

**Petro Matskiv**

Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
of Drohobych, Ukraine

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1853-5375>

Tetiana Botvyn

Ukrainian Academy of Printing,
Ukraine

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8590-8664>

The Semantic Scope of the Lexeme *Fear* in the Biblical Text

Abstract

The article is devoted to the peculiarities of the functioning of the lexeme *fear* [*strakh*] in the text of the Scriptures in the sphere of sacrum—profanum; the authors have described the method of research of emotional vocabulary in the linguistic aspect. The semantics of the mentioned word in a profane expression has been considered and based on the method of dictionary definition, etymological, contextual and conceptual analyses, and a complex approach. The authors have traced the understanding of fear in the sacral manifestation (fear of God), relying on the divine nature of this occurrence, which goes beyond the natural understanding of the studied phenomenon. The fear of God in the Bible should be considered as *blahohovinnia* [awe], which has three levels of manifestation: initial: it arises as gratitude to God for forgiven sins and leads a person to awe before the Lord and helps to save his soul. A higher level is the feeling of *blahohovinnia* which resides in a person when they stand before God and is ready to obey Him in everything. The highest level of awe is the concept of absolute service to God when there is no fear but only love.

The source language clearly distinguishes the concept of natural fear and supernatural fear, whose linguistic signs are separate lexemes, whereas in the Ukrainian language (as well as in Ukrainian translations of Scripture) the expression of these meanings occurs with the help of lexemes *strakh* [fear], *bohobiynyi* [God-fearing], *pobozhnyi* [pious], *boyatysia* [to fear], *shanutaty* [to honour] that does not correlate with the primary source.

Keywords

lexeme, fear, awe, fear of God, Bible, sacrum, profanum

Wilhelm Wundt, Oleksandr Potebnia, adherents of the linguistic ideas of Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt about language as spiritual existence (Humboldt, 1984, 307—323) define language as a spiritual phenomenon and treat it as a complex symbolic system, which is closely connected with the energy of the individual and the energy of the cosmos (Wundt, 1984; Potebnia, 1993). The philosopher Mykola Berdyaev wrote about the human microcosm, which contains absolutely everything that exists in the universe (macrocosm). The word occupies a special place in it: “The word is cosmic in its essence [...] and the human being is the world arena, the microcosm, because the world sounds in it and through it, therefore the word is anthropocosmic” (Berdyaev, 1994, 175).

It is vital to study the reflection of various aspects of religious consciousness in language for several reasons. Firstly, “irreligious consciousness is incapable of discovering a practical system of values around which a society can be organised” (Shreider, 1993, 3). Thus, religious content is always valuable because it seeks answers to the most important questions of existence, and language encodes these answers. Religious values become the meaning of life for a believer. Secondly, as Rogers Brubaker claims: “Language and religion are perhaps the two most socially and politically significant spheres of manifestation of cultural differences in the modern world,” being “the main sources and forms of social, cultural and political identification” (Brubaker, 2013, 2). Perception of the connection between language and religion as two forms of social consciousness is necessary for the characterization of the entire national collective, their worldview and self-awareness, which are largely formed under the influence of religious views, and it is especially relevant within the framework of the linguoculturological paradigm of linguistics. The power of verbal energy is especially evident in sacral texts. That is precisely why the study of the biblical text based on the mentioned hypotheses is attracting more and more attention of linguists specializing in emotional vocabulary.

The article elucidates the semantic peculiarities of the lexeme *fear*, analyses the peculiarities of the functioning of this lexeme in profane and sacral images in Ukrainian translations of the Bible.

Methodology

The semantic description (reconstruction) of the word in the research is based on the methods of dictionary definition, of etymological, contextual, conceptual and discourse analysis, and presents a comprehensive approach.

The method of dictionary definition is the starting point for understanding the semantic scope of a given lexeme. It is known that the dictionary definition contains only basic (nuclear) semes, which also reflect the meaning on a separate synchronic slice and therefore cannot reproduce the main components of the “knowledge of the world.” The second step towards revealing the semantic history of the word is turning to its etymology. Etymological data enable identifying the stages of the semantic development of the word, reproducing its ancient meanings, and thus supplementing its contextual analysis, and helping to build its semantic variants in a certain diachronic perspective. Analysing etymological data also expands the idea of a word’s associative connections in the biblical text and helps to find additional shades of its meaning when studying its use in context.

