation. Also communal knowledge should not be regarded as less superior to individual knowledge. As sociologists confirm people often are not aware of tacit influences made by communities to which we belong [1, p. 60–62]. Again Smith argues that there is nothing wrong with that for it is part of God's design for humans: «As a finite creature I am part of a community, the inheritor of a way or ways of ‘seeing’ the world, part of an interpretative tradition. We are always traditioned. We are always part of a tradition and always see through tradition – that is, we are human» [11, p. 152]. And since every interpretation is always conditioned by prejudice, a certain tradition or authority could be the source of legitimate prejudice [8, p. 162–64]. The community that teaches me to read and write creates my «linguistic tradition» and thereby opens possibilities for interpretation. The community then teaches me to interpret and I am never without them and this is simply part of my being human [11, p. 103].

Crucial to this model is that all humans naturally interpret the information they receive through a grid of expectations, memories, stories, moods, etc. In other words one's worldview functions as a lens that conditions information received. That is why Grenz argues that human experience has a narrative form and as a result it can be understood only in the narrative form [7, p. 272]. Also N. T. Wright, for example, reminds us that these metaphorical lenses, through which one comprehends reality, have a great deal to do with the communities to which one belongs. Hence he says: «Every human community shares and cherishes certain assumptions, traditions, expectations, anxieties, and so forth, which encourage its members to construe reality in particular ways, and which create contexts within which certain kinds of statements are perceived as making sense» [14, p. 36]. Hence, according to Wright, we make sense of multitudes of incidents in our life by drawing on story-forms already known to us and by then placing the information within them [Ibid., p. 40–44]. Stories and narratives form a symbolic world for which people are inclined to live and die. Stories bear a symbolic world in which humans can find a secure cognitive home. Naugle shows that since Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, philosophers have always understood that the human mind and consciousness are developed under the weightiness of stories and their plots. Stories bear an explanatory power which provides humans with the answers to questions concerning their identity and overall meaning of the world. Stories then can be compared to the hidden framework of a house that imparts meaning to life and thus holds it together [9, p. 297–298].

If Christian faith, as well as knowledge, is both personal and corporate then one needs both to believe in Christ as Savior personally and «to contend for the faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints» (Jude 3). Communal knowledge exists in different forms but mostly in forms



of narratives, rituals and certain traditions. That is why, as Grenz rightly emphasized, a communitarian theology is always *traditional* (keeps dialoguing with Christian tradition) and *narrative* (appropriates Christian tradition narratives). Therefore biblical narrative as it is presented by Christian tradition, becomes that which fashions our communal identity and is an indispensable epistemological hallmark. At this point Grenz again understood the nature of communitarian theology rightly.

If narratives are so important for our knowledge formation (and thus understanding of the world), why do we rarely talk about them? Only the architects of the modern project did their best to rid humans of their «primitive» and «troublesome» tales. Now narrative has been relegated to private life and the domain of values. Modern man brought a new scientific foundation for his existence and needed no more of the primitive mythologies of bygone religious or metaphysical eras [Ibid., p. 299]. The narrative unity of human life was destroyed in the context of modernity. Drawing on the work of Alisdair MacIntyre, Naugle states that a truly virtuous life exists only to the extent that it is conceived as a whole. Human existence should be, then, grounded in the integrity of narrative which links birth, life, and death into a coherent story embraced communally. For MacIntyre, these are narrative plots that reign in a human community which endows people with roles, determines the way they understand themselves and presents the structure of the world [Ibid., p. 301].

Considering the importance of ritual and narrative for our knowledge formation together with the symbolic nature of language, which is able to direct one's participation in God, we conclude that community is vital for Christian epistemology.

Coherentism, pragmatism and eschatological realism compose the ground for Grenz's epistemology. In my mind, it is really hard to find epistemological refuge within pragmatist and coherentist systems alone, even with an eschatological twist. Pragmatism can easily justify believing false things. It is also clear that pragmatism also needs non-pragmatic justification for beliefs about the goals that community pursues. So, I want to hold to the ideals of truth, healthy rationality, and objectivity but, at the same time, to acknowledge the provisional, fallible and contextual nature of human reason and the importance of communal epistemology. Since all knowledge is always mediated via interpretative frameworks and all data is theory-laden, I acknowledge that no set of data can be deemed foundational. But due to the aspectival realism (or even soft perspectival realism) concept, we can say that some true knowledge still gets through. What is the alternative then? Being honest I do not see how we can start theologizing without accepting something as basic and foundational (but not in the sense of classical foundationalism). Our contemplation on the nature of theological truth and revelation might present a hint, however.

The importance of ritual in communal life is well attested in Eliot Deutsch, «Community as Ritual Participation» [4, p. 15–27].

