



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED  
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

**ISSN: 0976-9595**

## **Editorial Team**

### **Editorial Board Members**

**Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali**

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

*Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.*

**Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed**

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

*Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.*

**Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi**

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

*Specialization: Politics and International Relations.*

**Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh**

Country: Mashhad Iran.

*Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.*

**Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna**

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

*Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education*

**Dr. Muataz A. Majeed**

Country: INDIA

*Specialization: Atomic Physics.*

**Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan**

Country: Egypt

*Specialization: Agriculture and Biological*

**Dr. Subha Ganguly**

Country: India

*Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.*

**Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU**

Country: India.

*Specialization: Mathematics.*

**Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim**

Country: Iran

*Specialization: Structural Engineering*

**Dr. Malihe Moeini**

Country: IRAN

*Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology*

**Dr. I. Anand shaker**

Country: India.

*Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry*

**Dr. Magdy Shayboub**

Country: Taif University, Egypt

*Specialization: Artificial Intelligence*

**Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich**

Country: Uzbekistan

*Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University*

**Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad**

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

*Specialization: Library and Information Science.*

**Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah**

Country: Iraq.

*Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.*

**Dr. Abdul Aziz**

Country: Pakistan

*Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.*

**Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira** - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

**Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar** - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

**Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara**

Country: India

*Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.*

**Dr. Neda Nozari**

Country: Iran

*Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.*

**Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich**

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

**Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich**

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamotharan Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

## IDENTIFYING CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURSE AND RELIGIOUS DISCOURSE

Turaxonova B.O, UzSWLU

Teaching English methodology department

**Annotation:** Meanwhile, the concept of discourse and, in particular, religious discourse, can be fruitfully applied in the analysis of religious issues. This article examines the concept of religious discourse and its functional features in the context based on the methodological approaches of various humanitarian disciplines. Its research task will be to consider the specific features of religious discourse highlighted by modern humanities, as well as to indicate the ways of its research in the context of the subject field of modern philosophy of religion and linguistic religious studies.

**Key words:** discourse, ritual, religious, sociocultural interaction, language of religion, faith, culture, extra-linguistic conditions, semiotic process.

Discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary area of contemporary humanities. Each social institution of modern society has its own institutional type of discourse. Therefore, in modern philosophy, discourse is one of the most popular ("interdisciplinary") research objects. The topic of discourse analysis arises in the context of logic, semiotics, theory of argumentation, philosophy of language, communication analysis, the problem of inter subjectivity, consensus, legitimation of ethical principles. Discourse is viewed as a whole as a means of constituting society, substantiating social norms.

The term "discourse" is used in several areas of modern humanities. "Today, the category of discourse in the social sciences plays a role similar to that assigned to the euro in the European economy" [1, p.11]. The most represented in the scientific literature are the linguistic and general philosophical directions. Each of them has developed its own definition of the concept of discourse and principles of analysis of discursive strategies and practices according to the subject field of their disciplines. Moreover, it is necessary to constantly remember that the content of this term in linguistics differs from its meaning even in literary criticism, not to mention other humanitarian disciplines, such as philosophy, cultural studies, sociology, psychology, etc.

A. Usmanova in her definition of discourse and discourse "in the broad sense of the word" indicates that discourse (discourse) "is a complex unity of language practice and extralinguistic factors (significant behavior that manifests itself in forms accessible to sensory perception) necessary for understanding the text, i.e., giving an idea of the participants in the communication, their attitudes and goals, the conditions for the production and perception of the message" [2, p. 240]. Traditionally, discourse was understood as an ordered written, but more often oral communication of an individual subject. In recent decades, the term has acquired new shades of meaning and is widely used in the humanities. The frequent identification of text and discourse is connected, firstly, with the absence in some European languages of a term equivalent to the Franco-English concept of discours (e), and secondly, with the

fact that earlier in the scope of the concept "discourse only language practice was included. In the course of the formation of discourse analysis as a special research area, it became clear that the meaning of discourse is not limited to written and oral ut The relevance of the proposed topic is determined by the contextual field of the modern paradigm of the humanities, the specifics of postmodern philosophizing with its "discursive turn", as well as the vagueness of the methodological aspects of using the term "religious discourse" in Russian academic religious studies.

The widespread use of the concept of "discourse" as a generic category in relation to the concepts of "language", "text", "dialogue" in philosophical, sociological and psychological terminology has become the norm. In modern philosophy, discourse is considered as a means of substantiating social norms, constituting society in general, as a conceptual schematization of a democratic system, the idea of an open society or the ideal of free communication, where the participants are equal [3, p. 3]. Hermeneutics, post-structuralism and postmodernism have developed their own, rather specific interpretation of the essence of discourse and related concepts. In the context of the ideas of post-structuralism and postmodernism, discourse is increasingly viewed as a language implementation specific to a particular culture and society, which constructs a certain "social order".