Contextual analysis provides greatest opportunities for studying the completeness of semantics, where the context is considered not only as a tool of analysis or an argument in favour of certain semasiological reconstructions, but also in terms of its structure. Linguists distinguish four types of the context:

1. System context, which reveals the lexical and grammatical compatibility of the word.
2. Linguistic context, that is a set of syntactic constructions, related in content and structure, expressing one of the micro-themes.
3. The context of the whole work, which reveals the culturally significant associations of the word, its connection with thematic and narrative discursive features.
4. Extralinguistic historical and cultural context, which includes all the knowledge and ideas of native speakers about a particular subject in a definite era. This usually includes data on the history, archeology, mythology, ethnography of the people. This type of context helps to reveal the meaning of a single word, as well as the extralinguistic causes of semantic shifts of lexemes. (Rusiatskene, 1990, 6)

Thus, contextual analysis, taking into account the etymological data on the word, allows the researcher to approach the true meaning of the lexeme, its semantic nuances, while revealing the influence of extralingual factors on the semantic dynamics of the word.

Contextual analysis in some way emphasises (complements) the discourse analysis, which traces the variability of the functioning of the researched language units in other textual formations. In this particular case, these are the main translations of the Bible into Ukrainian: *The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments* (translated by Panteleimon Kulish, Ivan Levytskyi, Ivan Puliui), *Gospel* (translated by Pylyp Morachevskyi), *The Bible, or the Books of Scripture of the Old and New Testaments* (translated by Ivan Ohiyenko), *Scripture of the Old and New Testaments* (translated by Ivan Khomenko), *The Bible* (the fourth complete

translation from the ancient Greek language by the hieromonk Father Raphael (Rafail Turkoniak)).

In the present article, the authors apply the comprehensive approach substantiated by Juri Apressjan for the lexical analysis of emotive vocabulary, according to which the initial components of the analysis are: emotions, person, image, language and concept. The interaction of these systems occurs by the following lines of connection: the impact of emotion on a person; a human reaction to the emotion; human comprehension of this reaction and assessment of their own feelings; an associative connection between the nature of the experienced feeling and the signs of physical phenomena; realisation of these associations in language through metaphor; formation of a certain image of emotion in the linguistic consciousness on the basis of numerous metaphorical manifestations of the general type; conceptualising emotion and returning to the starting point through a conceptual connection. Each emotion has its own scenario of origin and development, supplemented by an indication of the systems of emotions expression which form a chain in which each subsequent system is more complex than the previous one (Apressjan, 1995, 459), and there is also variability of language units which objectivise the researched phenomenon in different discourses. This scenario optimally determines the structure of the interpretation of emotions.

Results

In Hebrew, the word פחד, according to Strong's Concordance, was polysemous and expressed "fear" [*strakh*]: "A state of excitement, anxiety, worry caused by the expectation of something unpleasant, undesirable" (SUM 1970—80, vol. 9) and "awe" [*blahohovinnia*]: "The greatest, most sincere respect, honour; boundless love; piety" (SUM 1970—80, vol. 1). According to other sources, the word is monosemous, expressing fear in everyday (profane) manifestation, while "fear of God" is explicated by another lexeme ה' יראת, denoting "awe" [*blahohovinnia*]. The lexeme פחד, at a certain (primary) historical stage of its functioning, might have been a polysemant because in ancient times the meanings of words were syncretic. It was the semantic indivisibility of the meaning of an ancient word which could be expressed in the combination of completely different, sometimes incompatible, concepts in one word, explicating the sacral/profane opposition, originally embedded in the semantics of this lexeme. Later, one of the meanings declined, causing the appearance of a new word ה' יראת, which restores and actualises the missing

meaning. That is, in the source language, there is a clearly distinguishing line between the concept of natural fear and a supernatural one. There is no such structuring of fear in the Ukrainian language (more precisely, in Ukrainian translations). The data of the etymological analysis of the lexeme *strakh* [fear], despite its polysemy, reveal only signs of natural fear. The Proto-Slavic word *strakh* (originally [freezing with fear/numbness]) may be related to the Indo-European **ster*, which brings it closer to Lithuanian *stregti, stregiu* [to freeze with fear, to turn to ice], to Latvian *strēģele* [icicle], Middle High German *strac* [tight/numb], New High German *strecken* [stretch], the Old German *stracken* [to be stretched] (ESUM 1982, vol. 5). In the modern Ukrainian language, the lexeme *strakh* [fear] is polysemous, its semantics objectivises fear in everyday (profane) manifestation:

1. A state of excitement, anxiety, worry, caused by the expectation of something unpleasant, undesirable; An expression/manifestation of anxiety, worry, etc. (on the face, in the eyes, etc.).
2. [usually plural] A fantastic creature of unusual, scary appearance.
3. [as an adverb, colloq.] The same as terrifyingly.
4. [as an adverb, colloq.] Expresses admiration for, surprise at, etc. a large number of someone, something, or in relation to someone or something that is very large, strong, etc.
5. [as an adverb, colloq.] Extremely, very much (SUM 1970—80, vol. 9).