Due to the pragmatic nature of a postconservative theological enterprise, the question of truth becomes marginal in Grenz's method. Therefore, a strong notion of Christocentric (revelational) truth and reality, which are «eschatological» as well as «realized» is needed.

Hence, agreeing with Grenz on the hermeneutical nature of our knowing, we refuse eschatological realism in favor of hermeneutical or aspectival realism. This path opens before us a possibility of modest objectivity, based on the doctrines of Creation and Redemption. Whereas our reality is constructed by our language, it must not be stripped of all transcendent meaning, since the reality constructed by language has a carries a soteriological impact (even on a prelinguistic level). The power of language does not reside in its ability to promote some sort of magic, but rather in its function of creating sacred spaces. Thus, we can say «language saves», not by itself, but by the virtue of the reality it creates. The semiotic approach to all Christian communicative actions does better justice in describing how language works. Otherwise, the Christian community with its vision of «transcendent» is one among many trapped in the midst of language-games. Thus, a better post-foundational theological method is required. Hermeneutical realism is, nevertheless, realism and thus requires a cartographic model of knowledge formation that acknowledges the provisional nature of knowledge (thus map), realizes the importance of communal traditions and memory but retains the authority and truth not of our own making (revelation). In my opinion, this communitarian cartographic approach might be called a moderate constructivist view.

Contrary to Grenz, I have argued for a «realized» notion of truth and reality. This inevitably led me to consider a minimalist account of the correspondence of language, due to its symbolic nature, and thus, to preserve its connectedness with the transcendent (even if indirectly). In a manner similar to Grenz, I actually argued that language does things and creates realities into which God's Word can penetrate. After making this revision of Grenz's method, I have demonstrated that if we are to put this methodology into practice, the question of Christian Tradition will be the first to consider. Community might be a sphere where hermeneutics of trust could be practiced and thus certain tradition might become an authoritative guide for «reading» Scripture and all of the reality with the church. Community then becomes a narrative koinonia where participants are endowed with a Christian worldview, and therefore, a «non-foundational foundation» for our knowing or compass for orienting on the map of reality.

#### References

1. Adam A. K. M. Faithful Interpretation: Reading the Bible in a Postmodern World. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2006.
2. Brown Jeannine K. Scripture as Communication: Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academics, 2007.
3. Caneday Ardel B. «Is Theological Truth Functional or Propositional? Postconservatism's Use of Language Games and Speech-Act Theory». In Reclaiming the Center: Confronting Evangelical Accommodation in Postmodern Times. Eds. Millard J. Erickson, Paul Kjoss Helseth, and Justin Taylor. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 2004: P.137–160.
4. Deutsch Eliot. «Community as Ritual Participation». On Community: Boston University Studies in Philosophy and Religion 12 (1991): 15–27.
5. Dupré Louis. Religious Mystery and Rational Reflection: Excursion in the Phenomenology and Philosophy of Religion. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998.
6. Stanley J. Grenz, The Spirit and the Word: The world-creating function of the text in Theology Today 57:3 (October 2000).
7. Grenz Stanley J. and Olson Roger E. (1997). 20<sup>th</sup> Century Theology: God & the World in a Transitional Age. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press 1991, P.15–27.

8. Moltmann Jurgen. «Knowing and Community». On Community: Boston University Studies in Philosophy and Religion 12. 1991: P.162–177.
9. Naugle David K. Worldview: The History of a Concept. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2002.
10. Schmemman A. Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.
11. Smith James K. A. The Fall of Interpretation: Philosophical Foundations for a Creational Hermeneutics. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
12. Vanhoozer Kevin J. First Theology: God, Scripture & Hermeneutics. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
13. Vanhoozer Kevin J. The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical–Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
14. Wright N. T. New Testament and the People of God. Volume 1 of Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1992.
15. Wright N. T. Paul in Fresh Perspective. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2005.
16. Zizioulas John. Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.

**Шаталов Є. О.**, пошукач кафедри культурології, Національний педагогічний університет ім. М. П. Драгоманова (Україна, Київ), yevgen.shatalov@gmail.com

#### Роль мови і спільноти у теології

*Стаття репрезентує роль мови та спільноти в теології, згідно теологічної методології Стенлі Дж. Гренца. Мова відіграє важливу роль у теологічному методі Гренца. У процесі діалогу з сучасними лінгвістами та філософами Гренц вимовляється від референційної теорії мови і кореспонденційної теорії істини. Основна теза сучасних теологів полягає в тому, що мова створює символічний простір або контекст, в якому реальність знаходить свою реалізацію (чи то абсолютна, чи то навіть наша повсякденна реальність). Сучасна теорія мовленнєвого акту показує, що мова відіграє значно більшу роль, ніж лише формує суспільство у соціологічному аспекті. Знання може бути особистим, але воно також воно може бути і спільним, відповідно, маємо підстави вести мову про спільноту «інтерпретацію». Беручи до уваги важливість ритуалу та нарративу для формування нашого знання разом із символічним характером мови, здатного уможлилювати причетність до Бога, зроблено висновок, що спільнота є принципово важливою для християнської гносеології.*