The term "discourse" acquired a philosophical sound thanks to M. Foucault's robots [4]. Discourse is understood by him as a complex set of linguistic practices that take part in the formation of ideas about the object that they allow. In the "archaeological" and "genealogical" searches of M. Foucault, discourse turns out to be a kind of tool of knowledge, which represents a rather unconventional approach to the analysis of culture. M. Foucault is not interested in the denotative meaning of the statement, but, on the contrary, in the subtraction in the discourse of those meanings that are meant, but remain unexpressed. In this regard, the problem arises of analyzing the "discursive event" in the context of extra-linguistic conditions for the emergence of discourse - economic, political, etc., which contributed, although did not guarantee its appearance. The space of discursive practices is conditioned by the ability to combine events of different times in the language that slip out of the power of cultural identification, recreating the dynamics of the real. In discourse, M. Foucault discovers a specific "power of pronouncement", endowed with the ability to assert something. To speak is to have the power to speak. In this regard, discourse is like everything else in society - it is the same object of the struggle for power. Largely due to the robots of Foucault, Althusser, Derridi, Lacan, the French school of discourse analysis is distinguished by its philosophical orientation, attention to the ideological, historical, psychoanalytic aspects of discourse, but also covers extralinguistic semiotic processes.

In communicative philosophy, the emphasis in interpreting discourse is on its interactional nature. Discourse is, first of all, a language immersed in a social context (for this reason, the concept of "discourse" is rarely used in relation to ancient texts). Discourse is not an isolated textual or dialogical structure, since paralinguistic accompaniment of language, which performs a number of functions (rhythmic, referential, semantic, emotional-evaluative, etc.), becomes much more important

within its framework, which actualizes discourse analysis. religious phenomena. Discourse is "an important component of sociocultural interaction" (van Dijk).

From the point of view of modern social linguistics, each social institution of modern society has its own institutional type of discourse. So V. Karasik distinguishes scientific, religious, business, political, mass information, legal, diplomatic, pedagogical, medical, military, advertising, sports and other types of institutional discourse [5, p. 25-33].

Analysis of the language of religion as a whole, the narrative systems of individual religions, confessional written traditions, genre-thematic structure of religious texts seems impossible without analyzing the concepts of "religious discourse", "confessional type of discourse", "discursive sphere of a particular religion" and related transformations that the main epistemic entities (knowledge, thought, faith, fact) and procedures (verification, truth assessment, etc.) will experience in different discursive spheres, since the content specificity and degree of significance of the main epistemic entities of each religion reveals strong dependence on the discursive frame of reference in which they are realized contextually.

Religious discourse is a discourse of faith that dominates rational knowledge and yet allows for revealed knowledge.

In each discursive sphere (scientific, religious, political) these epistemic entities also differ in terms of axiological value and subject distribution. Thus, in the sphere of religious practice, faith as a global worldview category is the highest intersubjective value. At the same time, in the sphere of scientific discourse, which is indifferent to belief, faith in its purely epistemological aspect turns out to be partially demanded, and this semantic variety of faith, as a rule, is reduced to an inferior, "unverified" alien thought.

Verification standards in the field of religious discourse are based on the fact that truth is understood not as correspondence to reality, but as correspondence to the highest, sacred carrier of truth - the Text, and, accordingly, the verification operation, in fact, is combined into a single whole with the explanation operation, is of a textual nature. references. At the same time, attempts to use in the sphere of religious discourse logicalization, emphatically rational verification procedures that are far from it, are regarded as meaningless. If in the sphere of scientific discourse the proposition "God created man" belongs to the class of unverifiable and does not meet the requirements for a fact, then within the framework of religious discourse, the given proposition is considered as a fact that meets the content of the sacred Text and thus passed an adequate verification procedure.

No less interesting is the analysis of the principles of truth assessment of a statement/text in the discursive sphere of religion. In any discursive sphere, evaluative counter-discourse can be carried out within the framework of the criteria "true/false", "right/wrong". Religious counter-discourse allows the presumption of sincerity of the subject of the evaluated text to be observed, and deviation from the truth is considered in this discursive sphere as not controlled by the subject (mistake, delusion, illusion); in addition, the truthful assessment of a religious text can be

supplemented by such a specific parameter as the degree of sufficiency of the author's faith.