As we can see, the word *strakh* in the Ukrainian language space in none of the meanings is understood as sacral, which creates additional difficulties in reproducing this concept in the Ukrainian versions of the Bible.

We should say, the concept of *strakh* in the profane sense in the Bible is based on the methodology described in this article, while the sacral (Lord's) manifestation of fear has a different (divine) nature and goes beyond the traditional psycholinguistic understanding of this phenomenon.

For the first time in the Bible, the emotion of fear [*strakh*] is mentioned in the Book of Genesis (3: 1—24): the serpent tempts Eve to eat the forbidden fruit from the paradise tree, assuring, “shcho dnya toho, koly budete z n’oho vy yisty, vashi ochi rozkryyut’sya, i stanete vy, nemov Bohy, znayuchy dobro y zlo” [that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil] (Gen 3:5).¹ When Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit, their eyes were opened and they recognised their nakedness, but instead of feeling pleasure and joy, the fall caused only a feeling of sadness and anxiety (worry), since nudity used to be synonymous with childlike innocence and purity of the

¹ All English versions of the biblical quotations come from Read Bible Online at www.readbibleonline.net.

first people. Before the people tasted the forbidden fruit, they had no idea of shame [*sorom*] because they had done nothing wrong (Gen 2:25). The fear of a sick conscience of Adam and Eve, who had lost their innocence and purity, overpowered their mental abilities which they decided to hide from God (Gen 3:8), seeking refuge from Him in their naive blindness under the leaves of the trees of paradise. The above-mentioned authors then observe the growth of this emotion after the voice of the Lord was heard: “Pochuv ya Tviy holos u rayu i zlyakavsya, bo nahyy ya, i skhovavsya” [I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself] (Gen 3:10). The source of fear in this episode is temptation, and its future victims are not aware of this at the initial stage, then we see external changes (nudity), which generate the emotion of anxiety. The latter, in turn, induces protection (hiding), and at the last stage, anxiety grows into fear (as punishment for sin). Adam chooses a kind of protection—self-justification, not repentance (which God might have been waiting for), which led, as we know, to the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise and a radical change in God’s relationships with people.

The Book of Exodus (15:14—16) describes an episode focused on the feelings and emotions of the Philistines after receiving the news of the Jews leaving Egypt, of God’s constant help on the way of their deliverance. After the Egyptians, the Philistines were the first people with whom the Jews were constantly at war (Gen 13:17) because the main enemy was defeated: “Pochuly narody i tremtily, obhornula tryvoha meshkantsiv zemli fylystyms’koyi! Starshyny edoms’ki todi pobentezhylys’, moavs’kykh vel’mozh obhornulo tremtinnya, rozplyvlysya usi khanaantsi! Napaly na nykh strakh ta zhakh, cherez velych ramena Tvoyoho zamovkly, yak kamin’, azh poky pereyde narod Tviy, o Hospody, azh poky pereyde narod, shcho yoho Ty nabuv!” [The peoples have heard, they tremble: Pangs have taken hold on the inhabitants of Philistia. Then were the chiefs of Edom dismayed; The mighty men of Moab, trembling taketh hold upon them: All the inhabitants of Canaan are melted away. Terror and dread falleth upon them; By the greatness of thine arm they are as still as a stone; Till thy people pass over, O Jehovah, Till the people pass over that thou hast purchased]. The fear of being destroyed and captured is explicated here through external physiological manifestations: *tremtily*, *obhornulo tremtinnya* [trembled], a conceptual metaphor which objectifies this feature; specific experience of fear: *pobentezhylys’*, *rozplyvlysya* [dismayed, melted away]. The last word in the Ukrainian language is a polysemant and in one of the meanings, figurative “lose clarity of outlines; to become indistinct (in fog, twilight, dizziness, etc.)” acts as an approximate semantic correlate of the original word (Hebrew מָלַג, “to melt, to cause melting”), due to neurophysiological signs: *zamovkly, yak kamin’* [they are as still as a stone]. Strong fear is known to limit an

individual's perception, thinking, and freedom of choice. Man stops belonging to himself, he wants one thing—to avoid threats. Usually this emotion causes paralysis, as in the case described). Psychologists have no specific explanation for this phenomenon. However, there is speculation that we inherited this reaction from our animal ancestors, who froze, pretending to be dead when in danger of becoming prey for the predator. And although the emotion of fear refers to negative emotions, it can still play a positive role in a person's life. As the context shows, this emotion has a high intensity: “Napaly na nykh strakh ta zhakh” [Terror and dread falleth upon them].