**Ключові слова:** мова, спільнота, знання, нарратив, богослов'я спільноти, Стенлі Дж. Гренц.

\*\*\*

УДК364.142

**Чорнобай В. А.**,  
аспірантка кафедри культурології,  
Національний педагогічний університет  
ім. М. П. Драгоманова (Україна Київ),  
lerachern@icloud.com

#### САМОТНІСТЬ І СТАТЬ: ГЕНДЕРНІ ВІДМІННОСТІ В ПЕРЕЖИВАННІ САМОТНОСТІ СЕРЕД ХРИСТІЯН

*Робиться огляд джерел, присвячених основним відмінностям у переживанні самотності чоловіками і жінками. На підставі проведеного дослідження, відмічається, що самотність як багатоаспектне явище супроводжується різним спектром почуттів респондентів в залежності від статі. Вказується на зв'язок між самотністю і певними особистісними особливостями, такими як занижена самооцінка і не толерантне ставлення самотніми жінками до чоловіків, та тривожність і несформованість життєвих цілей у самотніх чоловіків. Доводиться, що проблема духовної самотності сприймається чоловіками значно гостріше, ніж жінками, особливо у старшому зрілому віці.*

**Ключові слова:** самотність, духовна самотність, комунікативна самотність, емоційна самотність, стать.

Феномен самотності завжди залишався і залишається однією з найбільш актуальних проблем для

наук, що вивчають людину і суспільство, до якої в різний час зверталися представники гуманітарних напрямків, збагачуючи розуміння цього феномену. У зарубіжній науці вивчення самотності пов'язане з іменами Ж.–П. Сартра, З. Фрейда, Е. Фромма, А. Камю, Р. Вейса, Дж. Зілбурга, В. Дж. Дерлеги, С. Маргуліса, К. Мустакаса, Л. Пепло, Д. Перлмана, К. Роджерса, Х. Саллівана, та ін. [4].

Серед російськомовних авторів вивченням самотності як соціально–психологічного феномена активно займалися І. Кон, О. Зінченко, Ж. Пузанова, Л. Старовойтова, Г. Тихонов, Т. Шагівалєєва; у дослідження культурно–історичних форм самотності внесли свій внесок С. Ветров, О. Данчева, М. Покровский, Ю. Швалб, Т. Шкурко та ін. [4]. Соціально–філософському аналізу феномена самотності, а також її гендерним аспектам присвячені роботи Н. Романової, Н. Цветкової та ін.

Наведений огляд досліджень, звичайно, не є вичерпним, але він показує, що в науковій літературі названа проблема досліджувалася з різних сторін, але, все ж таки, недостатньо. Зокрема, практично немає досліджень, присвячених порівнянню гендерних аспектів переживання самотності серед жінок та чоловіків. Поки що на вітчизняних наукових горизонтах існує значно більше робіт, присвячених вивченню самотності серед жінок, ніж чоловіків [4; 6; 8; 9]. Практично відсутні роботи, які всебічно вивчають спосіб життя самотніх чоловіків та жінок з числа християн, які не перебувають у шлюбі.

Об'єктом даної статті є самотні жінки та чоловіки сучасного українського християнського суспільства як соціально–демографічна група. Предметом аналізу є гендерні особливості суб'єктивного переживання самотності серед жінок та чоловіків з числа християн, що не перебувають у шлюбі.

Для виявлення сутності феномену самотності проведено аналіз ранніх та сучасних філософських уявлень, який показав, що на сучасному етапі розвитку суспільства слабшає відсоток тісних міжособистісних контактів, відносини все більше деперсоналізуються, формалізуються. За словами дослідниці проблеми самотності у сучасному суспільстві Н. Романової, «у зростаючому темпі суспільного життя люди змушені постійно адаптуватися до нових соціальних ролей, інтенсивно підтримувати соціальні контакти як в реальному світі, так в соціальних мережах, які здебільшого стають вимушеними і поверхневими. Люди відокремлюються від самих себе, не розуміють своїх власних бажань. Незадоволення потреби особистості в змістовному взаємно збагачуваному спілкуванні, прив'язаності і довірі до іншої людини породжує самотність» [8, с. 291]. Таким чином, можна сказати, що самотність як об'єктивна проблема сучасності зовсім не втрачає своєї актуальності, а навпаки, лише загострюється з часом.

Аналізуючи тему переживання самотності, ми вирішили дослідити поширеність цього явища та гендерні особливості у сучасних українських жінок і чоловіків, та порівняти отримані дані із результатами подібних закордонних досліджень. Метою дослідження стало: вивчити рівень і особливості суб'єктивного переживання самотності християнських жінок і