Thus, for an adequate analysis of the epistemic parameters of the creation of cultural texts, and especially religious texts, it is very important to clearly fix the boundaries of the discursive sphere in which this activity is carried out.

Religious discourse, understood as a religious text in a situation of real communication, allows different research approaches. From the standpoint of the linguistic approach, which explores the actual linguistic, lexical and grammatical fabric of a religious text, it is possible to analyze religious discourse in terms of the completeness, correctness, and logic of the statements of the text. With this approach, the researcher proceeds from the concept of "correctly constructed discourse" as an ideal type, and possible deviations from it, up to those communicative fragments that cannot be analyzed linguistically.

Within the framework of the sociological approach, from the standpoint of the participants in communication, all types of religious discourse fall into and status-oriented discourse. In the first case, the participants in communication seek to reveal their inner world to the addressee and understand the addressee as a religious person in all the variety of personal characteristics of his faith, in the second case, the communicants act as representatives of one or another religious group, perform the role that is given by the social and communicative situation. Person-oriented discourse manifests itself in two main areas of communication - everyday and existential, while everyday (everyday) communication is a genetically original type of discourse, and existential communication is expressed in the form of a theological dialogue. A status-oriented religious discourse can have an institutional and non-institutional character, depending on which religious institutions operate in society in a particular historical period of time.

The essence of the pragmatic approach is the coverage of the method of communication in the broadest sense. Within the framework of pragmatic concepts of discourse [See: 6], such types of communication as ritual - non-ritual, informative - fascinating, phatic - non-fatal are contrasted.

Certain characteristics of the types of discourse identified on a pragmalinguistic basis intersect. Non-ritual communication, for example, may include informing, fascinating text exchange, phatic and non-phatic components. There are elements of ritual discourse in almost every type of discourse - both in everyday life (there are family rituals) and in institutional ones. It is problematic, however, to single out ritual texts within the framework of existential discourse; it is difficult, for example, to bring the rituality of an artistic or philosophical text to light.

One of the types of discourse identified on a pragmatic basis is the ritual discourse, which has a high symbolic load, meaningful recursiveness, and firm formal fixation. Since the degree of rituality of religious discourse is the highest, the analysis of the specifics and functions of ritual religious discourse turns out to be one of the most fruitful areas of research within this subject field. "Ritual is the language of religion" [7, p. 76], especially in the culture of peoples who do not have a written language.

Ritualization, to varying degrees, is inherent in various types of discourse identified on a sociolinguistic basis, and is specifically refracted in the constitutive features of the types of institutional discourse (goal, participants, chronotope, values, strategies, genres, precedent texts and discursive formulas). This specificity is expressed in the form of a special communicative tone, the essence of which is the realization of the supervalue of a certain situation. The emotional and evaluative sign of such a situation can be either positive (ceremonial action, rewarding, message) or negative (mourning speech, official excommunication). At its core, the ritual is an initiation, i.e. the transition of one of its participants to a new status (confessional, marriage, hierarchical, etc.). The ritual tonality of communication rigidly fixes the hierarchy in the team and substantiates the system of values formed in it.

Thus, religious discourse seems to be an actual object of study within the framework of the philosophy of religion, linguistic religious studies, narratology, cultural studies, as well as a wide range of related disciplines of modern humanities. The analysis of religious texts from the point of view of modern discourse theory makes it possible to study them in a broad sociocultural context, taking into account their specific place in the system of religious worship. It is this approach to the analysis of the Christian written tradition that makes it possible to solve religious problems, since it is the religious discourse that comes to the fore, within which specific texts function, having their own doctrinal and genre-literary specifics.

**The list of used literature:**

1. Makarov M. L. Fundamentals of the theory of discourse. - M.: ITDGK "Gnosis", 2003.
2. Usmanova A.R. Discourse, discourse // Postmodernism. Encyclopedia. - Minsk: Interpressservis; Book House, 2001. - S. 240.
3. Philosophical thought. - 2000. - No. 2.
4. Foucault M. Archeology of knowledge. - K., 1996; Foucault M. Will to Truth: Beyond Knowledge, Power and Sexuality. - M., 1996. - S.47-96; Foucault M. *ioMre du discourse*. - Paris, 1971.
5. Karasik V.I. The structure of institutional discourse // Problems of speech communication. Saratov: Saratov Publishing House. un-ta, 2000.
6. Karasik V.I. Ritual discourse // Genres of speech 3. - Saratov: College, 2002.
7. Gill S.D. Beyond "the primitive": The religions of nonliterature peoples. - Prentice-Hall, 1982.