In the book of Joshua (2:9—11), the same event is interpreted (cf.: i skazala do tykh lyudey: YA znayu, shcho Hospod' dav vam tsey Kray, i shcho zhakh pered vamy napav na nas, i shcho vsi meshkantsi ts'oho Krayu umlivayut' zo strakhu pered vamy. Bo my chuly te, shcho Hospod' vysushyv vodu Chervonoho morya pered vamy, koly vy vykhodyly z Yehyptu, i shcho zrobyly vy obom amoreys'kym tsaryam, shcho po toy bik Yordanu, Syhonovi ta Ogovi, yakykh vy vchynly zaklyattiam. I chuly my tse, i zomlilo nashe sertse, i ne stalo vzhe dukhu v lyudyny zo strakhu pered vamy, bo Hospod', Boh vash, Vin Boh na nebesakh uhoru y na zemli doli!) [and she said unto the men, I know that Jehovah hath given you the land, and that the fear of you is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land melt away before you. For we have heard how Jehovah dried up the water of the Red Sea before you, when ye came out of Egypt; and what ye did unto the two kings of the Amorites, that were beyond the Jordan, unto Sihon and to Og, whom ye utterly destroyed. And as soon as we had heard it, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more spirit in any man, because of you: for Jehovah your God, he is God in heaven above, and on earth beneath]. Neurophysiological features dominate here: meshkantsi ts'oho Krayu umlivayut' zo strakhu, zomlilo nashe sertse, i ne stalo vzhe dukhu v lyudyny zo strakhu. If the prototype in the Book of Exodus is the emotion *strakh* [fear], then in the Book of Joshua it is *zhakh* [horror]. The components of these emotions are explicit in the first case, in the second case they are explicit and implicit. But taking the English equivalent into consideration, we can assume that there is no lexeme “fear” here. This notion is expressed with the help of the verb “to melt / melt away.”

Then, we examined the emotion present in the Book of Job, in which it is objectified in various forms and penetrates the vast majority of its chapters. Its general context is important for considering individual episodes. It consists of many conversations of Job, a wealthy and noble man who was suddenly struck by poverty and a serious illness. He could not cope with those trials. It was these events which determined his emotional state—a state of despair, loss of meaning in life. The author reflects on the eternal problems of man—the mystery

of God's ways, uneven distribution of goods among people, the suffering of the righteous and the welfare of the wicked, as well as on whether faith and piety are the result of visible goods or an unchanging inner gift (Vykhliantsev, 1998). We note that Job, with the help of the Lord, found the right answers to these questions. His doubts vanished. He sincerely repented and disavowed what he had said (Job 42:6).

In Chapter 3, verses 24—26, the process of unfolding fear and its inner manifestation can be traced: “Bo zidkhannya moye vyperedzhuye khlib miy, a zoyky moyi polylys', yak voda, bo strakh, shcho yoho ya zhakhavsya, do mene prybuv, i choho ya boyavsya pryshlo te meni... Ne znay ya spokoyu y ne buv vtykomyrenny, i ya ne vidpochyv, ta neshchastya pryshlo!...” [For my sighing cometh before I eat, And my groanings are poured out like water. For the thing which I fear cometh upon me, And that which I am afraid of cometh unto me. I am not at ease, neither am I quiet, neither have I rest; But trouble cometh] (Job 3:24—26). The source of this fear is illness (potential death), which makes his life meaningless. Job experiences a state of mental confusion (neurophysiological features), which is exacerbated by constant sighs and groans (external manifestations). This confusion is joined by something terrible, which he is afraid of and cannot get rid of (inner content). Here Job alludes, perhaps, to the visions which we learn in Chapter 4: “u rozdumuvannyakh nad nichnymy vydinnyamy, koly mitsnyy son obiy maye lyudey, spitkav mene zhakh ta tremtinnya, i bahato kostey moyikh vin strusonuv, i dukh pereyshov po oblychchi moyim, stalo duba volossya na tili moyim...” [In thoughts from the visions of the night, When deep sleep falleth on men, Fear came upon me, and trembling, Which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; The hair of my flesh stood up] (Job 4: 13—15) and Chapter 7: “to Ty snamy lyakayesh mene, i vydinnyamy strashysh mene... I dusha moya prahne zadushennya, smerty khochut' moyi kosti. YA obrydyv zhyttyam... Ne poviky zh ya zhytymu!... Vidpusty zh Ty mene, bo marnota otsi moyi dni!... [Then thou scarest me with dreams, And terrifiest me through visions: So that my soul chooseth strangling, And death rather than [these] my bones. I loathe [my life]; I would not live alway: Let me alone; for my days are vanity] (Job 7:14—16). Feeling confused, being exhausted by visions, Job cannot calm down for a moment. This fragment clearly demonstrates the following forms of fear: anxiety, fright, scare, dread, horror, panic, obsessive fear (phobia). The last form of fear (pathological) is clearly objectified in Chapter 7 (Verses 14—16), which is given above.

For Job, death is desirable because it would relieve the painful condition—the loss of understanding of the life meaning. Knowing the cause of suffering and fears could be a relief in his sad situation; but they are secret, he remains in

ignorance, “bo ne znyshchenyy ya vid temnoty, ani vid oblychchya svoho, shcho temnist' zakryla yoho!” (Because I was not cut off before the darkness, Neither did he cover the thick darkness from my face) (Job 23:17). One of Job’s three friends, Eliphaz (Job 22:1—30), tries to explain the reasons for his fear and suffering by saying that he “deserved” them and derives this view from the thesis of divine justice, noting that God punishes the righteous and sinners equally severely. The Lord’s attitude towards them all is not determined by a man’s desire to benefit himself and avoid harm. God punishes the sinner not because He is afraid of him and seeks to remove the threat from Himself, and He rewards the righteous not to encourage his great virtue and thus to bring benefit. Next, Eliphaz lists Job’s sins: he refused a thirsty man a sip of water and a hungry man a piece of bread; expanded his possessions by seizure; the requests and pleas of widows and orphans were ignored, and so on. All this, to Eliphaz’s mind, led Job to such a finale of life. This unjust and cruel accusation unleashed the wrath of God on Eliphaz and his friends: “Zapalyvsya Miy hniv na tebe ta na dvokh tvoyikh pryatelig, bo vy ne hovoryly slushnoho pro Mene, yak rab Miy Yov” [My *wrath* is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath] (Job 42:7), and only the burnt offering to the Lord (Job 42:8—9) and Job’s prayer were able to avert His anger (an emotion which, along with disgust and contempt, is part of the hostility complex (Izard, 2003)).

At the beginning of the research the authors have given the meaning of the lexeme strakh in the source language, which combines the emotion of *strakh* and the emotion of *blahohovinnia*, forming binary opposition at the profane level, but this binarity is eliminated in the sacral manifestation, in which *strakh* [fear] and *blahohovinnia* [awe] merge: khto boyit'sya Boha, toy blahohoviye pered Nym, i navpaky—khto blahohoviye pered Nym, toy i boyit'sya Yoho z bohobiynym trepetom, zakhplyuyuchys' Hospodn'oyu velychchyu, svyatistyu, nedosyazhnoyu Bozhoyu slavoyu i nezbahnennoyu Bozhoyu sutnistyu [Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace, whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe] (Heb 12:28). To study this phenomenon, the authors will include discourse analysis, investigating the variability of the functioning of the researched language units in other textual formations.

Man, who does not feel fear of God, lives only an earthly life in which there is no place for communication with God. Man is seized by the fear of “non-existence,” whose inner content is the loss of meaning of earthly life (the authors have examined this form of fear above).

Fear of God can be interpreted as a strong desire to do His will with a firm belief in the Lord’s righteousness. The feature of a true Christian is *lyubov do blyzhnikh* [love for neighbours], *poslukk Bozhomu Slovu* [obedience to God’s

Word] (1 John 2:4,10), and *blahohovinnya* [awe]. The last feature in the biblical text is expressed by the lexemes *bohobiyyny* [God-fearing] (Ohiyenko, Khomenko), *pobozhnyy* [pious] (Kulish, Morachevskyi), *boyatysya*, *shanuvaty* [to fear, to worship] (Turkoniak): Ta my znayemo, shcho hrishnykiv Boh ne poslukahaye; khto zh *bohobiyyny*, i vykonuye volyu Yoho, toho slukhaye Vin (John 9:31); My znayemo, shcho Boh ne vyslukhuye hrishnykiv, koly zh khtos' *pobozhnyy* i yoho volyu chynyt'—os' toho vin vyslukhuye! (John 9:31); Adzhe vidomo, shcho hrishnykiv Boh ne slukhaye, ale koly khto Boha *shanuye* i chynyt' yoho volyu,—toho vin slukhaye (John 9:31). The Ukrainian lexemes are expressed with the phrase “to be a worshipper of God.”

The fear of the Lord in biblical discourse must be considered while paying attention to the understanding of divine incarnations in Old and New Testament discourses: God the Father of Old Testament discourse is never equal to the believer, although they are in a dialogical relationship; God the Son of evangelical discourses in his human incarnation is present next to the believer directly and is visible to him, making the believer potentially equal to God. The very appearance of Christ, the earthly incarnation of God, testifies to the fact that God changed His attitude to man and to the world, having parted with the functions of judge, legislator and having equated Himself with His creation: “Tak bo Boh polyubyv svit, shcho dav Syna Svoho Odnorodzhenoho, shchob kozhen, khto viruye v N'oho, ne z'hynuv, ale mav zhyttya vichne” [For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life] (John 3:16). The evangelist John continues to explain this event in detail: “Ne v tomu lyubov, shcho my polyubyly Boha, a shcho Vin polyubyv nas, i poslav Svyatoho Syna vblahannyam za nashi hriky” [Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son [to be] the propitiation for our sins] (1 John 4:10). In Old Testament times, God appointed an offering system for atonement for sins, but this was a temporary solution in anticipation of the coming of Jesus Christ, who was to die on the cross, becoming an intercessory sacrifice for sin. In the New Testament, the Saviour who was promised in the Old Testament is revealed in all his fullness and glory. The New Testament gives the greatest commandment of love, which affirms all the Law and the Prophets, demonstrating the unity of the Old and New Testaments. That is why the fear of the Lord in the New Testament is “absorbed” by love: “Strakhu nemaye v lyubovi, ale doskonala lyubov prohanyaye strakh het', bo strakh maye muku. Khto zh boyit'sya, toy ne doskonaly v lyubovi” [There is no fear in love: but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath punishment; and he that feareth is not made perfect in love] (1 John 4:18). So, as the authors show, the binary opposition in the meaning of this emotion disappears, leaving only the emotion *blahohovinnia* [awe]: not fear, but

awe is a manifestation of love for God, that is, *blahohovinnia* is an organic component of love. On the one hand, man creates a sense of closeness to God and an awareness of the desire in his soul to become closer to God, and on the other hand, there is a sense of separation and awe before God and, consequently, recognition of imperfection, which must be perfected to be close to the Lord.

The fear of God in the Bible, as it is shown in our research, should be considered as *blahohovinnia*, which has three levels of manifestation: the word in the Bible is primarily the creative word of God, which is at the beginning of everything. Owing to its unlimited power, it communicates with reality and creates it: “Bo skazav Vin i stalos’, nakazav i z"yavylos” [For He said and it was, He commanded and it appeared] (Ps. 32:9).

The initial level of *blahohovinnia* is well illustrated in Chapter 86 of the Book of Psalms: “Berezhy moyu dushu, bo ya bohobiynnyy, spasy Ty, miy Bozhe, Svo-ho raba, shcho na Tebe nadiyu klade!” [Preserve my soul; for I am godly: O thou my God, save thy servant that trusteth in thee] (Ps 86:2); “YA budu vsim sertsem svoym vykhvalyaty Tebe, Hospody, Bozhe Ty miy, i slavyty budu poviky Im"ya Tvoye, velyka bo mylist' Tvoja nado mnoyu, i vyrvav Ty dushu moyu vid sheolu hlybokoho!” [I will praise thee, O Lord my God, with my whole heart; And I will glorify thy name for evermore. For great is thy lovingkindness toward me; And thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest Sheol] (Ps 86:12—13). Great gratitude to God that “vyrvav Ty dushu moyu vid sheolu hlybokoho!” [hast delivered my soul from the lowest Sheol] leads a person to treat the Lord with awe and helps to save his soul.

A higher level is the feeling *blahohovinnia* [awe] arising in a person when he stands before God and is ready to obey Him in everything. Abraham understands and feels the blessing of God and wants to obey Him unconditionally, ready to sacrifice his son. And only an angel of God can stop him in this act: “Anhol promovyv: Ne vytyahay svozeyi ruky do khloptsya, i nichoho yomu ne chyny, bo teper YA dovidavsya, shcho ty *bohobiynnyy*, i ne pozhaliv dlya Mene syna svoho, odynaka svoho” (Gen. 22:12) [And he said, Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him. For now I know that thou *fearest* God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me].

The highest level of *blahohovinnia* [awe] is the concept of absolute service to God. This level of *blahohovinnia* is fully described by the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Romans: “Khto nas rozluchyt' vid lyubovy Khrystovoyi? *Chy ned-olya, chy utysk, chy peresliduvannya, chy holod, chy nahota, chy nebezpeka, chy mech*. Yak napysano: Za Tebe nas tsilyy den' umertvlyayut', nas uvazhayut' za ovets', pryrechenykh na zakolennya. Ale v ts'omu vs'omu my peremahayemo Tym, Khto nas polyubyv. Bo ya peresvidchysya, shcho *ni smert', ni zhyttya, ni Anholy,*

ni vlady, ni teperishnye, ni maybutnye, ni syly, ni vyshyna, ni hlybyna, ani inshe yake stvorinnya ne zmozhe vidluchyty nas vid lyubovy Bozhoyi, yaka v Khrysti Isusi, Hospodi nashim!” [Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? *shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?* Even as it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; We were accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that *neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature*, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord] (Rom 8:35—39). The lexemes in italics objectify forms of fear which are overcome by love for God. The words of the evangelist John, already quoted by the authors, become even clearer (Strakhu nemaye v lyubovi, ale doskonala lyubov prohanyaye strakh het' [...]) [There is no fear in love: but perfect love casteth out fear [...]] (1 John 4:18).

In fact, such an understanding of *strakh* [fear], or rather *blahohovinnia* [awe], becomes clear when in the biblical text fear is correlated with *mudrist'* [wisdom], *premudrist'* [great wisdom], *syl'na nadiya* [strong hope], *chystota* [*svyatist'*] [purity (holiness)], *krynytsya zhyttya* [the source of life], etc. (Cf.: I skazav Vin lyudyni todi: Tazh strakh Hospodniy tse mudrist', a vidstup vid zloho tse rozum! [And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is *wisdom*; And to depart from evil is understanding] (Job 28:28); Strakh Hospoda chystyy, vin naviky stoyit'. Prysudy Hospoda pravda, vony spravedlyvi vsi razom [The fear of Jehovah is clean, enduring for ever: The ordinances of Jehovah are true, [and] righteous altogether] (Ps 19:9), U Hospodn'omu strakhovi *syl'na nadiya*, i Vin prystanovyshche dityam Svoym [In the fear of Jehovah is *strong confidence*; And his children shall have a place of refuge] (Proverbs 14:26); Strakh Hospodniy *krynytsya zhyttya*, shchob viddalyatysya vid pastok smerty [The fear of Jehovah is a *fountain of life*, That one may depart from the snares of death] (Proverbs 14:27).

Discussion

The source language clearly distinguishes between the notion of natural fear and a supernatural one, whose linguistic signs are individual lexemes, while in the Ukrainian language (as in Ukrainian translations) the expression of these meanings occurs with the help of the noun lexeme *strakh* [fear], as well as the adjectives *bohobiyyny* [God-fearing], *pobozhnyy* [pious], the verbatives *shanuvaty* [to honour],

boyatysya [to fear], that does not promote the exact reproduction of the meaning of the biblical source. Some meanings of the word *strakh* explicate the manifestation of admiration, surprise, and so on, or they express the maxima of something “Extremely, very much” (SUM 9, 753). There are senses in these meanings which can potentially correlate with the sacral dimension, but they are not substantial. The linguistic unit God-fearing is an example of a one-dimensional (atheistic) interpretation of the semantics of this adjective in the Soviet times: “Yakyy slipo viruye u vladu boha i tserkvy, boyit'sya porushuvaty zapovidi tak zvanoho svyatoho pys'ma” (SUM 1, 209). The authors have kept the spelling here unchanged. The sign formation *pobozhnyy* [pious] (cf.: “1. The one who zealously performs all religious rites; a believer/characteristic of a religious, pious person. 2. Associated with religion; churchlike. 3. Solemn, full of sincere honour, infinitely devoted; awesome, respectful” (SUM VI, 621)) potentially in a certain context reflects (the 3rd meaning) the idea of absolute love for and obedience to God. The verbalives *shanuty* [to honour], *boyatysya* [to fear] are unsuccessful equivalents to the researched primary source.

The given Ukrainian equivalents, with a few exceptions, secularise the sacral content of the analysed concept. In the analysed Ukrainian translations of the Bible, the authors did not record the most acceptable linguistic equivalent for the original source—the lexeme *blahohovinnya*. This word is to objectify the understanding of *strakh Bozhyy* [fear of God] in the Ukrainian translations of the Bible because this Church Slavonic term *blahohovinnya* is analogous to the ancient Greek term *ελαβεομαι*, which occurs twice in the Greek text of the New Testament (Acts 23:10, Heb 11:7), and also 38 times in the Septuagint. In the Ukrainian language, it is used with the meaning “The greatest, most sincere respect, honour; boundless love; piety” (SUM1, 192). As it is shown, its sacral component is also partially lost, but this is probably due to non-linguistic factors. The literal meaning of the lexeme *blahohovinnya* [awe] is “Fear and humility caused by love and faithfulness to God.”

Conclusions

In the Bible, the concept *strakh* [fear] is shown in profane manifestation and sacral, transcendent one. Sacral fear (fear of the Lord) has a different (divine) nature and goes beyond the psychological (natural) understanding of this phenomenon. Fear of God in the Bible should be seen as awe, which has three levels of

manifestation: initial, high, absolute. The lexeme *blahohovinnia* [awe] is to be present in Ukrainian translations of the Bible to denote the fear of the Lord. The authors are drawing attention to the imperfection of the translation of biblical texts from the original language into Ukrainian, in particular the lexeme fear. In the public consciousness, the concept *strakh* has, first of all, a profane, not sacral, meaning, which is also recorded in explanatory dictionaries. On the other hand, the sacral meaning is not always presented even in religious encyclopedias.

References

- Apressjan, Ju. D. (1995). *Izbrannye trudy* [Selected Works]. Vol. 2. *Integral description of the language and systemic lexicography*. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture.
- Berdyayev, M. (1994). *Filosofiya svobody* [The Philosophy of Freedom]. Moscow.
- Bibliya, abo Knyhy Svyatogo Pys'ma Starogo j Novogo Zapovitu (2012) [The Bible, or the Old and New Testament Scriptures] [trans. by Ivan Ohiyenko]. Kyiv: Ukrainian Bible Society.
- Brubaker, R. (2013). Language, religion and the politics of difference. *Nations and Nationalism*, 19 (1), 1—20.
- Etymologichnyj slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy* [Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]: vol. 7 (1982). Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. Institute of Linguistics of O.O. Potebnia. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Greek Lexicon by Strong* (c). Bob Jones University. <http://www.godrules.net/library/Slavic/>.
- Humboldt, W. (1984). *O sravnitel'nom izuchenii yazykov po otnosheniyu k razlichnym epokham ikh razvitiya* [On the Comparative Study of Languages in Relation to Various Epochs of their Development]. Selected Works on Linguistics. Moscow.
- Hladio, S.V. (2000). *Emotyvnist khudozhnogo tekstu: semantyko-kohnityvnyi aspekt (na materialy suchasnoi anhlo movnoi prozy)* [Emotivity of the Literary Text: Semantic-Cognitive Aspect (on the Material of Modern English Prose)]: dissertation abstract. Kyiv.
- Izard, K. (2003). *Psihologiya emocij* [Psychology of Emotions]. Saint Peterburg: SPb.
- Jewish Lexicon by Strong* (c) Bob Jones University. <http://www.godrules.net/library/Slavic/>.
- Kharkevych, H.I. (2012). *Stan tryvohy v konteksti khudozhnoi semantyky* [A State of Anxiety in the Context of Literary Semantics]. Lutsk: Vezha-Druk.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1987). *Metaphors we live by. Language and modelling of social interaction*. Moscow.
- Potebnia, O.O. (1993). *Dumka i mova* [Thought and Language]. SINTO.
- Read Bible online. For reference of the online Bible*. <http://www.readbibleonline.net/>.

- Rusiatskenskaja, R.A. (1990). *Funkcionalno-semanticheskij analiz leksiki, svyazannoj s ponyatijami «zhizn» i «smert» v yazyke drevneanglijskoj poezii* [Functional and Semantic Analysis of Vocabulary Related to the Concepts “Life” and “Death” in the Language of Ancient English Poetry]: dissertation abstract. Moscow.
- Saveliuk, N. (2020). Eho-stany ta obraz Boha v osobystii molytvi: psykholingvistychnyj analiz [Ego States and the Image of God in Personal Prayer: Psycholinguistic Analysis]. *Psycholinguistics: Collection of scientific works. Series: Psychology*, 27 (1). Perejaslav: FOP Dombrovskaya Ya. M.
- Shreider, Yu. (1993). Peredmova do knyhy [Foreword to the Book:] *Luigi Giussani. Christianity as a Challenge*. Moscow: Moscow Philosophical Fund.
- Slovyk ukrajyns'koyi movy* [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]: in 11 volumes (1970—1980), edited by I.K. Bilodid. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Vezhbitskaja, A. (1997). Tolkovanie emocionalnyh konceptov [Interpretation of Emotional Concepts]. *Language. culture. cognition*. Moscow: Russian Dictionaries.
- Vorobyova, O.P. (1997). Emotivnost hudozhestvennogo teksta i chitatelskaya refleksiya [Emotivity of the Literary Text and Reader’s Reflection]. *Language and Emotions*. Volgograd: Peremena.
- Vorontsov, S. (2016). Some Considerations on the Concept of Religion in the Etymologiae of Isidore of Seville. *Athenaeum-studi Periodici di Letteratura e Storia Dell Antichita*, 104 (1), 245—250.
- Vykhliantsev, V.P. (1998). *Polnyj i podrobnyj Biblejskij Slovar` k russkoj kanonicheskoj Biblii* [Complete and Detailed Bible Dictionary of the Russian Canonical Bible]. Moscow, Koptevo.
- Wundt, W. (1984). *Psikhologiya emotsional'nogo bespokoystva* [Psychology of Emotional Unrest]. Moscow: Moscow University Press.